

EOSC-Nordic feedback to EOSC Sustainability WG Tinman Document

EOSC-Nordic thanks EOSC WG Sustainability for the invitation to give feedback on the report: “Solutions for a Sustainable EOSC – A tinman report from the EOSC Sustainability Working Group”. EOSC-Nordic appreciates the Working Group’s efforts and wishes to provide expert advice for the further work on the report.

Critical points to take into account in further work:

Section 1.1: First iteration – EOSC-Core

- The EOSC-Core is essential in order to achieve the functionality of other layers – therefore, the main focus needs to be put in ensuring the functionality of the Core, and only after that on the other layers.
- The EOSC-Core’s success will be defined by the access to the needed resources, e.g. storage or computing resources. In further work the willingness of resource providers to supply such resources should be elaborated. Especially their incentives for providing the scarce resources, such as storage or computing, need to be examined sufficiently.
- The EOSC-Core vision to decouple data access and resource provision is commendable. This would allow a stepwise evolution and would ensure the benefits of data sharing even in the absence of service and resource sharing.

Section 1.2: First iteration – EOSC-Exchange

- EOSC-Exchange is still not sufficiently addressing the problems related to public service providers operating in privately-oriented markets – these challenges need to be tackled in order to provide a level playing field for all providers. Also, more analysis is needed about the relationship with other open science data providers and services outside the EU.

Section 1.3: First iteration – Funding model

- In order to achieve a sustainable funding model, it is crucial to examine and understand the prerequisites of member states’ financial commitments. Sufficient financial commitment will likely only be possible through a resource federation (including both national and institutional resources). Therefore, such models should be looked into.
- The way forward that relies on member states putting additional funding towards infrastructures should be backed up with a dialogue with the relevant stakeholders - otherwise the suggestion is merely an ideal, rather than a feasible way forward.
- Another key aspect to examine is the preparedness of funders to make new investments in the needed resources, or should already made investments, such as EuroHPC, be utilised.
- It needs to be investigated if access mechanisms and policies for member state resources can be made compatible with the objectives of EOSC.
- In the document, it is recommended to investigate an approach where users that make every step of their research public, could access EOSC data for free. In this context, it should be evaluated, how to consider research that cannot be completely open? Is it not enough to have data as closed as necessary and as open as possible?

Section 2 + 3: Second and third iteration – serving the public sector and industry

- Focus should be on science and research community first and these iterations should be studied and revisited after the first iteration is successfully completed.

Section 4: Governance Structure

- In order to increase the level of Member States' overall engagement, it is necessary to engage the Member States on the governance level.

Section 5: Timelines

- The proposed timeline is rather ambitious taking into account that a step-by-step approach is recommended.

Section 6: Further considerations

- As the Working Group itself states that it lacks the sufficient legal expertise, it would be recommended to hire a team of legal experts beyond the suggested Belgian and Dutch legal expertise. Especially as the group itself says that alternative legal bodies, beyond the Belgian and Dutch alternatives, cannot be excluded.