

**The first meeting of the Horizon 2020 Advisory Group on  
European Research Infrastructures including e-Infrastructures**

**Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> of October 2013, 13.30h-17.30h  
Building COV2 Room 9.183**

**Summary**

**1. Welcome and introduction with a tour de table**

Directors Octavi Quintana (Directorate B "European Research Area" at the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, DG RTD) and Thierry van der Pyl (Directorate C "Excellence in Science" at the Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Contents and Technology, DG CNECT) welcomed the participants and chaired the meeting until a Chair had been elected from within the Advisory Group (AG).

**2. Adoption of the draft agenda**

The draft agenda was adopted.

**3. Role and mandate of the group, Election of chair, vice Chair and rapporteur**

**3.1. Role and mandate of the group**

The role of the group was to provide input for the Commission during the preparation of the Horizon 2020 Work Programmes.

**3.2. Election of Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur**

Costas Fotakis was elected as the Chair, Luis Magalhaes as Vice-Chair and Sandra Collins as Rapporteur .

**4. Aims of Europe 2020 and Horizon 2020 (EC) - Introduction to Research Infrastructures and e-Infrastructures in Horizon 2020 (EC)**

The Commission outlined Horizon 2020 as a whole as well as the structure of the Work Programme 2014/2015 for Research Infrastructures and e-Infrastructures (see slides).

The Commission provides a Secretariat for the AG, for meeting logistics and minutes, any advice required, as well as for organising a workspace for document exchange on an access-protected Commission web site (known as CIRCABC).

The Rapporteur will be in charge of the drafting of the formal input AG provides to the Commission.

The AG is free to request ad-hoc participation of external experts or of members of the Commission services in order to learn about particular topics.

## **5. Future challenges for European Research infrastructures and e-Infrastructures**

Director van der Pyl outlined "Future Challenges for RI" (see slides). An appropriate timing for the Group to deliver its first input would be end 2014, to feed into Commission planning process for 2016/2017 Work Programme. The Commission would welcome broadly any contributions that provide input for the future Work Programmes.

The AG discussed widely different aspects of Research Infrastructures and challenges the area faces in the near future. As the AG's remit is very wide, and the topics discussed rather complex, it was agreed that specific topics be identified where the AG would focus on and could deliver concrete recommendations.

In conclusion, the AG agreed that its advice to the Commission would be structured into 6-7 Position Statements.

A summary of the Conclusions by the Rapporteur is annexed.

## **6. Discussion on next steps and timing of reporting and next meetings**

The timescale for producing the first advice is one year. It was agreed that the AG will focus on commonly agreed areas which would be selected according to general importance for RI.

The Commission will make accessible background information relevant to the topics discussed by the AG, such as: reports from previous ad-hoc high-level groups, information about the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) and the e-Infrastructure Reflection Group (e-IRG). The Commission recalled the importance of concentrating on topics of direct relevance to Work Programme.

There would be two meetings of the AG, to be held during 2014, one in spring and the next one in autumn.

## **7. Any other business**

There were no other points brought up.

## **8. Closing of the meeting**

The Chair thanked participants and closed the meeting.

**Notes by Sandra Collins, for the EU Expert Advisory Group on Research Infrastructures.**

31<sup>st</sup> October 2013.

To be inserted into the minutes of the meeting as provided by the EU Commission – Sebastian JESTER & Darko KARACIC.

The Expert Advisory Group on Research Infrastructures discussed and agreed to structure their work into 6-7 Position Statements, creating sub-groups of the EAG matched to expertise in order to achieve this under the advice and oversight of the Chair, Deputy Chair and Rapporteur.

The Position Statements agreed by the group follow.

1. Sustainability
  - a. Balancing new growth versus existing infrastructures and investments
  - b. Developing managed exit strategies for existing infrastructures to enable new investments
  - c. Leveraging and finding synergies with other funding sources such as Structural Funds, Smart Specialisations, Cohesion and Regional funds.
  - d. Consider also funding from the private sector/industry, mobilisation funds and other public funds.
  - e. Sustainability and the necessity for operational continuity and sustained services
  
2. Data
  - a. Benefits of access to data: both discovery and re-use
  - b. Best practice in data management
  - c. Policies, mandates, plans for data management – implementation and enforcement
  - d. Recommendations to the EU Commission regarding data management policies and practices for funding proposals and as grant conditions
  - e. Open access to publicly funded research data
  - f. Interoperability to enable data discovery and re-use (e.g. metadata, standards)
  - g. Data management issues of relevance to all domains versus the need for domain specific developments
  
3. Co-operation and Harmonisation
  - a. Good practice and strategies for engaging industry – attract industry to all parts of the value chain

- b. Consider generic technology roadmaps, and partnership with industry to deliver tools and infrastructure
  - c. International co-operation and inclusivity – avoiding a 2-tier Europe and digital divide
  - d. Balancing inclusivity with competition – global versus European competitiveness
  - e. Viability risks for research infrastructures with regard to legal harmonisation, data protection, privacy and ethical concerns and technical interoperability (e.g. standardisation and harmonisations of multiplying metadata standards)
  - f. The benefits and need for identity federation across research infrastructures globally, and across academia and industry
  - g. Inclusivity of all aspects of the data life cycle – data generators, users, publishers, infrastructures etc
4. Research Infrastructures and Innovation
- a. How do research infrastructures effect and enable innovation?
  - b. How does innovation impact research infrastructures?
  - c. What do we mean by innovation for research infrastructures?
  - d. How to optimise and synergise innovation in this sector
  - e. Review indicators/metrics of innovation from mature sectors such as Energy, and technology readiness levels
5. Mapping and Evaluation of Research Infrastructures
- a. Review various research infrastructures registries and mappings – make recommendations
  - b. In particular take account of work to date in this area from ESFRI and e-IRG
  - c. Map the landscape of research infrastructures across domains, geography, and industry/academia
  - d. Review, endorse various KPIs and metrics to measure and justify impact
  - e. Measure both research excellence but also the socio-economic impact
  - f. Consider such measures as the user base (how many users), the quantity and quality of results generated from the use of the research infrastructures
  - g. Review and make recommendations for business models for research infrastructures, including costing of the services, and the paradigm of the infrastructure as a service
  - h. Qualify how evaluation of research infrastructures can aid sustainability arguments
6. The Future for Research Infrastructures
- a. What new topics need to be addressed in H2020 – identify gaps
  - b. Consider near and longer timeframes – balance between research excellence and near-term commercialisation
  - c. The group to take a focused and grounded approach to directly influence the next work programme of H2020
  - d. Strategic rather than operational advice

Transversal Issues to be considered across the above 6 Position Statements:

- a. Impact and risk for career progression – e.g. the positive and negative impacts on researchers due to open access for publications
- b. How to encourage researcher buy-in by aligning with career progression
- c. How to encourage gender balance in this area and in funded projects.