

4th meeting of the EOSC Landscape Working Group

23rd October, 2019, Helsinki, Finland 09:00-15:00 CEST

Attendees: 1) WG members: John Womersley (chair), Volker Beckmann (remotely), Artur Binczewski, Isabel K. Bolliger, Odd Ivar Eriksen, Matthew Dovey, Odd Ivar Eriksen, Alizée Francey, Sanja Halling, Biljana Kosanovic (remotely), Susanna Nykyri, Žibutė Petrauskienė, Michel Schouppe, Federica Tanlongo, Sadia Vancauwenbergh **2) EC:** Thomas Neidenmark (partly), Michel Schouppe **3) EOSCsecretariat:** Saara Kontro, Iris Liinamaa, **4) Others:** Eva Pastorkova (remotely/ J. Hrušák's support team)

Apologies: Kessy Abarenkov, Paolo Budroni, Jan Hrušák, Isabel Campos Plasencia, Thomas Midtgaard, Gianluca Polenta, Eloy Rodrigues, Petros Sampatakos, Ronald Stolk, Achim Streit, Imre Szeberényi, Rupert Lueck**, Jean-François Abramatic**, Sarah Jones**, Juan Bicarregui**

**Coordinators of other EOSC WG

Summary of key decisions

The main results of the F2F on the 23rd October 2019 are:

a. Presentation of the LA report

- The idea is now to **condense information in a more uniformed format**, as the report needs some analyses. An external consultant engaged by the EOSC secretariat will support the analytical process.
- Regarding the next steps of the LA report, **Womersley** mentioned several elements, which are the following: a completion of data gathering (filling in the gaps), synthesis and analysis with the help of the consultant and Validation Workshop.

b. Next version of the report and discussion on the country sheets

- In order to better involve WG members in the drafting process in an efficient manner, **country sheets need to replace the current information.**
 - The level of description needs to be described first so that the information provided can be comparable.
 - A [report](#) from e-IRG summarizes a lot of information. In case more detailed information is needed, there is the possibility to find e-IRG representatives. Also, the policy level is new and will not be findable in the e-IRG report.
- Ⓢ Please be aware that a template (considering the discussed elements) is currently being prepared and will be shared among WG members shortly.**
- The aim of the report is to **answer to the Council request.**

c. Discussion on the Validation Workshop

- The idea of the Validation Workshop is to confirm that the WG covered what was supposed to be covered and to identify potential gaps.
 - There will be **two 'validation rounds': methodology and outcomes.**

d. EOSC Symposium

- The third F2F meeting is foreseen on **Wednesday, 27. November 2019.**
- By going through the [programme](#), it was highlighted that there is **a schedule problem notably with Breakout session 4.** On the **28. November 2019, more information is needed** about the 'Call5 Projects Landscape Task Force and the EOSC landscape WG closed meeting'. WG members would like to know what is

it about and who is going. Finally, who is attending the EOSC coordination day?
WG members would need to be informed.

Detailed minutes of the meeting along the agenda

1. Discuss the process of the Landscape Analysis

1.1. Presentation of the LA report

John **Womersley** introduced the goal of the meeting, which is mainly to discuss the process and review the progress of the LA report in order to list potential improvements and gaps. The idea is now to condense information in a more uniformed format, as the report needs some analyses. An external consultant engaged by the EOSC secretariat will support the analytical process. Moreover, a template is very much needed in order to provide a skeleton to the WG members to fill in information. The report needs to be a summary about the preparedness and policies across the EU policy area for open science. This would emphasise the need to involve EU MS and EU MS policies in EOSC implementation. This information is currently missing in the draft. Moreover, a snapshot of the situation in the rest of the world could be useful as well (ex: Canada, Africa,...). EOSC should be open to the world as connections are established worldwide. Otherwise, the science community will continue to use their worldwide network and EOSC might never get utilised properly. The data and services should be as open as possible in the future. The LA report contains 176 pages but might get shorter as most of the actual content is copy-pasted information. Therefore, this needs to be summarized and shortened. The goal of the report is to collect supporting information for other WGs and for policy recommendations, which should be consisted with the recommendations provided by other WGs. This first draft allows us to recognize the gaps. The report makes an overview of EOSC policy as well as of EOSC-relevant infrastructures and initiatives. The information is not completed and the INFRAEOSC-5B projects could help by completing the non-national forms and stakeholders. Only 5-6 countries so far are listed presenting information on national data, computing and HPC infrastructures. Matthew **Dovey** mentioned that the complexity of the document doesn't allow WG members to know which information is needed. **Womersley** answered that this is the reason why we need to start thinking about country sheets through a template. Another thing is some measure of scale of the spending (taking into account the total spending of EU MS), which sets the context. Regarding the national policies and legislatives strategies, it could be that some countries do not have open access policy. However, **Tanlongo** underlined that this shouldn't be concluded if we haven't asked for more information. Indeed, she has been talking with Italian contact point for Open Aire and the data gathered there are not always up to date. **Womersley** underlined that at the moment, national funders and policy embrace open access to publications and need to embrace open access to data and policies as well. There is also a need to check if data and services policies are updated there. The INFRAEOSC-5B projects are providing additional information, which might also partly cover some of the non-national actors (as for example research institutes). **Womersley** pointed out that there is a need to find a way to use the information, which has already been collected. More collaboration between the different EOSC groups is needed as people are getting annoyed to provide the same information already provided to another group. Regarding the next steps of the LA report, **Womersley** mentioned several elements, which are the following: a completion of data gathering (filling in the gaps), synthesis and analysis with the help of the consultant, a Validation Workshop. **Womersley's** hoped-for outcome is to ensure that "EOSC" and "national" plans for both investment and policy understand how to contribute to a single European Open Science landscape.

1.2. Next version of the report

In order to better involve WG members in the drafting process in an efficient manner, country sheets need to replace the information.

1.2.1. Discussion on country sheets

The aim of the country sheet is to list information of what is needed from each country and set up a deadline. For the moment, the LA report presents raw data and therefore is not a report yet. There is a need for an editing chief and a small team doing the work and circulating it through the WG members. **Womersley** underlined that at the moment, money is missing from the analysis and mentioning it would help making the message clearer. Sanja **Halling** agrees that a more structured level is needed but the level of description needs to be described first so that the information provided can be comparable (also regarding the level of details). There is a need to add a perspective of data sources and other actors in a standardized way. **Womersley** underlined the need to have country sheets in a single format. At the moment, we do not have a document making it easy to understand the content. We therefore need to re-write this report to make it shorter and easier to read. Isabel **Bolliger** suggested that since it's a landscape analysis, there is a possibility to draft a map, information could be filled in by country members in a table and then aggregated in order to get a map illustrating the landscape. **Tanlongo** underlined that there is a need to liaise more with the cluster projects. **Dovey** agrees. There are the INFRAEOSC-5B projects and there might be a few others. The risk is that others are doing the same as we do. Odd Ivar **Eriksen** suggested making more use of the e-IRG data. Indeed, a [report](#) from e-IRG summarizes a lot of information. In case more detailed information is needed, there is the possibility to find e-IRG representatives. However, the policy level is new and will not be findable in the e-IRG report. **Womersley** suggested listing what should be on the country sheets. Following the discussion, the following elements were mentioned: ① Please be aware that a template (considering the following elements) is currently being prepared and will be shared among WG members shortly. ①

Country's name

- **Current policy on open and FAIR science – who is responsible (is anyone responsible at national level?) (also including preparation / plans)**
 - o **Publications**
 - o **Data / services**
 - o **Research evaluation**
 - o **Open learning**
- **Current e-infrastructure landscape – who is responsible (paying, operating, HPC, repositories, data infrastructures) - that is to be federated / accessible to the EOSC.**
 - o **€ (in total, over the last 10 years + future provide an estimation).**
 - o **Plans / future**
 - o **Funding of researchers (€) (salary + research projects) – who is responsible?**
 - o **Numbers of researchers**
 - o **RI's at the national level? (ex: chart)**

Moreover, RI sheets could be listed in the Index. **Womersley** suggested adding best practices in a synthesized way (not per country) so that the report mentions clear policies supporting open science. Sadia **Vancauwenbergh** mentioned that a country sheet should not be limited in pages as federated states, like Belgium, have strategic science policy making bodies at the federal, regional and community levels with shared competence that are involved in the inter-federal coordination in the field of research infrastructures, which unequivocally leads to a broader listing of policies and practices. Nevertheless, the information of federated states might be important, as they could serve as a source of inspiration for EOSC. For example, in Belgium there is no overarching national research council, yet the federated states are in constant dialogue, and a coordination/consultation commission involving all Belgian actors exist.

Womersley suggested listing the differences and adding link if not all information can be tackled in the country sheet. Michel **Schoupe** detailed that the initial request for the mapping exercise come from the Council conclusions. The aim of the report is to answer to the Council request. The big exercise for the WG is to gather national infrastructures / initiatives, which could be federated to the EOSC. **Bolliger** mentioned that if there is a mapping exercise at national level, it could be federated.

After gathering the country sheets, the discussion addressed the content of the analysis, which should contain the following elements:

- o for example, n MS have policies on open science but only y MS have funding to support. A map could help illustrating the information.
- o MS have invested xx millions euros in e-infrastructures that could in principle be federated (accessible) to EOSC (over the past 10 years)
- o Preparedness of RI's (policies willing to support open science)
- o Rest of the world (it is clear that EOSC needs to be open to the world, a lot of research communities are global in scale)
- o Best practices for MS (which will follow from the observations)
 - Adopt policy of FAIR data / services with support and funding
 - Adopt a policy that e-infrastructures should be made accessible to EOSC whenever possible.

Womersley underlined that the hard judgement is to determine what could be federated to EOSC. Most of the ESRI RIs have an open access mission; they should be part of the open science providing computing resources. However, if people outside the federation cannot use it, it should not be seen as able to be federated to EOSC. **Dovey** mentioned that different countries might have different funding models. It would be good to capture that kind of information. Indeed, if researchers are smart enough, they could access the free version.

Womersley answered that this goes beyond the survey. However, in EOSC-hub, they have identified thematic (prototypes of those kind of things are foreseen). **Womersley** mentioned that if MS are going to federate their investment into EOSC, the return on investment needs to be taken into account by Sustainability WG.

1.2.2. Feedback from the EOSC in an international context, 22nd October 2019, RDA plenary, Helsinki

There were suggestions to include international context, position of RI, universities and providers. Also, it was underlined that it's important to mention policies and preparedness' for other stakeholders as well. **Womersley** underlined the need to balance what the Council and the GB expects with the feedback received. Also, the scientific community should be ready to take advantage of EOSC. If users are not ready to work in this way, this might fail. For the moment, the EOSC portal looks less than a minimal product, less of 100 users.

2. Discussion on validation workshop

The inputs coming from other projects could be ready in the first quarter of 2020. The WG members agreed that it's too soon to present the report in January as the timing won't work. The information from the INFRAEOSC-5B projects won't be available. The idea of the Validation Workshop is to confirm that the WG covered what was supposed to be covered and to identify potential gaps. **Schoupe** mentioned that the Workshop could be an opportunity to invite people from the GB in order to check methodology, outcomes and national country sheets. **Dovey** mentioned that if we would like the GB to validate the methodology, this should be done soon. However, there is also a possibility to present the outcomes. It needs to be decided whether we would like to present the outcomes or the scope of work. **Schoupe** underlined that if it's only about validating the methodology, it could be done during a GB-EB meeting (meetings in November 2019). Regarding the outcomes, then it should be a Validation Workshop. **Womersley** agreed the points mentioned and therefore there are two 'validation rounds'. Moreover, the respective objectives will set the dates.

3. Next steps, summary of the day; AoB

3.1. EOSC Symposium

The third F2F meeting will take place during the EOSC Symposium. The meeting is foreseen on Wednesday, 27. November 2019. The draft agenda might slightly changed notably due to the discussion of today. The entire week (25. November 2019 to 29. November 2019) is filled with EOSC related matters. There is therefore the opportunity to talk to a larger audience and present something that looks more strategic. By going through the [programme](#), it was highlighted that there is a schedule problem notably with Breakout session 4. On the 28. November 2019, more information is needed about the 'Call5 Projects Landscape Task Force and the EOSC landscape WG closed meeting'. WG members would like to know what is it about and who is going. Finally, who is attending the EOSC coordination day? WG members would need to be informed.