

Synthesis Assessment Report of the Project's Interregional Workshops - Final Version (1st to 9th Workshop)



Date: 15 Dec 2012
Project Partner: STROVOLOS, Cyprus

--	--

Project acronym: OSEPA
 Project name: Open Source software usage by European Public Administrations
 Project code: INTERREG IVC, 0918R2

Document Information:

Document title: Synthesis Assessment Report of the Project's Interregional Workshops
 Date of Delivery: 15.12.2012
 Component: CP3
 Component Title: Exchange of Experience
 Component Leader: USFD
 Distribution (Restricted/Public): Restricted to the partners of the Consortium
 Nature: Assessment

History Chart

Date	Changes	Cause of change	Implemented by
December 2012	Initial Document		STROVOLOS

Authorisation

No.	Action	Partner	Date
1	Prepared	STROVOLOS	15/12/2012
2	Approved		
3	Released		

Disclaimer

The information in this document is subject to change without notice.

All rights reserved

The document is proprietary of the OSEPA Consortium. No copying or distributing, in any form or by any means, is allowed without the prior written agreement of the owner of the property rights. This document reflects only the authors' view. The INTERREG Programme is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

Contents

1. Introduction	6
2. Purpose and Scope	7
3. Evaluation Plan.....	8
3. Evaluation of workshops	9
3.1 Sambruk workshop overall impressions	9
3.2 Sheffield workshop overall impressions	10
3.3 Valmiera workshop overall impressions.....	11
3.4 Strovolos workshop overall impressions	11
3.5 RER Overall workshop impressions.....	13
3.6 MFG Overall workshop impressions	14
3.7 Vysocina Overall workshop impressions.....	15
3.8 Bistrita Overall workshop impressions	15
3.9 Final OSEPA workshop impressions.....	16
4. Lessons learnt	17
4.1 Sambruk workshop lessons learned	17
4.2 Sheffield workshop lessons learned	18
4.3 Strovolos workshop lessons learned.....	19
4.4 Valmiera workshop lessons learned.....	19
4.5 RER Overall workshop lessons learned.....	20
4.6 MFG Overall workshop lessons learned	20
4.7 Vysocina Overall workshop lessons learned.....	21
4.8 Bistrita Overall workshop lessons learned.....	21
4.9 Final OSEPA workshop lessons learned	23
5. Workshop Comments & Suggestions.....	23
5.1 Comments & Suggestions for the Sambruk workshop	23
5.1.1 Comments	23
5.1.2 Suggestions	24

5.2	Comments and suggestions for the Sheffield workshop	24
5.2.1	Comments	24
5.2.2	Suggestions	25
5.3	Comments and suggestions for the Valmiera workshop	25
5.3.1	Comments	25
5.3.2	Suggestions	26
5.4	Comments and suggestions for the Strovolos workshop	26
5.5	Comments and suggestions on the RER workshop.....	27
5.6	Comments and suggestions on the MFG workshop	28
5.7	Comments and suggestions on the Vysocina workshop	28
5.8	Comments and suggestions on the Bistrita workshop	29
5.9	Comments and suggestions on the Final OSEPA workshop	29
6.	Thematic areas covered.....	30
6.1	Issues covered through the workshops' cycle	30
6.2	Brainstorming – Exchange of experiences.....	38
7.	Thematic areas not covered as it should	42
8.	Overall Conclusions	43
	REFERENCES.....	46

1. Introduction

This Synthesis Assessment Report of the Project's Interregional Workshops (Final Version) is based on the assessment carried out by the 8 interregional project workshops plus the final workshop organized from KEDKE. The 8 interregional workshops were organized from the partners Sambruk, Strovolos, Sheffield and Valmiera, Regione Emilia-Romagna, MFG Baden-Württemberg, Vysocina and Bistrita .

The purpose of these Workshops was to offer consortium partners (and other EPAs' representatives) the opportunity to exchange knowledge and experiences in various themes of FOSS usage by EPAs.

The OSEPA workshops pursued mainly the following objectives:

- Explore cases of migration at the micro-level (practical and policy-related dimensions of the process of migration to FOSS).
- Facilitate the exploitation of good practices and of lessons learnt by past cases of migration.
- Bring together elected representatives of territorial public administrations and IT managers and other managers of administrations, joined by FOSS developers and members of FOSS communities and experts to enable them benefit from a structured interaction, revolving around a specific thematic area.
- Promote the development of synergies for reciprocal benefits among public administrations and FOSS developers and communities.

The Interregional workshops focused on reviewing cases of good practice at a micro -level exploring and brainstorming on how/when FOSS can be successfully adopted and deliver productivity /cost/strategy gains and studied various use cases through brainstorming sessions. After each workshop ,the attendees answered the workshop assessment questionnaire that was prepared from Strovolos .**This document summarizes and analyzes the findings of the workshops, the partners points of views, the suggestions, conclusions drawn, lessons learnt, and experience exchanged taking into account**

and building on the first year workshop synthesis report . Moreover this report extends the first year's report focusing and placing a special emphasis on the topics covered on these workshops .Elaborating on this we can say that the first priority on this report is to become a comprehensive evaluation on which subjects were analyzed, which were not analyzed, and finally on those that were discussed on some degree but not enough.

2. Purpose and Scope

This document is an analytical report towards the collection of questionnaires from every individual partner regarding all the workshops that took place through the project . The questionnaire makes extensive use of rating scales in (mainly Likert scale questions from 1-5) , ticking answers as well as open-ended questions where the participants can make suggestions and express freely their opinion and thoughts regarding the workshops. A **Likert scale** is a psychometric scale commonly involved in research that employs questionnaires. It is the most widely used approach to scaling responses in survey research, such that the term is often used interchangeably with *rating scale*, or more accurately the **Likert-type scale**.Likert scales result when survey participants are asked to rank their agreement with survey items on a scale that includes ***strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree*** or in our case variations of those responses according to the type of the questions and the issue it seeks to explore. Meaning that we are using a Likert scale with the format of a typical five-level Likert item, that is :

1. **Strongly disagree**
2. **Disagree**
3. **Neither agree nor disagree**
4. **Agree**
5. **Strongly agree**

The objective of this document is to summarize the findings (partners suggestions, negative feedback, lessons learned of the collected questionnaires that were reported in the individual

workshop assessment reports) and give interpretations of the results. Finally the present report has as an overall target & purpose to summarize the partners' views of the workshops' overall organization, covered issues and structure, content covered and content not covered and come to some conclusions .

The Scope of the Workshops' Evaluation Process was closely attached to the following aspirations:

- To assess how effective and efficient were the planning, implementation and monitoring of the project workshops. .
- To examine the extent to which the collective work undertaken by individual partners (thematically and geographically), helped in better addressing the issues concerning the OSEPA Project and the outcomes.
- To examine the thematic areas covered, not covered and partly covered and try to find the reasons why
- To draw conclusions regarding the project's workshops strengths and weaknesses. This body of work can act as a basis of recommendations regarding methodologies and strategic alternatives in order to ensure sustainability of the project's workshops activities, beyond its completion.
- To measure effects/benefits of the project workshops and reach overall conclusions ;

3. Evaluation Plan

The idea of the workshop synthesis report is to be an Evaluation Plan for the OSEPA workshops that took place towards the project and attempt to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success, or the lack therefore, of the ongoing phases and eventually the completion of the Project workshops and their content .

In regards to the above, the evaluation was being undertaken selectively in order to answer specific questions, to provide information on whether the issues covered in the project's workshops development were valid, what worked and what did not work and why.

Additionally this evaluation process aims to determine the overall relevance, validity of design, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the OSEPA Project itself. In general, it meant to focus on monitoring the workshop implementation process and improving the work in progress while increasing the likelihood that the OSEPA project could be successful.

The Evaluation Plan, was conducted with the solid purpose of analyzing the execution of the workshops (objectives, results , activities) comparing the initial plan to the practice. This present evaluation focuses more on appraising the results and outputs of the OSEPA project workshops as a whole, throughout the project lifecycle.

The methodology of the evaluation contains several components: review of the individual workshop questionnaires assessments, the brainstorming sessions/ round tables discussions ' review ,the organizers' overall experience and observations etc.

3. Evaluation of workshops

3.1 Sambruk workshop overall impressions

The participants' feedback indicate that the Workshop session in Malmö was well structured and conducted , as well as prepared on the theoretical part and the practical part . The majority of the participants' learning objectives were met and the overall impression given was that the workshop time was well spent as a constructive and productive event. The structure and the content of the workshop were very well designed which provided to the participants useful information and helped the exchange of experience. The brainstorming sessions were followed by best ideas selection which helped to identify the most important issues discussed during the group discussions. There was a combination of very good academic point of view and practical insights of the participants. The content of the workshop was very useful and very interesting. It covered very important issues of OSS and a lot of views and opinions were exchanged during the workshop that helped us to improve our knowledge on specific issues on OSS. **The main issues that discussed were OSS licences and copyrights** .The most partners believe that the brainstorming and the idea selection parts were the most useful parts of the workshop, since all the issues were

discussed in detail and experiences between participants were exchanged. Throughout the brainstorming during the workshop sessions, many excellent ideas were proposed to persuade Public Administrators to adopt OSS.

3.2 Sheffield workshop overall impressions

The participants' feedback indicates that the workshop organized in Sheffield was well delivered. The workshop included interesting presentations regarding various issues like for example **the cloud computing and punishment**. The participants particularly valued the presentations relating **to cloud solutions, the UK government IT strategy the socio – technical aspect as well as the people perspective of implementing new software**.

Other issues that were discussed were :

- The human aspects of implementing FOSS
- Cloud computing
- UK strategy open-source adoption ideas
- Motivation techniques for employees
- ICT Strategy
- The human aspects of implementing FOSS
- Implementation of new technology from the people perspective.

Nonetheless the partners wished to the workshop had covered issues such as :

- The experience of other municipalities
- Ontologies used in systems to the public sector.
- More presentations about technical OSS solutions and implementations in municipality
- IT infrastructures

The time for questions and discussions during presentations was quite enough. There was a good balance between the different activities .The practical activities were very effective because they were based on the debate and exchange of experiences.

3.3 Valmiera workshop overall impressions

This workshop's presentations were assessed as very informative, enabling to take into consideration cases of other countries at work. For some participants the workshop was better than expected, it had a specific and well defined subject, and provided very good level of discussion among participants. Group brainstorming and discussions were assessed as the most useful and constructive. In addition, presentations and information given by the University of Sheffield and LATA were pointed out as useful. In regard to the usefulness of workshop for work at home, participants found the "Speed brainstorming" section was essential, pointing out that several people from different countries were able to discuss and present FOSS examples, problems etc from their country point of view. However, some questions were very difficult to answer, as well as sometimes discussions were too long and the questions to be discussed - not appropriate since they focused on economic knowledge too much. Moreover, it was mentioned that it was interesting to learn about the **Latvian Open Source Network, as well as cases from other countries** were really useful. The main negative feedback were concerning:

- 1) lack of more details of the economic issue (e.g., is there a benefit analysis done Management issues on FOSS implementation in PA's;
- 2) too little focus on particular topics, i.e., Change Management methodology and end-user acceptance and reluctance to change;
- 3) too complicated and not straight forward questions in the group sessions;
- 4) topics should be more relevant to all partners;
- 5) the workshop discussions had too much focus on the hosting country's situation;
- 6) some of the questions needed evidence from previous academic researched and literature.

3.4 Strovolos workshop overall impressions

The most important conclusions extracted from the Strovolos workshop assessment were that in general the workshop was at a good level, well balanced and organized, included various and interesting topics and the time was well distributed among the sessions. There

was a good interaction between the presenters and the attendees. The basic feedback was that the most partners considered interesting this workshop and its topics and some others believe that it was just a “usual” workshop covering issues that were discussed again in the previous workshops. The most interesting sessions were the speed brainstorming sessions as well as the presentation of various use cases regarding the use of FOSS in Cyprus and other countries. The main negative feedback was regarding the explanation of the project objectives, where an important percentage of partners think that it should be better explained. The main opinion of some partners actually was that the workshop’s objectives and goals were not really clarified. Moreover partners stated that they would like to see in the workshop more live demonstrations as well as more video and audio content. The main sense of the partners was that the workshop could be more technically oriented and especially regarding the existing OSS solutions for EPAs. Nonetheless some partners express the opinion here that the workshop was better than expected and the presentations were very informative. The most popular answers regarding the ways of improving the workshop were that the workshop objectives should be better clarified and the agenda could included more stimulating activities .e.g more technical ones. Other major suggestion was to use tools like videos etc and make the workshop more technical oriented.

The main thematic areas to cover were :

- **“Existing FOSS solutions for public administrations”**
- **“Ways to put pressure on governmental bodies in order to consider FOSS solutions”**
- **“Present Situation in Cyprus /Existing solutions for public administrations in Cyprus”**
- **“Examples to be avoided /Examples to follow”**
- **“Existing FOSS solutions in the private sector and ways to apply these uses in the public sector”**
- **“Ways to put pressure on governmental bodies”**
- **“The University of Cyprus Experience”**

3.5 RER Overall workshop impressions

The OSEPA workshop – organised by Regione Emilia-Romagna – has been held in Bologna on 28 – 29 September 2011. This workshop held presentations from IT and FOSS experts coming from the public sector, the private sector and the universities. The flow of presentations has been intervened by three interactive sessions aiming at facilitating the exchange of opinions and experiences between the OSEPA partners and the expert speakers. The overall rate of the answers goes from positive to highly positive in practically every aspect of the workshop. Nevertheless some answers provided useful hints for possible improvements. The content evaluation was quite positive as well. **The following issues were discussed :**

- **“Open Source in regional Public Administrations: how to support them in adopting FOSS”**
- **Spread and how to use the Free, Libre, Open Source Software in the municipalities of the Autonomous Friuli Venezia Giulia Region**
- **Emilia-Romagna Region “Bologna Municipality experiences on adopting FOSS on desktops”**
- **The Free Software Center South Tyrol: experiences and actions**
- **Organizing for collaborating with OSS communities: why granting autonomy to employees?**
- **Absorbing knowledge from unconventional sources. How collaborations with the Open Source community shape the innovation performance of entrepreneurial ventures**
- **Italian companies and FOSS: AISL, an association of FOSS firms to foster common growth**
- **“PloneGov: An example of Open Source community in EPA”**
- **FOSS in the Public Sector: Business and Sustainability Models**
- **Migrations to FOSS experiences: issues and errors**

3.6 MFG Overall workshop impressions

The participants' feedback indicate that the Interregional Workshop of the 6th OSEPA – organised by MFG Baden-Württemberg (held in Stuttgart from 1-2 December 2011) was well structured and conducted, as well as prepared on the theoretical part and the practical part. The structure of the Workshop was a combination of presentations, talks and sharing of experiences in small groups. The workshop started with look into the **Political Dimension of Open Source Software and was followed by a moderated discussion on Open Office Migration** where the representatives of the migration processes in Freiburg, Munich and Schoten gave their views on successes and failures of their respective projects. The first day was concluded with two examples of **Open Source Infrastructure in Schools as realized by the cities of Bremen and Berlin, where the aim was to reduce the weight of IT in management and release resources to the schools' main function: teaching.** This was done through process optimization and cloud servers. The second day focused on **interoperability** followed by the discussions. Overall the learning within the workshop was regarded as high value and the speakers' level of experience and knowledge very high. The possibility to interact with the speakers was especially appreciated. The discussions especially were considered helpful and useful

The topics of the discussions were:

- **From Closed to Open – against or with each other?**
- **Interoperability and integration between Cloud Services and local IT infrastructure**
- **Interoperability and integration – long term savings by OSS.**

The results of the discussion were that **even though proprietary software might feel more stable, safe and secure, the benefits of the open software come in the long term. Findings on interoperability and integration suggested that there is a need for such between cloud servers and local structures. Long term savings by OSS discussion found it more profitable to start small and expand on the small scale victories, so the benefits are quicker and results faster.**

3.7 Vysocina Overall workshop impressions

The workshop aimed to map the status of FOSS in the area of the Czech Republic. With respect to the existing environment challenges and opportunities were described. FOSS communities and developers had the opportunity to introduce themselves. Inhibitors, barriers and obstacles were tackled. **Topic included FOSS in schools, public institutions and municipal offices.** As the audience ranged from technical to non-technical participants, some participants engaged interested in technical and some in non-technical topics. Presentations covered problems such as **compatibility and resistance of users, political pressure, licences, FOSS promotion. Main focus was put on Migration of a Public Administration to Open Source Technologies.**

Moreover attention was paid to the following issues:

1. **Determining the migration budget – methodology, TCO, risk assessment**
2. **Licensing software policy**
3. **Software technologies and their implementation**
4. **Data conversion, data formats – data as core value**
5. **Training and education of users – risk prevention, barrier elimination**

The topics were discussed and demonstrated through case studies. Existing solutions and best practices were presented

3.8 Bistrita Overall workshop impressions

The 8th Interregional Workshop of the OSEPA project was organized by PMB – Bistrița City Hall and was held in Piatra Fantanele from 15-16 May 2012. The Workshop structure included presentations, discussions and brainstorming sessions in small groups. The learning within the workshop was scored by the participants as high value and the speakers' level of experience and knowledge was appreciated as high.

Most of the participants felt that the most useful part of the event consisted in the presentations about **local examples of open source** that were seen as innovative and adapted solutions. Also, the possibility to ask questions after each presentation and the possibility to interact with the speakers was seen as a positive point of the workshop.

Participants found the brainstorming sessions very helpful and useful, because they had the chance to exchange ideas and to share experiences.

The most liked part of the event was the part in which **the OSEPA participants learned about FOSS in Romania and more particularly how open source software solutions are used in Bistrita (at local level). Also the practical presentations of using FOSS in education (Moodle platform) and in other fields (open e-payment platform, Content Management System and Infokiosk) were appreciated.**

The participants wished more use of video and audio content, more live demonstrations and printed handouts. The less liked part of the workshop was the fact that some presentations were too detailed and that a few of them were presented in Romanian and then translated in English, fact that made more difficult to follow the ideas of the presented material.

3.9 Final OSEPA workshop impressions

The Final OSEPA workshop –organized by the Central Union of Municipalities of Greece– was a combination of presentations, talks and sharing of experiences in small groups.

The workshop **explored the usage of Free Open Source Software (FOSS) in the Greek Public Administration (PA) environment.** Workshop participants had the opportunity to study and assess selected practices presented by ICT and academic executives working in public and non-profit organizations. On the whole, the **workshop was both business and technical oriented. The thematic areas covered include: "Migrating to Zimbra", "Moodle in PA's", "Open Source & Open Standards for the large scale provisioning of reusable open content", "Capabilities of Asterisk", FOSS in Education Services and Data in the PA's", "FOSS for Transparency and Open Government Projects", "FOSS License Issues", "FOSS in Greek School Network", "Open Data Distribution of Demands, Citizens Data & Communications", and "Configuration of an Open Source CMS for e-service Provision, Using Data and Metadata Maintained by Different Public Agencies".** Specifically, keynote speakers came from: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the non-profit movement of FreeMoodle.org, the National Documentation Centre, Higher Education, the National Centre for PA and Local Government, the Ministry of Administrative Reform and E-governance, the Greek Free / Open Source Software Society, the Computer

Technology Institute and Press, the Iraklio Attica Municipality, and the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change.

4. Lessons learnt

4.1 Sambruk workshop lessons learned

- How to encourage and convince broader use of OSS in public administration, schools, hospitals and ways to finance that.
- How other European countries deal with e-government issues and use some of the presented ideas to my work.
- How the Swedish municipalities plan to organize the various public sector tasks into an e-government system. How they are planning to collaborate throughout the analysis and specification in order to ensure a better result from both economical and functional aspects.
- Learned about the kind of licences when you hire a company to develop open source software.
- Learned a lot of information about SAMBRUK, how the organisation is structured, the way SAMBRUK functions. the challenges, mission and responsibilities and also the advantages the member of SAMBRUK have. It was also very interesting learning about the problems the organisation faces and how they try to overcome them.
- Learned about the problems supplier of OSS vendors face and the licence and revenue models of OSS.
- Learn about many cases and differences about OSS licensing and copyright aspects.
- Listen to some ideas how to implement OSS solutions to public administration.
- How Sambruk plans to organize Swedish municipalities to facilitate their public sector services.

- Legal advices + practical way of doing things by other EPAs
- New approaches of FOSS development, how the FOSS can be more easily adopted by the public sector.
- Supplier perspective for FOSS and the different versions of licensing was very important.

4.2 Sheffield workshop lessons learned

- The presentation for the cloud computing was really appealing and interesting. More specifically the distinction between open cloud and open-source cloud, agpl for web apps, data ownership, privacy issues.
- Learn a lot about how the other countries manage different areas, what and why it's important.
- Very interesting presentations from **Professor Mike Holcombe** about the new UK Government ICT strategy for public administration.
- ICT resources consolidation, and moving to cloud computing
- Presentation from **Andrea Corbett** "Implementation of new technology from the people perspective" was interesting as it's touching many social and physiological aspects when moving or changing ICT tools at people work spaces.
- Presentation by Dr **Mariam Kiran** about Open Source and Cloud Computing
- Learned about the UK government policy and the socio-technical aspect
- The presentation about implementation of new technology from the people perspective. Implementation of new techniques from the people perspective. People in general don't like changes, resistance to change is normal. People fear the effect the change will have in their lives.
- The human aspects of implementing FOSS
- UK strategy open-source adoption ideas
- Motivation techniques for employees

4.3 Strovolos workshop lessons learned

The participants expressed different opinions and point of views as some answered that they enjoyed the workshop content ,others that they preferred the “Speed brainstorming” sections and the problems discussed there , and some others referred especially to the different FOSS solutions in each country and especially in Cyprus. It is really important that the partners liked several things of this workshop as this shows clearly that the content and the issues covered were interesting. Some partners said that the most important thing they learned were cases and FOSS solutions from other countries and that someone can learn a lot from these discussions

Some of the covered issues were :

- Present Situation in Cyprus /Existing solutions for public administrations in Cyprus”
- “Examples to be avoided /Examples to follow”
- “Existing FOSS solutions in the private sector and ways to apply these uses in the public sector”
- “The University of Cyprus Experience”
- “Existing FOSS solutions for public administrations”
- “Ways to put pressure on governmental bodies in order to consider FOSS solutions”
- The overview of Open Source initiatives and activities in Cyprus ,
- The networking and share of experience with the “colleagues” from other public authorities
- The FOSS solutions in the different countries

4.4 Valmiera workshop lessons learned

- Discuss and present FOSS examples, problems etc from their country point of view
- Learn about the Latvian Open Source Network, as well as cases from other countries were really useful.

- Presentations and information given by the University of Sheffield and LATA were pointed out as useful
- The presentations were assessed as very informative, enabling to take into consideration cases of other countries at work

4.5 RER Overall workshop lessons learned

Participants have generally given a very positive feedback to the overall experience. The interactive sessions have been particularly appreciated by most participants. This is how one of the respondent to the questionnaire describes these sessions: “the Interactive Session was really constructive. Indeed, several people from different countries were able to discuss and present FOSS examples and current FOSS situation, problems etc from their country point of view. Therefore, on my return to work I will take into consideration all the above and especially the cases of other countries”

4.6 MFG Overall workshop lessons learned

In general the workshop was seen as productive, inspiring and useful. Many enjoyed the opportunity to hear about others’ experiences and in the feedback one responded saying that “we will try to present this [idea] to the ... board of directors and start using open source solutions.” Another was more optimistic stating that they will “start using more cloud computing services.” All in all the response of the participants was very optimistic and several of them stated that upon their return they will share the best cases with the key stakeholders. The results of the discussion were that even though proprietary software might feel more stable, safe and secure, the benefits of the open software come in the long term. Findings on interoperability and integration suggested that there is a need for such between cloud servers and local structures. Long term savings by OSS discussion found it more profitable to start small and expand on the small scale victories, so the benefits are quicker and results faster.

4.7 Vysocina Overall workshop lessons learned

Based on their professional background participants appreciated different topics. A considerable number of participants appreciated the opportunity to meet participants from different countries, networking as well as informal talks at intervals. The workshop aimed to map the status of FOSS in the area of the Czech Republic. With respect to the existing environment challenges and opportunities were described. FOSS communities and developers had the opportunity to introduce themselves. Inhibitors, barriers and obstacles were tackled. Topic included FOSS in schools, public institutions and municipal offices.

The participants enjoyed especially the following issues :

- GEO mapping.
- Real life examples.
- Benefits of using OSS licences.
- Presentation about political pressure.
- Licensing of FOSS.
- How to create truly accessible websites, GIS and free data ...
- ODF and migration tools.
- FOSS in schools / FOSS in secondary education
- The Czech experience, web services in support of open standard.

4.8 Bistrita Overall workshop lessons learned

The first day (the 15th of May, 2012) of workshop started with a set of presentations. Mr. Dumitru Cincea (PMB Adjoint Executive Director-Legal Department) and Mr. Ioan Cioba (public procurement expert) from Bistrita City Hall presented a few insides of **the Romanian national laws on copyright and open source software public procurement**. There also were presentations on:

- **Open Source Software instruments in Public Administration in Romania,**
- **Open Source software solutions for interactive geo-spatial information (case study – Infokiosk implemented at Bistrita City Hall),**
- **Content Management System for Public Organizations using OSS**

- **Free access for citizens to the decisions and other documents issued by public authorities.**

A very interesting and appreciated material was the one presenting the Moodle platform as an efficient learning tool. Mr. Costinas Sidor spoke about this platform also known as a Learning Management System that starts to become more and more popular among educators around the world as a tool for creating online dynamic web sites for students. The second day of workshop was dedicated to materials presenting other open source software solutions.

The representatives of the company MONDO IT talked about **open source data integration solutions and open source enterprise email server** (Zarafa).

Then Mr. Ciprian Ghise and Mircea Lazar from Indeco Software company ended the workshop session with presentation of 3 open source software systems.

At the end of each presentation the participants at the workshop had the opportunity to ask questions and to discuss about the topics of the workshop.

During this two days of workshop there were also brainstorming sessions in which the participants were divided into small groups in order to discuss about a specific topic. At the end of the brainstorming session each team had to present the conclusions reached. The brainstorming sessions focused on the following themes:

- “The problem of the market offers”. The participants had to identify concrete actions and measures that local, regional, national and European public administrations can take in order to balance the situation in the areas where the dominant market is the one relying on the licensed software solutions.
- “The problem of the source code reuse by European Public Administrations”. – What kind of approach would be indicated?
- “Technological factors in favour to the adoption of open source software solutions.”
 - Identify opportunities and threats for software with open source code in the context of the actual trends.

4.9 Final OSEPA workshop lessons learned

The OSEPA members were given the opportunity to discuss the lessons learned from the overall exchange of experience of the partnership. The partners had an interactive and productive discussion on the very key aspects of the project. FOSS on Open Government and Transparency projects” was rated as the most appealing topic by the majority of the respondents. “Open Licensing Schemes for Open Data and Source Code” was also interesting. Other topics participants found interesting are: Asterisk, FOSS in Education Services and Data in the PA , Moodle in PA, the case study of Zimbra, the case study of Iraklio Municipality, and the Open Source &Open Standards for the large scale provisioning of reusable open content

5. Workshop Comments & Suggestions

5.1 Comments & Suggestions for the Sambruk workshop

5.1.1 Comments

-More exchange of practical experience on already implemented OSS projects for public administration and schools. Not just MS Office replacement by OpenOffice but also file storage, databases and backup realizations.

-We learnt that Sambruk will use an open IT architecture to support their e-services. Nonetheless It was not made clear who will develop this software and what technologies they think of using.

-All the content that was planned to be discussed was examined to a very good extent. There are many other issues that we need to discuss during the project. However, was not feasible to be discussed in two days.

-
- Too long group discussions- going into deep detail. Some partner that were not experts on technical details, it was difficult to contribute
 - The lack of technical issues presentations, such as presenting already developed e-government systems.

5.1.2 Suggestions

- More presentations about technical OSS solutions and implementations in municipality IT infrastructures should be added in the agenda or experience from outside EU , Norway (Opland community), may be from USA.
- Maybe there was a need for presentations by representatives of a public administration applying open source software
- A session for technical stuff presentation could be essential and extremely useful.

5.2 Comments and suggestions for the Sheffield workshop

5.2.1 Comments

- There were enough presentations and discussions but almost none activity.
- Too long discussions we could make them shorter and more constructive.
- There were not much practical activities.
- We didn't visit different experiences, apart from the experiences of the University of Sheffield
- There is a small risk that the presentations contain the same pro- and cons of open source.
- The presentation about the road to FOSS was unnecessary. We heard that already in other workshops.
- We spent one half of the time with presentations and the other half with open discussions. We could make better use of the time
- The exchange of experiences in the round tables after every presentations session; in

- any case we should have changed the distribution of groups between sessions
- There weren't so many questions from participants to the presenters
 - Follow-up discussions were too general. It would be better spend less time in follow-up discussions or do not do this at all.
 - Time for questions and discussions during presentations was quite enough.

5.2.2 Suggestions

- I would like to learn more about motivation techniques for employees.
- I would like to have more exchange of practical experience on already implemented OSS projects for public administration and schools.
- I would like to make a visit from other different institution in the city if Sheffield (City Council, for instance, in the case that they have implemented any FOSS solution)
- I would like to see the experience of other municipalities
- I would like to see ontologies used in systems to the public sector.
- I would like to see more presentations about technical OSS solutions and implementations in municipality IT infrastructures.

5.3 Comments and suggestions for the Valmiera workshop

5.3.1 Comments

- Lack of more details of the economic issue (e.g., is there a benefit analysis done Management issues on FOSS implementation in PAs)
- Too little focus on particular topics, i.e., “Change Management” methodology and end-user acceptance and reluctance to change;
- Too complicated and not straight forward questions in the group sessions;
- Topics should be more relevant to all partners;
- The workshop discussions had too much focus on the hosting country's situation;
- Some of the questions needed evidence from previous academic researched and literature.

5.3.2 Suggestions

- Management commitment and change management, end-user training and reluctance to change;
- To use more printed handouts;
- To use video and audio content, software presentations;
- To use live demonstrations of pilot case;
- To initiate more interaction of participants, more live examples;
- To provide training in real OSS;
- To include topics like “Business oriented OS policies”, “End User acceptance”, “Management commitment & Change Management”
- To have concrete group members list, before the schedule;
- To provide better information before the workshop;
- To clarify the workshop objectives
- To improve the tests used in the workshop;
- To increase the content covered in the workshop;
- To improve the instructional methods;
- To make workshop activities more stimulating.

5.4 Comments and suggestions for the Strovolos workshop

The most popular answers regarding the ways of improving the workshop were the workshop objectives clarification (33%) and the inclusion in the agenda of more stimulating activities .e.g more technical ones (33%).16 % of the participants answered that they would add more video to the workshop while 8% answered that they would made it more difficult. Finally a percentage of 8 % answered that they would allocate more time to the workshop. Also some partners said that they were hoping to see more about the FOSS solutions in the environment of the municipality of Strovolos.The main observation is that we should clarify better the workshop objectives ,use tools like videos etc and make the workshop more technical oriented.

Regarding what extra training material – tools in their opinion should be used in order to help the workshops succeed better their objectives the most popular answer was the more live demonstrations with a percentage of 38 % followed from a percentage of 15 % that voted that they would prefer to see more printed handouts and another 15 % that said that it should be used more video and audio content. A small percentage of 7 % said that they wanted to see software solutions and another 7 % referred to the number of presentations. These opinions should be taken seriously into account for the next workshops in order to be able to differentiate as much as possible every workshop from the previous ones. Moreover **most** people express the opinion that they would like to see some participatory discussion/exercises in order to understand better the objectives of the workshop

5.5 Comments and suggestions on the RER workshop

Participants have generally given a very positive feedback to the overall experience. The interactive sessions have been particularly appreciated by most participants. This is how one of the respondent to the questionnaire describes these sessions: “the Interactive Session was really constructive. Indeed, several people from different countries were able to discuss and present FOSS examples and current FOSS situation, problems etc from their country point of view. The balance between the different activities has had a very good evaluation too. Regarding the content ,the evaluation ranged from positive to highly positive. Some of the participants would have appreciated more time dedicated to technical and “hands on” sessions. A couple of respondents pointed out they didn't receive enough information on the workshop goals. Regarding the teaching materials ,they have been evaluated from sufficient to good. Many participants indicated that the use of videos and live demonstrations as extra training materials would have been helpful

Suggestions

Even though the evaluation of the workshop has been very positive, this is a summary of the hints for further improvement we collected from the workshop assessment questionnaire:

- **Interactive sessions:** they were highly appreciated, and could be further developed i.e.dedicating enough time for a full “barcamp like” session

- Use not only slides but **the use of videos** as teaching/disseminating materials
- **More practical presentation and live demonstrations** of projects could rise the interest and attention of the attendants
- **Clarify workshop objectives:** this need is particularly felt by the participants that are not fully involved in all the activities of the OSEPA project. It would be a good idea to dedicate a few minutes at the beginning of the meeting with a recall about overall OSEPA goals and the specific goals of the workshop

5.6 Comments and suggestions on the MFG workshop

From the response of the participants there was indication that the experiences of business and organizational environment with Open Source migration would have been helpful. There could have been more experiences on this and these could have been possibly shared best in the Knowledge Café. Still, the participants were active in sharing their experiences and the interaction between participants and the speakers and moderators was lively and seemed to bring about ideas and practices to be tried afterwards. One participant would have wanted to hear more on the actual way of calculating long term savings of the OSS migration. Some use could be found on finding a concrete example on savings through OSS in the long term. This could interest those making the decisions “back home.” The participants wished more hands on examples and hoped to hear more about the experiences that cloud computing has given to others. To improve the workshop more live demos and video material were requested and some hand-out material would have been useful to some of the participants. The least liked part was the company presentations. One participant stated that the focus was too much on the “federal side” and would have wished more discussion on the other aspects of public administration as well

5.7 Comments and suggestions on the Vysocina workshop

Participants would have appreciated a more interactive agenda. A few complained about a cancelled brainstorming session, as the technical oriented staff were highly interested in FOSS for GIS. There were also remarks regarding the Czech text of presentations. Some participants proposed they would have appreciated more opportunity to discuss with participants from other countries. The workshop was attended by participants who were

highly interested in the topic and already familiar with FOSS in some degree. Thus they were motivated and eager to discuss topics relevant to their situation. They would have appreciated more personal discussions and a higher degree of interaction. As for the topic they were considered relevant by participants.

5.8 Comments and suggestions on the Bistrita workshop

According to the questionnaire completed by the participants it would have been helpful if the themes of the event also included presentations about open source mobile programming, and more discussions about licensing.

A part of the OSEPA partners attending this event would have liked more stimulating activities during the workshop, and one participant suggested that it would be very helpful if the materials presented on this occasion will be made available online.

In general the workshop was rated as helpful, productive and interesting (the workshop overall was rated 4, 5 out of 5). On question on learning many indicated having learned a lot or sufficient (scoring 3 or 4 out of 5 when asked to what extent they feel they have learned from the workshop). The length of the program was rated to be just right and the difficulty level of the workshop was appropriate (scoring a majority of 4 out of 5 when asked). As a conclusion the participants stated that this workshop helped them to find and learn more and new things about: Romanian local policies, local examples, innovative solutions of use of FOSS, new applications of open source software solutions and why not a possibility to use at their return open source software solutions for interactive geo-spatial information, especially the infokiosk. One of the participants pointed that “the open source community of Bistrita is quite active and with some more effort more and more people will start using open source solutions”.

5.9 Comments and suggestions on the Final OSEPA workshop

On the whole, the workshop received high appreciation by the majority of responders. In particular, the workshop overall scored 3.8/6 on average.

Two of the respondents claimed that they gave this rating due to the weak interaction of participants. Another comment was that most of the workshop topics have been already

explored. Two of the participants comment that the less useful part of the workshop was the Brainstorming Session. Others found that Asterisk, Moodle, and Licensing Schemes presentations were the less effective ones.

The learning objectives of respondents were relatively achieved, scoring 4.1/6. Similarly, the level of difficulty was close to suitable and the presentations were on average useful for the participants. The workshop gained lesser gratitude in terms of interest, interaction among participants, and practice/feedback. On average, participants think that the workshop was well conducted and spaced out with a flexible structure and good use of time. However, it seems that participants would have wanted more discussions and activities; and more challenging, demanding, and stimulating topics for discussion. In the context of training methods, three (3) out of the sixteen (16) respondents suggested that they would have wanted more printed hand-outs and software. Four (4) of the workshop participants stated that they would have liked further use of video and audio content, and five (5) would have prefer the use of more live demonstrations. Moreover a part of the respondents provided some recommendations for the improvement of the workshop. The most outstanding suggestion was making workshop activities more stimulating by improving instructional methods. Other recommendations involve the adding of visuals, shortening the time and content of the workshop and finally proving better information before the workshop and clarifying the workshop objectives

6. Thematic areas covered

6.1 Issues covered through the workshops' cycle

The OSEPA interregional workshops were foreseen to explore issues related to the use of FOSS by public administrations at the micro-level, i.e. at the level of organizations experimenting with FOSS and the benefits for third parties accruing thereof. Indeed, the workshops are primarily about the exchange of experiences and the sharing of good practices with regard to the use of FOSS among those individuals from territorial public administrations who are involved in the selection of software and are capable of assessing

both the needs and requirements of their organizations and the results of past and ongoing endeavours. The OSEPA interregional workshops were organized aiming to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and experiences at the (inter)regional level, as far as policy aspects of the migration of territorial public administrations to FOSS are concerned. Moreover regarding the criteria and the priorities initially set about the thematic areas (referred below) we consider that the workshops satisfied these priorities either through the main agenda's presentations given from experts of academic and industry background either through the brainstorming sessions that complemented these presentations. The matrix of the section 6.1 displays a wide variety of issues covered through the interregional workshops .

The following criteria have been considered (described in OSEPA Memo suggesting themes for the interregional workshops report - prepared by Regione Emilia Romagna) for the designation of the themes and topics of the workshops:

- Public administrations' needs and challenges, with regard to software and FOSS.
- Latest trends in the software sector and in the political economic context.
- The results of relevant past events and activities.
- The aims and objectives of the OSEPA project, the preferences and expertise of the partners and the issue of transferability.

The thematic areas of high priority are:

- Acquisition of technical support for free/open source software (FOSS). **(1A)**
- Costs and benefits of migrating to FOSS: cost evaluation methodologies. **(2A)**
- FOSS license issues: license options and compatibility with local copyright law. **(3A)**
- Opening up public procurement of IT solutions to FOSS'.**(4A)**
- FOSS and e-government. **(5A)**

The second priority thematic areas were defined as follows :

- Existing FOSS solutions for territorial public administrations **(1B)**
- Developing custom FOSS solutions **(2B)**
- Psychological / perceptual dimension of the migration to FOSS **(3B)**
- Personnel training for the migration to FOSS **(4B)**

- Technical aspects of the migration to FOSS **(5B)**
- Economic impact of FOSS on the regional economy (software market and beyond) **(6B)**
- The organizational dimension of the migration to FOSS **(7B)**
- Language and localization issues **(8B)**

The suggested thematic areas for each workshop as defined in the OSEPA Memo suggesting themes for the interregional workshops report (Component 3) prepared by Regione Emilia Romagna :

Proposed thematic areas for each workshop

Workshop / partner	Proposed thematic area 1	Proposed thematic area 2
2 nd workshop LPS	Costs and benefits of the migration to FOSS – cost evaluation methodologies	Economic impact of FOSS on the regional economy (software market and beyond)
3 rd workshop STROVOLOS	Opening up public procurement of IT solutions to FOSS	Acquisition of technical support for FOSS
4 th workshop USFD	Developing custom FOSS solutions: public administrations' involvement in open source communities	Language and localization issues
5 th workshop Valmiera	Opening up public procurement of IT solutions to FOSS	Personnel training for the migration to FOSS
6 th workshop RER	Costs and benefits of the migration to FOSS – cost evaluation methodologies	FOSS licensing issues
7 th workshop MFG	Developing custom FOSS solutions: public administrations' involvement in open source communities	Existing FOSS solutions for public administrations
8 th workshop VYSOCINA	Acquisition of technical support for FOSS	Economic impact of FOSS on the regional economy (software market and beyond).
9 th workshop KEDKE	FOSS and e-government	Existing FOSS solutions for public administrations

Towards this direction the following thematic areas were covered through the workshops:

1	Problems supplier of OSS vendors face and the licence and revenue models of OSS
2	OSS licensing and copyright aspects.
3	Existing FOSS solutions in the private sector and ways to apply these uses in the public sector”
4	“Ways to put pressure on governmental bodies”
5	The way FOSS is used in various PA activities
6	Political Dimension of Open Source Software Migration
7	Open Source Infrastructure in Schools
8	Interoperability in the public sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>From Closed to Open – against or with each other?</i> ○ <i>Interoperability and integration between Cloud Services and local IT infrastructure</i> ○ <i>Interoperability and integration – long term savings by OSS.</i>
9	Open Source Software Migration - The political dimension
10	Preparing an OS Migration: Modelling your IT processes Method, Tools and Exercise
11	Determining the migration budget – methodology, TCO, risk assessment
12	Interoperability in the public sector- how to manage heterogeneous identity federations
13	Training and education of users – risk prevention, barrier elimination Benefits of Using OSS Licences in Public Administration
14	OpenDocument Format in Practice

15	Legal Deconstruction of OSS Licence Myths
16	Open Source Implementation from Supplier's Perspective
17	Licencing software policy
18	Software technologies and their implementation
19	Data conversion, data formats – data as core value
20	FOSS for Data Boxes
21	Practical Use of Creative Common Licences in the CR
22	How to Create Truly Accessible Websites
23	Implementation and Use of Custom SMS Comm. System
24	FOSS in Secondary School Environment
25	"Capabilities of Asterisk",
26	"FOSS License Issues"
27	Political Pressure on Open Solutions
28	Free and Open-Source Software for GIS and Free Data Usage Migration of a Public Administration to Open Source Technologies
30	Age of Free Open Source Software (FOSS) in the Greek Public Administration (PA) environment.
31	"FOSS for Transparency and Open Government Projects",

32	"FOSS in Greek School Network"
33	Open Source & Open Standards for the large scale provisioning of reusable open content"
34	FOSS in Education Services and Data in the PA's"
35	"Open Licensing Schemes for Open Data and Source Code".
36	"Configuration of an Open Source CMS for e-service Provision, Using Data and Metadata Maintained by Different Public Agencies".
37	Open Source Software in Education Services and Data in the Greek Public Administration
38	Moodle in PA's"
39	Migrating to Zimbra
40	"Examples to be avoided /Examples to follow"
41	"Open Data Distribution of Demands, Citizens Data & Communications
42	"Present Situation in Cyprus /Existing solutions for public administrations in Cyprus
43	"The University of Cyprus Experience"
44	Organizing for collaborating with OSS communities: why granting autonomy to employees?
45	FOSS in the Public Sector: Business and Sustainability Models
46	Migrations to FOSS experiences: issues and errors
47	"Open Source in regional Public Administrations: how to support them in adopting FOSS"
48	Spread and how to use the Free, Libre, Open Source Software in the municipalities of the Autonomous Friuli Venezia Giulia Region
49	The Free Software Center South Tyrol: experiences and actions

50	Italian companies and FOSS: AISL, an association of FOSS firms to foster common growth
51	Absorbing knowledge from unconventional sources. How collaborations with the Open Source community shape the innovation performance of entrepreneurial ventures
52	Digital Agenda and Emilia-Romagna regional ICT program: FOSS relevance
53	“PloneGov: An example of Open Source community in EPA”
54	“Bologna Municipality experiences on adopting FOSS on desktops”
55	Considerations on copyright
56	Considerations on open source software public procurement
57	Content Management System for the Public Organisations using Open Source Software
58	ProjectIX Software Bistrița
59	Moodle platform - efficient learning tool
60	OpenSource software instruments in Public Administration in Romania
61	OpenSource software solutions for interactive geo-spatial information: case study Infokiosc Bistrita City Hall
62	Free and direct access for citizens to the decisions and other documents issued by public authorities.
63	Open Source Data Integration Solutions
64	Advantages of an open source approach
65	OpenSource Multiseat computing (10 for Romanian Education)
66	OpenSource Enterprise Email Server (Zarafa)
67	SIGMA / Aqua = Interactive Software System for Administrative Management – business intelligence software for public administration
68	SNEP = Sistemul National Electronic de Plati online cu card bancar (National Electronic System for Online Payments) – IT open platform for online tax collecting for public institutions

	Indeco Software
69	AsiSoc = Integrated System for Social-security Aid Management – software for identifying, analyzing, optimizing the intervention and tracking of the social cases and developing coherent social programs
70	UK strategy open-source adoption ideas
71	Cloud computing
72	The human aspects of implementing FOSS
73	Implementation of new technology from the people perspective.
74	Motivation techniques for employees

Taking a closer look we can observe that the issues covered through the workshops lifecycle overlap the priority thematic areas set at the beginning .We can say that the workshops' mostly covered thematic areas were the following :

- FOSS license issues: license options and compatibility with local copyright law. 3A
- Opening up public procurement of IT solutions to FOSS'.4A
- Existing FOSS solutions for territorial public administrations 1B
- Developing custom FOSS solutions 2B
- Personnel training for the migration to FOSS 4B
- FOSS and e-government. 5A
- Costs and benefits of migrating to FOSS: cost evaluation methodologies. 2A

Moreover other major issues like the political dimension were discussed. We can say that a wide variety of examples of successful solutions in the public and the private sector as well as use cases were demonstrated through the workshops

At the section 7 we refer to a list of areas or issues that in the partners' opinion have not covered as they should such as

- Economic impact of FOSS on the regional economy (software market and beyond) (6B)
- Language and localization issues 8B

- Technical aspects of the migration to FOSS 5B

6.2 Brainstorming – Exchange of experiences

Brainstorming sessions or focus groups took place through all the workshops as a tool for discussion, exchange of views and collection of information. A focus group is a form of qualitative research in which a group of people is asked to discuss a concept or a theme that the researcher aims to investigate in depth. Focus groups allow to *“explore in depth the perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes of the community, to study the motivations underlying thought and human behaviour”* (Zammuner, 2003, p. 9).

Privileged context of a conflict / confrontation of points of view and experiences, the focus group can drive the participant to a new opinion during the debate, changing his previous mind or confirming it because widely shared and reinforced by others' opinion.

This technique, therefore, favours the exploration and clarification of the group views in a more simple and natural way than an individual interview might do.

The structure of the focus group provides the use of a discussion or generative track that can be made up by questions with a non very dissimilar than a “funnel” approach (Oprandi, 2000): open questions, simple and generative at the beginning and with a higher level of depth and complexity in the later stages and at the end, always considering the factors "fatigue" and "deconcentration".

The focus group concerns the comparison of questions called "generative" at first general and then, with a funnel way, on specific topics of research. In our case, the proposed track of discussion provided an initial **exploration phase** of the representations of the participants through brainstorming while a moderator is coordinating the discussion.

Then, the focus groups were conducted to depth some areas of reflection and discussion, in line with the specific objectives of the project that were presented before. In this way, the discussion was focused on the **content**, the **experience** (how to apply open source, through which measures or practices) and the **network** (who are the actors on the field applying open source). The group moderators then summed up the findings of each of the groups and a more general discussion was followed after each group presented its findings and its point of views regarding the selected topic

The specific objectives of the focus groups can be summarized as:

- Collection of perceptions and views of practitioners and professionals about the legal framework in the partners' countries specifically regarding open source approaches in the e government
- Collection of perceptions and views of practitioners and professionals about the application of open source approaches in the partners' countries
- Collection of best practices and study of successful use cases in the local context of the partners countries
- The problems faced by public administrators involved in open source. The adoption of new good practices used by other countries
- Collection of perceptions and views about strengths or weaknesses in the system
- Collection of perceptions and views on the level of communication and collaboration between the various state departments involved in the application of open source approaches.
- Collection of feedback and opinions about necessary improvements to the system.

Therefore, the following **areas of discussion** have been introduced:

1	Successful or Unsuccessful FOSS Initiatives
2	Main factors of the succession of the adoption of FOSS Solutions
3	Exchange of views about possible strategies for the adoption of FOSS Solutions used in the Private sector, by Public Administrations
4	Discussion whether it is always in the best interest of the organisation the adoption of FOSS Solution depending on the situation (Examples). Where are the boundaries
5	<p>OSS licences/ODF/open standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In what ways can the use of OSS licences in public administration influence ICT planning and deployment? o How to tackle the widespread misconceptions and prejudices against free licences in a largely proprietary software-dominated environment?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The most common document compatibility issues and their solutions (document exchange: citizens vs. institutions and between institutions). ○ Current barriers to the adoption of open standards in government and public institutions. ○ Are open standards mandated/recommended/preferred in your jurisdiction? Should they be? What kind of policy decisions should be made?
6	<p><i>Commercial OSS/govt-funded closed solutions/IT policies vs. politics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why prefer commercial OSS products and services over similarly priced proprietary solutions? ○ Are there any benefits to attempts to supplement state-sponsored closed-source solutions with open alternatives? ○ Has commercially-supported OSS made any inroads in the area of public administration in your country? ○ Have you been witness to ICT decisions made or modified as a result of outside political or commercial pressures? ○ How to defend the best public interest in a potentially hostile political environment?
7	<p><i>Archives, libraries, schools/self-sufficient deployments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gaining support for case-by-case OSS-powered infrastructure deployment in regional or municipal settings. ○ Can the use of OSS result in significant financial savings even in areas covered by statewide funding schemes? ○ What are the main reasons for the continuous resistance to OSS alternatives? ○ In what ways can large-scale OSS deployment in academia influence decision-making at lower levels of the education system? And vice-versa? ○ Implementation obstacles to consider when pushing for a migration to OSS in a school or a small town.
8	<p>How to persuade Public Administrators to adopt OSS.</p>

9	Discuss about the most common FOSS solutions of each country
10	Overview of Open Source initiatives and activities in the partners' countries and discussion about the FOSS solutions in the different countries
11	The problem of the market offers". The participants had to identify concrete actions and measures that local, regional, national and European public administrations can take in order to balance the situation in the areas where the dominant market is the one relying on the licensed software solutions.
12	"The problem of the source code reuse by European Public Administrations". – What kind of approach would be indicated?
13	"Technological factors in favour to the adoption of open source software solutions." -Identify opportunities and threats for software with open source code in the context of the actual trends.
14	Examples to be avoided /Examples to follow
15	Existing FOSS solutions in the private sector and ways to apply these uses in the public sector
16	Ways to put pressure on governmental bodies
17	Licensing and Legal framework
18	Official policies per country
19	Main factors of the succession of the adoption of FOSS Solutions
20	From Closed to Open – against or with each other?
21	Interoperability and integration – long term savings by OSS.

22	Interoperability and integration between Cloud Services and local IT infrastructure
23	Existing FOSS solutions in the public sector

7. Thematic areas not covered as it should

A number of issues were highlighted during the discussions and the working groups on the themes above. Some of the key recommendations that emerged include that we should give more emphasis on the following issues:

1	OSS Filing service.
2	FOSS for GIS
3	Hear more on the actual way of calculating long term savings of the OSS migration. Some use could be found on finding a concrete example on savings through OSS in the long term. This could interest those making the decisions “back home.”
4	Experiences of business and organizational environment with Open Source migration would have been helpful.
5	Lack of more details of the economic issue e.g., is there a benefit analysis done Management issues on FOSS implementation in PA's;
6	Include topics like Business oriented OS policies, End User acceptance, Management commitment & Change Management;
7	Too little focus on particular topics, i.e., Change Management methodology and end-user acceptance and reluctance to change
8	More technical focus especially regarding the existing OSS solutions for EPAs
9	Hear more about the experiences that cloud computing has given to others.
10	The future of PA in terms of technologies utilized and their impact on various activities as well as a more practical section in order to show how FOSS work
11	Exchange of practical experience on already implemented OSS projects for public

	administration and schools. Not just MS Office replacement by OpenOffice but also file storage, databases and backup realizations.
12	The lack of technical issues presentations, such as presenting already developed e-government systems
13	New applications of open source software solutions and why not a possibility to use at their return open source software solutions for interactive geo-spatial information
14	More focus on innovative solutions and local policies, local examples, of use of FOSS,
15	Give more emphasis on the experience of other municipalities
16	More presentations about technical OSS solutions and implementations in municipalities
17	Ontologies used in systems to the public sector.
18	IT infrastructures

The main observation is that the partners believe that thematic areas such as

- Economic impact of FOSS on the regional economy (software market and beyond) (6B)
- Language and localization issues 8B
- Technical aspects of the migration to FOSS 5B

The partners desire for more technical aspects presentations as well as to refer more to innovative solutions

8. Overall Conclusions

FIRST YEAR :

In conclusion we can say is that in the future we should make use of a bigger variety of tools like printed handouts ,live demonstrations and video and focus on more technical oriented workshops along with a little different variety of topics in order to have the chance

to make some more productive discussions and differentiate the next workshops from the previous ones. The most important conclusions extracted from the first year's workshops assessments were that in general the workshops were at a good level, well balanced and organized, included various and interesting topics and the time was well distributed among the sessions. There was a good interaction between the presenters and the attendees. The basic conclusion was that the most partners considered the workshops interesting and constructive and the topics and some others believe that the workshops were covering issues that were discussed again in previous workshops and could include more technical oriented issues. The most interesting sessions were the speed brainstorming sessions, the exchange of ideas as well as the presentation of various use cases. Nonetheless some partners believe that many of these discussions were just too long and the same issues were repeated each time.

The main negative feedback was regarding the explanation of the project objectives where a big percentage of partners think that it should be better explained. Moreover partners stated that they would like to see in the workshop more live demonstrations as well as more video and audio content. Other popular answers regarding the ways of improving the workshop referred to the necessity for better clarification of the workshop objectives and the inclusion in the agenda of more stimulating activities, e.g. more technical ones as well as to shorten the time of the brainstorming discussions and to make them more focused.

In conclusion, taking into account this feedback, we should try in the future to make use a bigger variety of tools like printed handouts, live demonstrations and video and focus on more technical oriented workshops along with a little different variety of topics in order to have the chance to make some more productive discussions and differentiate the next workshops from the previous ones.

SECOND YEAR :

The workshops of the second year of the project cover a lot of substantial issues and focused on a great range of topics related to the challenges of FOSS for public administrations like for example Open Source Software Migration - The political dimension, Interoperability in the public sector, political pressure on Open Solutions, determining the migration budget – methodology, risk assessment, licensing software policy Software technologies and their implementation, Data conversion, data formats – data as core value, Training and education of users – risk prevention, barrier elimination, considerations on

copyright, Open Source Data Integration Solutions, Business and Sustainability Models for FOSS in the public sector, "Open Source & Open Standards for the large scale provisioning of reusable open content", "FOSS in Education Services and Data in the PA's", "FOSS for Transparency and Open Government Projects", "FOSS License Issues" etc. In general the partners enjoyed mostly the interactive & brainstorming sections and the organization of the workshops that were well balanced. The content and the structure of the workshops received mostly positive feedback with some minor comments.

Theoretical conversations and brainstorming sessions were joined with presentations of case studies and good practices. All these lead to a number of interesting conclusions that were also extracted from similar workshops and events such as that a significant range of high quality FOSS applications for public administrations has been developed and that numerous European public administrations of various types find usefulness on FOSS.

Of course the improvement of FOSS features (which lag behind the respective features of proprietary software: certification, security, and usability) is essential.

Moreover there are many important issues that must be taken into account for a successful FOSS migration, such as the political dimension, the technological difficulties, the economic impact, the training of the users etc. For this reason successful or unsuccessful FOSS Initiatives and existing FOSS solutions in the public and private sector and ways to apply these uses were studied towards the workshops. The combined conclusions indicate that, even though FOSS solutions are developed at rapid paces and the interest of public administrations is high, some issues remain to be resolved to allow public administrations enjoy the benefits from FOSS. First, the lack of information and knowledge about good practices of FOSS usage by public administrations, and especially about the particular aspects and transition costs of the process of migration is a crucial issue. Second, there is a need for the buildup of critical masses and synergies for the effective and efficient exploitation of lessons learnt by past successful cases.

REFERENCES

1. OSEPA_CP3_Memo suggesting themes and topics for the interregional workshops_07102010 (REGIONE EMILIA ROMAGNA)
2. OSEPA 1st workshop synthesis report (STROVOLOS)
3. Likert scale http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Likert_scale