Part 1

What do we know about data spaces and social economy umbrella organizations?

1. Introduction

According to the European Commission and its European Data Strategy, creating a single market for data requires building "EU-wide common and interoperable data spaces" (European Commission. Directorate General for Communication., 2020).

In line with the European Council's call to "accelerate the creation of common data spaces, including ensuring the access to and interoperability of data" (Statement of the Members of the European Council, 2021), our project aims to identify knowledge gaps preventing social economy organizations to take fully part in the creation of data spaces.

This chapter presents a preliminary theoretical work addressing the following question: why some social economy umbrella organizations are more proactive than others in engaging in digital projects facilitating data sharing among their members? We investigated the scientific literature to identify factors influencing social economy umbrella organizations' readiness to engage in a data space project.

Our research enabled us to draw a theoretical model and a list of factors, aimed at offering an analytical grid from grasping mechanisms at play when an umbrella organization decides (or not) to activate a data space strategy.

This preliminary study served to set a baseline framework for project deliverable 1: collection of best practices. The chapter is structured as follows: after reminding the study's context and objectives (1), we specify the study's scope and methodology (2) before presenting our findings (3).

2. Context and objectives

This section presents data spaces' strategic importance for the social economy (a), challenges related to the emergence of data spaces (b), and justifies the literature review strategy to answer baseline questions (c).

a. What is a data space and why is it important for the social economy.

In its staff working document (Commission Staff Working Document on Common European Data Spaces, 2022), the European Commission provides the following definition: "A common European data space brings together relevant data infrastructures and governance frameworks in order to facilitate data pooling and sharing." This includes both relevant data governance structures, ensuring a

transparent and fair control and processing over data, as well as the adoption of interoperability standards.

The European strategy on data spaces represents a two-fold opportunity for the social economy. First, a data space could offer a suitable infrastructure supporting the emergence and upscaling of social economy digital projects in line with the principle of inter-cooperation. More specifically, an interoperability infrastructure would enable platform cooperatives to increase their efficiency and relevance, by pooling data among cooperatives rather than relying on (or competing with) their capitalistic counterparts (Airbnb, Booking, Uber…).

Second, the European Data Strategy could greatly benefit from social economy's values and experience. For instance, the European Commission is willing to encourage the emergence of governance structures for data spaces, guided by principles of "fair, transparent, proportionate and non-discriminatory access to, sharing and use of data" (Commission Staff Working Document on Common European Data Spaces, 2022). In this respect, the European Commission already commended the potential of data cooperatives to offer a suitable governance model for the control of personal data (A European strategy for data. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 2020).

b. Which challenges to establish a data space.

As we saw earlier, data spaces facilitate data sharing and pooling. In practice, organizations willing to participate in a data space need to enable their own information systems to communicate with each other, through common interoperability standards. Interoperability standards are technical specifications enabling the automated exchange of data among autonomous systems and organizations (Brunsson et al., 2012). In other words, an interoperability standard is a language for computers. Just as you and I learnt English (a standardized language) enabling us to communicate, computers need to adopt a common language to exchange and read data.

The main challenge with interoperability standards is that they must be accepted by a group of stakeholders, and adopted in a relatively simultaneous way by such stakeholders. Adopting and implementing a standard incurs a dual risk. The first risk is financial: an organization needs to invest money into the conception or adoption of standardized solutions, hoping that benefits will exceed expenses. The second risk is connected to lock-in effects: an organization opting for a standard renounce to an alternative standard, and will thus be locked in the network offered by the said standard. Adopting an interoperability standard is thus a bet: an organization believes that such standard will become widely used by its partners, and takes action by joining the dynamics and implementing the said standard in its own information system (Besen & Farrell, 1994; Cecere et al., 2014; Tassey, 2000).

Building a data space for the social economy would thus require one or several actors to take leadership and mobilize their partners, convincing them to adopt a common interoperability standard. We believe that social economy umbrella organizations could be relevant leaders to take leadership. This belief is built upon two observations:

- open technical standards are usually built and maintained by umbrella organizations (SWIFT, Web, ISO…);

- social economy organizations aim to preserve balanced power relationship, and may thus be reluctant to join a project upon which they have no control.

c. Why a literature review.

Scientific research in management helps practitioners in understanding complex phenomena affecting organizations' lives, and design strategies informed by empirical observations. Research about inter-organizational information systems (IOIS) is a relevant literature stream to understand some of the challenges related to the emergence of data spaces. However, three characteristics limit its applicability to data spaces for the social economy.

First, most of the research on IOIS focuses on older technologies (such as electronic data interchange or EDI), which have been supplanted by newer systems (the Internet, the Web, the blockchain…) offering higher flexibility in data management (Robey et al., 2008). Second, to our knowledge, IOIS studies focused on traditional capitalistic cases, rather than social economy contexts. By extension, and thirdly, they tend to overemphasize the role of private software providers, giving poor consideration to collective innovation frameworks such as umbrella organizations.

On the other hand, other research streams have revealed strategies around technical standards (highlighting phenomena such as lock-in effects and dependency paths) (e.g.: Tassey, 2000), and on umbrella organizations as governance frameworks for collective innovation (e.g.: Berkowitz, 2018). A literature review is a relevant strategy to bridge among different research streams to establish a new study framework. In other words, we looked for relevant knowledge pieces into existing academic papers.

3. Scope and methodology

We designed a methodology enabling us to focus on social economy umbrella organizations (a), and more specifically on the factors influencing their readiness to engage in a data space project (b). The research objectives led us to opt for a realist literature review (c).

a. Our focus: umbrella organizations and innovation ecosystems.

Umbrella organizations are established by social economy organizations to benefit from a net of collective action. Umbrella organizations' role consists of defining a collective identity ("who we are as a social economy movement"), institutionalize it (recognition from stakeholders and external partners), and ensure its long-term existence (resilience and adaptation). This entails both preserving social economy organizations from external shocks (e.g., by lobbying governments to establish dedicated legislative frameworks) and stimulating change and innovation among their field (e.g., by diffusing information and providing capacity building content to social economy organizations) (Harter & Krone, 2001; König et al., 2012).

Such roles and functions make umbrella organizations potential key actors in addressing profound technological changes, whose societal and economic impacts can hardly be addressed at the level of an organization (Audebrand & Barros, 2018; König et al., 2012). For instance, social economy umbrella organizations aimed at encouraging Internet adoption by their members – when this technology was still emerging. Their actions included a sense-making process ("why is the Internet aligned with our identity and mission"), information-sharing and best practice promotion ("here is a great example of

what the Internet can allow you to do"), and capacity building (Harter & Krone, 2001). The same approach is currently being implemented by umbrella organizations exploring emerging technologies such as blockchain, web3, and more broadly data spaces.

Umbrella organizations can also make a step further by establishing and facilitating innovation ecosystems. Innovation ecosystems can be defined as multi-stakeholder frameworks, in which organizations collectively experiment and build upon a common innovation. Innovation ecosystems are especially relevant in the context of deep and disruptive innovations requiring aggregating skills and expertise, but also views, to ensure both the emergence and adoption of such innovations. Umbrella organizations demonstrate key capacities to establish appropriate governance frameworks, allowing multiple organizations to join a common project while preserving collective ownership over pooled resources (Berkowitz, 2018).

Summing up, umbrella organizations are well-equipped to lead collective innovation processes aimed at addressing and capitalizing upon disruptive technological innovations. This leads us to wonder why only some umbrella organizations effectively engage in data space projects.

b. What we are looking for: factors influencing the emergence of data spaces.

Although umbrella organizations are theoretically well-equipped and legitimate to lead the emergence of collective innovations such as data spaces, all may not be equally ready to take leadership. Then comes the question: which umbrella organizations would be ready to conduct a data space strategy? What makes them ready? And how do we build up, or improve, their readiness? Two baseline considerations need to be taken into consideration.

First, umbrella organizations are structurally complex entities. The very fact that their members are organizations rather than individuals makes any change management fundamentally different at the umbrella level compared to the organizational level. They have typically less resources than their member organizations; they need to deal with organizations whose decision-making processes are less predictable than individuals'; they are poorly equipped to deal with resistance from their member organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2005; Berkowitz & Bor, 2018). In addition, characteristics of umbrella organizations' governance require adapted change management approaches. Such characteristics include: heterarchical (or horizontal) consensus-based decision-making; limited intimacy with local needs (staff being informed through member organizations); and a high turnover among "champions", i.e., innovators willing to initiate change among the field (König et al., 2012). Lastly, umbrella organizations' strategies respond to a dual pressure: needs and expectations from the field (their members); and changes triggered from governments and the overall environment (Audebrand & Barros, 2018; Frandsen & Johansen, 2018; Harter & Krone, 2001).

Second, data space emergence is a complex phenomenon, which was already exposed in section 2.b above.

Consequently, factors influencing the emergence of data spaces are multilevel and multidimensional. Multilevel means that they can stem from the national (e.g.: governmental policies), sectoral (e.g.: emerging competition from new actors), inter-organizational (e.g.: culture of collaboration among member organizations), and organizational (e.g.: availability of skills and resources within member organizations) levels (Kurnia et al., 2019). Multidimensional means that factors can pertain to the umbrella organization's internal structure (e.g.: governance rules), to its external environment (e.g.:

pressures from governments or members), and to the technology used (e.g.: constraints imposed by the solution) (Baker, 2012).

c. Our method: realist literature review.

"[R]ealist reviews [...] are theory-driven interpretative reviews that were developed to inform, enhance, extend or alternatively supplement conventional systematic reviews by making sense of heterogeneous evidence about complex interventions applied in diverse contexts in a way that informs policy decision making" (Paré et al., 2015, p. 189). The realist review was found relevant to conduct a sensemaking process aimed at pulling together pieces of information from eclectic research fields, and mobilize them in a format and content aimed to address some specific practitioners' concerns.

The research was conducted from the database ABI/INFORM global, using two keyword batches:

- Keywords batch 1: (standard* OR "inter-organizational information system*" OR blockchain) AND ("trade association*" OR "industry association*" or "cooperative association*" or "meta-organization*" OR "meta-organisation*" OR "professional association*" OR "social economy" OR umbrella or federation)
- Keywords batch 2: (standard* OR blockchain OR "inter-organizational information system*" OR ""interorganizational information system*" OR blockchain) AND ("innovation ecosystem*" OR "innovation network*")

Additional articles were added from incremental research and references identified during previous research works. We ended up with a first batch of 90 articles, from 1975 to 2022.

Articles' relevance was assessed using a list of criteria, such as: does the research deal with diffusion of standards? Does it involve a meta-organization or an innovation ecosystem?

Our final sample included a total of 36 scientific articles.

4. Findings

We identified two sets of factors which might influence an umbrella organization's disposition to engage in a data space project. The first set focuses on the umbrella organization's internal characteristics (a), while the second set relates to the umbrella organization's external environment (b).

a. Social economy umbrella organizations' assets for creating data spaces.

To begin with, the literature reminds us that organizations can support or, inversely, resist change and innovation: they apprehend mutations and innovations through their existing sociocultural background (Harter & Krone, 2001; König et al., 2012; Wang & Ramiller, 2009). Thus, umbrella organizations may support new ideas such as data space initiatives which appear to be compatible with their mission and field identity (Font et al., 2019; Harter & Krone, 2001). Inversely, should they consider that such an innovation represents a threat to themselves or their members, they may resist its diffusion (Rodón et al., 2008). Resistance can be whether passive (e.g.: not mentioning data space projects), or active (e.g.: questioning data space's credibility and relevance, or pointing out risks and threats stemming from data space projects).

Umbrella organizations' mandates typically involves a mission to foster trust and cooperation among their field, while implementing strategic activities such as monitoring and diffusion of information to their members: this mandate creates a favourable ground for umbrella organizations to learn about innovations, and possibly engage with them (Berkowitz, 2018; Spillman, 2018).

In addition, umbrella organizations tend to prevent dynamics which might negatively affect relationships with their members. Umbrella organizations' bylaws are intended to ensure stability and predictability: adding or transforming their mandate can represent a risky move (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2005). An umbrella organization typically places extensive consideration in preventing any competition with its own members (Reveley & Ville, 2010). More specifically, should a member already be proactively leading a data space project, the umbrella organization will likely abstain from engaging in another parallel project. Thus, an umbrella organization may prefer to conduct a data space project in partnership with one of its members, especially if the latter demonstrates a dominant position in its field and is able to mobilize resources in favor of such a project (Brunsson et al., 2012; Kurnia et al., 2019; Wenyu (Derek) Du et al., 2018).

An umbrella organization which has an ongoing mandate of managing pooled resources may benefit from a powerful lever to mobilize its members (Reveley & Ville, 2010), especially when the data space project aims to strengthen and improve efficiency in managing and accessing such pooled resources.

b. An enabling environment for establishing data spaces.

Umbrella organizations' readiness to engage in a data space project is influenced by conditions pertaining to their internal conditions (as we just saw), but also by their external context. Factors stemming from the environment can be presented as four levels: national, sectoral, inter-organizational, and organizational.

National level: Governments can substantially shape the national context, hereby facilitating or discouraging the emergence of data space projects. One approach consists in technology-related regulations: governments can encourage or even force actors to adopt a standard, for instance by approving a given technology for exchanging sensitive data (Bauerle, 2003, 2005). Non-technological regulations may also indirectly influence the emergence of data spaces, by structuring inter-organizational collaborations and sectoral configurations. For instance, new ecological and budgetary constraints may create a need for organizations to collect additional data internally and among their value chain, while free competition regulations may encourage firms to invest in data sharing tools with their partners rather than attempting to buyout such partners (Carrigan et al., 2017; Leys & Joffre, 2014; Radnejad et al., 2017; Reimers et al., 2014). Finally, softer governmental interventions may also facilitate the emergence of data space projects, such as public investment programs aimed to modernize Internet infrastructures or public subsidies supporting inter-organizational collaborative innovations (Kurnia et al., 2019; Leys & Joffre, 2014; Reimers et al., 2014; Schaede, 2004).

Sectoral level: The scientific literature pays extended attention to emerging pressures towards a sector, leading actors to invest into a modernization of their processes. In this respect, organizations operating in a sector characterized by high entry barriers and sectoral standards defined by public authorities (typically the health industry) might feel low incentives to invest in a long, expensive and risky data space project (Reimers et al., 2014). Inversely, a sector might feel pressured by an emerging technology (e.g.: the taxi industry versus platform businesses), or by the public opinion (e.g.: growing expectations to accelerate money transfers among banking institutions), which might result in a gain

of interest towards automated inter-organizational systems (Campos, 2016; Font et al., 2019; Kurnia et al., 2019; Radnejad et al., 2017; Snell et al., 1999; Snell & Herndon, 2000). Timespan also be a factor per se. While digital innovations may be characterized by a high diffusion speed, while policymakers need time to produce regulations. In such a scenario, umbrella organizations can demonstrate abilities to mobilize their members around a collective innovation project (such as a data space) in a relatively short time (Schaede, 2004). Lastly, the sector's structure can also influence the emergence of a data space project. Should the sector be characterized by a dominating organization, such an actor may have strong capacities to diffuse and impose standards among the field (Kurnia et al., 2019; Rodón et al., 2008; Wenyu (Derek) Du et al., 2018). Cohesion among field actors, especially through a commonality of products and services (typically: taxi companies, versus the overall transportation sector) may facilitate the diffusion of common standards among such a field, and thus create a favourable context for a data space project (Carrigan et al., 2017; Dasgupta & Shin, 1999; Radnejad et al., 2017; Schaede, 2004).

Inter-organizational level: Scientific literature suggests that power relationships among organizations among a field can have a major influence on the emergence of a data space project. In the context of power imbalances, a dominant organization may have acquired strong capacities and legitimacy to define, diffuse and impose standards towards its partners (Kurnia et al., 2019; Reimers et al., 2014). Paradoxically, an aggressive strategy might also generate resistance from other organizations, especially when the data space project is perceived as likely to favor overconcentration of resources and power at the benefit of a given actor (Rodón & Sesé, 2010; Vale et al., 2017). Dominant organizations might thus find in an umbrella organization a relevant partner to diffuse standards (Vale et al., 2017) through softer cultural actions aimed at improving trust, cooperation, communication, and mutual understanding among actors – which are identified as key components of a favourable field for data space emergence (Bauerle, 2003; Kreuzer et al., 2015; Kurnia et al., 2019; Reimers et al., 2014; Reveley & Ville, 2010).

Organizational level: While the umbrella organization and the overall ecosystem need to offer an enabling field, organizations' individual readiness to envision and adopt a new digital solution is also key in a data space project. Organizations' readiness to change encompass a set of multidimensional factors, including structural and cultural aspects. Structural readiness to change include the organization's size, financial capacities, internal workflows and governance processes, as well as available organizational technologies (Font et al., 2019; Kreuzer et al., 2015; Kurnia et al., 2019; Shahrasbi & Paré, 2014). Cultural readiness to change include top management's involvement in the data space project, the long-term vision around it, whether actors have a positive or negative perception about interoperability standards proposed by data space leaders, and the overall expertise around interoperability standards available within the organization (Font et al., 2019; Kurnia et al., 2019; Vieira Soares et al., 2021).

5. Conclusion

Our literature review was designed to help us getting a better understanding about the factors which may influence (positively or negatively) social economy umbrella organizations' readiness in engaging a data space strategy. Two key takeaways can be drawn from it, in relation with the overall objectives pursued by our Erasmus+ project.

First takeaway: social economy umbrella organizations demonstrate several key assets to conduct a data space strategy. Namely, they are experienced and recognized actors in analysing and sharing information, building collective visions, and fostering trust and cooperation among their members. However, umbrella organizations' membership structure may strongly condition their capacity to conduct a data space strategy. Typically, umbrella organizations whose members demonstrate high cohesion (e.g.: commonality of products) and are used to pool common resources (ideally within the umbrella organization itself) might be well-equipped to introduce a new data space project. In addition, umbrella organizations may need to strengthen internal capacities to be (and feel) able to apprehend and design a relevant data space strategy. Importantly, an umbrella organization would need to elaborate a data space vision consistent with its existing mandate and missions. Establishing a partnership with one or several leading members may represent an important lever for the umbrella organization to consolidate its resources, expertise, and legitimacy in conducting a data space strategy.

Second takeaway: umbrella organizations need an enabling environment to engage in data space strategies. Creating an enabling environment requires to act at multiple levels, and coordinate with multiple actors. Governments may be able to stimulate the emergence of data spaces through support mechanisms (such as subsidies, investment programs and regulations) encouraging organizations to collaborate and pool data through digital solutions. Existing relations among member organizations should also be considered when designing the data space strategy: should the sector be characterized by a dominant organization, the latter would be a key actor in co-building a data space project with the umbrella organization. Inversely, should the sector be characterized by a balanced relationship among member organizations, the umbrella organization may adopt an inclusive co-design process involving a larger group of stakeholders. Awareness about individual organizations' capacities to take part in a digital project may also be key. In this respect, actions aimed at developing social economy enterprises' structural and cultural readiness for digital change could positively impact the umbrella organizations' readiness to engage in a data space project.

Part 2

Experimenting a collective visioning workshop for social economy data spaces.

1. Why a collective visioning workshop.

As argued in chapter 1 above, the development of data spaces represents an opportunity for social economy actors to create the conditions of a sustainable and inclusive citizen-led data economy.

Establishing a new data space entails a paradigm shift. Nowadays, we are used to collaborating through web platforms which centralize and store our data. Consequently, we are not trained to be aware about what is our personal data, and how such data could be valorized to facilitate our collaborations – we mainly rely on external providers who do it (somehow) for us.

A collective visioning workshop was experimented within the framework of DSE Tools project as a process to enable participants to structurally envision a data space for social economy. Our methodology, further developed in Deliverable 2 - Handbook, aimed at identifying a specific use case, and pin-pointing opportunities and challenges to take into consideration in a data space project.

2. An approach designed for umbrella organizations.

Umbrella organizations were identified as potential relevant actors for the emergence of data spaces, as they have both the role and the capacity to identify existing resources among their members and create the conditions for resource-pooling at the level of their field.

Umbrella organizations have however the specificity to be complex, multi-stakeholder environments. Our approach (further elaborated in Deliverable 2 - Handbook) thus entailed to identify needs, resources, and potential resistance, at three levels:

- the overall network facilitated and represented by umbrella organizations: type of membership, cohesion and diversity among members, existing collaborative practices;
- the umbrella organization itself: its secretariat, internal governance frameworks, current strategic priorities, and information systems;
- the member organizations: local interest and capabilities to join and benefit from a European digital project, anticipated dynamics and resistance.

In addition, we explored participating umbrella organizations' capabilities to lead a data space project through two topics:

- digital strategies: current understanding and vision about digital-related considerations by the umbrella organizations' staff and governance;

- collective leadership: umbrella organizations' past experience and current capacities to engage their members in a committing structural project.

We invited 7 European social economy organizations, among which 5 of them participated in our workshop.

3. Main outcomes.

Digital strategies

Firstly, we asked participants about existing umbrella organizations' digital strategies. They highlighted the need for a more in-depth debate about the impact of technology on the social economy, as digital transition can sometimes lead to the loss of people. They also suggested that using technology to simplify internal processes within organizations and networks could be beneficial, and that a sector approach might be more effective than a strictly social economy approach. Participants reported that their members often question the relevance of investing significant amounts of money in implementing a digital strategy, and emphasized the importance of political leadership from the EU in driving the digital transition. They pointed out the opportunity created by the EU initiative "transition pathway on proximity and social economy", which could lead umbrella organizations to be willing to collect readily standardized data from members. Additionally, participants noted that most coops are SMEs, which may be marginalized from complex and technical discussions related to digital innovation.

Network-level data space strategies

We then asked participants to consider how data spaces could transform their social economy networks, and to focus on three key areas: knowledge sharing, best practices promotion, and capacity building. To begin with, participants discussed the importance of building capacities of umbrella organizations' as well as their members' staff, for them to fully apprehend data spaces' opportunities and challenges: simplifying communication and adopting a progressive approach towards digital transition opportunities and strategies. Participants also highlighted the potential for data spaces to enable more efficient knowledge sharing and the promotion of best practices, through digital solutions automating data exchange at the level of their networks. They emphasized that a data space should enable them to manage different types of data (depending on the project and sector involved), and deal with national differences (especially the language barriers) within the network. Finally, participants suggested that a data space could contribute to creating more participatory decision-making spaces increasing accessibility and participation for members who rarely travel to Brussels.

Umbrella organizations' level data space strategies

When asked about implementing a data space in their own social economy umbrella organization, participants identified several challenges. One of the main challenges mentioned was budget and resources, with some participants suggesting that small changes could be made through pilots to minimize disruption. Another challenge was the need for competencies and expertise, both within the organization and among members. Participants highlighted the importance of communication and engagement to encourage adoption of new technologies and facilitate knowledge-sharing. However,

some participants also mentioned the challenge of bureaucracy and the potential for competition with other networks. Finally, participants wondered how a data space would be maintained in the long-run, and whether social economy organizations trust each other enough to share data in a meaningful way.

Members' level data space strategies

Participants highlighted potential challenges and opportunities which could be experimented by their members when implementing a data space within their social economy umbrella organization. These include budget limitations, limited resources and competencies, complexity of the organizational structure, and the need for education and awareness-raising campaigns to promote the use of the data space. To address these challenges, participants suggested starting with pilot projects, focusing on existing projects, and engaging early adopters who can help educate others. They also emphasized the challenges represented by different levels involved (national, EU, and local levels), which require complex communication schemes – and proposed to establish focus groups to better understand members' needs and expectations. Participants recognized that members have different capacities and needs, and that a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate. They suggested creating a specific service to support members in integrating a data space and developing a proof-of-concept platform suited for the needs of selected projects that are already conducted in partnership between umbrella organizations and their members. Additionally, participants highlighted the importance of creating a progressive transition to the data space and simplifying communication to make it more accessible. Overall, participants agreed that implementing a data space in their social economy umbrella organization would require a combination of education, communication, and engagement strategies to promote the benefits of the data space and to ensure that all members can participate and benefit from it.

Leadership

Lastly, participants were asked about a relevant leadership approach to elaborate and implement a data space for the social economy. During the discussion, participants shared their views on how to conduct leadership in the context of implementing an open data space. They agreed that leadership is necessary and that umbrella organizations should lead by example. They also emphasized the need for expertise and suggested creating a task force to run a pilot in a small framework. Participants also recognized that change management is a process that requires a systemic approach, and that members may need support and access to resources to successfully implement the transformation. Finally, they acknowledged that the process may have an impact on the relationship with stakeholders, but agreed that it is a necessary step towards a more transparent and collaborative future.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the discussion with participants revealed that there are several challenges and opportunities associated with the implementation of data spaces in the social economy. While there are concerns around budget and resources, competencies and expertise, bureaucracy, and competition, there is also recognition of the potential benefits of data spaces in enabling more efficient knowledge sharing, promoting best practices, and creating participatory decision-making

spaces. Participants emphasized the importance of communication and engagement, as well as a progressive approach towards digital transition, to ensure that all members can participate and benefit from the data space. Leadership was also identified as crucial, with umbrella organizations leading by example and creating task forces to run pilots in a small framework. Ultimately, the implementation of data spaces in the social economy requires a systemic approach that involves education, communication, and engagement strategies, as well as support and access to resources for members to successfully implement the transformation.

References

A European strategy for data. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (COM(2020) 66 final). (2020). European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/communication-european-strategy-data-19feb2020_en.pdf

Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2005). Organizations and meta-organizations. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 21(4), 429-449. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2005.09.005

Audebrand, L. K., & Barros, M. (2018). All Equal in Death? Fighting inequality in the contemporary funeral industry. Organization Studies, 39(9), 1323-1343. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617736934

Baker, J. (2012). The Technology–Organization–Environment Framework. In Y. K. Dwivedi, M. R. Wade, & S. L. Schneberger (Éds.), Information Systems Theory : Explaining and Predicting Our Digital Society, Vol. 1 (p. 231-245). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-6108-2_12

Bauerle, J. F. (2003). Technology, law, and banking : From Woodstock nation to eBay nation—Emerging standards for electronic records and signatures. The Banking Law Journal, 120(1), 70-79. ABI/INFORM Global.

Bauerle, J. F. (2005). TECHNOLOGY, LAW, AND BANKING: SPePRS REVISITED: ESTABLISHING STANDARDS TO ASSURE ENFORCEABLE ELECTRONIC FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS. The Banking Law Journal, 122(10), 1033-1038. ABI/INFORM Global.

Berkowitz, H. (2018). Meta-organizing firms' capabilities for sustainable innovation : A conceptual framework. Journal of Cleaner Production, 175, 420-430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.028

Berkowitz, H., & Bor, S. (2018). Why Meta-Organizations Matter : A Response to Lawton et al. and Spillman. Journal of Management Inquiry, 27(2), 204-211. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492617712895

Besen, S. M., & Farrell, J. (1994). Choosing How to Compete : Strategies and Tactics in Standardization. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 8(2), 117-131. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.8.2.117

Brunsson, N., Rasche, A., & Seidl, D. (2012). The Dynamics of Standardization : Three Perspectives on Standards in Organization Studies. Organization Studies, 33(5-6), 613-632. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612450120

Campos, P. (2016). Compliance Tools for a Global Market Based Measure for International Aviation. Carbon & Climate Law Review : CCLR, 10(2), 153-163. ABI/INFORM Global.

Carrigan, M., Mceachern, M., Moraes, C., & Bosangit, C. (2017). The Fine Jewellery Industry : Corporate Responsibility Challenges and Institutional Forces Facing SMEs : JBE. Journal of Business Ethics, 143(4), 681-699. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3071-4

Cecere, G., Corrocher, N., Gossart, C., & Ozman, M. (2014). Lock-in and path dependence : An evolutionary approach to eco-innovations. Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 24(5), 1037-1065. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-014-0381-5

Commission Staff Working Document on Common European Data Spaces (SWD(2022) 45 final). (2022). European Commission. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/staff-working-document-data-spaces

Dasgupta, S., & Shin, J. (1999). Information sharing, information free-riding and capital structure in oligopolies. International Journal of Industrial Organization, 17(1), 109-135. ABI/INFORM Global.

European Commission. Directorate General for Communication. (2020). The European data strategy :shaping Europe's digital future. Publications Office. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2775/645928

Font, X., Bonilla-Priego, M. J., & Kantenbacher, J. (2019). Trade associations as corporate social responsibility actors : An institutional theory analysis of animal welfare in tourism. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27(1), 118-138. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1538231

Frandsen, F., & Johansen, W. (2018). Voices in Conflict? The Crisis Communication of Meta-Organizations. Management Communication Quarterly, 32(1), 90-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917705734

Harter, L., & Krone, K. (2001). The boundary-spanning role of a cooperative support organization : Managing the paradox of stability and change in non-traditional organizations. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29(3), 248-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909880128111

König, A., Schulte, M., & Enders, A. (2012). Inertia in response to non-paradigmatic change : The case of meta-organizations. Research Policy, 41(8), 1325-1343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.006

Kreuzer, S., Born, F., & Bernius, S. (2015). Who Needs to be Informed ? – Empirical Results From a Field Experiment on The Adoption of IOIS Among SMEs. Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 19. ABI/INFORM Collection; Publicly Available Content Database. https://doi.org/10.3127/ajis.v19i0.1041

Kurnia, S., Parker, C., Ali, M., & Reyner Karnali. (2019). The Impact of Multilevel Contextual Factors on IS Adoption at the Inter-organizational Level. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 44, 24. ABI/INFORM Collection. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04424

Leys, V., & Joffre, P. (2014, mai). Méta-organisations et évolution des pratiques managériales : Une étude appliquée au champ de la santé. Revue Française de Gestion, 241, 121-134,137. ABI/INFORM Global.

Paré, G., Trudel, M.-C., Jaana, M., & Kitsiou, S. (2015). Synthesizing information systems knowledge : A typology of literature reviews. Information & Management, 52(2), 183-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.08.008

Radnejad, A. B., Vredenburg, H., & Woiceshyn, J. (2017). Meta-organizing for open innovation under environmental and social pressures in the oil industry. Technovation, 66/67, 14. ABI/INFORM Global.

Reimers, K., Johnston, R. B., & Klein, S. (2014). An empirical evaluation of existing IS change theories for the case of IOIS evolution. European Journal of Information Systems, 23(4), 373-399. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2013.7

Reveley, J., & Ville, S. (2010). Enhancing Industry Association Theory : A Comparative Business History Contribution. The Journal of Management Studies, 47(5), 837. ABI/INFORM Global.

Robey, D., Im, G., & Wareham, J. D. (2008). Theoretical Foundations of Empirical Research on Interorganizational Systems : Assessing Past Contributions and Guiding Future Directions. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 9(9), 497-518. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00171

Rodón, J., Pastor, J. A., Sesé, F., & Christiaanse, E. (2008). Unravelling the dynamics of IOIS implementation : An actor-network study of an IOIS in the seaport of Barcelona. Journal of Information Technology, 23(2), 97-108. ABI/INFORM Collection; Asian & European Business Collection. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000131

Rodón, J., & Sesé, F. (2010). Analysing IOIS adoption through structural contradictions. European Journal of Information Systems, 19(6), 637-648. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2010.44

Schaede, U. (2004). Cooperating to Compete : Determinants of a Sanctuary Strategy among Japanese Firms. Asian Business & Management, 3(4), 435-457. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.abm.9200114

Shahrasbi, N., & Paré, G. (2014). Rethinking the Concept of Organizational Readiness : What Can IS Researchers Learn from the Change Management Field? Unpublished. https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.1.3470.8564

Snell, R. S., Chak, A. M.-K., & Chu, J. W.-H. (1999). Codes of ethics in Hong Kong : Their adoption and impact in the run up to the 1997 transition of sovereignty to China : JBE. Journal of Business Ethics, 22(4), 281-309. ABI/INFORM Global.

Snell, R. S., & Herndon, N. C., Jr. (2000). An evaluation of Hong Kong's corporate code of ethics initiative : APJM. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 17(3), 493-518. ABI/INFORM Global.

Spillman, L. (2018). Meta-Organization Matters. Journal of Management Inquiry, 27(1), 16-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492616688856

Statement of the Members of the European Council (SN 18/21). (2021). European Council. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/48976/250321-vtc-euco-statement-en.pdf

Tassey, G. (2000). Standardization in technology-based markets. Research Policy, 29(4), 587-602. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00091-8

Vale, J., João Alves Ribeiro, & Manuel Castelo Branco. (2017). Intellectual capital management and power mobilisation in a seaport. Journal of Knowledge Management, 21(5), 1183-1201. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2017-0043

Vieira Soares, A. L., Mendes-Filho, L., & Gretzel, U. (2021). Technology adoption in hotels : Applying institutional theory to tourism. Tourism Review of AIEST - International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism, 76(3), 669-680. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-05-2019-0153

Wang, P., & Ramiller, N. C. (2009). Community Learning in Information Technology Innovation. MIS Quarterly, 33(4), 709-734. https://doi.org/10.2307/20650324

Wenyu (Derek) Du, Pan, S. L., Zhou, N., & Ouyang, T. (2018). From a marketplace of electronics to a digital entrepreneurial ecosystem (DEE) : The emergence of a meta-organization in Zhongguancun, China. Information Systems Journal, 28(6), 1158-1175. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12176