e-IRG Workshop Brussels, 13-14 October 2010

### e-Infrastructure Governance: legal and financial aspects





Kyriakos Baxevanidis (kyriakos.baxevanidis@ec.europa.eu) European Commission - DG INFSO Deputy Head of Unit, GÉANT & e-Infrastructure Unit



### Questions

- How to finance investment in international e-Infrastructures, without creating barriers for international use
- How to remove artificial national (legal) barriers for international e-Infrastructure service provision
- How to balance national and European contributions to e-Infrastructure ecosystem



## **Overview of situation today**

- There is no "one size fits all" approach
- Various existing approaches depending much on degree of distribution of e-Infrastructure
  - Establishments under national law in most cases

Media

- Reaching beyond European borders can add significant complexity
  - Different approaches depending on region
- Special case: software infrastructures
- Catalytic role of EU procedures and funding

## **Example: GEANT**

#### European backbone network GÉANT

- Highly distributed
- DANTE established under UK law
- National (NREN) contributions proportional to GDP
- Open access to all member NRENs
- International links of GÉANT
  - Co-funding agreements of links to developed regions (e.g. 50-50% with the USA)
  - Increased EU contribution in case of developing regions (approach depends much on the region and the overall relations between the EU and the region)
- Catalytic role of EU procedures and funding

### **Example: EGI**

#### European Grid Infrastructure (EGI)

- Highly distributed
- EGI.eu established under the NL law
- Nationally owned computing resources
- National (NGI) contributions to European operations of EGI proportional to GDP
- Open access to participating NGIs; allocation of resources driven much by needs of virtual research communities per scientific field

#### International links of EGI

- Peering with similar infrastructures in (developed mostly) regions (e.g. USA)
- Allocation of resources driven much by practices/needs of virtual research communities per scientific field
- Companion EU-funded projects link EU infrastructure/ communities with infrastructures/communities around the world (L.America, SE Asia, China, India, Mediterranean etc)

# Example: HPC (PRACE/DEISA)

- European HPC-infrastructure
  - Infrastructure highly concentrated in a few countries
  - Established under Belgian-law
  - Nationally funded and owned in principle supercomputing machines
  - Additional EU-level funding and in-kind contributions by other MS (notably for SW, operations)
  - Proportion of computing time for European level use
- International links of HPC-resources
  - Peering with similar infrastructures in (developed mostly)
    regions (e.g. TeraGrid in the USA Joint global file system)



## **Special case: SW-infrastructures**

- SW is a very significant part of all e-Infrastructures
- Important SW parts are generic across vastly distributed HW-infrastructures (e.g. gridmiddleware) or across geographically distributed scientific communities (scientific gateways)
  - SW expertise is broadly distributed as well
  - Many entities/countries benefit directly by co-developments
- This makes the co-funding/openness of SW-based e-Infrastructures easier to achieve
- Examples:
  - EGEE/EGI-projects on European level
  - Possible co-funding on international level of development of SW for exascale HPC-systems (International Exascale Software Project)

e-infrastructure

# **Comparing with highly localised facilities**

- Typical examples are the ESFRI-roadmap RI
- More difficult to reach establishment/co-funding and open access agreements than in e-Infrastructures
  - Important upfront costs
  - One country benefits usually most
  - Complex legal and other issues (lengthy establishment negotiations – e.g. CERN, ITER) variety of legal structures)
- ERIC regulation key instrument for international RI establishment agreements (co-funding, open access)
- Recent efforts to develop more distributed RI positive (central facilitating role of e-Infrastructures)
- EU procedures and funding playing a catalytic role (facilitating establishment, European level access through transnational access programmes etc)

e-infrastructure

## Some conclusions, lessons learned

- International agreements easier when infrastructures are highly distributed
- Important European experiences on establishment/ co-funding, open access to intern. e-Infrastructures
  - Need of continuous excellence (innovation & sustainability, openness to international excellent science, competition & benchmarking, user support & friendliness..)
- Users playing important role in fostering open access
- Collaboration agreements on SW-parts of RI can leverage co-funding & open access agreements
- Key role of e-Infrastructures in enabling access to highly localised facilities; also in facilitating creation of more distributed RI schemes
- Catalytic role of ERIC & EU procedures and funding
  e-intrastructure

### Thank you!

#### www.cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/e-infrastructure/







