

5th meeting of the EOSC Landscape Working Group

27th November 2019, Budapest, Hungary, 11:30-13:00 and 14:30-16:00 CEST

Attendees: **1) WG members:** Jan Hrušák (chair), Eloy Rodrigues, Eva Pastorková, Artur Binczewski, Achim Streit, Paolo Budroni, Matthew Dovey, Sadia Vancauwenbergh, Biljana Kosanovic, Isabel K. Bolliger, Volker Beckman, Petros, Gianluca, Alizée Francey, Sanja Halling (remotely), **2) EOSCsecretariat:** Saara Kontro, Iiris Liinamaa, **3) Others:** Eva Pastorkova (J. Hrušák's support team)

Visitors: Jan Wiebelitz (e-IRG delegate), Antonella Passani (T6 Ecosystems), Simona De Rosa (T6 Ecosystems)

Apologies: **1) WG members:** John Womersley (co-chair), Odd Ivar Eriksen, Susanna Nykyri, Imre Szeberényi, Thomas Midtgaard, Ronald Stolk, Isabel Campos Plasencia, Kessy Abarenkov, Rupert Lueck**, Jean-François Abramatic**, Sarah Jones**, Juan Bicarregui **, **2) EC:** Thomas Neidenmark

**Coordinators of other EOSC WG

List of Tasks

Number	Action Point	Responsible person	Deadline
1	- Country sheet template to be filled and sent to Alizée Francey	All	3rd December
2	- to comment the document of the leading questions for 5b cluster projects	All	16th December
3	- to volunteer in producing a short chapter to introduce the annex of the H2020 countries and development - to extract the most interesting information of country sheets in order to introduce the analytical part	Sadia Vancauwenbergh	January 2020
4	- Task Force to describe one page of how the WG has constructed the country sheets. - Glossary task force and wording for the template	Sadia Vancauwenbergh, Achim Streit, Isabel K. Bolliger	January 2020

5	- to introduce all 44 EOSC related projects by for the LA report	Paolo Budroni, Eloy Rodriguez	15th January 2020
---	--	----------------------------------	-------------------

1. 1st Session 11:30-13:00

At the beginning of the session **Jan Hrušák** gave a current overview of the situation of the WG. He mentioned the 2nd draft of the LA report will be sent to EB on the 5th of December and the country sheets will be shifted to the annexes.

1.1 Discussion

1.1.1 Synthesis of the annexes/ country sheets to be made

Jan Hrušák started the discussion with presenting the current stage and next formal steps of the LA report. **Alizée Francey** had a presentation of the LA report's current stage and started the discussion on how to improve the annexes and country sheets.

Paolo Budroni added the WG should consider why it collects information. **Jan Hrušák** explained the EB exchanges progresses. Other WG's are waiting for our input and they are working on matters that are out of us. The Landscape WG shall also reflect the needs of WGs and to WG coordinators have an access to the meetings of the Landscape WG.

Paolo Budroni mentioned that from the legal point of view it would be just a sentence saying what would be publicly available in any moment. **Jan Hrušák** added that a reasonable compromise should be found in reasonable time. The WG should develop common understanding what is relevant for the time being. **Achim Streit** mentioned the problem is that there is a concern of putting information on the country sheet since the possibility the information may not be 100% true for the country is reasonable. He suggested the WG should address that the WG has done their best for gathering information and who has gathered it but in the end the person either gets good feedback or criticism. It was mentioned the WG cannot get 100% overview of a country. **Sadia Vancauwenbergh** explained there can be decisions to be made in the future that should be taken into account as well. She also mentioned there may be a large amount of comments coming from outside. **Eloy Rodriguez** added that information of potential interest to EOSC should be collected since it is a moving target.

Jan Hrušák mentioned Validation Workshop as a chance for the MS/AC to validate what the WG is doing and offering. There will never be a situation where the information is complete.

The WG should speed up with processes but overestimations and unrealistic expectations should be avoided. **Jan Hrušák** noted the WG feedback should stay on the national level though. He mentioned the WG is moving information from the core of the report to country sheets to be put into the annexes. He also highlighted the deadline to deliver something for the EB/GB on time. Due to this matter the country sheets should be sent to EB before the 5th of December. The country sheets should be provided to **Alizée Francey** by Tuesday 3rd December.

Sadia Vancauwenbergh asked what is meant by the number of researchers in the Country sheet. **Jan Hrušák** it answered those filling in the information should indicate what exactly is meant by the figure describing the situation in every country. **Sadia Vancauwenbergh** mentioned the country sheet would need a harmonized definition. **Jan Hrušák** highlighted that the info is collected by the WG mainly for the WGs and that the document is not public. Thus, it is important to have a common understanding rather than strict definitions.

1.1.2 Support from outside WG

As an idea **Sadia Vancauwenbergh** suggested the WG could have a Task Force among the members for looking for better wording for template. The task force consists of three WG members: **Sadia Vancauwenbergh, Isabel K. Bolliger, Achim Streit.**

Jan Hrušák added the WG will have help from the co-creation budget as well since the WG has got representatives from the T6 Ecosystems to support work. He mentioned there are many processes going on in parallel. As consultancy company T6 Ecosystems will help the Landscape WG. **Jan Hrušák** had agreed to have a F2F meeting with the consultancy company in the afternoon to discuss the concrete things.

Paolo Budroni suggested to start with the leading questions for 5b projects and how they could develop the analyses of the consultants as well. The leading questions he has mentioned are part of Sustainability WG. The 7 topics are relevant and related to the topic of Pan-European level. It is discussed in both WG's as a starting point. It was mentioned that the consultants could have a chance to synchronise matters. **Paolo Budroni** added that it is interesting for ESFRI and e-IRG as well and that also from that point of view it would be important to describe the topics.

2. 2nd Session 14:30-16:00

2.1 Leading questions to 5b projects as the following:

Paolo Budroni introduced his thoughts on the topics which could be addressed by the INFRAEOSC 5b projects in course of the evaluation of the survey. He emphasized that these questions are important, and he noted that there is always a regional dimension.

Those topics are:

Topic 1

Support to ESFRI: Based on the findings of the surveys: how can the Work of the ESFRI on research infrastructures be supported?

Topic 2:

Support to educational ecosystems: How is the impact in the support on educational ecosystems?

Topic 3:

Identification of regional research priorities: are there any regional research priorities /smart specialisation strategies, that can be recognized?

Topic 4:

Research infrastructures and policy recommendations: identified major/significant gaps between the regions covered by the surveys

Topic 5:

- a) **Integration with neighbouring Research Infrastructures**
- b) **are there any regional ecosystems to be mentioned?**

Topic 6:

Increase of data availability (focus: open data according to the prescriptions of the PSI directive : how can greater harmonisation and standardisation of access rules and procedures (especially development of access charters) ensure fairness and consistency?

Topic 7:

on how establish or reinforce relations to services to industrial cooperation?

2.2 Discussion

2.2.1 Comments on the leading questions for 5b projects

Biljana Kosanovic explained that Moldova and Romania will be covered by 5b projects but their topics are different than for Nordic area. She noted that it is not easy to fix all the information on the 7 topics. **Jan Hrušák** mentioned it will be difficult to connect items presented. One of the missing points for the EB is that the WG shall not lose the connection to data users and to keep them as part of the implementation plan. **Paolo Budroni** emphasized that the leading questions are important and noted that there is always a regional level for the topic. **Jan Hrušák** added that not everything can enter to the report in our timeline. This report may enhance the final by the EB.

Achim Streit suggested the document could be sent around the Working Group and their input could be asked for. **Paolo Budroni** mentioned the data of 5b projects rely on their surveys. He suggested the WG could share the questionnaire among them as well. **Jan Hrušák** emphasized the issue must be properly introduced to those who are not in the room, the WG could create a telco re. these topics for projects and the WG. **Paolo Budroni** asked if the WG would like the idea to reflect to these 7 topics. He proposed to collect comments, which do not have to be used, but they can be very informative. **Jan Hrušák** answered it would be good to have a document with introduction that would be shared. It would be a common document to access by the WG in order to add comments. **Paolo Budroni** noted

that he will prepare a Google document, which will be shared including the questionnaire and topics.

Jan Hrušák mentioned it should be indicated how the WG can benefit from the questionnaire. **Paolo Budroni** explained the first comments to be added by 16th December. It would evolve into discussions and afterwards the WG could continue working on it. **Jan Hrušák** emphasized a deadline for interaction on questionnaire would be required. **Antonella Passani** mentioned that the plan for their actions will be done and it can be indicated next week.

2.2.2 Further discussion on country sheet and the parties involved

Jan Hrušák mentioned that approximately 2 weeks time for the MS is required to have reflection on any submitted document and this indicates how much time the WG has for preparation. The WG shall put out more power in order to finalise its work. He also mentioned that the WG could share the template with the GB. **Eloy Rodriguez** noted that it is a question of validation. **Jan Hrušák** added that on 9/10 December is a EB/GB meeting which could be used to discuss the template and country sheets. Prior to it, it would be still possible to discuss the template in detail by the WG as well.

2.2.3 Validation workshop

Jan Hrušák informed the WG after discussion on suitable dates that the Validation Workshop. It will take place in the end of January or beginning of February. There are 100-120 participants expected, and it will be a noon-to-noon workshop. Doodle will be sent regarding the best date to be found. As a suggestion he mentioned if a suitable place would be in any of WG members' areas where they work/ live.

Jan Hrušák mentioned the date should be between 27th January-14th February, and he will ask from EB/GB about the suitable dates as well. **Alizée Francey** noted that perhaps Brussels would be good since many participants are already there. Supporting this idea **Sadia Vancauwenbergh** volunteered to have a look for suitable premisses.

2.2.4 AOB

Jan Hrušák mentioned ESFRI is preparing a document on the European research area as an entry for the EC working document, and as an entry for political discussion of MS. He also explained ESFRI is intensely discussing with Croatian presidency on a dedicated conference on Research infrastructures with outreach to EOSC. This ESFRI conference will be held during 19th-20th March. Data sharing between research infrastructures and the related policies are seen there as an element of concern. It could be interesting for the WG members to attend the conference.