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Snapshot of the current situation

• Most of the pilot sites involve local authorities, however in order to avoid time consuming in public procurement,
  • a well-prepared local ecosystem, including both the demand and the supply sides, has entered ACTIVAGE as a whole
  • any new stakeholders to be attracted are limited to the winners of ACTIVAGE open calls
  • all needed devices and services are usually bought by a non-public member of the local ecosystem

➤ One may say that the best practice in the eyes of ACTIVAGE participants has been to try to eliminate the need for public procurement!

➤ So far, there was no need for collective work on this topic, but we are starting to address it as part of the ACTIVAGE exploitation strategy
One interesting case from a previous LSP called ReAAL

- The concept developed by the Puglia region in Italy
  - the suppliers were recruited by the citizens themselves from a list of candidates; the region provided the citizens with vouchers
  - in order to become a candidate, the suppliers had to take some risk in advance and comply with certain criteria, as solutions to deploy had to
    - be based on universAAL (the common open platform in ReAAL)
    - pass two test phases and
    - participate in the planned evaluations
  - Five relevant non-profit Italian associations were contracted to help with the quality of this approach, two of them to consult the suppliers and three of them to consult the citizens

➢ As a matter of fact, the implementation faced several difficulties, both due to elections in Puglia and due to the EC not accepting some costs
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Some important issues

• Local authorities have to follow old regulations not ready for the digital era

• There is a lack of common understanding of the challenges of the digital era in the regions due to the complexity of challenges, such as
  • Isolation of the solutions leads to the fragmentation of personal data in contrast to the expectations from the “networked world” of the digital era
  • The business with personal data “in the backstage" without involving the real owners of the data in this business kills the trust
  • Too confusing market with unclear mainstream open platforms (everybody talks about offering a platform even when in reality offering a solution)
  • The complexity of becoming part of open distributed systems of systems (odSoS) causes that innovation remains confined to vertical or closed solutions; as a result, many potential investors are still trapped in the conventional way of thinking, not really ready for odSoS of the digital era

• Local SMEs that the regions would like to support are not ready for the digital era due to sticking to previous investments & the complexity mentioned above
Possible priorities for the next steps

• Modernize related legislation

• Educate both regions and their local SMEs

• Public funding for innovation that affects SMEs must be aligned very well with a common policy for the digital era and make sure that there is **durable impact** on moving to open evolving systems that are extensible by third parties and can be linked with other open systems without vendor lock-in