Notes from the Open Science Fair 2017

EOSCpilot Governance Workshop in Athens, 8 September 2017

Introduction

This 1.5 h workshop was a continuation of the Towards a Policy Framework for the EOSC: The EOSC Pilot Perspective Workshop arranged earlier the same day. There were twenty eight participants.

Matthew Dovey started by briefly presenting the EOSCpilot and the governance work package. He explained that the project was constructing a framework to allow engagement with all stakeholders including both consumers of EOSC services and resources (such as research communities) as well as providers of services and resources into EOSC. It was also necessary to accommodate both top down and bottom up driven governance models.

- There are comparisons between any prospective EOSC governance with the governance of the Internet – this is mentioned in the first EOSC High Level Expert Group Report. A good infographic of internet governance has been created by ICANN.
- A key aspect of internet governance is that “No one person, organization or company governs the digital infrastructure, economy or society. Digital governance is achieved through the collaborations of multi-stakeholder experts acting through polycentric communities, institutions and platforms across national, regional and global spheres”
- The digital governance infographics has three layers (Economic and Societal; Logical; and Infrastructure). For EOSC, it was felt that there should be four layers (Research Community; Thematic Services; Data and Content; and e-Infrastructure). One purpose of the workshop would be to test the usefulness of this structure.

Athanasios Karalopoulous (EC Policy Officer) continued the presentation he gave in the previous session. He mentioned again the June 2017 Summit that brought together the stakeholders to agree on the vision of EOSC and to exchange ideas concerning the next steps towards the implementation of the first stage of EOSC. EC in agreement with the stakeholders are implementing the governance structure for the operational phase of the EOSC (that is 2018-2020). After 2020 a different kind of governance will be invoked.

- The EOSC Declaration includes a section about governance where a three layer governance is proposed: strategic layer (where EC and member states are directly involved), executive/operational layer (including a governance board at the executive level and relevant working committees, such as thematic and functional) and advisory layer (Stakeholder forum). The three layers will be coordinated/supported by a coordination structure.
- The draft of the Roadmap that will be made public by the end of December will include the proposal for the governance; after that there will be 3-6 months to improve the proposal so that by the end of May the roadmap will be finalized. It is expected that the new governance structure to be functional by the beginning of Austrian Presidency.

1 https://www.icann.org/news/multimedia/1563
- EOSC Stakeholders’ Forum is open to all categories represented at the summit plus those endorsing EOSC Declaration and plays the role of Advisory board. The EC planned a meeting on 28-29th of November, initially built on the EOSCpilot project (1st Stakeholder Engagement Event). The Forum is conceived to help shaping output/decisions of EOSC Governance Board and to support, implement and monitor the commitments taken by EOSC stakeholders. During this meeting, a more concrete proposal for the governance will be presented and discussed with all the stakeholders. EC will define the application procedure and working modalities of the Forum.

- A Funding proposal draft for supporting the delivery of EOSC by 2020 is, at the moment, in preparation and foreseen to be ready by the end of October. The proposal consist of 6 action points:
  3. INFRAEOSC-01-2018 – Access to commercial services through the EOSC hub (Opens 05.12.2017/ deadline 22.03.2018)
  5. INFRAEOSC-02-2019 – Prototyping new innovative services(opens 20.10.2018/deadline 29.01.2019)

### Discussion about the framework

The participants divided into four groups to very briefly discuss the governance framework with four layers presented by Matthew Dovey. The question was if they could relate to the framework and where they saw their own affiliation in this framework that was based on four layers: the research community, the thematic service layer, the data and content and finally the e-Infrastructure layer. In all groups there was some confusion, since the participants often considered themselves (or their organizations) to cover several of the layers, often all four. Also the relation between the governance model presented by Karalopoulos and this framework was difficult to grasp and was unclear, until Dovey clarified it.

Some participants made remarks concerning the importance – when talking about governance - of focusing on architecture, structure, service provision etc. as these are the actors more fit into the structural/operational group of EOSC governance. Also, some relevant actors are missing: societal, end-users, citizen science to name few.

Matthew Dovey answered the concerns by showing another slide (with different layers) that he initially chose to suppress due to its apparent complexity. This considers the different stakeholders, the different roles the stakeholder might play (including consumer, provider, funder etc.), the areas of interest they might have in the governance.

Karalopoulos commented that the governance structure should be inspired by the services provided, not by the system. If, in the present format, the layers are not all fed, then it’s a problematic, nonfunctional governance structure.

Some questions from concerned citizens: Are the citizens included in this ecosystem and how? How the interaction and collaboration between layers is handled?
Panel discussion

Panelists: Athanasios Karalopoulous - EC, Donatella Castelli – CNR, Penny Labropoulou – CLARIN, moderator Jessica Parland-von Essen, CSC

**Penny Labropoulou** introduced herself and CLARIN. Her main message was that a strong point for the governance has to do with collaboration and interaction between layers. How to create proper working groups (starting from the research communities) able to pass the information between them and then to the next level.

**Donatella Castelli** pointed out that rewarding mechanisms should be in place and to be considered an important factor. She commented on what Labropoulou said that CLARIN offers services at different levels (from researchers to infrastructures) and consequently CLARIN should be in the governance. EOSC is open in terms of services. The governance should decide what the services to be provided by EOSC are and who operates them. “EOSC is a system of systems”. According to Castelli we should discuss about the rules that establish who is part of EOSC, how trustworthy is a participating organization, who is providing the services for monitoring and mandating the rules of engagement.

**Athanasios Karalopoulous** started his speech by saying that EOSC should be open in terms of transparency, decision-making approach, clear possibilities, clear processes and clear definition of layers and also who can participate. Citizens should be part of the governance, especially in the strategic role. In creating the governance, there are some requirements that have to be considered, together with the definition of some clear success criteria and together with a clear methodology on how to create a governance.

Jessica Parland-von Essen asked how to involve citizen science and gave as an example of Wikipedia or Wikidata. Furthermore a question how to ensure citizens access was brought up.

A participant from the audience commented that communities like Wikipedia have a clear governance structure and engagement with third parties. They developed themselves as interaction/communication platforms. We should look at what they have done and learn. However, there are other citizens that are not part of a community. They should also be able to access EOSC and also have some influence.

To conclude **Penny Labropoulou** stressed that the governance has to meet some requirements: it has to be as less bureaucratic as possible, adaptable to changes and flexible.