Holger’s email on Feb 12th

Dear All,

We should start with a first meeting and agree on some first targets, distributing some jobs and tasks, electing a kind of a JPC, etc.

*A full DoW somehow implies that all partners and possible activities have been identified, so it might be premature by now. According to Adel, we must now focus on proposing a governing body and identify those tasks that will be the core of the tJP whenever it will be launched.*

*We can anyway draft a consolidated version of SPs belonging to the new tJP from the list itemized in the pptx file already circulated.*

In principle the JP does not need to have a special governance.

*As stated in the pptx file, we are proposing a special governance structure because the new tJP doesn’t have a specific SC, as it uses the ExCo as SC, and it includes by default all EERA members. Actually, this is the way to make it truly transversal.*

In case there is no fee, full members should be those, who are getting a job and are active. Others are welcome associates.

*As starting point, the idea that we initially propose is that the fees for this tJP are the EERA fees as all participants are by definition involved. Therefore, there is no distinction between full and associate members (full members are those that have direct representation in the SC, by definition, but since we do not propose a SC for a t JP …).*

Joblist could be : JPC, S-PC, deputies, treasurer, JP-contact responsibles, rapporteurs of research in the different MSs, responsibles for contacts with industries, or important rapporteurs of ongoing national or EU projects . I am sure the list could be extended.

*Due to we are bounded to only make a proposal on objectives, governing structure, and scope of work, we rather identify a short list composed of Coordinator, Deputy coordinator, and main SPCs. The partial list referring to SPCs would be one person coordinating HPC, one person coordinating BD&AI, and the people coordinating ongoing SPs who have clearly shown their interest in the tJP on DfE (additional Deputies SPCs could be identified as well so they will act as backup from their coordinators).*

*In principle, since we’re assuming fees are EERA’s ones, we do not need a treasurer.*

We then could discuss some special rules for the JP. Do we allow full voting industries, of course taking the exceptions into account, as defined in the EERA governance. E.G. SPC, JPC cannot be elected by industries.

*As far as we know, EERA is still debating whether to have industries or not on board, thus at the moment this problem does not exist, and if and when EERA will decide to have industries on board there will be guidelines.*

Then we need:

 1.)     to look for some volunteers, being and feeling responsible for the sub-programmes. My recommendation is to have two, a coordinator and deputy.

*That is OK for us as previously stated.*

2.)    After a while, we should target to have a kind of a secretary, doing the e-mailing and organising workshops, etc .For this we would need something like a 1/3 or 1/2 position. May be less.  Could be supported by a running project or membership fee.

*Bearing in mind the tJP structure reading before, such duties should be carried out by EERA. Otherwise, this tJP could become a traditional one and not a real transversal one.*

3.)    Then we would need about 10k€ for the starting phase for covering catering costs.

In earlier times this was given from  the EERA budget. Is this still the case ? This is a question for Adel !

4.)    In the long run, we also need something like 10k€ per year for catering costs , etc, or otherwise the activities will drop.

*We are proposing to launch this tJP relying on EERA fees.*

5.)    One of the target should be a SRIA, to be discussed with the MSs.

*We are bounded to only make a proposal on objectives, governing structure, and scope of work. It is true that a Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda is cornerstone, but we guess that such an issue should not be tackled in this meeting.*

*Not forgetting that there are SRIAs on HPC, BD, AI, etc. being issued by other European initiatives as well, it is crystal clear that the SRIA will be a further step in the coming future. Such a SRIA must be produced by the scientific community in a bottom up way, so we must first launch the tJP and create the community from which the SRIA will be drafted.*

Then for the **governance**of the JP. Key issue is the membership fee. If we have a fee, then  actions will show up  quickly, if we have no fee, the JP  will be a slow-moving vehicle. But how to handle the fee. Should the linked JP actors pay a fee? If they want to have voting rights, yes.

*We are proposing to launch this tJP relying on EERA fees.*

Overall we should stick to the overall EERA governance and then simply find a way to fund actions.

*We propose the following lightweight governance structure with a clear emphasis on interaction with vertical JPs:*

*1 coordinator*

*1 deputy coordinator*

*1 management board (composed of 1 person per SP)*

*1 SP on HPC*

*1 SP on Big Data*

*A number of SPs coming from other JPs (4 confirmed by now)*

*1 person acting as secretary according to what reads before*

Adel’s comment: “So at this point in time the initial ppt is a good starting point, but several aspects need to be developed for presentation to ExCo, in particular, objectives, interaction with other JPs, scope of work (we should clearly define the expertise classes in DfE, as the scope is potentially extremely wide, ranging from IoT to HPC / HTC to AI) and financial implications.”

*Objectives: Already described in the forwarded pptx as annexes II and III*

*Interaction with other JPs: the proposed structure is largely aligned with this issue*

*Scope of work: two main areas focused on HPC and BD&AI is proposed*

*Financial implications: rely on EERA fees*

Holger’s email on Feb 20th

The Geothermal people adapted the DoW , and one of the key ideas was, that the content of the JP is based on running projects. There are real technical deliverables in, but often those deliverables are made anyway for other projects or are combination of other project deliverables.

*We count on EoCoE-II for this starting and launching phase*

Then we need people feeling responsible for certain tasks. Better a few for each task.

*We propose the following lightweight governance structure with a clear emphasis on interaction with vertical JPs:*

*1 coordinator*

*1 deputy coordinator*

*1 management board (composed of 1 person per SP)*

*1 SP on HPC*

*1 SP on Big Data*

*A number of SPs coming from other JPs (4 confirmed by now)*

*1 person acting as secretary according to what reads before*

In the moment I would start small with two Sub\_programme on HPC issues and FAIR data issues.

We have running or soon starting projects here, which helps a lot to structure activities and keep them alive. Of course if we find volunteers, we could do more.

*We do agree. See above.*

In the first instance I would not discuss a special governance of a cross-cutting JP. I would like to have an active JP, in which the participants exchange information and structure new project ideas with each other.

*We have proposed a lightweight governance that could push this tJP ahead…*

The JP Ocean has nobody, who takes care on secretary issues. The level of actions happens in non-EERA frameworks, like the ETIP Ocean or the IWG from the SET-PLAN. JP on digitisation does not have an ETIP or on IWG. For improving and optimising the operational activities most of the JPs establish a membership fee and have a 30-50% position for a secretariat.

*We would start relying on EERA fees…*

If we want this JP to be cross-cutting, it needs to establish good communications with relevant JPs.

And this needs somebody who takes care, meaning we need to establish a JP secretary office with someone in. Naturally this person would be employed by the organisation of the JPC. Or maybe by the EERA AISBL.

Someone has to fund this. What options do we have:

1.) Normal JP membership fee (other JP members could become JP DfE participants and pay as well)

2.) From running projects, man-power could be used to support the communication to the other JPs.

3.) EERA AISBL supports the secretariat of the JP DfE, because it is of interest for nearly all the other JPs.

4.) A combination of 1,2 and 3.

*We would start relying on option 3 for this launching process in order to attract different JPs and really make it transversal*

If we have established the man-power for the communication with the other JP, we can discuss how we do it. And this will mostly likely depend on the available resources.

The JP DfE could easily eat up large chunks of EERA resources and dominate an annual EERA conference.

This would be a nice way to bring everybody together.

Anyway we should make a plan, how we proceed.

Speak to you tomorrow !