



SELECT FOR CITIES END OF PHASE 3 DELIVERABLES & EVALUATION REPORT (D6.1 - v. PUBLIC)

Project Acronym: ***SELECT***
Standardized, opEn, data-driven, service-oriented & user-centric pLatform Enabling large-scale Co-creation, Testing & validation of IoE services for Cities

Project Title: ***Testing & validation of IoE services for Cities***

GA Number: ***688196***

Authors: Buyers Group
Version: V.1.0
Dissemination level: Public

Document revision history

Revision				
No	Author	Organization	Date	Work effectuated
1	Hugo Goncalves	Forum Virium	30/11/2019	Initial draft
3	All	Consortium	10/12/2019	Finalized draft

Approvals for final version

Contributor	Author	Organization	Date
Consortium	Consortium	Select for Cities Consortium	15/12/2019

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Project internal consultation results	6
Conclusion	7

Executive Summary

This report is the overview of the project-internal consultation to gauge city partners' stakeholders in procuring one or more of the solutions developed in SELECT for Cities (which would then need to be part of a normal procurement process, open to other bidders that did not participate to one of SELECT for Cities' phases).

This report is to be read in addition to final project deliverables, in particular deliverable D5.3 'Evaluation report, PCP Phase 3' as it is directly linked to the activities and results obtained during the PCP Phase 3 solutions testing in living labs within the cities of Antwerp and Helsinki.

This report is based on the feedback received during the solutions testing and via direct discussions with key City representatives. Below follows a list of the City representatives upon which we based on findings and their role/participation in the project.

Project internal consultation results

The following represents a consolidation of the statements and input collected from the actors listed above.

The Solutions were interesting and the demo cases mostly reflected possible usage scenarios, including IoT AQ data, using map data and predictive analytics and charting data with graphs.

The City based users part of the testing expressed a positive impression of the solutions and interest in continuing to be involved in their development and testing if possible. However they all remarked that in order for the solutions to be implemented in their respective contexts, integration work should be contracted to the solutions providers, and some further technical development would also be required to ensure their robustness and data privacy as reported in above.

By using specific demo cases during the user's interaction with the Solutions, some degree of innovation scope was lost. Also, some key aspects on data privacy and consent management raised questions, that would need to be clarified before a city-wide platform usage can be considered. Nevertheless some of the solutions have developed models based on the MyData approach for data consent management system, and the modularity of the platforms allows for such types of upgrades. The scaling as a possible deployment on a wide city level was also a question mark, but furthermore known to be less significant and a technically achievable issue.

The technical issues detected during the solutions pilot, were mostly based on these scenarios:

- the usage or usability with several IoT devices require wide scale of protocol support (this is also available in the Florence platform), easy-to-setup-platform (UI and visibility),
- the sign-in process features (how a big organisation can deploy users to the platforms) and finally,
- how data storages, APIs and connectivity to existing software can be handled (Helsinki City has over 1000 software applications in use).

Despite the positive impressions, no stakeholder showed a clear interest in the continuation of the work via a Public Procurement of Innovation (PPI) project, which could support the solutions further development via a co-funding grant.

This is due to the burdensome work that a PPI application entails, its long time scale till the communication of the proposal results and the conviction that a customisation work to match the department concrete need would be a more effective way forward.

The conclusion was that the platforms are currently able to be used in a narrow band/selected applications (citizen usage and city officer usage). And for a larger scale adoption they would require a customised integration work and a security and usability audit, including exhaustive testing prior to official launch. This would be a resource intensive exercise.

Conclusion

From a technical standpoint the solutions are already open source and able to be immediately up-taken (GitHub).

The Buyers group members will still consider possible implementations after PCP Phase 3 deployment process is evaluated at a higher department/division level. At this moment no Buyers are not yet able to make a formal assessment of a possible procuring of one or several of the final SELECT for Cities solutions.

It is important to remember that the final results of the Select4Cities project have just been released and time is needed to analyse the platforms performance and integration into the City wider ICT framework.

Therefore, due to the easy access to the solutions via their open source versions and the lack of capacity to consider a large scale deployment at this stage, there is no interest in the development of a PPI proposal based on SELECT for Cities results.

Despite the lack of interest in the continuation of this endeavour via a PPI, we perceive this as a positive outcome, as the solutions proved relevant to multiple stakeholders and are also being uptaken by other cities.