Dear Michel  
  
Raivo Ruusalepp and I (Börje Justrell) are, as you know, peer reviewers  
of D5.1. You have really struggled hard to get the text into a good  
shape in a very short time, which we will add to your credit.  
  
However, there are some adjustments we will propose that, having in mind  
the time frame for changing the text, will improve the shape and content  
of the document. See this also as our peer review. We have used the  
current version 0.7.  
  
Firstly, the introduction (the un-numbered part) should be rewritten to  
align better with WP3 activities. As it is now, it may raise  
expectations to the project and particularly the D3.1 which can be a bit  
tricky to fulfil later. Therefore, we propose a new text for  
introduction, which we will send you tomorrow (Monday).  
  
Secondly, section 2.1 and 2.2 can be as they are, maybe with some  
polishing of the text as follows from changes in other sections.  
  
Thirdly, the text in section three is too detailed when it comes to  
SCRUM. It´s a methodology normally used for system developing but can of  
course be used also in other contexts. So, focus more of how SCRUM will  
be used and give only a brief overview of what it is. For further  
details it is okay to reference the numerous literature covering this  
topic. We do not really need to write lengthy deliverables for the sake  
of European Commission or our project partners.  
  
Fourthly, sections 4 and 5 need a bit of further “chewing”. We propose  
that section 5 presents more of a “plan for the piloting”, rather than  
already detailed criteria for assessment. We do not yet know exactly  
what or what kind of services we will be piloting, and we can only guess  
at this stage what the appropriate assessment criteria are. We think  
that there is a mis-match between the delivery dates of D3.1 and D5.1.  
Currently, the latter has to come first (month 3) and the former only at  
month 6. Whereas it would be much more sensible to have discussions of  
the D3.1 in the project first and only then decide what and how to pilot  
as proofs of concept. But, we are where we are. From our end, we  
endeavour to deliver a draft of D3.1 as soon as we can. Until then, our  
suggestion, thus, is to hold back a bit on the details in D5.1 and just  
give a broader overview / framework on how the piloting process will be  
performed (round 1 and 2) and perhaps a more detailed description of  
round 1.  This could describe the “pre-conditions” for pilots – the  
technical infrastructure required, the MoUs in place with NRENs in  
participating countries, the necessary digital data for experimenting,  
and the technical methods used during proofs of concept. All of this is  
largely there now in the text. We’re just worried that we don’t go too  
much into details that will have to be changed later once the concrete  
services are picked for piloting.  
  
Round 1 (first proof of concept) should be very general and based on the  
actual situation in the countries/institutions that will execute the  
first proof of context. This strategic way of handling development is  
sometimes called “picking the low hanging fruits first”.  
  
Sweden (RA) can focus on archival data (which we also discussed at the  
kick off in Rome) and expand the proof of context to data from other  
cultural institutions in the round 2. This will bring into the project  
the long experience of digital preservation (since the 70ths) that RA  
have.  
  
Belgium (BELSPO) can focus on making their data available via the  
Belgian National Grid Infrastructure (Begrid), which brings experience  
of how to access via GRID into the project.  
  
Estonia (EVKM) can use the KANUT (with its experience of archiving  
digital data) and let them focus how it will be to move these activities  
to EENet.  
  
Poland (PSNC) can focus on the specific analyses mentioned in section  
4.5.  
  
Hungary (NIIFI) can focus on how they, as being a the basic countrywide  
infrastructure provider, see the conditions for confirm to the road map  
thinking that will be outlined in deliverable D3.1  
  
We think this will give material enough on a reasonable level to fill  
deliverable D5.3 in month 12.  
  
Built on D5.3, but also D3.2 , D3.3 and results from Task 3.4, work  
package 3 will produce deliverable D3.4 (Intermediate version of the  
roadmap), which will be the main input for the second proof of concept  
(round 2).  
  
 Round 2 (second proof of concept) has to start with an updated version  
of D.5.1, giving the details for what to be tested, the functions of it,  
what kind of data etc. The results will be published in deliverable  
D5.4.  
  
Please regard these as friendly suggestions and feel free to ask further  
questions.  
  
Regards  
  
Raivo Ruusalepp and Börje Justrell