

Meeting 20 feb 2005

LOLA International Board EU Chapter

Meeting at Brussels Airport on the 20th February 2005

Present:

Johan Van der Waal VIAG
Caroline Ishola-Burrows Socitm
Antionette Van Leeuwen VIAG
Louis Massagé V-ICT-OR
Luc Stinissen V-ICT-OR
Arend van Beek VIAG
Bob Griffith Socitm

1. Representation – it was agreed that consistency of representation should be achieved and this will normally be as follows:

- (a) V-ICT-OR - will normally be LM and LS
- (b) Socitm – CI-B and one from the Presidents Team together with BG who will provide the support resource
- (c) VIAG – AvL, AvB and JvW will attend
- (d) Concern was expressed at the absence of KommITS and as a result the frequency of meetings was reconsidered. KommITS have said that they will only attend every other meeting. It was not known if cost is a problem for KommITS because every other association finds it costs less money than many internal methods of travel. It was agreed to ask KommITS to reconsider and to also reconsider the frequency of meetings if that makes it more acceptable (either three or two times a year).

2. ITIL – KommITS have asked Socitm to provide a speaker on ITIL to attend their conference. Socitm will identify someone soon. VIAG have produced a guide to ITIL (written in Dutch which is translated from the English-UKoriginal). ITIL is still at an early stage in government.

3. Minutes of 26th-27th September 2004 – agreed.

4. Questions for individual Societies:

(a) Frequency of meetings – it was agreed to hold the three meetings that have been arranged. JdeW will speak to KommITS about their attendance.

12th/13th June 2005 – London

18th/19th September 2005 – Stockholm

11th/12th December 2005 – Amsterdam

For the London meeting it was agreed that everyone will tell BG where they can get cheap flights – which London airport.

(b) Resources – JdeW and BG will provide resources.

5. RIC – BG sent a holding reply to their application to join LOLA and offered observer status (until their membership increased) but RIC have not replied to this offer. LM has spoken to RIC which has indicated to him that it wishes to co-operate.

6. Future LOLA Members – discussions have taken place with France, Italy, Germany and Australia but they do not have any organisations that are the same as those in LOLA.

7. Position of GMIS and ALGIM – there was concern about the role of this group in relation to the full LOLA Board. It was agreed that the Full LOLA Board will meet once a year (as already agreed) and that this group will be called the EU Chapter. The EU Chapter will then report to the full LOLA Board.

8. EU – there is a problem for the Associations getting EU funding because the EU Funding Programmes are not geared up to associations. There is a need to have an EU Chapter meeting with the EU Commissioners. It was agreed that a standard email about LOLA should be prepared which could be sent to

specific EU Commissioners to justify entering into a dialogue. We have to tell them about LOLA and to tell them about the advantage of working with LOLA in that LOLA can speak for over 1000 public organisations. Regarding the Better Connected International (estimated budget of €70,000) project it has proved difficult to find sponsorship though VIAG are talking to Oracle about their involvement. CI-B has been seeking contacts with Hansen which is big in the USA. It was suggested that the June meeting should include Oracle.

9. Microsoft – planning for the meeting with Microsoft on the following day. It seems that the way that Microsoft is working in Europe varies within each country. Socitm negotiated on MoU with Microsoft as part of a national agreement in 2002 but the take-up has been low. V-ICT-OR has an arrangement – GOLP (Government Open Licence Programme) where Microsoft offered the same terms as the Belgium Government (which has a minimum of five licences). Within VIAG, the Netherlands Department of Justice agreement is still too expensive.

The agenda for the meeting with Microsoft will be:

(a) Introduction – what is LOLA and what do VIAG, V-ICT-OR and Socitm represent, plus details about KommITS, GMIS and ALGIM

(b) The Socitm MoU

(c) How this related to the global issues :

- multiversion strategy
- take-up of MoU
- third world use
- free will of users

10. Meeting with Microsoft – it was decided that Johan van der Waal would chair the session and Bob Griffith introduce LOLA and the issues involved.

11. LOLA – Microsoft Meeting (21/2/2005) – Johan Van der Waal welcomed attendees who introduced themselves. The various associations were described:

V-ICT-OR – was founded five years ago and represents 180 local authorities in Belgium

VIAG – represent local government (almost all authorities in Holland)

Socitm – has 1800 members and represents almost all UK local authorities, police, fire, etc and the private sector

The position of LOLA and the not present other associations – KommITS, ALGIM and GMIS – were described.

BG described the MoU in the UK and the reaction of SOCITM members in adopting a multiversion strategy (rather than the expected current version strategy). Other issues that need to be considered are the third world and the emerging countries use of technology, the free will of users and interoperability. Nigel Bates described the way in which Microsoft is changing its approach to the public sector. Gordon McKenzie welcomed the joint approach taken by LOLA and described the new role that he is now fulfilling. UK, France, Germany and Spain are being considered as part of a common EU approach for Microsoft to do business. The take-up by SMEs in the EU is being examined in relation to how can Microsoft add value? In the UK NB is heading up an initiative to use new resources to understand the market and to make sure that Microsoft globally understands the feedback obtained in such a way that it can evolve its future strategy. Microsoft feels that it has not been fully effective in explaining the facilities of its new software and as a result in the UK it is working with selected authorities to pilot solutions. As part of the round table debate the issues that were raised were:

(a) Trust – users were not happy three years ago in that they felt they were being forced down a route dictated by Microsoft and as a result they are now looking for a far more open approach where users have choice

- (b) The UK and Netherlands are adopting an approach that is more open where facilities are made more available
- (c) Licensing – GH described the different approach that has been required by different EU countries. Licensing has to enable rather than act as an impediment to the use of the facilities available. Over the last three years GH felt that Microsoft has matured its approach and has worked hard to aggregate some of the smaller customers in order to improve terms. Microsoft is now providing a greater variety of licensing in order to give customers choice and create a more open environment.
- (d) KommITS (Sweden) are concerned about the impact of successful new ICT initiatives and the effect on fixed public sector budgets. Microsoft recognises that local authorities can make major savings from the use of ICT and considers that those savings should be shared. Public sector business cases can get very complicated, especially in the way that this interacts with the budget process. The emergence of the CIO (Chief Information Officer) will assist in resolving some of the issues associated with the business processes.
- (e) Unit pricing may not be the only way forward for the public sector. Also, the public sector (especially local authorities) are considerably disadvantaged by the current licensing policy because the licensing costs represent a far higher proportion of total costs than for the private sector.
- (f) Social responsibility at the global level is becoming of greater importance. NB reported that in the USA this has been recognised and this is being rolled out globally. Jerry Elliot has been appointed to represent these issues.
- (g) Microsoft are actively trying to contact every public sector organisation in the EU (there are about 100,000 of them) in order to create a relationship that will help to redirect the future strategy.
- (h) Emerging markets – GH is considering some of these issues but there are IPR implications. Discussions are taking place (especially with India and China) to understand their requirements in relation to their financial capabilities.

12. Summary of Actions – Johan requested a summary of actions that LOLA and Microsoft could pursue. How can LOLA help to ensure that the changes considered above can be effectively adopted?

- (a) Single point of contact for Microsoft is GM. For LOLA it is JdW and BG.
- (b) Licensing needs to be reconsidered
- (c) Need to meet the requirements of the smaller authorities
- (d) Dealing with emerging economies
- (e) Better communication with customers
- (f) There is a need for consistent approaches
- (g) There are no quick fixes

Johan thanked everyone for attending and participating in an open debate.

13. LOLA Close Out Session – everyone felt that the meeting went well and Microsoft demonstrated (with the levels of the people attending) that they regarded the meeting and LOLA as important. Microsoft and other suppliers tend to think that speaking to the public sector means talking to central government but this meeting has shown that they also need to speak to the local public sector. Also, LOLA is demonstrating that it has a unique advantage in that it speaks across national boundaries and central government does not do this. The format for this LOLA meeting was felt to be very effective.

14. Minutes – it was agreed that BG will circulate the minutes in draft to the attendees, including Microsoft for their section, and then to publish the agreed minutes on the website.

Microsoft Attendees:

Graham Harrop EMEA Director of Bids and Licencing
Marijke Schroos Belgium
Vincent Cornet MS Licensing - Belgium
Nigel Bates UK
Ritse Klink Netherlands
Luc Schryvers EMEA
Gordon McKenzie LG Strategy Europe
Richard Link
Bruno Schroder PS Director Benelux
Bob Griffith
Socitm
February 2005