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Below, an analysis focused on **structural and cultural challenges**, as well a recommendation.

**E-Infrastructure provider’s structural and cultural challenges, which are detrimental to development of EOSC**

Research communities have during the past 10 to 20 years noted that development and provision of research e-Infrastructure to an increasing extent has been handled by university **Campus IT** departments. These have mostly handled IT within **Corporate Enterprises** style administration, where they have done ok. They have also to some extent been responsible for research e-Infrastructure, either directly or via their cooperation with and influence over national research e-Infrastructure providers. But when it comes to research IT instruments and e-Infrastructures Campus IT department have by and large not performed impressively.

Over the recent 10 years, two additional e-Infrastructure provider organisations have entered the landscape, with increasing strength.
1. The national research e-Infrastructure providers
2. The European e-Infrastructure (EC) projects (FP7; Horizon 2020)

Both have to some extent their competence base derived from Campus IT department and the privet sector in such a way that they have inherited a specific **organisational** tradition, work **cultural** and **competence** profile, which is ill suited for building research instruments and e-Infrastructure:

a) Strong tradition for loose, decentralised and very autonomous governance and management.
b) A significantly lesser degree of drive, vigour and especially **subject matter competence**, than is the case in both the privet sector as well as academic active research staff. Wages are significantly higher among academic staff and privet sector IT – for good reason.

It is assumed that EOSC is all about bringing into existence a public alternative to vendor cloud storage and cloud compute e-Infrastructures, which can serve the European research community better in a number of critically important ways (e.g. control over data, pricing and technology).

The consequences of the mentioned structural and cultural challenges on the assumed EOSC raison d’etre, is that the traditional e-Infrastructure provider’s pool of human resources, which might be ready and willing to engage the EOSC endeavour, simply are not able to deliver: i.e. unable to work focused, effectively, and competently on a large project, which is technically, organisationally and politically challenging. To put it mildly, it is implausible to imagine that the traditional research e-Infrastructure providers even slightly would be able to produce something that is even slightly comparable to the commercial providers like Dropbox, Google Drive, OneDrive and Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2) – i.e. comparable to cloud solutions already attracting academics.

**Slow build-up of a joint European software developer organisation**

Consequently the present national as well as European e-Infrastructure providers and their projects (**EUDAT, LIBER, OpenAIR, EGI, GÉANT**) should have **only a very subordinated role**, if any at all, in the EOSC endeavour. Pending its more precise definition, EOSC must, consequently, be pursued through a slow build-up of a joint European (ESFRI or Airbus style) software developer organisation, with a strong independent board, director, management and budget. National research e-Infrastructure providers, and/or their owners, should finance the EOSC organisation, with adequate assistance of EC.