Resource Sharing in Business-to-Business Contexts: A Conceptualisation and Guide for Future Research

Karina Von Dem Berge, Uta Juttner-Schlange and Stan Maklan

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to conceptualise sharing in the B2B context by reviewing three literature fields, which deal with B2B sharing but have not yet been integrated: B2B sharing economy, horizontal collaboration, and industrial symbiosis. A systematic literature review is used, based on 51 studies from the three fields. Findings are structured into:
1) Four key conceptual constructs – actors (who), resources (what), governance (how), motivations (why) and 2) Implementation barriers of B2B sharing. From an integrated view on constructs and related barriers, three research avenues are identified.

This study contributes to the development of B2B sharing, an emerging field which is subsumed under the sharing economy but, compared to C2C sharing, under researched and practiced. No study has yet investigated the origins and scope of this ill-defined concept, linked the current knowledge, and focused on the specific implementation barriers as a requirement for further advancing the field.

Keywords: B2B sharing economy, horizontal collaboration, industrial symbiosis

Track: Business-To-Business Marketing & Supply Chain Management

1. Introduction

The sharing economy has been gaining traction for the last two decades. Although B2B is generally enumerated as one among several implementation contexts of the sharing economy (e.g. Muñoz & Cohen, 2017), the large majority of conceptual as well as empirical studies represent the C2C sector. Several authors therefore recommend an increased focus upon B2B sharing, pointing out that the current absence of clear definitions and formal solutions will leave willing B2B sharing partners with little guidance (e.g. Antikainen et al., 2018; Grondys, 2019). Their call for further developing the B2B sharing field is substantiated not only by the magnitude and constant growth of the B2B sector (Slagen, 2014), but also its potential advantages and favourable sharing conditions (Tetrevova & Kolmasova, 2021). For example, the efficient use of resources is conducive to maximising profits through procurement cost reduction, operational efficiency and joint financing of high-quality infrastructure (Esselin & Falkenberg, 2019). In addition, several studies emphasise the positive effect of B2B sharing on innovation capabilities and can support the digital transformation of smaller companies towards Industrie 4.0 (Brettel et al., 2014; Prieto-Sandoval et al., 2018). Furthermore, the sharing economy, as it is based on accessing and reusing resources (e.g. Belk, 2014) is identified as a means for transitioning towards circular economy and supply chains (Palmié et al., 2021). It can reduce the purchase of new goods or equipment, thereby decreasing overproduction and resource exploitation (Acquier et al., 2019). This impact is greatest for resources with a significant CO2 footprint, such as logistics or industrial machinery (Pomponi et al., 2015). These latter examples also illustrate the similarities and potential overlap between collaboration practices among businesses, which have been researched in parallel to the sharing economy without mutual referencing: “Horizontal collaboration” is a term coined in the supply chain literature which investigates resource sharing between logistics companies in order to reduce empty loading and facilitate savings of storage costs, rest periods and detours (Eschberger, 2020). This focus on a more efficient and sustainable resource use is an equally strong goal in the literature on “industrial symbiosis”, which was first mentioned as far back as 1989 (Chertow, 2008). The concept is seen as the basis for a more sustainable industrial development and refers to interfirm resource sharing which includes physical exchanges of materials, energy, water, and by-products among diversified clusters of firms (ibid). To date, no attempt has been made to review the knowledge from these three B2B resource sharing concepts to arrive at a common conceptualisation which can foster research in a united field. This paper addresses the gap by conducting a systematic literature review

(SLR) on B2B sharing, horizontal collaboration and industrial symbiosis. Our objectives are first, to develop a joint conceptual understanding and second, to identify the implementation barriers which could inform us why the field is still struggling to gain traction. Our contribution to the field is a unified view on B2B sharing and its main implementation barriers, from which future research avenues to leverage this important topic, can be derived.

2. Methodology

We followed the five steps proposed by the seminal paper by Denyer and Tranfield (2009) for conducting SLRs in our review which was conducted in autumn 2021: 1) question formulation, 2) location of studies, 3) selection of studies, 4) analysis and synthesis of studies, and 5) report of results to answer the review question: How is resource sharing defined in B2B contexts and what barriers have been identified? Study location considered three databases (EBSCOhost, Scopus, ABI/Inform ProQuest) to obtain robust, and cross-checked data. In line with Rojon et al. (2021), we argue that nascent research fields such as B2B sharing are best explored by combining grey and academic literature, since the latter is often lagging behind and a combination of the two can best reveal the linkage between research and practice. Two search strings were developed: the first captures references to the sharing economy, collaborative consumption, horizontal collaboration, and industrial symbiosis. This was combined with a second search string addressing the B2B context and comparable meanings such as interconnected industries. The search yielded 439 articles after duplicates were removed. For all articles, titles, abstracts, and keywords were screened to check their relevance against the review question. Articles were excluded when, e.g., the focus of sharing turned out to be on consumer sharing or the sharing relationships were purely based on risk and reward sharing. The initial screening reduced the number of articles from 439 to 79. These were subject to full reading, which further reduced the number of articles to 28. To increase the comprehensiveness of current knowledge and practice, references of the identified articles were tracked, identifying further 23 relevant articles. This is in line with Greenhalgh and Peacock (2005), who deem locating up to 51 percent of relevant sources through snowballing as common and acceptable. From the total of 51 publications considered as the basis for this study, nine articles each address the topics of horizontal collaboration (2007 to 2017) and industrial symbiosis (2007 to 2020). The remaining publications under the sharing economy umbrella range from 2014 to 2021. Our thematic analysis of all 51 studies led to an initial list of 37 codes, which was collapsed through an iterative process into four

conceptual constructs (actors, resources, governance, and motivation) and 19 construct-specific barriers.

3. Results

3.1 The concept and its constructs

From a comparison of 22 studies with genuine definitions of sharing between companies, four constructs emerged with field-specific foci but also field-overarching common themes, upon which our proposed conceptualization is based (see Table 1). *Actors* refer to the participants in resource sharing, answering the question "who" is involved. B2B sharing exchanges are investigated either in dyadic, triadic (including a facilitating intermediary) or networks of organisations. While the latter are focused on industrial symbiosis as well as horizontal collaboration studies, dyadic or triadic configurations are characteristic for studies under the B2B sharing economy umbrella. Actors may be competing (e.g. Cruijssen, Cools, et al., 2007) or unrelated organisations (e.g. Govindan et al., 2020). Some studies state that companies are part of the same supply chain (e.g. Ferrell et al., 2020; Ocicka & Wieteska, 2017), different supply chains (e.g. Pan et al., 2019) and they may represent the same (e.g. Ma et al., 2020) or separate industries (e.g. M. Chertow & Park, 2016). Industrial symbiosis studies stress that separate industries promote sharing due to heterogeneity of resource demand and excess capacity. Instead, horizontal collaboration builds on synergies which stem from the high match of activities between actors in direct competition. Hence, competing manufacturers could collaborate in the final distribution of their products through a jointly hired logistics service provider. The example highlights a separate intermediating role in B2B sharing, which in the sharing economy studies is taken over by platform providers (e.g. Muñoz & Cohen, 2017) while fulfilment agents are mentioned in the other two fields. *Resources* as tangible or intangible "objects" answer the question "what" is shared. They mark the difference between sharing transactions and traditional customer supplier relationships. The literature covers a broad range of strategic, non-strategic resources from all primary and supporting value creating processes of actors' business models. A common characteristic is that shared resources are distinct from the core products, services, or solutions that actors promote to customer markets in their value proposition. In other words, resources which are shared enable the fulfilment of the value proposition with co-creating customers but sharing relationships occur upstream of the actors' customer markets. *Governance* refers to the operating and control mechanisms by which the actors' interests in

the sharing transactions are held to account and answers the question "how" B2B sharing is managed. The governance mechanisms emphasised in the three different fields are markedly different: While the B2B sharing economy studies see platform technology and related functionalities as essential (e.g. Laczko et al., 2019), industrial symbiosis investigates self-organising paths between the collaborating partners in networks (Pyakurel & Wright, 2021). Horizontal collaboration appears to take a middle ground position with governance mechanisms negotiated, agreed, and formalised between strategic sharing partners (Pomponi et al., 2015). Finally, *motivations* cover the range of drivers which lead actors into sharing transaction and answer the question "why" they occur. In line with research on value in customer relationships, they comprise pre-sharing expectations as well as post-sharing benefits (and/or cost) and follow similar classifications into economic (and financial), ecological and/or social dimensions (Ruiz-Martínez et al., 2019). All three fields acknowledge the multitude of motivations, but different priorities are still visible: whereas industrial symbiosis and horizontal collaboration look at synergies between ecological and economic benefits at the company and cluster level, B2B sharing economy stresses the triad of economic resource access and usage, social as well as ecological motivations (e.g. Esselin & Falkenberg, 2019).

	B2B sharing economy	**Horizontal collaboration**	**Industrial symbiosis**
Actors (20)	***Field-specific foci***		
	Openness towards: the position within the supply chain, the industry as well as the business relationship – often an intermediating actor is mentioned (e.g. Breunig et al., 2021; Govindan et al., 2020)	Firms that operate at the same level of the supply chain, often competitors (e.g. Cruijssen, Dullaert, et al., 2007; Ferrell et al., 2020)	Usually many different actors from a range of industries or industry clusters, potentially competitors (e.g. M. Chertow & Park, 2016)
	Common denominator		
	Two or more companies which may or may not compete, come from the same supply chain or industry or not. In addition to a resource provider and resource lender, an intermediating actor can be involved.		
Resources (19)	***Field-specific foci***		
	Very diverse resources, emphasis on non-strategic resources with strategic resource sharing as exceptions (e.g., Industry 4.0 machinery) (Perks & Moxey, 2011)	Mainly strategic resources related to logistics and distribution (physical such as warehouses but also non-visible resources such as orders) (e.g. Ocicka & Wieteska, 2017)	All resources instrumental for increasing sustainability (such as infrastructure, utilities (energy and water), by-products and waste (e.g. Ruiz-Puente & Jato-Espino, 2020)
	Common denominator		
	Underutilized, investment- or pollution-intensive, strategic, or non-strategic resources, both, tangible, and intangible, covering a wide range of value-creating processes such as machinery, labour, capacity, services, and knowledge - used sequentially or simultaneously.		
Governance (9)	***Field-specific foci***		
	Heavy emphasis on platform technology and viable business models for mediators which	Often strategic alliances between two companies with a logistics provider in	Self-organising, longer-term collaborations, can be government supported.

	match resource lenders and providers (e.g. Govindan et al., 2020; Laczko et al., 2019)	a fulfilment role (e.g. Pan et al., 2019; Pomponi et al., 2015)	Organization borrows from symbiotic exchanges in industrial ecology (e.g. Maqbool et al., 2018; Pyakurel & Wright, 2021)
	Common denominator		
	Continuum between technology-based matching platforms of resource sharing transactions to community based, mainly self-organising, long-term collaborative ecosystems.		
Motivation (21)	***Field-specific foci***		
	Increasing resource efficiency (higher resource utilization, lower fix cost) and effectiveness (access to rare and investment-intensive resources, additional revenue) across the business model (e.g. Antikainen et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2020)	Focus on logistics specific benefits such as higher service quality, lower distribution cost, lower logistics CO2 footprint (e.g. Cruijssen, Cools, et al., 2007; Ferrell et al., 2020)	Focus on economic and environmental benefits from pollution-intense resources (e.g. M. Chertow & Park, 2016)
	Common denominator		
	Additional value for all actors involved, often focused on economic benefits but also environmental and social benefits		

In brackets: number of articles with definitions in which the respective construct is apparent

Table 1: Conceptual domain of sharing practices in the B2B context

Our proposed conceptualisation is synthesised in the following definition, which accounts for the field specific foci: *The B2B resource sharing concept can be defined as the collaboration between two or more related or unrelated companies upstream of customer-supplier relationships, driven by motivations to create economic, ecological and/or social value by simultaneous or sequential use of as yet underutilised or inaccessible resources (tangible or intangible, strategic or non-strategic), often but not necessarily facilitated by an intermediary role such as a sharing platform provider or fulfilment partner.*

3.2 Implementation barriers and proposed future research avenues

The main barriers to sharing in B2B contexts from the literature are captured in 19 codes and linked to the key conceptual constructs. From these construct-barrier combinations, three avenues for future research were derived (see Table 2).

B2B sharing construct	Implementation barriers	Proposed future research avenue
Actors	Lack of awareness (13; SE, HC)	1)B2B sharing relationship management
	Lack of trust (16; SE, HC, IS)	
	Partner recruitment and selection (9; SE, HC, IS)	
	Difficulties to achieve critical mass (5; SE)	
Resources	Laborious resource identification procedure (2; SE)	
	Quality concerns (3; SE)	
	Complex disassembly, transport and (re)installation (3; SE, IS)	
	Lack of interoperability of information systems and flows (21; SE, HC, IS)	
Governance	Lack of and/or restricting rules and regulations (7; SE, IS)	2)B2B sharing business case mapping &
	Complexity of contracts and sharing agreements (4; SE)	
	Complexity of operational resource planning integration (8; SE,HC, IS)	

	Lack of intermediary business modelling support (4; SE, IS)	modelling support
	Lack of sharing business case mapping and implementation (13; SE, HC, IS)	
	Lack of management resources (5; SE, HC, IS)	
Motivation	Lack of incentive (3; SE)	3)B2B sharing value
	High transaction cost (13; SE, IS)	
	Difficulties in quantifying anticipated benefits (4; SE)	
	Difficulties in measuring value captured (4, SE, HC, IS)	
	Uncertainty relating to fair risk and reward allocation (5; SE, HC)	

In brackets: number of articles mentioning the barriers; Letters: SE = articles from the B2B sharing economy; HC = studies from horizontal cooperation; IS = Industrial symbiosis studies

Table 2: B2B sharing constructs and their implementation barriers

The barrier "lack of awareness" among actors further supports the need to develop the field. All other barriers related to "actors" and "resources" point at the idiosyncrasies of the interlinked social and operational aspects of sharing relationships, which warrant further research. Lack of trust was identified as the most influential relational barrier and led to the suggestion of a range of different mitigation means, ranging from the potential of "digital trust" (e.g. Breunig et al., 2021), to the role governments could play as more trustworthy candidates enhancing the sharing of sensitive data (Pyakurel & Wright, 2021). Furthermore, trust appears to be a driver for some of the other actor- and resource-related barriers in the literature such as "partner selection and recruitment" (i.e. actors may not be selected due to a lack of trust), "resource quality concerns" (i.e. the actors lack trust in the resource quality) or "lack of interoperability of information systems" (i.e. actors are not willing to grant access to IT systems due to a lack of trust). Relationship management in B2B has a long history of investigations into the social aspects of buyer-supplier, channel, or vertical cooperation relationships. However, most research regards buyer–supplier relations from a power-dependency perspective or as strongly determined by the pressure for vertical supply chain integration. In addition, little attention has been given to the role of intermediating actors (Hingley at al. 2015). How the social and operational dimensions can be nurtured aside from these traditional roles and be interdependently determined and managed throughout the course of dyadic, triadic or network relational configurations, needs to be researched. Concerning "governance", the barrier of uncertainties in the regulatory requirement are likely to be addressed once the field develops since the advanced C2C sharing economy has shown that legislation follows the prevalence of business practices. Other barriers such as "planning and contract complexity", "lack of business case mapping" (for resource lending and providing firms) and "lack of business modelling" (for platform provider) underline the need for research into suitable supporting tools. While the sharing economy in general has investigated the variety of business models for platform providers and synthesised the findings into

navigation and business model design tools (Munoz & Cohen 2018), in the B2B context studies are either limited to testing the applicability of generic models such as business model canvas (Choi et al., 2014) or applied business model experimentation workshops to single sharing projects (Antikainen et al., 2018). While the latter are promising methodologies for fast and flexible testing of ideas, they inhibit the transfer of the findings from the resulting business cases to other contexts. The future research avenue proposed should therefore emphasise the breadth of alternative B2B sharing solutions and their contingencies. All barriers related to "motivation" jointly urge the need for research into the specifics of sharing value creation, capture and allocation. Interestingly, for once ecological value dimensions such as the prominent CO2 footprint appear to be easier to measure (Ruiz-Puente & Jato-Espino, 2020) and do not cause the same reservations towards "fair" allocations as some of the economic and financial value dimensions. Research into methods assessing the economic sharing value potential can convince organisations to pursue sharing as a value creation means beyond the prioritised value created in customer supplier relationships. Furthermore, they could mitigate reservations towards fair value allocations if the potential is deemed substantial. Such a prioritisation of economic value seems justified, given that social value dimensions seem to play a minor role compared with C2C sharing and are only mentioned in sharing of innovative technologies and the accompanying knowledge exchange in these high trust sharing relationships (Grondys, 2019).

4. Conclusion

The topic of sharing in B2B contexts is fast gaining momentum with all 51 studies reviewed in this paper published in the new millennium and almost 80% in the last 5 years. Our conceptualization attempts to propose a consensus view on the disparate current research. This in turn, should support the establishment of a strong and growing united field of sharing in B2B contexts which outgrows its so far neglected role in the sharing economy. As such, the abundance of opportunities in all relevant B2B sharing sectors, ranging from logistics to production, services and technology can be supported through new knowledge on the idiosyncrasies identified in B2B sharing: Sharing business case mapping and modelling, relationships as well as value creation, capture and allocation. In line with the B2B sharing proponents we argue that not only the participating companies themselves, but also competing industries, countries and even the global environment are the beneficiaries (e.g. Govindan et al., 2020; Schneider et al., 2019).

References

Acquier, A., Carbone, V., & Massé, D. (2019). How to Create Value(s) in the Sharing Economy: Business Models, Scalability, and Sustainability. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, *9*(2), 5–24.

Antikainen, M., Aminoff, A., & Heikkilä, J. (2018). Business model experimentations in advancing B2B sharing economy research. *Innovation, The Name of the Game*, *No. 78*. https://cris.vtt.fi/en/publications/business-model-experimentations-in-advancing-b2b-sharing-economy-

Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(8), 1595–1600.

Brettel, M., Keller, M., & Rosenberg, M. (2014). How Virtualization, Decentralization and Network Building Change the Manufacturing Landscape: An Industry 4.0 Perspective. *International Journal of Mechanical, Aerospace, Industrial and Mechatronics Engineering*, *8*(1), 37–44.

Breunig, K. J., Johanson, H., & Kristiansen, J. R. (2021). Digital Entrepreneurship across P2P, B2C and B2B Contexts: A Bibliometric Analysis Deconstructing Extant Research on Sharing Economy Business Models. In E. Vinogradov, B. Leick, & D. Assadi (Hrsg.), *Digital Entrepreneurship across P2P, B2C and B2B Contexts*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Chertow, M., & Park, J. (2016). Scholarship and Practice in Industrial Symbiosis: 1989–2014. In R. Clift & A. Druckman (Hrsg.), *Taking Stock of Industrial Ecology* (S. 87–116). Springer International Publishing.

Chertow, M. R. (2008). "Uncovering" Industrial Symbiosis. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, *11*(1), 11–30.

Choi, H. R., Cho, M. J., Lee, K., Hong, S. G., & Woo, C. R. (2014). *The Business Model for the Sharing Economy between SMEs*. *11*, 10.

Cruijssen, F., Cools, M., & Dullaert, W. (2007). Horizontal cooperation in logistics: Opportunities and impediments. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, *43*(2), 129–142.

Cruijssen, F., Dullaert, W., & Fleuren, H. (2007). Horizontal Cooperation in Transport and Logistics: A Literature Review. *Transportation Journal*, *46*(3), 22–39. JSTOR.

Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 671–689). Sage.

Eschberger, T. (2020, März 3). *B2B Sharing: Der nächste Schritt für die Sharing Economy?* https://www.lead-innovation.com/blog/b2b-sharing. (Last accessed: September 29, 2020)

Esselin, C., & Falkenberg, A. (2019). *B2B Sharing Platform. The Next Logical Step*. Umeå University, Department of Business Administration. https://www.umea.se/download/18.2365ee511709905e39c1472/1583154637537/2019%20B2B%20SHARING%20PLATFORMS.%20THE%20NEXT%20LOGICAL%20STEP,%20D-uppsats%20UMU.pdf. (Last accessed: August 24, 2020)

Ferrell, W., Ellis, K., Kaminsky, P., & Rainwater, C. (2020). Horizontal collaboration: Opportunities for improved logistics planning. *International Journal of Production Research*, *58*(14), 4267–4284.

Govindan, K., Shankar, K. M., & Kannan, D. (2020). Achieving sustainable development goals through identifying and analyzing barriers to industrial sharing economy: A framework development. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *227*, 107575.

Greenhalgh, T., & Peacock, R. (2005). Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: Audit of primary sources. *BMJ*, *331*(7524), 1064–

1065.
Grondys, K. (2019). Implementation of the Sharing Economy in the B2B Sector. *Sustainability*, *11*(14), 3976.
Laczko, P., Hullova, D., Needham, A., Rossiter, A.-M., & Battisti, M. (2019). The role of a central actor in increasing platform stickiness and stakeholder profitability: Bridging the gap between value creation and value capture in the sharing economy. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *76*, 214–230.
Ma, H.-L., Wong, C. W.-H., Leung, L. C., & Chung, S.-H. (2020). Facility sharing in business-to-business model: A real case study for container terminal operators in Hong Kong port. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *221*, 107483.
Maqbool, A., Mendez Alva, F., & Van Eetvelde, G. (2018). An Assessment of European Information Technology Tools to Support Industrial Symbiosis. *Sustainability*, *11*(1), 131.
Muñoz, P., & Cohen, B. (2017). Mapping out the sharing economy: A configurational approach to sharing business modeling. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *125*, 21–37.
Ocicka, B., & Wieteska, G. (2017). Sharing Economy in Logistics and Supply Chain Management. *Logforum*, *13*(2).
Palmié, M., Boehm, J., Lekkas, C.-K., Parida, V., Wincent, J., & Gassmann, O. (2021). Circular business model implementation: Design choices, orchestration strategies, and transition pathways for resource-sharing solutions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *280*, 124399.
Pan, S., Trentesaux, D., Ballot, E., & Huang, G. Q. (2019). Horizontal collaborative transport: Survey of solutions and practical implementation issues. *International Journal of Production Research*, *57*(15–16), 5340–5361.
Perks, H., & Moxey, S. (2011). Market-facing innovation networks: How lead firms partition tasks, share resources and develop capabilities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *40*(8), 1224–1237.
Pomponi, F., Fratocchi, L., & Rossi Tafuri, S. (2015). Trust development and horizontal collaboration in logistics: A theory based evolutionary framework. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *20*(1), 83–97.
Prieto-Sandoval, V., Jaca, C., & Ormazabal, M. (2018). Towards a consensus on the circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *179*, 605–615.
Pyakurel, P., & Wright, L. (2021). Energy and resources cooperation for greenhouse gases emissions reduction of industrial sector. *Energy & Environment*, *32*(4), 635–647.
Rojon, C., Okupe, A., & McDowall, A. (2021). Utilization and development of systematic reviews in management research: What do we know and where do we go from here? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *23*(2), 191–223.
Ruiz-Martínez, A., Frasquet, M., & Gil-Saura, I. (2019). How to measure B2B relationship value to increase satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *34*(8), 1866–1878.
Ruiz-Puente, C., & Jato-Espino, D. (2020). Systemic Analysis of the Contributions of Co-Located Industrial Symbiosis to Achieve Sustainable Development in an Industrial Park in Northern Spain. *Sustainability*, *12*(14), 5802.
Schneider, P., Folkens, L., Meyer, A., & Fauk, T. (2019). Sustainability and Dimensions of a Nexus Approach in a Sharing Economy. *Sustainability*, *11*(3), 909.
Slagen, D. (2014, September 8). From P2P to B2B: The next phase of the sharing economy. *VentureBeat*. https://venturebeat.com/2014/09/08/from-p2p-to-b2b-the-next-phase-of-the-sharing-economy/. (Last accessed: August 24, 2020).
Tetrevova, L., & Kolmasova, P. (2021). *B2B Sharing as Part of the Sharing Economy Model* (J. Maci, P. Maresova, K. Firlej, & I. Soukal, Hrsg.; S. 780–789).