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