



# e-IRG Workshop

## Parallel Sessions Conclusions

---

*24-25<sup>th</sup> Nov 2015, Luxembourg*

The following conclusions can be drawn from the discussions that took place during the break-out sessions of the Workshop:

### KEY CONCLUSION 1:

**The key concepts of the e-infrastructure Commons (IC) and the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC) need to be further clarified to resolve the current confusion of the end users.**

- The IC concept should identify the elements and stakeholders addressed.
- There should be examples of what IC is and what it does (i.e. Include Users in the Definition, Define Users and Use Cases)
- IPR to be addressed by the EOSC (this could be in conflict with the commercial environment)
- This process needs to be driven by the EC Member States or the EC
  
- **On the implementation of the concept of e-infrastructure Commons:**
  - Member states and EC need to integrate the existing e-infrastructure services into a commons with interoperability, steering it towards a common integrated approach..
  - The definition of IC should specify the interactions with other elements.
  - IC should support the whole research process.
  - Researchers should be able to control their results and improve their profile (use best practices and policies of research).
  - Data Management should be enabled, including the ability to cite, anonymise data, etc.
  
- **On the difference between the e-Infrastructure Commons and the European Science Cloud:**
  - Cloud is the way we use the commons to serve open science.
  - Cloud is flexible, adaptable and available for different user needs
  - e-Infrastructure Commons is the basis for the EU Open Science Cloud. The EOSC can be also considered an instance (“incarnation”) of the e-Infrastructure Commons<sup>1</sup>.

### KEY CONCLUSION 2:

**The essential elements of e-Commons include:** connectivity, data, computing, tools, federated access, security, policies, legal and ethical issues, human networks.

### KEY CONCLUSION 3:

**Integrated Approach means: ‘User-centric integration’ i.e. being driven by user needs.**

### KEY CONCLUSION 4:

**Interoperable services means: All providers should virtualise and publicise their resources in a standard, common or interoperable way.**

- User communities need to define the requirements:
  - Define the entry point for various disciplines, or per community
  - Service Levels for the entry points needs to be determined

<sup>1</sup> Diverging opinions were raised on this point





#### KEY CONCLUSION 5:

**Governance should be central but following a bottom-up user-driven approach, with the involvement of the EC**

- Hub and spoke approach between service providers (RIs-e-Infras) and User Communities
- ERIC could be a suitable legal form, also good for sustainability

#### OTHER CONCLUSIONS:

- Recommendations for National governments/research funding agencies:
  - National funding should be an enabler for participation in the commons for the national e-Infrastructures.
  - The researcher communities should have the possibility of choosing between commercial and public providers (remove national restrictions, apply clear rules)
- Recommendations for the European Commission:
  - Develop resource granting mechanisms on the European level to address European-wide research challenges;
- Recommendations for National (public) e-infrastructure providers:
  - Virtualise/abstract and make available/publicize their resources in a standard/common/interoperable way
  - Support the whole range of user needs: from big sciences to the long tail!
  - Develop cost models and demonstrate their added value compared to commercial providers;
  - There is a need of an incentive structure which will make the infrastructures accountable to the end user
- Recommendations for Commercial e-infrastructure providers:
  - Beware of market failures that might jeopardise long-term project sustainability

