

Outcome of Working Groups on Organisational Structure, Governance and Management of Distributed RI

Ute Krell

DESY

on behalf of ePP-CC

ePP-CC

Who?

ePP-CC: ESFRI Preparatory Phase Projects-Coordination Committee
members: 12 volunteers of 7 PP-projects

What?

structuring the exchange of experience between the PP-projects

- regular ePP-CC meetings via telephone (4 + 10 in 2009)
- prepared workshops for all PP-projects:

2 Workshops on legal issues

6 Februar together with Commission

13 May specific for legal experts of PP-projects

3 Workshop on organisational and governance structure

14 May organisational structure, governance &
management of distributed RI

29 Oct

30 Oct together with Commission

ESFRI Project	
CLARIN	Krauwer
CLARIN	Maegaard
COPAL	Brenguier
EC	Thies
EMSO-PP	Favali
EMSO-PP	Franceschini
FAIR	Lemm
FAIR	Weissbach
IRUVX-PP	Feldhaus
IRUVX-PP	Krell
Lifewatch	Los
PRACE	Berberich

ePP-CC workshop on organisational structures of distributed ERI - 1

Brussels 14. May 2009

17 participants (representing 18 PP-Projects)

Chaired : U. Krell; Rapporteur S. Spyrou

- Collected informations on represented PP projects
- News by the Commission: status of ERIC
- Selected issues for exchange of experiences:
 - **How to proceed in order to create an organisational/.. structure?**
Influence of the legal framework on the organisational structure?
How to deal with sub-coordination or the management of distributed nodes...?
 - **Influence of the users**
 - **How to ensure sustainable funding?** How to involve funding agencies?

How to proceed in order to create an organisational/.. structure?

- Break down the mission of the consortium towards tasks
- Identify stakeholders and their tasks
- Analyse existing organisation and governance models

Examples from IRUVX-PP, PRACE, GBIF/Lifewatch and CESSDA
=> lively discussion

Governance structures from PRACE, CESSDA, COPAL were presented
see SINAPSE

- Guiding principles: ensure that the structures keep easy!

Influence of users

- ❑ level of integration in the ERI
- ❑ evaluation of users' access *further discussion on 29 Oct*
- ❑ possibility to influence the decisions on the future scientific usage/
upgrades of RI

- Users may need to be registered (= open access to data)

- Users may respect certain conditions e.g. confidentiality

- User involvement is very important
to ensure high quality in science & service and for political support

How to finance the central organisation?

- MSs commit certain cash contribution
- use external funding
- fixed fee per year by involved organisations
- secondment of existing personnel

Sustainable funding

- including funding agencies is not enough
- should be included in the statutes or in additional bilateral agreements

ePP-CC workshop on organisational structures of distributed ERI - 2

Brussels 29. Oct. 2009

30 participants (representing 15 PP-Projects)

Chair: U. Krell, Rapporteur: M. Raess

- ❑ Collecting of issues to share exchange of experience
- ❑ Distributed RIs - What are the problems? by S. Krauwer, J.-L. Brenguier
- ❑ Presentations by PP-projects: DARIAH, COPAL, NFFA
- ❑ Paralell sessions on: **How to include the governmental level in a network-like ERI?** (chair: S. Krauwer, Rapporteur: J. Konijn);
Pan European Access (chair: J.-L. Brenguier, Rapporteur: W. Los)
- Need for further exchange of experience !!!
via SYNAPSE, working groups, workshops
- Working groups: financing scheme, governance structure, website

Parallel Session on Governance

The group reflected on some of the questions raised during the morning session:

- How do you struggle with the issue of stakeholders and how they interact with Member States?
- What is the right size of an ERIC?
(Monetary wise, memberships.....?)
- Process: how to involve the right people?

Parallel Session on Governance

What parties should be integrated in the governance structure and at what level?

Three different type of parties/actors:

1. Funders/policy people (bureaucrats)
 2. Operators (technical/scientific people)
 3. Users
- + other investors (external)
- + EC (control /supervision), Internat. Partners, Others

Parallel Session on Governance

Different levels of an ERIC:

Formal levels determined by the ERIC Regulation:

- General Assembly: some RI suggest two members from each member (policy and operational)
- Executive Board: size should be small, scientists & skilled managers

How do you involve other institutions and networks that are crucial for the infrastructure?

- Difficult to articulate this second level (operators/R&D):
Distributed RI: each one has different reality and needs
=> different structure

Parallel Session on Access

The Council Regulation favours open access to research infrastructures. However RIs often have a limited capacity. ERIC countries may want to limit access for scientists from other countries.

Implications:

- Provide access to the best researchers from all over the world (after scientific evaluation).
- Specific problems when the marginal operational costs are much higher than the basic structural costs.

Recommendation: Promote a common policy of countries so that users have access *on equal terms* for a specific RI or scientific domain.

Access to “RIs in the Internet”

- “Research infrastructures in the Internet” provide in principle unlimited access (after registration). Limitations exist only for data and software availability.
- Users asking special services requiring extra development etc. this depends on the limited support capacity of the RI organisation.

In this regard they are comparable with the users of physical RIs.

Open access and national policies

- How to convince governments and national funding agencies to invest in RI construction and operation when users from other countries have open access?
- RI funding organisations are not always sensitive for arguments on spin-offs or economic benefits.

Recognition of RI scientists

“Instrumentation” scientists or “RI-service” scientists of infrastructures are in their home institution often not recognized or valued for their crucial position.

Recommendation:

A common HRM policy should be considered (credits, salaries, other benefits).

Concertation of national decision processes

- It is in many countries not clear which are the appropriate funding agencies and/or decision-making persons with respect to the ESFRI process.
- In some situations its is even unknown whether there is a ESFRI decision making process.
- National ESFRI decision processes are not coordinated at the European level. Synchronisation and mutual consultation must urgently be addressed.

It is **recommended** that the ESFRI adresses these issues.

Further Recommendations 1

- better differentiation according to RI types should help focusing discussions and avoiding confusion
- best practice guide and/or guidance essential to prevent reinvention of wheels
- models for inclusion of non-ERIC institutions should be explored (organisational and financial aspects)
- funding gaps due to project-based funding may cause highly qualified managers and technicians to leave; alternative models should be explored
- reflection on success criteria needed for data RIs

Further Recommendations 2

- access comes in at least 2 completely different types:
 - for physical RIs
 - sharing limited capacity in the best possible way
 - for data RIs
 - respecting IPR and access rights
 - respecting (different) national legislations (needs to be harmonized for ERA – task for legislators)
 - ensuring interoperability
- networked RIs require special attention for management at the operational level
- phasing for physical RIs is discrete, for data RIs it is gradual and evolutionary; this has consequences for operation and governance

Thank you
to the ePP-CC members,
rapporteurs,
workshop participants,
and for your attention