

Deliverable D3.2

Node deployment roadmap

Project Title Grant agreement no	Genomic Data Infrastructure Grant agreement 101081813									
Project Acronym (EC Call)	GDI									
WP No & Title	WP3: Deployment of 1+MG National Nodes									
WP Leaders	Bengt Persson (7. UU)									
Deliverable Lead Beneficiary	6. CSC									
Contractual delivery date	31/10/2023 Actual delivery date 21/02/20									
Delayed	Yes									
Partner(s) contributing to deliverable	6. CSC									
Authors	Dylan Spalding	(CSC)								
Contributors	N/A									
Acknowledgements	Dilza Campos (VIB)									
Reviewers	Susanna Repo (Hub)	(CSC), Juan Arenas Marc	quez (ELIXIR							





Log of changes

Date	Mvm	Who	Description
08/02/2024	OV1	Mercedes Rothschild Steiner (ELIXIR Hub)	Copy circulated to the GDI-MB for review
21/02/2024	1VO	Mercedes Rothschild Steiner (ELIXIR Hub)	Final version submitted to the EC portal

Table of contents

Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Contribution towards project outcomes	4
3. Methods	6
4. Description of work accomplished	7
5. Results	7
5.1 GDI Phase Timings	8
5.2 Node aspirations	10
6. Discussion	13
6.1 Phase Deadlines	13
6.2 Landscape Analysis	13
7. Conclusions & Impact	14
8. Next steps	15
9. Glossary	16
Appendix I	17





1. Executive Summary

This deliverable aims to determine the timelines for each country to deploy a European Genomic Data Infrastructure node, as well as start to understand the expectations and requirements each country has regarding the deployed and operational GDI node. This information will help Pillar II to address specific issues raised by participating countries, and identify common issues and gaps raised by the different countries.

Presented here are the results of two different outreach activities to the participating countries, the first to understand each country's timelines to reach onboarding, deployment, or operational status, and second to get a high level understanding of each country's expectations and requirements of a GDI node.

For the first activity 59% of the countries involved in GDI responded, and for the second 66% initiated a response, and 54% had answered one or more questions. This clearly indicates a risk related to the lack of engagement from some countries, with an associated risk that the development of the technical infrastructure within GDI may not support every country's specific use cases and requirements nor the 1+MG requirements for providing border access to high quality genomic and health data. To address this, a specific face-to-face node engagement workshop is being planned for March 2024 to tackle the technical issues and increase engagement and feedback between the countries and Pillar II. Additional actions would be required to be taken by Pillar I and/or the project coordinator to tackle non-technical issues, e.g. securing long-term national funding for the operations of the infrastructure through the establishment of national genomics plans or equivalent

The responses also indicate a range of ambitions in terms of reaching a specific stage in the deployment process. This needs to be investigated to ensure that the understanding of the requirements for each stage is the same for all countries and also conforms to the 1+MG Data Governance model. This will be explored and completed in association with the quarterly reporting and the maturity level model, as well as a Cross Pillar F2F meeting.







2. Contribution towards project outcomes

With this deliverable, the project has reached or the deliverable has contributed to the following project outcomes:

[Select 'Yes' (at least one) if the deliverable contributed to the key result, otherwise select 'No'. For more details of project outcomes, see <u>here</u>]

	Contributed
Outcome 1 Secure federated infrastructure and data governance needed to enable sustainable and secure cross border linkage of genomic data sets in compliance with the relevant and agreed legal, ethical, quality and interoperability requirements and standards based on the progress achieved by the 1+MG initiative.	Yes
Outcome 2 Platform performing distributed analysis of genetic/genomic data and any linked clinical/phenotypic information; it should be based on the principle of federated access to data sources, include a federated/multi party authorisation and authentication system, and enable application of appropriate secure multi-party and/or high-end computing, AI and simulation techniques and resources.	No
Outcome 3 Clear description of the roles and responsibilities related to personal data and privacy protection, for humans and computers, applicable during project lifetime and after its finalisation.	No





Outcome 4 Business model including an uptake strategy explaining the motivation, patient incentives and conditions for all stakeholders at the different levels (national, European, global) to support the GDI towards its sustainability, including data controllers, patients, citizens, data users, service providers (e.g., IT and biotech companies), healthcare systems and public authorities at large.	No
Outcome 5 Sustained coordination mechanism for the GDI and for the GoE multi-country project launched in the context of the 1+MG initiative.	No
Outcome 6 Communication strategy – to be designed and implemented at the European and national levels.	Yes
Outcome 7 Capacity building measures necessary to ensure the establishment, sustainable operation, and successful uptake of the infrastructure.	No
Outcome 8 Financial support to the relevant stakeholders to enable extension, upgrade, creation and/or physical connection of further data sources beyond the project consortium or to implement the communication strategy and for capacity-building.	No





3. Methods

To define the node level roadmaps, the nodes themselves needed to feedback the timelines for their plans and aspirations. Note that in this document a node corresponds to the institution or institutions deploying the infrastructure, on behalf of a country, to allow for a centralised or federated node which enables cross-border data access. These timelines were, minimally, the date on which the node planned to achieve one of the three European Genomic Data Infrastructure (GDI) phases: onboarding, deployment, or operational. These phases are linked to the Quarterly Reporting and Technical Readiness Levels (TRLs) via specific technical and non-technical indicators. Additional information that was deemed relevant was also collected that could also feed into an analysis of the whole landscape of node deployment plans, such as, alignment with Federated European Genome-phenome Archive (FEGA), national and international projects and dataspaces seen as important on a national level, e.g. European Health Data Space (EHDS), and high priority use cases, e.g. Genome of Europe (GoE).

Within GDI, WP6 was also working on a node level Data Management Plan (DMP), which covered some of the same information as relevant in this deliverable, as well as additional questions specific for the DMP. WP6 utilise the Data Stewardship Wizard (DSW)¹ to elicit responses from the nodes, and had started gathering feedback from the nodes, so it was agreed that the WP3 questions specific to the node level roadmap would be tagged and added (if necessary) to the questions within the GDI DSW², as detailed in D6.1 Draft data management policy including ELSI best practice³.

Responses were invited from the nodes for the DMP related questions with the aim of presenting the responses during the Pillar II workshop in Rome (09.10.23–11.10.23). Additionally, the DMP was also presented at the same workshop, which included some of the questions relevant for the node level roadmap.

Based on feedback from a subset of nodes, WP3 prepared a simplified separate query, which was sent out after the Pillar II workshop. This query asked specifically for the minimal set of dates by which each node aimed to reach a particular GDI phase, and whether this date was based solely on technical or non-technical, or both, indicators as detailed in the Quarterly Reporting spreadsheet.

¹ <u>https://ds-wizard.org/</u>

² <u>https://qdi.ds-wizard.org/</u>

³ https://zenodo.org/records/7956612





4. Description of work accomplished

The plan for outreach to the nodes for input to the node level roadmap, D3.2, was presented⁴ for discussion during the August Pillar II meeting on 02,08.2023, and resulted in the proposal to align the work in the DMP with the questions feeding into the node level roadmap. In collaboration with WP6, a set of questions were outlined specific to the roadmap, and mapped to the set of questions already in the DSW, where if a question was novel it was added to the DSW and tagged 'roadmap'.

The DMP and the associated requirements for this deliverable were presented at the September Pillar II meeting (06.09.2023), as well as an outline on how to give feedback on the DMP questions specific to WP6. Feedback was elicited from the nodes, and acted upon within the DSW, and on 27.09.2023 the nodes were requested to complete the questions in the DSW.

In order to complete the DSW questionnaire, an account had to be created for the individual(s) representing each node. This was facilitated by the nodes being asked to nominate up to 3 individuals in a spreadsheet, and an account on the DSW would be created for those nominated. These individuals could then log into the DSW and complete the questions, as well as leave comments. For the roadmap subpart of the DSW, a deadline of 3.10.2023 was proposed to allow time to analyse the results prior to the Rome workshop.

WP6 provided a script to list the responses currently submitted in the DSW ready for further analysis. Node responses in the DSW were monitored and a snapshot taken directly before the Pillar II Rome workshop, and these were presented to the workshop participants as a summary and as a way to engage with additional nodes who had yet to complete the DSW questionnaire.

5. Results

Given the different ways that we communicated with the nodes, the results are presented in separate sections.

⁴ <u>https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1j1OS9LmJpoYIW5KwrWKPep_EXqA9_LFq/edit#slide=id.p1</u>





5.1 GDI Phase Timings

Fourteen nodes completed the spreadsheet⁵ with the dates they aimed to achieve each of the GDI phases they aspired to, and this is given in Table 1 (accurate as of 04.1.2024) and Figure 1. All nodes that responded, with the exception of Norway, stated they would achieve onboarding status during 2023. For deployment, only Spain stated it would achieve that in 2023. For deployment, four nodes (Belgium, Finland, the Netherlands, and Portugal) are aiming for 2024, with Norway and Slovenia aiming for 2025. To achieve the operational phase, Spain was aiming for early 2024, with Finland and Portugal aiming for 14te 2024, while the other nodes (Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, and Slovenia) all aiming for 2026 to become operational, with Slovenia indicating operational status 1 month after GDI finishes.



Figure 1. Timeline indicating the number of nodes reaching onboarding, deployment, or operational status between October 2023 and October 2026. A majority of nodes use the default dates of October to hit the next level, indicated by the coloured lines. For those nodes that did not respond, the timelines from the GDI proposal were used.

⁵ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1pddAoMqKosjcAykYqJiBXAGoP6Nq1Zq4eSkEpi6lhFw/edit#gid=0





Table 1. Node responses regarding the dates at which they aim to achieve onboarding, deployment, or operational phases within GDI. The table shows the date at which a node aspires to achieve each of the applicable phases, the scope of the response, and any comments or justifications for the response. Text in grey indicates the default dates as defined in the proposal and that the node has not actively confirmed these dates. Grey cells indicate a node does not intend to reach that phase during GDI.

Country	Onboarding	Deployment	Operational	Scope of response	Comments and justification
Belgium	2023-12-31	2024-10-31	2026-09-30	Technical	
Bulgaria	2024-12-31	2026-05-31		Technical	
Croatia	2026-10-31				
Cyprus	2026-10-31				
Czech Republic	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		
Denmark	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31	Technical	
Estonia	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31	Technical	
Finland	2023-10-01	2024-05-31	2024-10-31		
France	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		
Germany	2024-07-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-30	Technical	
Hungary	2026-10-31				
Ireland	2026-10-31	31/10/2027	31/10/2028	Both	Ireland had committed to the onboarding readiness levels for the duration (48 months) of the GDI project. Genomics infrastructure within Ireland is very minimal at this point in time and there is a reliance on the implementation of our national genetics and genomics strategy and national genetics/genomics office. Therefore given our current status we propose these dates.
Italy	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		
Latvia	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		Both	





Lithuania	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		Both	
Luxembourg	2024-10-31	2025-10-31	2026-10-31		
Malta	2026-10-31				
Netherlands	2023-12-21	2024-10-31	2026-10-31	Technical	National genomics plan is still in the works; national elections in 2023-11.
Norway	2024-06-30	2025-10-01	2026-10-31		
Portugal	2023-10-11	2024-11-30	2024-11-30	Technical	
Romania	2026-10-31				
Slovenia	2024-03-31	2025-10-31	2026-11-30	Technical	
Spain	2023-11-30	2023-12-31	2024-01-31		
Sweden	2023-10-01	2025-01-31	2026-10-21	Technical	

5.2 Node aspirations

As of 8.01.24, 16 nodes had registered to and accessed the DSW questionnaire and hence were able to answer the questions in the DSW. Of these, 13 had answered 1 or more questions resulting in a response rate of registered countries of 81%. Their responses are recorded in Appendix 1 as derived from the table in this spreadsheet⁶. Where 'None' is included in a cell no entry was given for that question, despite it being asked. A blank cell indicates the question was not asked as it is a conditional question based on an previous response that did not satisfy the condition for the question to be asked.

The responses for product usage (Table 2) was fairly heterogeneous. 10 out of the 12 nodes who responded indicated they wished to use the Beacon, while 75% wished to use REMS, and 5 countries envisioned the need for additional products at this time. However, for Containerised Computation and Archival Technology, the results were mixed with 5 and 6 or more nodes either undecided and / or aiming to replace that particular product respectively. For federated computation, only 1 node aims to keep the product, with 7 still undecided.

Table 2: Summary of responses about the expected product usage per node within GDI. Nodes were given the option to state if they would keep, replace, or were still undecided on the use of a particular product within their node. They were also able to indicate if they anticipated the need for additional products.

⁶ <u>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1KJV5eDMJqhhdD5Rvj8InOkozMBfn-BJ6/edit#gid=70597679</u>





	REMS	Beacon	Federated Computation	Archival Technology	Containerised Computation	Additional products
Keep / Yes	9	10	1	5	6	5
Not Decided	3	2	7	4	4	4
Replace / No	0	0	2	2	1	3
Not Answered	4	4	6	5	5	4

For Federated EGA, 50% of nodes aim to host a Federated EGA instance and 50% do not (Table 3). Of those that do aim to host a FEGA instance all aim to share the same technical infrastructure. Additionally six nodes envision allowing data download, similar to the methodology of data access utilised by FEGA, however within GDI this would have to be covered by the GDI data governance requirements.

Table 3: Summary of the results on the data access model and co-deployment of FEGA nodes.

	Allow data download?	Also host FEGA?	FEGA sharing the same technical infrastructure?
Yes	6	6	6
No	4	6	0
Not Decided	1		
Not Answered	5	4	0

A majority of nodes had important associated projects, and infrastructures or data spaces, but only four nodes indicated they had priority national use cases (Table 4). Where nodes answered the question on priority GDI use cases, all GDI use cases were mentioned at least once (Appendix I).





	Important associated projects?	Important infrastructures or data spaces?	Priority national use cases?
Yes	7	7	4
No	4	4	2
Not decided	5	5	5
Not Answered	0	0	5

Table 4: Summary of the responses regarding important associated projects, dataspaces or infrastructures, and priority national use cases.

Only one node had so far decided if it would host non-genomic data, and of the 10 nodes who responded to the question on checking genomic data quality, 5 of nodes indicated they would check the genomic data quality, 2 not checking genomic data quality, and 3 being undecided (Appendix I). However 9 of the 11 nodes who responded aimed to check data integrity once it had been transferred to the node (Appendix I).

There was a range of 2,000 to 15,000 for the number of whole genome sequences each node anticipated to host. This metric appears low relative to the ambition, as well as the number of genomes sequenced by Genome of Europe, however it is possible the question was misinterpreted as whole genome sequences (WGS) can often be interpreted as BAM/CRAM files as opposed to gVCF or VCF files, or that nodes are expecting to host whole exome sequences as well.

Finally no nodes had decided on which ontologies to utilise; however this would be determined in collaboration with the 1+MG WG3 and 4 working groups for the data to be ready for inclusion into the 1+MG.





6. Discussion



6.1 Phase Deadlines

There was a 58% response rate to the questions on when a node aims to reach the GDI phases. This lack of engagement is a significant risk to the success of the project, and hence the ability to monitor and provide support to the nodes is subsequently limited. To address this issue, a specific face to face workshop is being planned for March 2024, where each node will be invited to present how they plan to reach their operational readiness goal they are committed to as f a GDI node, including timelines and support required from Pillar II.

Additionally, based on the questionnaire, it appears that the aspiration of some nodes may be over ambitious, For example, Spain aims to be operational by the end of January 2024, with both Finland and Portugal aiming for an operational status by the end of 2024. However, all the other nodes aim to reach operational status just by the end of the project Oct-2026, but before the conclusion of the GDI and is not manageable without nodes pushing their promotion to become operational. Feedback from the nodes indicated clarification on the definitions of operational status should be made by the Pillar leaders and the coordinator in conjunction with the quarterly reporting, to ensure that the aspirations are realistic and achievable for each node. Work is already ongoing, such as the planned workshop in March 2024, to ensure the definitions are better understood.

Some nodes queries if the responses were on whether the aspiration was purely technical, or fully operational, i.e. was actually supporting cross border data access on real genomic data. This is in part driven by the national situation, for example, the Netherlands stated that the National Genomics Plan was still in progress, so any non-technical deadlines were out of scope. Also as the GDI does not yet have a clearly defined legal framework, and the requirements from the 1+ Million Genomes working groups, as well as the Genome of Europe use case, are still evolving, it may be that the lack of clarity here is affecting the response rate to the phase deadlines. The existence of parallel initiatives, like the EHDS, that could have a potential impact on the final implementation and the fluid regulatory landscape could also be a factor in the engagement and the level of certainty provided by the different nodes when addressing the questions.

6.2 Landscape Analysis

The fact that five nodes already expect there to be a requirement for additional products indicates that Pillar II will need to investigate the support needs for these products, and if their use will be isolated to a specific node or represents a common requirement across nodes. Currently the





additional products specified in the questionnaire include a data catalogue, Molgenis, Beacon Network, Galaxy, and proxies for APIs. The fact that most nodes agreed to utilise Beacon and REMS also helps with the homogeneity of the GDI. The differences in the storage and compute products may reflect the differences in the underlying hardware and software at each node. These products, as long as they have suitable APIs, are more internal to a node or deployment, so the differences here have less influence on the interoperability of the GDI than other outward facing products. A generic platform, such as Galaxy, can also help provide a more homogeneous computation capability within GDI. Within the deliverable D4.1 - Helpdesk Roadmap, there is the requirement to define the change management processes and these should include how to suggest, evaluate, deploy, and test new products within the infrastructure.

The foreseen technical infrastructure sharing with FEGA is positive for GDI, and was a core aim at the outset to maximise interoperability and reduce unnecessary replication of core infrastructure; however, is not until the final GDI legal framework is in defined that non-technical aspects like data compliance with data governance interoperability and ELSI requirements can be evaluated. The fact that not all nodes aim to co-host a FEGA instance also demonstrates that GDI may help increase the number of countries willing to share genomic data beyond those that are already interested in FEGA. The different methods of data access, i.e. allowing data download or not, indicates that currently the data envisioned to exist within GDI may have different Ethical, Legal, and Societal Issues (ELSI) relating to it depending on the jurisdiction and the source of the data specific to each node. This difference in data access methodology needs to be confirmed with 1+MG WG2 and Pillar I, and if confirmed the current starter kit products will need to be checked to ensure they support this.

7. Conclusions & Impact

Improved communication between the Pillar II participants, Work Package 3, and Coordination leads in GDI and the participating nodes is a requirement to help mitigate the identified risks for reaching operational status. The lack of engagement could be due to overloaded communications at the nodes, lack of human resource at the nodes, or the messages not getting through to the intended audience. Understanding the reasons for lack of engagement is crucial. Responses to the node level deadlines for each GDI phase are divergent, and these need to be clarified in terms of the GDI project as a whole.

This deliverable has a significant impact within the GDI. It demonstrates a large diversity in the level of engagement, higher than expected, of the different countries that could have an impact not only on the deployment of the different nodes but also on the readiness of the EU-level infrastructure services, and highlights the need to increase engagement. However it also shows that GDI has the





potential to deliver genomic data access in countries which currently are not engaged in FEGA, increasing the coverage of European Union countries aiming to share genomic and health data.

The volume of data anticipated within the nodes appears to be low, and clarification on these figures needs to be performed in conjunction with the expectations of both national priorities and Genome of Europe, with GoE itself expecting more national genomes than indicated here⁷.

The diversity of products anticipated for use by the nodes means care must be taken when determining the technical performance and conformance of a node to the required service levels and performance indicators. These different products cannot negatively affect the performance of the GDi as a whole, and the ongoing work in WP4 and 5 on the monitoring of the infrastructure must take account of the responses given in this document.

8. Next steps

All GDI use cases being mentioned at least once in the responses indicates that the use cases are relevant for all nodes. However, where a priority national use case exists that is not covered by the GDI use cases there should be a way of ensuring the requirements from those use cases are brought into GDI, either via the 1+MG framework or via GDI stakeholder engagement. A procedure for this process will be created in collaboration with WPs 1, 4, and 7.

Further analysis of the landscape question is required, as well as node level clarifications, for example the data access model and how this relates to the 1+MG Data Governance. Presentation of these findings may itself help increase engagement with the nodes, and the planned node engagement workshop in March 2024 will help with this. Additionally the node engagement workshop will enable the countries to feedback on the technical progress and influence the work needed to ensure it meets the national requirements, with the aim of developing a roadmap that aligns the national requirements with those of GDI, both from a governance and technical perspective. Progress should be made on separating the technical requirements out from the operational, legal, and national requirements so the technical monitoring of the progress towards having a genomic data sharing infrastructure can be properly conducted, and also proceed as much as possible while the ELSI and governance model is fully defined.

⁷ <u>https://zenodo.org/records/8055610</u>





9. Glossary

BAM/CRAM - Binary / Compressed Reference-orientated Alignment Map file that contains the raw data from genome sequencing.

Beacon - A GA4GH standard allowing a query to be performed on genomic and phenotypic data with a response tailor to the access level of the user.

Beacon Network - A network of Beacons which allows a single Beacon query to be sent to multiple Beacons, and the responses returned to the user, allowing a user to find a genomic variant of interest in multiple different genomic data repositories.

DAC (Data Access Committee) - A committee that reviews and decides on access requests to controlled access resources.

FAIR - Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable.

FEGA (Federated European Genome-phenome Archive) - A federated node of the European Genome-phenome Archive (EGA) that provides controlled access to human genetic and phenotypic data.

GA4GH - The Global Alliance for Genomics and Health - A standard setting and policy framing not-for-profit organisation.

GA4GH Passport - A GA4GH standard that holds a set of attributes and entitlements for a specific electronic identity, for example the entitlement to access a controlled access resource.

Galaxy - An open source platform for FAIR data analysis.

Molgenis - Data platform for bioinformatic data analysis.

REMS (Resource Entitlement Management System) - Software that allows the management of data access permissions to different resources. It allows users to request access to a resource, DAC to grant or reject these requests, and provides a GA4GH Passport allowing the user to access a particular resource.

VCF (gVCF) - (Genomic) Variant Call Format files that contain a list of genomic variants from 1 or more samples.







Appendix I

	Country	РТ	BE	BG	FI	SI	LV	NL	ES	SE	EE	NO	IE	FR	LU	DK	DE
	Beacon	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	None	None	None	None				
Beacon	What is the timeline to deploy it?	2023-04-0 1	2023-09-2 7	2025-10-3 1	2024-05-3 1	2023-12-0 4			2023-12-3 1	None	2023-12-1 5	2023-06-3 0	None				
	What is the timeline to decide it?						None	None									
REMS	REMS	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	None	None	None	None				
	What is the timeline to deploy it?	2023-06-0 1	2023-09-2 7	2025-10-3 1	2024-05-3 1	2023-12-0 4				None	2023-12-1 5	2023-06-3 0	None				
	What is the timeline to decide it?						None	None	2023-12-3 1								







	Archival Technology	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Will keep	Have not decided yet	None	Will replace	Will keep	Will keep	Will replace	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None
Archiva I Technol ogy	What is the alternative?								Custom solution based on Spanish node FEGA			FEGA storage and interfaces , currently very aligned with the GDI starter kit compone nt.					
	What is the timeline to deploy it?	2023-09-0 1		2024-12-3 1		2023-12-0 4			2023-12-3 1	None	2023-12-1 5	2023-09-2 1	None				
	What is the timeline to decide it?		2024-09-0 1		2023-12-3 1		None										
Federat ed Compu tation	Federated computation	Have not decided yet	Will replace	Have not decided yet	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	None	Will replace	None	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None
	What is the alternative?		Galaxy or WfExS						Custom solution based on Galaxy		2023-12-1 5	2024-12-3 1	None				







									and openVRE					01			
	What is the timeline to deploy it?		2024-09-0 1		2024-05-3 1				2023-12-3 1								
	What is the timeline to decide it?	2023-11-3 0		2025-10-3 1		2023-12-2 1	None										
	Containerise d computation	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	None	Will replace	Will keep	Will keep	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None
Contai nerised Compu tation	What is the timeline to deploy it?					2023-12-2 2	None		Custom solution based on openVRE			2025-09-3 0	None				
	What is the timeline to deploy it?	2023-09-0 4	2024-09-0 1	2024-12-3 1	2024-05-3 1				2023-12-3 1	None	2023-12-1 5						
Additio nal	Are you using additional products?	No	Yes	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Yes	Have not decided yet	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None
Produc ts	What are the products?		None	2024-12-3 1	2023-12-3 1	None	None	None	None				None				







	What are the products? (1) Name	Galaxy		Molgenis	a data catalogue	Beacon Network		None	0		
ľ	What are the products? (2) Timeline to deploy it	None		4.12.2023	Q3/Q4 2023	31/12/20 23		Proxy services for data in and data out endpoints to/from the secure infrastruct ure.			
	What are the products? (3) URL	None		https://w ww.molge nis.org/	None			Already deployed for FEGA. Being used for both FEGA and GDI currently.			
	What are the products? (3) URL							None			







Within node Federat ion	Within-Node Federation	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	Only part of the data will be centralize d	Only part of the data will be centralize d	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	All the data accessible through GDI will be federated within the node - no central data warehous e	Only part of the data will be centralize d	Only part of the data will be centralize d	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	Have not decided yet	None	None	All the data to be accessible through GDI is located on a single centralize d data warehous e	None
	What is the timeline to decide it?												None				
	Is data transferred in an encrypted format?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	

Data Transfe r







What is the encryption format?	Crypt4GH	We aim to use GA4GH Crypt4GH standard	Data is generated at the same site where it will be stored and will be transferre d securely within the LAN segment.	Crypt4GH	None	Data themselve s are not encrypted , however, transfer will be performe d through https or SSH File Transfer Protocol	crypt4gh	Crypt4gh	Crypt4GH	Crypt4gh		Only on ingestion, not relevant for GDI	
How will data be transferred to the centralized data storage?	using SDA-cli	The preferred way is Globus, other arrangem ents will have to be made for partners without Globus	Have not decided yet	Using the htsget protocol.	Network connectivi ty.	Through API defined by the storage provider which uses https protocol.	None	None	this is yet to be defined by WP3 and WP6	Using Life Science login authentic ated upload endpoints to the Storage and Interface compone nt of GDI. Similar to functional ity implemen ted for		None	





			-				-								-		-
												FEGA Norway.		01			
	Data users will be allowed to download the data from the node after DAC review?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Have not decided yet	Yes	No	Yes	None	No	Yes	Yes	None	None	No	None
	Will there be prioritization of specific use case or stakeholder needs?	Not decided yet	Yes	GDI use case 7.1 (Genome of Europe demonstr ator)	No	No	Yes	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	Yes	Not decided yet	Yes	None	None	None	None
Prioriti y use cases and	Do you have any priority GDI use cases?		GDI use case 7.1 (Genome of Europe demonstr ator)	Won't prioritize 1+MG use cases			GDI use case 7.1 (Genome of Europe demonstr ator)						GDI use case 7.1 (Genome of Europe demonstr ator)				
stakeh olders	Do you have any priority 1+MG use cases?		Yes	Yes			Yes				GDI use case 7.1 (Genome of Europe demonstr ator)		Yes				







Please, describe Do you have any priority national use		Cancer usecase Yes	Rare Diseases			Use in Polygenic risk score calculatio ns Yes				Won't prioritize 1+MG use cases No		Cancer, populatio n genomics, rare diseases Yes				
Please, describe		Belgium Genome Biobank data				Data use for rare disease analysis						Variant lookup, creating a represent ative reference genome for this lookup and for variant calling				
What is the expected timeline to your node reach onboarding status?	2023-10-1 1	2023-12-3 1	2024-12-3 1	2023-10-0 1	2023-12-2 2	2025-10-3 1	2023-12-2 1	2023-11-3 0	2023-10-0 1	None	2024-06-3 0	2026-11-3 0	None	None	None	None







What is the expected timeline to your node reach deployment status?	2024-11-3 0	2024-10-3 1	2026-05-3 1	2024-05-3 1	2025-10-3 1	2026-10-3 1	2024-10-3 1	2023-12-3 1	2025-01-3 1	None	2025-10-0 1	None	None	None	None	None
What is the expected timeline to your node reach operational status?	2024-11-3 0	2026-09-3 0	2027-03-3 1	2024-10-3 1	2026-11-3 0	None	2026-10-3 0	2024-01-3 1	2026-10-2 1	None	2026-10-3 1	None	None	None	None	None
Will you also host a FEGA instance?	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	None	None	None	None
Will GDI data and FEGA data be hosted on the same technical infrastructur e?	Yes			Yes				Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes				





How will the different governance models between FEGA and GDI be handled?	They will have separate governan ce		FEGA service is handled under its own contracts and service ownershi p. While some of the data holders might coincide, in terms of the DAC process and contracts				We are still defining the governan ce model for GDI	None		Although FEGA and GDI may be hosted on the same technical infrastruct ure, with two different governan ce structures , a level of separatio n is expected. This could range from two parallel operation s/complet	Unknown		
GDI be handled? Europe: Genomi Infrastr	an c Data ucture		in terms of the DAC process and contracts, the data are separately defined in each case GDI proj grant ag	ect rece reemer	eives fu 1t numb	nding fr er 1010	om the 81813.	Europea	an Unio	This could range from two parallel operation s/complet e deployme nts, with partly overlappi ng teams, operating under the different	al		







											Norwegia n part of GoE cohort is planned for inclusion in both GDI and in the Norwegia n national genome center, and ongoing work on a national genetic variation reference database.					
Do you have any associated projects which are important to GDI?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	Yes	No	Yes	None	None	None	None





				 _	_					_	
1	Please, list them	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	01		
	Please, list them (1) Name of the project	BGB	REMS	None	EOSC4Can cer Operation al organisati ons like HMF (Hartwig Medical Foundatio n: https://w ww.hartw igmedicalf oundation .nl/)	IMPaCT (https://i mpact.isci ii.es/). Spanish national project	Genome of Europe	EHDS,Nati onal Strategy for Genetics and Genomics Implemen tation Plan,All Island Cancer Research Institute, Data Access Storage Sharing and Linkage (DASSL),F utureNeu ro Research Centre			
1	Please, list them (2) When it will	None	2024-05-3 1	None	2024-10-3 1	2023-12-3 1	2024-12-3 1	None			





 be deployed?							D C	01		
Please, list them (3) Does it use the same products of the starter kit?	Some of them	Yes	None	No	No	No	None			
What product of the starter kit will be used?	Beacon; REMS			Use cases in EOSC4Can cer are aligned with the Cancer use case in GDI HMF has its own operation al infrastruct ure (currently using Google Cloud)	Some of the products will be used but they will be customize d to have the same function as the starter kit products.	Via 1+MG				





Do you have any associated data spaces or infrastructur es important to GDI?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	None	None	None	None
Please, list them				None	None	None	None		None	None	None					
Please, list them (1) Name of the dataspace/in frastructure				Sensitive data services, SD Connect	ELIXIR-SI data storage	None	Health-RI		BigPicture	National Health Informati on System (TEHIK)	National Genome Center Norway					
Please, list them (2) When it will be deployed?				2022-11-0 1	None	None	2023-12-2 8		None	None	2026-10-3 1					
Please, list them (3) Does it use the same products of the starter kit?				Some of them	No	None	No		None	No	No					





not Not yet decided decided/e xplored. yet; depends Technical infrastruct Not At the on dependab catalogue adjustme ure for What level; le on nts of the product of htsget; LS filesystem legal National same AAI; the starter None usage. DCAT-AP framewor Genome REMS kit will be Used only model k to allow Center as used? for data should be data flow well as employed storage. from governan national ce model health is not records to decided GDI yet. What existing genomic data None VCF files None formats/type s will you be Data using? Types and What Ontolo existing gies genomic FASTQ FASTQ FASTQ data VCF files VCF files BAM files VCF files ~50TB files files files formats/type s will you be using? (1) What





existing genomic data formats/type s will you be using?										0'		
 What existing genomic data formats/type s will you be using? (2) What volume of data of this type will you be working with?	<100GB estimated	1000+	500TB	Smaller portion of data.	BAM files		2000 full genomes	None	Unknown			
What existing genomic data formats/type s will you be using? (3) What existing genomic data formats/type	CRAM files		VCF files	BAM files	~500TB			BAM files	VCF files			





s will you using?	u be									01		
What existing genomic data formats/ s will you using? (4 What volume of data of t type will be worki with?	c /type u be 4) ~300 of this I you ing	ЮТВ		100TB	Smaller portion of data.			None	Unknown			
What existing genomic data formats/ s will you using? (5 What existing genomic data formats/ s will you using?	c /type u be 5) c /type u be			CRAM files	VCF files			CRAM files				













existing genomic data formats/t s will you using? (8) What volume o data of th type will be workin with?	type ı be) nis you ng											None					
Has the encoding rminolog vocabula /ontologi will you b using for phenotyp data collectior being decided?	ss/te ies/ ries ies be bic	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	None	None	None	None
Encoding minologie ocabulari ontologie	/ter es/v ies/ es	None	2024-09-0 1	2024-12-3 1	2024-03-3 1	None	None	None	2023-12-3 1		2025-12-3 1	None	None				





	_			-	_		-	-							-	
Encoding/ter minologies/v ocabularies/ ontologies (1) Name	Minimal Informati on about a high throughp ut SEQuenci ng Experime nt															
Encoding/ter minologies/v ocabularies/ ontologies (2) Link	https://fai rsharing.o rg/FAIRsh aring.a55z 32															
Will you use ontologies for user consent?	Yes	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	No	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	Yes	Not decided yet	None	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	Not decided yet	None	None	No	None
What is the timeline to decide it?		2024-09-0 1	2024-12-3 1		None	None	None	2023-12-3 1		2025-12-3 1	None	None				
Which ontology will you use?	None															







	Will you monitor data integrity once it has been transferred?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	No	None	Yes	Yes	No	None	None	Yes	None
	Will you be keeping a master list with checksums of certified/cor rect/canonic al/verified data?	Yes	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	Yes	Have not decided yet				Yes	Yes				Yes	
	Will genomic data quality be assessed?	Yes	Have not decided yet	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	None	No	None	Have not decided yet	Yes	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None
Data Quality	What is the timeline to decide it?		2024-09-0 1								2025-12-3 1		None				





		_	 							
How will genomic data quality be assessed?	FastQC, BioQC or others defined in the project	We will follow B1MG D3.2 Best practices for Next Generatio n Sequencin g (10.5281/ zenodo.7 912923) and the recomme ndations will be implemen ted in the routine pipeline.	Genomic QC tools (FastQC, Nanopolis h, etc.)	None			Routine QC metric measures are being implemen ted in FEGA, as well as in 1+MG dedicated WG. We plan to implemen t measures from both of these sources.			
If genomic data does not reach a stablished quality standard, will it still be made available through GDI?	No	No	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet			Have not decided yet			







Will you use a metadata label to describe genomic data quality?	No		Have not decided yet		None					None					
What is the timeline to decide it?			2024-12-3 1		Yes	Have not decided yet				Have not decided yet					
Please, describe					overall accuracy (error rate), depth, average read length, number of reads										
What is the timeline to decide it?						None				None					
Will you host non-genomic data?	Have not decided yet	Other types of data	Have not decided yet	None	Have not decided yet; Other types of data	Have not decided yet	Have not decided yet	None	None	None	None				





For now I would say that those that have submitted the 1+MG Survey and indicated the amount of WGS are the ones that are given terms of use available in How many the form of a Have not WGS you are dataset. See About 14000 2000+ 10000 3000 3500 the decided None 2000+ 15000 >2000 None None None None planning to 3000. dashboard yet host? https://dashl oard.onemill ongenomes.e u/ -> select surveys -> filter on country: Netherlands and those additional to be sequenced for the Genome of Europe









