"Linked Open Apps Ecosystem to open up innovation in smart cities"

Project Number: 297363

Deliverable:	**D6.4. Comparative analysis workshop**
Version:	**1.3**
Delivery date:	**09/10/2015**
Dissemination level:	**PU**
Authors:	**Universitat Oberta de Catalunya**

Summary

This report summarizes the Comparative Analysis Workshop to discuss the sociological evaluation in order to extract conclusions.

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date of issue	Status	Content and changes	Modified by
0.1	15/09/2015	Draft	First draft	Ramon Ribera (UOC)
0.2	30/09/2015	Draft	Revised draft	Ramon Ribera (UOC)
0.3	09/10/2015	Final	Final version	Raluca Ciungu (IMI)

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Acronym	Description
App	Application
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
API	Application Programming Interface

1 Introduction

This document summarises the organization and conclusions of the comparative workshop held on the morning and early afternoon of Tuesday, 8th of October. The workshop had a double aim. On the one hand present the provisional sociological evaluation of WP5 pilots in order to validate them with the consortium partners and, on the other hand, discuss the lessons learnt (challenges, weaknesses and opportunities) during the experimental pilots in order to sustain co-creation process in the future and the sustainability of iCity.

2 The workshop

2.1 Organization

As the development of pilots expanded until July, it was seen convenient to postpone the workshop until results of the pilots were finished and the first draft of the sociological evaluation analysis was available. Due to (a) agenda problems between partners and (b) that many if the issues discussed in the workshop has been already treated partially in the several meetings of the consortium, it was decided to held the workshop virtually through a WebEx Conference.

The meeting was attended by teams participating in the pilots (Barcelona, Bologna, Genoa, Citilab), the project management team, and Retevision, as the main technological partner in the pilots.

2.2 Structure

After a brief introduction by UOC's team, where the goals of the evaluation were presented and changes in the evaluation methodology explained, the workshop was organised in six blocks of discussion. In each of them, there was a 10-15 minutes presentation by UOC's team and open time for discussion for each topic, which depending in the topic lasted from 5 to 15 minutes. The six blocks were:

1. Evaluation of co-creation processes
2. Evaluation of final results of pilots
3. Evaluation of governance processes
4. Challenges faced in the deployment of the project
5. Opportunities raised during the pilots experience
6. Discussion on the overall vision of the pilots

After the discussion on these six blocks, the final part of the workshop was set to validate that the conclusions of the sociological evaluation was coherent with the pilots development.

To prepare the presentations and discussions, previous to the workshop it was set a series of tasks to guarantee an efficient discussion of the sociological evaluation:

- The writing of the first draft of the sociological evaluation report were, after the analysis, preliminary conclusions were taken by UOC's team.

- The distribution of a questionnaire to partners on the governance of the project (figure 1). Partners were asked to consult with local stakeholders and extract the main views on seven questions. The survey was answered by Barcelona, Bologna, Genoa, Citilab, Fraunhofer and Retevision.

- Recompilation and analysis of participant's observation notes by UOC's team in face to face meetings during the project.

- Contrasting results of sociological review with conclusions of the workshop "Can a smart city engineer its ecosystem?" held on October 14th 2014 at the Museo d'Arte Moderna di Bologna with participation of Italian local authorities, stakeholders, and academics participating in different smart city projects.

- Internal workshop of UOC's team to discuss information and analysis of the previous steps held on Monday September the 7th.

Figure 1. **Governance questionnaire**

1. In your opinion, do you think that participation in the project has reached all potential stakeholders and agents? What has facilitated/make difficult that?

2. Do you think that the potentially interested actors in your city were aware of the iCity project and its key potentialities (platform, co-creation, apps....)? And of the iCIty results?

4. Do you think that the iCity goals envisioned by your city were the same that the other partner cities at the moment of implementation? And do they were different from other stakeholders and local actors participating?

5. According to your view, what has been the main conflict(s) that has emerged in developing the project;

      Topic:

      Scale (within the city, between cities, etc.):

      Actors involved:

      Has it been solved?

      If yes, how?

6. At general level, which have been the most positive outcomes of the project?

7. At general level, which have been the most negative outcomes of the project?

2.3   Discussion

The main results of the discussion were:

Evaluation of co-creation processes: there was a general agreement that the processes of co-creation were partially successful. In this regard it was noted that the process raised a lot of interest in local innovation ecosystems, it was well received and that the potential for future developments was seen by stakeholders. However, more than co-creation, the engagement methodology provided process of creation by developers. In this regard, it was pointed the necessity of (a) engaging with citizens and SME and (b) the necessity to explain much better what co-creation means to interested stakeholders.

Evaluation of final results of pilots: discussion was set around the causes of why there were less than expected apps in the project. Though numbers are low, it was clear that the success of developing apps was more a matter of quality and solving citizens' needs than quantity. In addition it was discusses other potential uses of the city iCity platform.

Evaluation of governance processes: based on the questionnaire circulated previous to the workshop, it was discussed the conflicts aroused during the pilots and an exercise of self-reflexivity carried, assessing decisions taken and lessons learnt.

Challenges faced in the deployment of the project: linking with the previous discussions, in this block it was debated the challenges faced in deploying the pilots. For issues were seen as central: first, technical issues and technical-dependencies (delays on the pilots were due to technological delays? Due to lack of control on APIs and data by the cities?); second, an over-optimistic view at the beginning of the project on apps development in what was called an apps hype; third, the reflection on the complexity and diversity of each local innovation ecosystem diversity and co-creation; and fourth lessons learnt in defining and engaging with stakeholders, in particular citizens and users.

Opportunities aroused during the pilots experience: beyond the development of apps, four opportunities were seen as potential uses of the platform: iCity platform as a management tool for urban projects; iCity platform as a real data/real infrastructure learning tool for IT students and potential to integrate them in the local innovation ecosystems; iCity platform useful for resilient urban governance: in the event of social or environmental conflict, the conjunction of coordinated and homogenized data from different open infrastructure can be of great usefulness; and, iCity platform as fundamental part of the sharing economy, both as a way of regulating sharing services and as well as a technological platform for open community sharing economy governance.

Discussion on the overall vision of the pilots: to wrap up the previous debates, this block focused on the overall assessment of the project. Consensus was reach in five points:

1. iCity project was a very ambitious project: open infrastructure, open data and co-creation with citizens. Most of innovative projects try to do one or two at the same time.

2. Clearly the big contribution of the project has been a platform with open infrastructure. An innovative process that presents many difficulties. Difficult to apply *OPEN data/source to Hardware.*

3. Though participants in co-creation processes positively evaluated the pilots and the platform, and some apps were created, so far the project has not been successful in creating many co-creation results.

4. Governance of the pilots framed within the development of the platform and different local innovation systems.

5. However, many unexpected opportunities have been created through experimentation during the project life that can be the base for new innovation.

2.4 Conclusions

All these comments and discussion were incorporated in to the sociological analysis of WP5 Pilots and the reflections were incorporated to D6.5 Pilots sociological evaluation report. Their incorporation was done after contrasting consensual and opposing views of partners with the objective data compiled and analysed by the UOC's team.