

Comments from GEDE-RDA to E-IRG RoadMap

Open e-IRG Workshop

Bratislava 15/16 November 2016

Introducing the Group of European Data Expert in RDA

- **Composition**

- Representative from e-infrastructure + European chairs (or co-chairs) from RDA groups.
- Action supported by RDA-EU project.

- **Goals**

- Based on bottom-up process
- Consensus forming about core components and data fabric configurations
 - Act as a platform for integrating EU data professionals.
 - Assure coordination with RDA and/or other technical/data communities' outputs.
 - Based on Open interaction

- **Operational life**

- Collaborative work through RDA web site (https://rd-alliance.org/groups/gede-group-european-data-experts-rda_).
- Regular interaction through forum, mailing list, wiki, teleconf and face-to-face meeting for
 - Exchanging about the state-of-the art and innovative solutions
 - Participating into discussions

Comments Introduction

- It is important to have *e-IRG* for discussing issues and policy at the EU level
- GEDE
 - Has no mandate to make policy statements about the RoadMap
 - Could be used for collecting individual comments from e-infra practitioners
- The following comments
 - May help for finishing the roadmap document
 - Have been mentioned during the GEDE discussions, with no evidence that these are shared by every GEDE member

Basic difficulty

For large national or institutional (e.g. CERN, ESO) computing and data centres

- The EU involvement is a small non critical part of their activities. The Excellent experts may not be involved.
- Their own communities agendas may have a higher priority.
- This probably explain why the most common science oriented services have been invented by private companies and/or individuals.
- A change of EU culture is required for driving innovation
- The EU open science cloud may be a good attempt on this way

Service orientation

- Service orientation is a good chance (practitioners will know what real services and contributions are).
- Service orientation makes sense in a competitive scenario
 - Open and direct interaction about quality of services
 - Little policy involvements
 - EU policy may introduce criteria which limit the effectiveness of competition
 - Possibility to stop a service
 - if there is no user community
 - If a minimal quality standard is not reached

Service evaluation

- Services need to be funded by the users
- Users communities need to be willing to pay from their budget for common services
- This is a major criterion for ensuring that data and services are useful for a given community and that quality requirements are satisfied.

Service difficulty

- In data driven science, services lack of interoperability
 - Generic ready-made services do not work directly in many scenarios
 - Extensive expert software development is usual required in most scenarios.
- This kind of issues may be solved only by specific communities:
 - Find the good partners
 - Collaboration experience and trust relationships are key factors

Service continuity

- Quality, continuity, support are crucial elements for services
 - Otherwise people don't spend time in adapting and adopting
- Today too many factors limit trust in continuity

Open forums

- Discussions occur mainly during official meetings
 - Critical statements may be censored to not make enemies
- If this cycle continues to exist, even mid-class services may exist forever
- An Open Forum (criticism without fair) may be organised by the users.
 - This activity may be supported somehow.

National Orientation

- National and/or communities services clustering seems more attractive than EU level.
- Strong communities hubs need to be part of largest federations, without claiming leading roles.
- Federation does not imply absence of competition

Commons

- A common layer (normalizing both technical and policy aspects) is recommended
 - It is good to have such normalisation
 - This Introduce a supplementary brokering level
- Brokering should
 - Have little own agenda (focus on few points)
 - Be neutral for generating trust
 - Have clear governance rules for interaction between service officers
- The European Commission decided to fund a project for establishing open forum for services
 - This project should promote an open forum for gathering community comments
 - This service registry need to be open to all actors and not be in isolated island.

Traditional split

- Hardware and virtual layer seems widely separated (discussion from EOSC)
 - CPU storage network on one side
 - E-services and e-science one the other.
- Need a clear perspective for application and needs from the research communities before investments in basic infrastructure.
- This approach seems adopted by some national data centres.

Some points from GEDE face to face meeting

- What is the real situation in building Commons ?
- People would like to see the services and prices (who does pay for the services, what is the long term archive solution?)
- Users would like to have packaged solutions and having nothing to develop.
- Nothing is mentioned about concrete service into recommendations. These may seems a collection of statements.
- Roadmap may highlight different strategy for implementing commons in case of e-infrastructure, data infrastructure, clouds, etc...