

**ACRONYM : SABER**

**TITLE: Satellite Broadband for European Regions**

**PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR: CSI-PIEMONTE**

**WORK PACKAGE 2 LEADER: Skylogic Spa**

**Work Shop 1 MEETING MINUTES**

**Cork, 19th February 2013, 9:00 – 16:30.**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

<b>1 – CSI-Piemonte, IT:</b>	Vittorio Vallero;
<b>2 – CNR-IREA, IT:</b>	<a href="#">Mario Angelo Gomasasca;</a>
<b>3 – Fundecyt, ES:</b>	Kety Cáceres;
<b>4 – Lepida, IT:</b>	<a href="#">Sandra Lotti;</a>
<b>5 – SIR, IT:</b>	<a href="#">Luciano Cococchia, Agostino, Sciascia, Domenico Lilla;</a>
<b>6 – WNRI, NO:</b>	Ivar Petter Grøtte;
<b>7 – BHV, NO:</b>	Kjell Pedersen-Rise;
<b>8 – NEM, UK:</b>	Alex Roy;
<b>9 – Niverlan, FR:</b>	Gaelle Rousseau;
<b>10 – ACREO, SE:</b>	<a href="#">(ABSENT);</a>
<b>11 – SWRA, IE:</b>	Claire Davis, John Forde, Teresa O’Halloran;
<b>12 – MWRA, IE:</b>	Fiona Mc Cormack, Liam Conneally;
<b>13 – COI, PL:</b>	Anna Siemek-Filus;
<b>14 – RDHOR, SI:</b>	Davorin Rogina;
<b>15 – MIT, RO:</b>	Aristica Iagar;
<b>16 – ETA-2U, RO:</b>	Teodora Frunza, Bogdan Grecu, Mariana Radu;
<b>17 – eTRIKALA, GR:</b>	Kalli Liatou;
<b>18 – TOSP, IT:</b>	Sabino Titomanlio;
<b>19 – INFOTER, HU:</b>	Sàndor Mester;
<b>20 – DEVONCC, UK:</b>	Karen Bridgford;
<b>21 – RCITT, PL:</b>	Jacek Korona, Lukasz, Bilski
<b>22 – SLINUA, IE:</b>	Rosemary O’Connor, Patrick Sullivan;
<b>23 – EUTELSAT, FR:</b>	Stefano Agnelli, Lea Lanaud;
<b>24 – ASTRIUM, FR:</b>	Agnes Salvatori; KRETZSCHMAR, Valentin

**25 – SKYLOGIC, IT:** Luisella Ciani, Giorgio Tarchi;  
**26 – SBBS, LU:** Nima Azarmgin. Francisco Jose Cabanas

**Guests**

**27 – NEREUS** Roya Ayazi  
**28 – RSC4Business** Ian Martin  
**29 - DG CONNECT** Philippe Lefebvre  
**30 – TESA** Francis Castanié  
**31 - National Space Centre** Rory Fitzpatrick, Fiona Eivers

## Agenda:

### Introduction:

1. SABER Project SABER Coordinator– Vittorio Vallero (CSI Piemonte)
2. Irish EU Presidency Patrick Sullivan (Slí Nua Development Ltd) on behalf of the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources
3. Workshop Introduction and overview Coordinator WP2 – Luisella Ciani (Skylogic)

### Panels session:

Panel 1: Best practices

Panel 2: Requirements of the early stream regions

Panel 3 : Roadblocks on satellite broadband deployment + Satellite services procurement

### Working session: Guidelines on Satellite services procurement

1. Introduction Coordinator WP2 Skylogic – Luisella Ciani
2. Working Groups session – How to develop guidelines
3. Working Groups Results and Debate

### WP 2 Next steps Coordinator WP2 (Skylogic) – Luisella Ciani

### Workshop Conclusions John Forde (South West Regional Authority)

## 1) Introduction

### 1.1 SABER Introduction

Vittorio Vallero welcomed everyone to the First SABER Workshop and briefly introduced the SABER project describing objectives, activities, outcomes, the consortium, the coordinator, roles, the project streams, the chosen approach and the anticipated impact of the project.

An overview of the five work packages of the project was presented along with the chart of project Gantt and the project management system.

(Power point presentation is in ANNEX 1 .)

## **1.2 Irish EU Presidency - Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources**

Patrick Sullivan (Slí Nua Development Ltd) welcomed the SABER Work Shop participants on behalf of the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources and made a brief presentation on the Irish National Broadband Plan.

After explaining the background and the context of the strategy he detailed the Broadband programmes, the objectives, the targets and the investments underling that the Irish Government is working attentively to remove the infrastructure barriers.

## **1.3 Workshop Introduction and overview**

Luisella Ciani (Skylogic Spa) briefly introduced the main objective of the workshop stressing the importance to engage regions to share knowledge and experience and to raise awareness of how satellite broadband can be used to address broadband gaps.

After presenting the outline of the workshop, she provided a specific introduction of the morning session with the description of the specific objectives and participants of the 3 panels.

## **2 Panels session**

### **2.1 Panel 1: Best practices**

The first panel was moderated by Nima Azarmgin, SES (Luxembourg).

The main objective of the panel was to share the experience of SABER regions in deploying Satellite Broadband and to identify the elements to be taken into account in order to achieve successfully further deployment of satellite broadband in EU.

#### Panelists:

- Karen Bridgford, Devon County Council (UK);
- Lea Lanaud, Eutelsat (France);
- Kalli P. Liatou, eTrikala (Greece) and;
- Kjell Pedersen-Rise, Bykle & Hovden Vest

#### Presentations

##### **Kalli P. Liatou**

Trikala, in the centre of Greece is mainly a mountainous region with a population of 150938 spread in an area of 3389km<sup>2</sup>. 4 spots of the mountainous part of Trikala benefited from the deployment of Satellite Broadband among them the village of Gardiki and the well known ski resort of Seli. The deployment started in 2008 with the contribution of the Hellenic Aerospace Industry.

According to eTrikala, remote areas which cannot be accessed neither by ADSL nor fibre optics can best use Satellite internet in order to have broadband connection taking into account the difficulties that might occur. During the 5 years' experience eTrikala had with satellite broadband, the main concerns the region had with satellite consisted in the transmission speeds and problems encountered during rain and snow but also the cost of the service (+/- 60euros) and of the equipment. The cost of the service was 450€ per month while the interconnection speed was Download:2Mbps/Upload:256kbps (all prices are without VAT).

On the other hand, eTrikala submitted that satellite was a resilient technology with wide coverage especially in areas not accessible through wired lines with a cost which is independent from the distance between the stations that are going to communication.

eTrikala further explained that their project was part of a national project in the frame of the 3rd strategic framework activated in 2008.

To the question, what eTrikala would change for the next deployment eTrikala responded that they would perform a more in depth research on the providers before the deployment as well as a wider consultation of various stakeholders.

To the question, what eTrikala would change for the next deployment eTrikala responded that they would perform a more in depth research on the providers

before the deployment as well as a wider consultation of various stakeholders.

### **Léa Lanaud**

Mrs Lanaud's presentation focused on the funding model of broadband deployment. She gave an overview of the French case which could be potentially replicated as a best practice in other regions of Europe. Indeed, in order to ensure the coverage of the 1% of French households still ineligible to DSL lines, more than half of the départements, through their broadband deployment plans, put in place a demand stimulation mechanism using vouchers to subsidise the purchase and installation of the satellite equipment.

The successful example of Auvergne region and its "Auvergne haut débit" plan was developed. Satellite broadband as part of the mix of technologies was subsidised, thanks to ERDF, to ensure 100% coverage of the region. By November 2012, 38% of the households ineligible to DSL were connected to satellite broadband. The regional authority awards the end users with vouchers that consist in €400 for the equipment costs and €200 for the installation costs. The end users can select among the offers of 5 different satellite broadband service providers so that competition between service providers was ensured.

### **Karen Bridgford**

The "Rural Connection" plan which started in November 2011 and will end in December 2013 in the rural upland areas of Devon and Somerset County (UK), has allowed the installation of 100 user terminals so far according to Mrs Bridgford as part of a wider technology neutral plan for connectivity across the counties. The main target groups were SMEs, households and tourism and leisure sector as the objective of the plan was to stimulate rural economy and social life. The budget allocated to this project was 550,000 euros with the IT support and the "Digital mentoring" also provided as part of the project.

Although they enjoyed a fair recognition among the authorities and users, because of some past experience with the quality of services (compared to terrestrial technologies for instance) and the pricing, satellite technologies met some resistance notably from SMEs (data cap).

Devon's answer to that passed by a refreshed marketing message ("seeing is

believing and you can have it NOW!’ and “Satellite is a legitimate option for some remote areas”) addressing the specific question of the pricing and the quality, facilitated by the upgrade of satellite capacities. Also, the fact that in some areas the economics of fibre or fixed lines made it difficult to ensure connectivity was put forward and played in favour of satellite technologies. As a result, 113 businesses, 50 groups/organisations were connected and 68 SMEs have received 8 hour 1 to 1 support.

### **Kjell Pedersen-Rise**

In 2008 the residents in Agder were given a guarantee of getting broadband at their homes. (The guarantee will end at about 2013. 07.01) The provider was allowed to use 160 broadband connections by using satellite.

A short time there were about 200 connections by satellite. At the moment about 80 residents are using satellites.

Feedback from users showed that speed and capacity were not always adapted to their needs notably because of the limitations imposed by Fair Use Policies. Mr. Pedersen also mentioned the prices were perceived as not comparable to xDSL’s notably because of the subsidisation of parts of the costs by the region. However, Mr. Pedersen recognised that new offers and upgraded capacity were closer to meet users’ needs and that efforts made by the region to better assess existing offers and technologies, could only help achieve better targets and bring more satisfaction for the users.

Mr. Pedersen recognised as well the positive role of satellites in areas where no other technology is available but also mentioned that the substitutability of the technology was high with larger offers notably with 3G.

### **Q/A Sessions**

During the questions and answers session participants, while recognising the role of satellites in bringing connectivity raised the question of the cost and the latency which they see as a barrier for further take up of the technology.

To the latter, other participants answered that there might be in most cases a misperception about the satellite broadband offers as most data discussed during the panel were relatively “outdated” if compared to the current advances in the technology (Ka) and the ever improving quality of services across Europe.

The panelists took well note of the fact that a better assessment of existing

offers should be made in order to have the fairest approach towards satellite broadband and in return provide the users with the best services and technologies available. Mrs Liatou talked about the necessity to do better research before deployment of the technologies and make sure all the stakeholders are rightly consulted. Mrs Bridgford advised to come to the basics with the messages and to make a better usage of available funding mechanisms to which Mr Pedersen agreed. The latter also underlined the importance of the ISPs who play an important role in the technology choice and advised to assess their technical and commercial capabilities before taking the deployment decision.

## 2.2 Panel 2: Requirements of the early stream regions

The second panel was moderated by Patrick Sullivan, (Slí Nua Development Ltd).

There were five regions represented on Panel 2. These were:

- Vittorio Vallero, CSI Piemonte (Region Piemonte - Italy)
- Sabino Titomanlio, Association Toscana Spazio (Region Toscana - Italy)
- Sándor Mester, Infotér (Hungary)
- Gaelle Rousseau, Nièvre Numérique (formerly Niverlan)(Nièvre County, Burgundy - France)
- Luciano Cococcia IT Technical Infrastructures Co-ordinator, Region of Abruzzo (Italy)

### Introduction

The first workshop is the first step in engaging regions to share knowledge and experience and to raise awareness of how satellite broadband can be used to address broadband gaps and to review demand aggregation schemes.

The Panel 2 was composed of representatives of the early stream regions. The early stream regions are those regions that are in an advanced stage of addressing their broadband gaps and not spots to achieve 100% basic broadband coverage in their region and which are ready to begin the process of deploying a solution. The objective of the panel 2 discussions was to gain an insight into the regions preparedness for addressing their broadband gaps and not spots and to review the extent to which satellite technology would be

relevant to reduce the digital divide and hence help achieve the 2013 Digital Agenda for Europe targets.

The early stream regions were asked to prepare a presentation answering two questions. The first question was 'What is the current situation of broadband in your region?' This question sought to gain an insight into the market needs for broadband and in particular the needs that could be addressed by satellite technologies. The second question was 'Where is satellite broadband positioned, in terms of programming and funding, within the overall broadband strategy for you region? And, are you confronted to the risk of automatic de-commitment of EU funds?' If the first question was to establish the market need for broadband in the region, the second follow on question was to ascertain whether the region was seriously considering satellite technology as a possible solution to address the market need.

## Summary of the Panel 2 presentations

### Market Needs

All the regions of the panel 2 identified a market need for broadband and these needs were expressed in different ways:

- Around 1,000 households and businesses possibly living in not-spot areas;
- There are about 5% of citizens (circa 200,000) living in mountainous areas without qualified broadband access;
- 500 – 700 settlements (small villages) out of 3,200 have no sufficient broadband coverage (19%);
- There is a growth potential of +1,000 homes for satellite technology;
- 11.47% of the population live in areas with a “digital divide” in broadband access

From the presentations given it is clear that all regions represented on the panel have not yet hit the 2013 Digital Agenda for Europe target of 100% of the population having access to basic broadband services. It is also clear that the regions represented face different challenges in addressing their broadband gaps. These challenges include:

- the presence of difficult mountainous terrains with scattered communities and houses, political;
- prolonged recognition of the importance of broadband for economic and

- social development by key policy and investment decision makers;
- the lack of demand has resulted in a lack of investment by the private sector;

## **The positioning of Satellite Technologies within Broadband Strategies and Plans**

Three of the five regions explicitly mentioned that satellite broadband solutions were available in their regions. However, cost was a barrier to their wide exploitation.

Three of the regions stated that broadband was included, or was about to be included, in their regional development strategies and plans. Two regions stated that satellite broadband was not included in their broadband development plans. A challenge for one of the regions was to gather as much evidence as possible to convince policy and investment decision makers of the merits of satellite broadband.

### **Implementation plans**

Two of the five regions stated explicitly that, during 2013, they are introducing new initiatives targeted specifically at the introduction of incentives to encourage the take-up and exploitation of satellite technology broadband services. The implementation of broadband initiatives that explicitly include satellite broadband services, remain a challenge for a number of the regions. However, the representatives on the panel indicated that, gaining evidence of the practical and productive use of satellite technologies to address broadband gaps would significantly assist the process of including satellite in their broadband deployment plans.

### **Summary of the Open Discussion**

The open discussion produced a wide and varied number of topics which were addressed briefly by the panel. However many of the topics will be taken forward for further debate as the series of workshops get underway.

The workshop participants raised the following questions:

#### ***Question. Understanding your plan for 2013, but what next?***

Responses. There will always be places and locations where it will not be possible to get access to broadband services, in particular for services to be delivered to satisfy the DAE 2020 target. The volume of consumers could be

anywhere in the region of 0.1% to 3% and it is very unlikely that the market will be sufficient for the private sector to invest alone. It is seen very much as a political and social issue because it will likely be the poorest communities that will not be served and therefore it is probable that the public sector will need to continue to intervene if the 2020 targets are to be realised.

**Question. Which models were used for mapping the broadband penetration in the region?**

Responses. No specific models for mapping the broadband penetration were put forward as a likely solution for those seeking to map their own broadband penetration. However, a number of interesting comments were made concerning the mapping of offers linked to providers of certain services. The mapping ought to be linked to the broadband needs of an area and then superimpose the services available to satisfy that need. In that way the broadband needs and the absence of service provision can be identified.

**Question. When planning interventions what problems do you face?**

Responses. The main problems faced are more from an administrative perspective. How do you fund the intervention? How does it link to the National Policies, and how do you address state aid? A further issue is concerned with how you increase the number of users. Many interventions address the lack of infrastructure and then rely on the private sector to attract the consumer base. When addressing broadband gaps, in particular through the use of satellite technologies, the intervention is targeted at the end consumer providing incentives to encourage their investment in the services. Therefore a plan for how to handle broadband subscriptions using public support is quite challenging, especially when dealing with the state aid issues.

**Question. In addressing the broadband gaps, are you introducing different strategies for businesses and households?**

Responses. The panel members agreed that this was an interesting question in that different strategies are generally required to support the different target groups. One respondent stated that their initiatives would be to encourage businesses, through the provision of free consultancy services, to increase their use of broadband thereby pushing users to demand higher broadband speeds therefore increasing the market. This approach of increasing the size of the market is aimed at encouraging increased investment in broadband infrastructure from the private sector.

Regarding householders, the panellists considered this to be more challenging, in particular from an administrative point of view. Regional Governments have traditionally found it easier to co-fund infrastructure, unlike with satellite

services where the intervention needs to be targeted at the end consumer. The challenges therefore are more to do with identifying and encouraging end consumers to apply for grant aid and then dealing with the administration of state aid.

The panel 2 session concluded with an acknowledgement that many of the topics discussed will require further debate as the workshop programme develops.

## 2.3 Panel 3: Roadblocks on satellite broadband deployment + Satellite services procurement

The third panel was moderated by Roya Ayazi, NEREUS Secretary General

Panelists:

- Anna Siemek-Filus (Cities on the internet),
- Stefano Agnelli (Eutelsat);
- Agnes Salvatori (Astrium SAS),
- Francis Castanié (TeSA – Nereus Member)

The panel comprised a sound mix of relevant interest groups, amongst which two industry representatives, a research player and a representative of an NGO. (see Annex I Agenda)

**Roya Ayazi**, SG NEREUS introduced the session highlighting that the focus was on accessing the non-technological barriers that hinder regional and local authorities to enhance a broader deployment and use of broadband and satellite services. The technological solutions were in place but nevertheless the up-take was still slow. The session had the objective to learn more about the reasons and factors that caused the slow uptake.

**Anna Siemek-Filus**, representing “Cities on the internet”, a Polish expert NGO with the mission to support the development of Information Society at the regional level, took the floor and explained briefly the nature of her organisation. While presenting some examples where the deployment of broadband/satellite technologies was supported with public funding within the Innovative Economy Operational Programme, Priority VIII: Information

Society – Increase of economy innovativeness, Activity 8.3: e Inclusion and Activity 8.4: „last mille” broadband internet, she still stated a slow/little up-take of satellite services. As major problems she identified the combination of a lack of information/knowledge and the cost issue. The low level of awareness and partly false or out-dated information about satellite solutions among both citizens (potential customers) but also public authorities were key elements for the low public acceptance. Relevant target groups are often not up-to-date regarding the services quality, performance or potentials. For several reasons (market not developed, limited demand, access to public funds very limited, lack of procurements) satellite solutions are rarely used in Poland. Both factors lead individual customers but also public authorities to be sceptical of broadband solutions and less inclined to consider them as a viable option. Anna quoted as an evaluation example where satellite solutions were in the evaluation scheme less valued than other technology solutions to illustrate the difficulties. One evaluation criteria had been indicated as “technological solutions are effective and adjusted to project’s area characteristics”. While you could gain 35 points of a maximum of 100 for all criteria, the use of satellites technologies was awarded with 7 points and in some highly justified (= no other solution is possible) cases 14 points. (More info see Annex II: ppp Siemek-Filus)

**Stefano Agnelli**, (Eutelsat) admitting that the lack of awareness among users but also public authorities as regards actual prices and actual performance was an important drawback, put in his intervention emphasis on the legislative aspect. More clarity was needed regarding legislation. The difficult access to public funding for broadband and satellite procurement is partly due to the fact that public authorities do not respect the Technology Neutrality principle (e.g. award criterion based on different number of points for different technologies). Although they claim to be “technology-neutral” public tenders or state aid programs are often conceived in a way that they exclude satellite network architecture or take it not adequately into consideration. Further to this, would the bundling of service objectives with unnecessary infrastructure requirements (e.g. restriction of technical solutions to “construction”) be a factor that disadvantages the deployment of satellite solutions. Even more important, satellite network architecture is often not taken into account in supposedly “technology-neutral” calls for Tender / State Aid Programs. For instance, in satellite networks, no separation exists into backhaul and last mile. Therefore any reference architecture based on this separation does not make it possible to consider satellite-based solutions. Finally, Agnelli stressed that OPEN ACCESS is guaranteed in the provision of

satellite-based services, and claiming that this was not the case would be another drawback (More info see Annex III: ppp Agnelli).

**Agnes Salvatori**, (Astrium SAS), presented in her intervention a number of projects that Astrium Satellites led or participated in since 2004 (see list ppp Astrium). For supporting the SABER-initiative, Astrium reviewed the findings of those projects and interviewed the projects actors to draw a set of lessons-learned. A major finding is that it is difficult in many countries to identify the right contact point at regional level to address the broadband deployment issues. Furthermore, past projects showed that there is a clear lack of local expertise and motivation for involvement; they also revealed the scepticism of regional and local authorities towards new types of services as key roadblocks. Further to this, Agnes Salvatori stated that the involvement and support of relevant EC-directorates at local/regional level, in particular DG REGIO, was missing while it would enable the regions in need to better use the Structural fund. She called for the EC to install a kind of “ICT Council” presence and expertise in all regions needing it, ensuring a sustainable local support to the DAE targets achievement at large. Lastly she also noted that the sustainability of the actions had most of the time not been ensured beyond FP7 projects termination: indeed R&D projects do not implement a value chain close enough to “real life”.

**Francis Castanié, TÉSa** (Telecommunications for Space and Aeronautics) brought into the discussion the socio-economic dimension of satellite solutions by introducing an example of telemedicine. In particular with respect to the challenge of an ageing European population and aging populations in remote areas, telemedicine was in many cases an indispensable solution. Referring to the cost argument Castanié underlined that the broadband deployment can not only be seen under budgetary aspects but that the benefits for the public health system were much broader. In cases of mass spreading of the procedures throughout wide areas: chronic diseases, elderly patients, telemedicine offered unique solutions that are much more efficient and in the long run also more cost-efficient than existing solutions.

## Debate

The presentations were followed by a vivid debate among the WS-participants. In the first place environmental aspects were brought into the discussion. The EC was directly addressed and asked for its views regarding

the environmental aspects of broadband deployment. Some participants stressed that the deployment of broadband is particularly environmental friendly as no large constructional changes are necessary. Considering the Natura Directive that many regions have to comply with in their territory, they suggested that in competition with other technological solutions the environmental capability could be an asset. In comparison to other solutions it should be valued in favour of satellite solutions that the infrastructure fits well in the landscape.

The EC (represented by Philippe J. Lefebvre) signalled that the EC has already difficulties spending regional funds on broadband deployment. Referring to environmental issues as a base to secure EU-funding within an environmental program seemed not too convincing to him. The EC suggested instead making a sound analysis of the situation, looking at the obstacles in a rational way, demonstrate the benefits and impact and clearly quantify the economic added value. Then it would be possible to discuss elements for potential solutions scenarios. It was underlined by participants of the debate that the major objective was a 100% coverage across Europe. Satellite solutions were not only particularly useful in rural and remote areas but offer a broad range of benefits.

### 3 Pannel session conclusions

Luisella invited Mr Philippe Lefebvre to conclude the first part of the Work Shop.

Philippe underlined that DG Connect expects SABER Projects results to test and validate satellite broadband ability to bridge the digital divide. In this contest, depending on the territories, satellite will be a gap filler or a long term solution as proved by the BB Med Study financed in cooperation with ESA and now available.

It's important to focus on:

- how to write the broadband scheme to include satellite solutions
- find the correct and effective way to provide grants to finance the CAPEX

This could be done also thanks to best practices from other countries and continents.

For this reason DG Connect suggests SABER to investigate potential synergies

with the project BRESAT, financed within the same Thematic Network, in view of possible cooperation / exchanges of information.

## 4 Working session: Guidelines on Satellite services procurement

### 4.1 Introduction

One of the tasks of Work Package 2 is to write a deliverable on preliminary guidelines on satellite deployment planning to support early stream Regions.

Luisella explained that, in order to verify the main interest of the partners on how to develop guidelines useful to analyze, plan, solve issues linked to satellite broadband deployment, the WS participants were divided in 4 Working Groups (WG) as follow:

WG 1	WG 2	WG 3	WG 4
CNR-IREA	Lepida	Abruzzo	Toscana spazio
Astrium	Skylogic	SBBS	Eutelsat
RDHOR	MIRA	ETA-2U	CoI
Fundecyt	Niverlan	eTrikala	Infoter
CSI-Piemonte	RCITT	SWRA	MWRA
SLINUA	NEM	BHV	DEVON
NEREUS	WNRI	TeSA	

Each Working Group analysed the same topics and selected a coordinator.

The topics object of the discussion were:

1. SOLUTIONS TO IMPLEMENT SATELLITE BROADBAND ACCESS OPERATION (OVERVIEW INCLUDING FINAL BENEFICIARIES, FINAL RECIPIENTS, STATE AID BROADBAND GUIDELINES, DEMAND

AGGREGATION)

2. IMPLEMENTATION/PROCUREMENT METHODS: Vouchers; Call for tender;
3. Financial Circuit
4. Monitoring

Each topic was expressly not described in details to let the partners to have an open discussion on the base of each experience.

Working Groups coordinators:

- WG1: Ian Martin
- WG2: Alex Roy
- WG3: Nima Azarmgin
- WG4: Karen Bridgford

The timing for each WG discussion to develop the analysis was 1:30 hour. During the WGs discussion Luisella provided assistance in case of specific requests.

## 4.2 Working Groups Results and Debate

Each WG Coordinator presented the analysis undertaken (see the WG Presentations in annex II).

The main highlights for each topic are:

	SOLUTIONS TO IMPLEMENT SATELLITE BROADBAND ACCESS OPERATION
WG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Bases:</b> Bridging broadband gap; Economic equalisation and Green agenda.</li> <li>- Separation between Final Beneficiaries and final recipients</li> <li>- <b>Demand aggregation:</b> Needs clustering, Interregional/transnational collaboration; Critical mass of potential users</li> </ul>
WG 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Prior demand registration</b> from the end user to</li> </ul>

	<p>understand scale of demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community- led <b>demand aggregation</b>.</li> </ul>
WG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The analysis of the different needs of end user is essential to know the Number of terminals, scope of the intervention, speed, applications</li> <li>- <b>Demand aggregation</b> has to be the result of of the Mapping, Types of needs and types of end users</li> </ul>
WG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Common approach to mapping existing infrastructure.</li> <li>- Common set of criteria to assess need – analyse areas of greatest needs (poorest speeds, lowest wages, greatest social problems).</li> <li>- Demand aggregation – difficult to find a solution that works across Member State boundaries.</li> </ul>

	IMPLEMENTATION/PROCUREMENT METHODS:
WG 1	<p><b>Vouchers:</b> Pros: technology agnostic, real choice, beneficiary is the final user; Cons: very heavy burden on administrations, difficult to monitor, potential confusion on choice of vendors.</p> <p><b>Call for tender:</b> Pros: more control, strategic view, easier to monitor. Cons: risk of unspent funds, initially labour intensive, Only one company awarded.</p>
WG 2	<p><b>Vouchers:</b> invest upfront &amp; refund; end users can decide what service they want – possibility of pre-qualify number of minimum offers but can still innovate.</p> <p><b>Call for Tenders:</b> Frozen service specifications</p>
WG 3	<p>Consideration of different architectures in the call for tenders in respect of technology neutrality</p> <p>Respect of the rules regarding the amount of money which is available (e.g De minimis rule) and EU state aid guidelines</p>

WG 4	<p><b>Voucher scheme</b> may be easier to administer –</p> <p><b>Call off arrangement</b> – produces list of verified suppliers (might be difficult to propose multiple suppliers in rural areas?).</p> <p><b>Open tender to select a single service provider</b> – can assess their quality, customer service, marketing as well as basic ability to deploy, and provide assistance to, satellite equipment.</p> <p>Procurement route will need to assess value for (public) money and any stipulations by funders.</p>
------	--

	Financial Circuit
WG 1	Identification of the most appropriate funding; adaptation of the procedures to the legal framework of the fund/s
WG 2	<p>Initial investment in infrastructure to provide services for free for limited time &amp; then services paid for &amp; infrastructure sold;</p> <p>To reduce service price, consider to rent part of the satellite infrastructure.</p> <p>Satellite + Wi-Fi hybrid</p>
WG 3	Call for tenders according to the scope of the project (municipal level, national call, open call)
WG 4	<p>Choice of procurement route may depend on what the public administration is trying to achieve: stimulation of competition amongst service operators or uniform quality of solution from a single supplier?</p> <p>Voucher scheme: need to think through how the beneficiaries apply for the voucher.</p> <p>Call for tender: set out maximum value of subsidy available but pay against installation results.</p>

	Monitoring
WG 1	Independent feedback gathering that includes: Legally binding survey; Remote SW monitoring; User validation; Quantitative and qualitative measuring
WG 2	Compliant to the public fund; track PCE installed with the service on.
WG 3	Fundamental topics: Milestones; assure and check a Competitive dialogue; check the respect of the Clawback mechanism.
WG 4	<p>Monitoring of spend on equipment will depend on funder requirements and accepted Accounting procedures.</p> <p>Customer satisfaction surveys – may monitor supplier quality of deployment AND also end user satisfaction.</p> <p>Demand Aggregation activities may assess level of ICT skills/usage before satellite broadband deployment and user experience post deployment.</p>

#### Main conclusions of the 4 WGs:

- Identify the key elements of the scheme in order to understand what has to be done, how and what is needed in terms of demand, services and applications. All in line with the funds framework regulation.
- Satellite can be part of hybrid solutions, with long-term evolutionary potential – e.g. aggregating demand for satellite to feed Wi-Fi, which can be replaced over time with fibre
- Demand aggregation could be an effective, cost efficient solution to be included in the scheme proposals. Demand stimulation activities – especially complementary support on ICT skills is important to derive maximum benefit from the project.
- Choice of procurement route depends on the overall objective
- There are different kind of procurement to be analysed and that could be used within the scheme: **Voucher, call of arrangement, call for tender.**

- **Distinction between Final beneficiaries and Final Recipients.**
- Monitoring has to track PCE installed with the service on.
- Cash flow has to be identify on the bases of the procurement and monitoring rules.
- Customer satisfaction surveys - important to measure real impact of deployment

## 5 WP 2 Next steps

To receive feedback of the workshop Luisella asked to all participants to fill in the anonymous questionnaire included in the folder delivered at the beginning of the day. The result and analysis of the feedbacks can be checked in Annex III.

Luisella proceeded asking to the partners the availability to cooperate on the elaboration of WP2 deliverables. Signally:

1. Early Guidelines on Satellite Services Procurement (M6, PU). The following partners agreed to cooperate:
  - Partner Eutelsat
  - Partner RDHOR
  - Partner CSI Piemonte
  - Partner Skylogic
2. Regional and National satellite broadband implementation case studies x 5 (M6, PU). The following partners agreed to cooperate:
  - Partner DevonCC
  - Partner eTrikala
  - Partner Eutelsat
  - Partner Skylogic
  - Partner BHV

Luisella will provide the template after the WS.

3. Early report on Satellite Broadband as an option for Regions; including non-technological roadblocks and potential for demand aggregation (M6, PU). The following partners agreed to cooperate:
- Partner SBBS
  - Partner Eutelsat
  - Partner Skylogic
  - Partner CSI Piemonte

Considering that the next Work Shop will cover the deliverables of WP2, in order to invite different stakeholders to the event, Vittorio and Luisella proposed to hold it in Brussels. The partners agreed.

In this contest Vittorio and Luisella asked the partner possible available dates to launch a Doodle. The partners agreed on checking the following dates: April 16/17-23/24 or May 6/10

Before concluding the Work Shop, Vittorio, Luisella and all the partners thanked John Forde, Claire Davids and all the colleagues of the Regional Authority for the excellent organization of the Work Shop.

## **6 Workshop Conclusions John Forde (South West Regional Authority)**

John expressed his satisfaction to host the first WS of the SABER Project. He underlined that this event is particularly significant for his Region: with Cork, the second biggest city in Ireland, being extremely well served in terms of connectivity and the rest of the territory with a consistent part in digital divide. Satellite broadband connectivity has to be considered as one of the important solution for the economic sustainability of the rural areas.