

# AMB '11

Brussels, from 10:30 to 17:00, 7<sup>th</sup> of June, 2011.

Version 3 (22/06/2011)

## Agenda

1. 10:30 – 10:45 Opening
2. 10:45 – 11:45 Open platforms and AAL market opportunities & barriers
3. 11:45 – 12:45 Example candidate platforms for porting projects  
12:45 – 13:45 Lunch break
4. 13:45 – 14:30 Funding possibilities for porting projects
5. 14:30 – 15:30 Discussion – Part I  
15:30 – 16:00 Coffee break
6. 16:00 – 17:15 Discussion – Part II
7. 17:15 – 17:30 Closing

## Hosts

- Reiner Wichert (Fraunhofer AAL Alliance, originator)
- Francesco Furfari (CNR-ISTI, representing AALOA as co-organizer)
- Peter Wintlev-Jensen (EC – INFOSO – ICT for Inclusion, co-organizer)
- Silas Olsson (AALA – AAL JP – CMU, Supporter)

## Moderator

- Saied Tazari (Fraunhofer IGD)

## Participants

1. Jan Alexandersson (DFKI GmbH)
2. Gemma Avellaneda (Leitat Technological Center)
3. Jesus Bermejo (Telvent)
4. Jose Ignacio Blanco Cuesta (IPLUSF)
5. Luc Brouckaert (Tunstall)
6. Jürgen Bund (Meticube Lda)
7. Stephanie Carretero (polibienestar University of Valencia)
8. Roberto Casas (University of Zaragoza)
9. Bart Collet (mhealth.be)
10. Francesco Furfari (CNR-ISTI)
11. Thomas Fuxreiter (AIT)
12. Thomas Karopka (EFMI)
13. Peter Klein (UID GmbH)
14. Antonio Kung (Dialog)
15. Juan Pablo Lazaro (TSB)
16. Frederic Lievens (International Society for Telemedicine & eHealth)
17. Manrique Lopez (Andago)
18. Marie T. Lubs (Egmont IRR)

19. Andrew Macfarlane (Casala)
20. Karina Marcus (AALA)
21. Marius Mikalsen (SINTEF)
22. Sofia Moreno-Perez (Evia-Ametic)
23. Neviana Nikoloski (Phonak Communications AG)
24. Silas Olsson (AALA)
25. Cristina Ozón Pereira (Fundacion Galicia Europa)
26. Carmen Pastor (Tecnalia)
27. Javier Quiles Del Rio (Fundacion Galicia Europa)
28. Reza Razavi (Ambient Activity Systems)
29. Antonio Remartinez (Ibernex Ingenieria S.L.)
30. Ma Pilar Sala Soriano (ITACA Association)
31. Jose Sanchez (Integrasys)
32. Christian Schoen (GTN SAS)
33. Thomas Sinnwell (Consistec GmbH)
34. Mayda Stoshikj (Grupo Gesfor)
35. Michael Strübin (Continua Health Alliance)
36. Yasushi Takeda (NEC Europe)
37. Saied Tazari (Fraunhofer IGD)
38. Fernando Tricas (Pariver S.A.)
39. Ad van Berlo (Smart Homes)
40. Reiner Wichert (Fraunhofer IGD)
41. Peter Wintlev-Jensen (EC – INFOSO – ICT for Inclusion)
42. Gottfried Zimmermann (University of Tübingen)

## Detailed Minutes

The first four sessions were mostly presentation based; most of the presentations are available online under <http://aaloa.org/workshops/amb11>. The purpose of these minutes is to summarize the discussions mostly taken place in the sessions 5 and 6.

The minutes consist of three major parts:

- A digest of notes taken by Juan Pablo Lazaro during the discussions. These notes are grouped into four sub-topics, each starting with the original slide shown by the moderator for stimulating the discussions
- A summary of discussion points provided by Antonio Kung along with his suggestions for further steps
- A short report about the workshop communicated by Saied Tazari as an email to AALOA supporters

### The digest of workshop notes by Juan Pablo Lazaro

**1. Benefits for the owners of (prototypes of) AAL products and services**

- Benefit from research at cutting edge level
- In success case, benefit from being among the early adopters

general benefits of using a widely accepted platform

- In success case, improve chances on the market through improved interoperability
- In success case, improve chances to be included in several service delivery packages

The premise is that platforms offer a certain level of interoperability of software and hardware artefacts. This interoperability is a benefit for:

- End users:
  - o Because nobody owns the whole market.
  - o Because it is possible to substitute software and/or hardware artefacts from different vendors (same benefit of using standards).
- Producers:
  - o Because the work (and risk) of creating and maintaining the platform is divided into several stakeholders. One doesn't need to do everything in order to provide a final and complete solution.
  - o Because it leverages progressive improvement of existing features of platforms.

Barriers:

- SMEs, in general, do not want to change a certain technology if they already have solutions that work and they control. They will adopt platforms/technologies if:
  - o Those platforms are in the market and a market is created around that platform
  - o Benefits of using that platform have been demonstrated and then SMEs can join and base their products on it.

- Those platforms should not be expensive and it must be easy to learn how to use them.
- Evolution in ICT is too fast that SMEs in general:
  - Don't have the time to analyze all the new alternatives, so they stay quiet.
  - Cannot see a clear path on the evolution of the technology, so they prefer to bide their time until a clear solution is there.
- Another barrier in the industry about AAL: IPR. Many EU projects have nice ideas that never get into the market because of IPR problems between partners. Whereas in case of proprietary solutions the protection of rights can be assumed as guaranteed. Many SMEs don't want to participate in research because they must invest resources and at the end there is no exploitable product.
- In order to adopt a new platform liability must be ensured. SMEs never will base their products on "obscure" technology that is not clear who will provide support or who is behind.
- Lack of capacity of most SMEs to make investments.
- In the AAL domain, considering EU level, it is very hard to take decisions that really provide a business plan that illustrates income in the next 3, 5, or 7 years.

Potential solutions to overcome barriers:

- Policy makers should promote platforms whose features and performance have been demonstrated.
- The idea of common platforms is that they mitigate costs at production and maintenance time.
- By sharing the work on common aspects that affect most SMEs, they will contribute actively to the evolution of the technology and they can perceive they are part of the solution and commit.
- By creating consortia of a great number of SMEs, they can together provide a market.
- A platform must not only provide a technological solution but also provide a fast and effective way of reaching real customers for those SMEs adopting it. A platform must cover the two aspects: technology provision and connection to customers.
- There should be a neutral organization that helps to evaluate and select the best platforms to be used by SMEs for AAL, and whenever possible promote interoperability among them.



## 2. Achieving market breakthrough

- a) Generally: promoting ecosystems by open platforms
  - Support development, market, & operation phases
    - optimize processes → reduce costs → attract customers
  - Achieve open interoperability across all possible application domains (critical for mass markets like AAL) → increase chances for all apps
    - serendipity → aggregation of value
- b) In particular: porting projects
  - Create an initial set of products and services around platforms to improve the portfolio on the offer side
  - Pave the way for converging conclusions on platforms



Matters about market conditions:

- SMEs are worried about how to attract customers and how to make lower the barriers with regional governments.
- A real platform (in the non-technological way of thinking) should have some level of connection with regional governments and make barriers lower.
- Put something in the market is not only a matter of developing it (reliable, nice, effective, robust...) but also a matter of cost for marketing, and in some cases even higher than the investment in the technology. SMEs find problems in financing this part.
- SMEs might not easily participate in open source projects as contributors. Many worry about lack of governance, lack of quality, lack of liability measures... and do not understand how IPRs are managed.
  - o However, a general agreement is that: open source is not bad for SMEs if there is a good governance and management.

Since the notes do not reflect comments that show the claimed “general agreement” about open source, here some points added later by Saied Tazari as a member of the AALOA governing board (note that AALOA promotes an open source policy with regard to a common AAL platform):

- o Talking about open platforms does not necessarily mean that the platform must be open source; however, if a platform should emerge from consensus building processes by involving several entities in order to lead to wider acceptance, it will have more chances to succeed and survive over time if it remains very consistent with openness and transparency, e.g., by being open source in order to guarantee the independence from any single organization and by being free in order to guarantee trust and collaboration. That way, it will be possible to mandate an association to be responsible for the needed level of governance and management.
- o If a platform is open source and free, it doesn't necessarily mean that the products on top of it must also be open source and free.
- o Contribution to open source is usually driven by each organization's own priorities. If a widely accepted and used platform is available as open source, an organization that has a certain requirement might decide to develop the needed add-on by its own and donate it back or even keep it proprietary (the latter, only if the licensing allows it). Alternatively, it can provide resources to the governing body, if that body increases the priority of the needed developments in return. The resources can be in form of, e.g., dedicating n developers for m months or taking over the quality tests.

- A good platform must ensure that it is “future-proof”. An AAL platform’s customers need to be sure that the technology will be there for years helping them as they age. Nobody wants to make a link with a dying technology.
- The existence of an ecosystem of interoperable solutions is appreciated by customers as well as by vendors that cannot dominate the market in whole alone but are trying to find their own niche.
- It is not clear in AAL if SMEs who already have a product, are willing to port their solution to a platform and share their products with other products provided by other providers. However, there are several examples of platforms that are based on this principle (i.e. Apple, Google).
- Interoperability is a technical concept, and we should be careful in using it as a selling argument. However, interoperability must be perceived by end users as a natural feature of the platform so unnecessary barriers must be avoided.
  - o The statement above was complemented by emphasizing the role of interoperability as perceived by end users. Here, a reference was made to <[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/european-standards/files/wsd-2010/annesophie-parent-age\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/european-standards/files/wsd-2010/annesophie-parent-age_en.pdf) > presented by Ms. Anne-Sophie Parent, the director of the AGE Platform Europe at the World Standards Day on Accessibility and Design for All, where she, as the representative of end users, tried to make clear why interoperability is equally important from the viewpoint of end users.

Steps to create market conditions:

- First, creation of an interoperability framework (platform?), not necessarily providing the final interoperable solution but a place where to start identifying and merging interoperability use cases, discussing alternative solutions, providing proof of concept, concluding...
- Second, creation of an ecosystem for the interoperability framework: a place where the platform can be downloaded, used, evolve, maintain in the future...
- Third, projects and examples that make use of the platform with good solutions to attract the interest of stakeholders and SMEs.
- Finally, promote these solutions as a starting point of a market, and help with marketing actions.

The EC proposes a tool that might help: CIP ICT PSP<sup>1</sup> projects. In these projects, innovative technology is deployed to pilot sites in different regions in Europe while involving many relevant market stakeholders, such as (in case of AAL) hospitals, municipalities, social service entities (i.e: Red Cross), associations representing end users... For this reason, CIP projects are an opportunity for validating platforms and showing their usefulness and maturity in cooperation with AAL customers.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ICT Policy Support Programme as part of the Competitiveness and Innovation framework Programme (CIP) under [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/ict\\_psp/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/ict_psp/index_en.htm).




### 3. Challenges for candidate platforms

- From theory of open interoperability to practice, from R&D to production
- Show practicality and usability
- Get ready for critical support services and sustainable maintenance




Challenges identified in this session (other challenges might appear in other discussion topics at this workshop):

- Updates of platform must be ensured in time.
- From prototype to active ecosystem: Most platforms are now prototypes. And it is known that from EC projects it is difficult to have something similar to a product. So, if nobody uses those results then nobody will maintain it (negative loop until the platform disappears and we must start from scratch again and again).
  - o Consortia should support platforms beyond the project that created it.
  - o It must be promoted from the EC as well.
- **Investment** in the creation of a mature solution:
  - o EC could prioritize the creation of such a platform that is not only providing a technological asset but also solving a socio-economic problem: the creation of an AAL market.
    - The EC invested around 35M€ in research platforms because it is aware of the value of a platform for promoting innovation in AAL and because it is convinced that, as it happened with the web, the solution will come from the research.
    - Since call 4 of FP7, the EC is funding universAAL with the objective of consolidating best technical solutions into a single reference platform for AAL offered in open source, together with the creation of a supporting community that is sustainable in time.
    - EC is listening for proposals of actions to continue with this strategy.
  - o Other stakeholders could invest, for instance, customers.
  - o Platforms could be managed following classical business models in open source: provide a free open source version and provide a payment version with support and proprietary advanced features.
- Coordination with other approaches is necessary, especially with Cloud Computing and Future Internet communities.
- Certification: different standard organizations have been successful because of the existence of certification programs. They ensure quality and real interoperability.
  - o The universAAL platform is currently not providing any explicit certification tool. However, it is developing the so-called “conformance tools” with the objective to verify the conformance of applications with the platform at development time. Somehow, this is the seed of a certification process.
- Real community, the example of AALOA:
  - o AALOA is not promoting any platform yet but promoting comparison, evaluation, share experiences, work on building blocks...

- AALOA is in incubation phase. Although not yet a legal entity, the formal / legal establishment is work in progress.
- AALOA is not universAAL; universAAL will be a project, as any other else in the world, inside AALOA umbrella.
- This workshop organized and promoted by AALOA is looking for attracting other platforms to join into the project list in order to start comparing and evaluating them with the aim to reach converging conclusions towards a common service platform for AAL that promotes an ecosystem of AAL technologies and application. The association is then supposed to take over the maintenance of such a platform.





EC view:

- For EC, the ICT PSP projects of CIP are an opportunity:
  - o They follow a demand driven approach, which is the preferred option for EC.
  - o They do not develop new technology but normally have to do with localization due to organizational and cultural differences of deployment sites, leading to some technical adaptation of platform but not giving the importance to technology.
  - o The efforts must be used for the pilot and local adaptation of a mature solution in several regions in Europe.
  - o These projects can be used for porting because R&D is not in the centre and what is required is adaptation.
    - Problem: current platforms have been implemented in FP7 where some pilots and proof of concepts have been done. However, there is a gap between this status and the level of maturity required for a CIP pilot.
- EIP-AHA (<http://ec.europa.eu/active-healthy-ageing>) is also a tool that could help this process though it is not a call for proposals, but an instrument to promote innovation and link offer and demand side.
- Reuse of platforms will continue being promoted in future calls about AAL in FP7 and in AAL-JP.

Proposed actions to mobilize funding:

- CIP ICT PSP may help.
- FP8 should include more explicitly how to build an ecosystem and fund the most promising initiatives to ensure its maintenance in the short term.
- Coordinate funding actions (public or private) with other domains: mobility, eHealth, energy efficiency... This may help to share one of the most important costs that are a barrier: equipment for AAL at households
  - o The combination of services that share the same infrastructure will reduce the costs. In business cases, this must be taken into account.
- Coordinate efforts with ENoLL (Open Living labs, European Network of Living Labs) in order to find mechanisms to install and promote common platforms in key Living Labs and deploy demonstrators to easier reach customers thanks the wide distribution of available associated Living Labs across Europe and even the world (Brazil, Japan...).
- A different tool than CIP or FP7/8 calls is required. It should be ensured that all aspects are taken into account: liability, maintenance, marketing... No matter who finances but it has to be considered as a whole if we want to be effective in going to the market.

- Public technological roadmaps are necessary.

Other actions that may help:

- Promote the creation of an ecosystem by creating a European repository where all open source projects are committed to deliver their code there. Inspiration can be getting from a similar initiative in Brazil for open source applications for public sector. They have defined strict rules and certification process to enter in the repository what ensures that only those really important solutions are available under the label of the repository. By belonging to this repository it is ensured that the government promotes your solutions automatically. This European repository should have mechanisms to report about features, interfaces provided, level of completeness... so any SME can go there and take the solution that better fits with its needs.
- Question: "how about outside Europe? Do we have knowledge about how AAL is being managed abroad?" answers were vague. It is required an action that creates links with the USA, Canada and Asia.
  - o URC, one of the platforms presented in this workshop, has partners with high involvement from USA and Canada.

Main conclusions and action points of this session:

- AAL-JP (Silas Olsson):
  - o There is a need of a platform/ecosystem to create better market conditions.
  - o AALA is a board of Member States that is willing to hear proposals and initiatives and take decisions, especially because the plans with regard to a time-to-market of 2 years seem not work very well.
  - o AAL-JP is thinking about support actions; funding horizontal projects as summarized in the bullet below might be possible in this context.
    - An idea suggested to Mr. Olsson was that porting projects could be defined as such horizontal projects and that prototypes resulting from the ordinary calls of the AAL JP temporarily join the porting projects, do the porting, write an evaluation report, and leave them again. This way, they will have an opportunity to explore the potential of common platforms from a technical, innovative and market point of view. Considering that the projects of the first call are almost ending and delivering results, time is ripe for such horizontal projects.
  - o It is a pity that the program of Lecce AAL Forum is already closed. Because this is an important aspect to be discussed with coordinators of AAL projects.
- This discussion must be continued with the opinion of partners of both European and national AAL projects and at the AALOA community. Disseminate these needs through the LECCE declaration promoted from MonAml project.
- The participants agree in creating a list of recommendations both for the EC (mostly the EIP on AHA) and AALA with the objective to start to define a solution for the situation. List of recommendation will be based on three main issues:
  - o Platforms are useful for creating more innovative solutions, in shorter time than vertical solutions.
  - o Platforms are useful for promoting new market opportunities.
  - o Platforms/ecosystems ensure sustainability in time.

## **The moderator's (Saied Tazari) report:**

*According to the list of people who signed the participants list on site, 42 from the 52 registered people attended the workshop. In my opinion, from a programmatic point of view the workshop was a success: both the presentations and the discussions were appreciated very much, the timing of the sessions was ok, and especially the involvement of non-organizing participants in the whole event, even in the discussions, was very obvious. I believe that this real openness of the organization has once more attracted more trust to AALOA.*

*The workshop, however, couldn't define any funding scheme for porting projects. Instead, the following can be enumerated as the results:*

- *According to my understanding, awareness about the positive role of widely accepted AAL platforms for the success on the market was created and where already existing, it was increased.*
- *I think that it was also understood that porting projects*
  - *force the platforms to deliver the evidence of being practically useful, and hence*
  - *can serve the process of consensus building so that the number of candidate platforms can be reduced to only few very promising that have the chance to be accepted and used very widely.*
- *But the fear was that the owners of prototypes cannot be sure if they are in the "right" porting project (in the sense of being in a project that finally approves the used platform as a promising one)*
- *From the side of the commission, the role of the European Innovation Partnership (in case of AAL, AHAIIP standing for Active and Healthy Ageing Innovation Partnership, also known as EIP on AHA) in the definition of the new priorities was highlighted. As far as I understood, the EIPs are supposed to deliver their first results until the end of the year and any idea about why and how to push the process of consensus building on platforms should be communicated to them as soon as possible.*
- *From the side of the AAL JP, it was emphasized that the importance of a platform is now clearer for the CMU and that the CMU is open towards any suggestion on the incorporation of this topic in the AAL JP. However, there is no guarantee if and how such suggestions can be considered; also, any decision in this regard will take time because it must be ratified by the AALA board.*
- *The concrete suggestion about launching "horizontal" porting projects in parallel to the projects of the AAL JP calls, where the prototypes coming out of the running projects temporarily join the porting projects was also classified as one of those ideas that can be suggested to the CMU for further examination.*
- *The participants agreed to create a protocol with a set of recommendations that is then sent both to the AAL JP CMU and to the EIP on AHA. For this purpose, they will use a mailing list of AALOA. We will put the protocol on the two pages [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/einclusion/events/aal\\_market/](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/einclusion/events/aal_market/) and <http://aaloa.org/news/amb11>. Also, most of the presentations will be put on these pages in the second half of June.*

## Notes and Conclusions from Antonio Kung:

List of points/recommendations/suggestions discussed during the June 7th workshop:

- *Some barriers mentioned*
  - *Having a stable ecosystem (SME cannot invest if ecosystem is instable)*
  - *Interoperability*
  - *Technology cost, operation cost.*
  - *IPR*
- *Some suggestions made*
  - *Funding a foundation that would manage the development of open source software while ensuring a level of compliance (cf Brazil repository) that would guarantee quality and trust.*
  - *Setting up a repository to store interoperable artifacts developed in collaborative projects (FP7, AAL, CIP), enforcing documentation of interoperable interfaces and documentation on the level of stress testing achieved*
  - *Include in the work programme topics projects on ecosystem building (definition and implementation of technology roadmap, technology stress testing, porting of a starting set of applications, definition of assurance mechanisms and development of related tools).*
  - *Recommendation to the EIP-AHA steering group*
    - *Need to have an interoperability approach enforced in R&D projects*
    - *Create one or several demand-supply ecosystems for platforms. Demand comes from application developers. Supply is provided by platform technology providers. Ecosystem creation includes consensus building on interoperable technology and certification, development of interoperable technology, maintenance enablers, operation enablers, and appropriate stress testing e.g. through living labs.*
    - *Create one or several demand-supply ecosystems for application developments. Demand comes from users and services providers. Supply is provided by application providers and platform providers. Ecosystem creation includes consensus building on interoperable applications and certification, integration of multiple platforms (e.g. for social network, service, accessibility), development of interoperable applications, maintenance enablers, operation enablers, and appropriate stress testing e.g. through living labs*

### **Suggestion for next steps**

- *prioritised set of recommendations (using this thread of discussion?)*
- *disseminating the recommendations e.g. through a LECCE declaration with wide AAL community endorsement (see MonAMI declaration attached as example)*
  - *Suggestion that declaration should use the phraseology to match the mindset of policy makers discussing the EIP-Active-Healthy-Ageing.*
  - *For instance*
    - *calling for measures enforcing interoperability of ICT for ageing*
    - *calling for measures to create one or several demand-supply ecosystems for platforms*
    - *calling for measures to create one or several demand-supply ecosystems for application development*