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**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The report describes 2015-2016 EGI training plan. A intensive list of training programs is given which can be classified into 4 categories: 1) general EGI training courses to be delivered at high-impact conferences/training events; 2) EGI training services to serve EGI communities needs; 3) EGI-NGIs collaborative training programs; and 4) possible training programs coming out from future projects collaborations. A neat training model has been presented in the case 1. In case 2, 3, 4, besides a list of training events, it’s better to give more descriptions about the EGI training (service) platform, e.g., the objectives and scopes of trainings, EGI training responsibilities in particular in the collaborative training programs (with NGIs/EGI communities), targeting audience, facilities to use, courses developments, evaluation methods, etc. |
| **Response from Author:** |
| **Although these comments are valid, the document intends to follow a different logic. Instead of clustering EGI training into different programmes (and unavoidably causing fragmentation inside EGI) the goal is to use the effort in T6.1 to integrate the relevant contributions from the NGIs, CC, UCB and core training providers into a single ‘training portfolio’ that can fulfil those roles that are defined in Section 1. Updates have been made in several places to strengthen this concept.** |

**Additional comments**

*(not affecting the document content e.g. recommendations for the future)*

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
| 1) It seems besides EGI training course, EGI also offers a training service platform. A model for such a case should be developed, which may include the following elements: 1) the objectives and scopes of the training event, what do we want to achieve, why it is important, what are the responsibilities of each partners when collaboratively to deliver a training event, etc. 2) identify the targeting audience, who will be there, what are their knowledge background 3) select topics, design the course, prepare the facilities, 4) deliver the course, 5) evaluate the training results -- do we achieve the training objectives? How much the audience understand? How can do better next time?  2) A training model shall include evaluation process -- how to measure the success of a training events? How much technology/knowledge the learners understand? Is the training achieve the objectives, is the quality of the training good? A good evaluation analysis can help continue improve the future training quality.  3) While EGI already provides Webinars and training marketplace, the idea is to further automate the training process where we can, which can largely reduce human efforts/cost. Could we consider to develop courses using available e-learning software where available, setting up portals where learner can hand-on practice, providing question forms/chat window where learners can ask questions, providing feedback forms, where we know their requirements in order to continue improving the quality of training.  4) Should we also consider education for the next generation? E.g., university student, PhD, and young researchers. Many university already have courses such as distributed systems, cloud/grid computing etc. It would be easier to connect with these courses, and students would be benefit from hand-on experiences. The value of providing training for young generation is that they will be the future users of the technology, and in 4 or 5 years time, there will be a large group students knowing the knowledge and skills, who can carry to their work and research communities. These likely to generate long-term impacts.  5) Modern technologies, e.g., web media, video, are now popularly used in education. Injecting fun elements are proved to have better results for learning. We may need to consider to gradually update traditional training approach by learning from modern education.  6) We shall think hard about how to increase the impacts of each training event. E.g., in an identified high-impact-training-event, how to attract more audience, how to achieve goals in relevant short time with many constrains, what are different training environment shall be expected? |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author (correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **6** |  | Table 6.1, it’s better to add column titles. | **Added.** |
| **2** | **7** |  | **HTC** etc. when appears at the first place, it’s better give the full name. | **Expanded.** |
| **3** | **11** |  | When mention “the currently available EGI Training Marketplace **can satisfy the current needs** of the EGI NGIs … ”, it’s better explain how we know that EGI Training Marketplace can satisfy the current needs. | **Rephrased.** |
| **4** | **11** |  | When mention “… the content that’s available in the marketplace needs to be **reviewed** and refreshed where necessary...”, it’s better clarify to be reviewed by whom. | **Clarified.** |
| **5** | **11** |  | When mention, “**Further development** of the Marketplace is envisaged within the EDISON H2020 project”, it’s better to give some examples to explain what kinds of developments. | **Explained and an extra section has been added about EDISON.** |
| **6** | **13** |  | In sub-section 2.7, it’s better at the beginning to explain how we identify those events as high-impact, (e.g., having large potential targeting trainees), highlight the benefits for EGI, the goals of EGI training to be achieved in such events, etc. | **Text added. The table aims to capture the important details about events.** |
| **7** | **13** |  | 1) It’s better to give table title; 2) When mention staff’s name, it’s better to give full names. | **Full names added.** |
| **8** | **14** |  | When mention “There are **no plans** at the moment for repeating this MOOC, or to prepare a new MOOC with EGI/NGI involvement”, it’s better to explain why there is no plan, was the course failed? What will take place? | **Rational given.** |
| **9** | **15** |  | Section 3 describes the training plans for EGI user communities. The training services seem different from the one described in section 2. It’s better at the beginning of the section, to explain the differences. It seems section 2 describes a training model that how to deliver general EGI training courses, and section 3 describes a training service platform, which can support communities to deliver training courses in addition to EGI courses. | **Scope is now explained at the beginning of the section.** |
| **10** | **18** |  | Section 4 describes the collaboration training plans between EGI and NGIs. At the beginning of the section, it’s better explain the responsibilities of EGI in supporting NGIs in training. How a collaborative training model looks like? Who response for what? Is the training community request-driven (pull model) or technology-provider-driven (push model), or both? If a push-model, how frequently shall deliver? Can EGI consider non-human involved training methods to reduce training cost? | **Scope is now explained at the beginning of the section.** |
| **11** | **18** |  | When mention “**We** would be interested if trainers from EGI could participate in some of our training events as lectors and also **we** could use training content that is being developed”. It’s not clear who are “we”, it doesn’t seem to be EGI. | **Changed we to the respective group/NGI name.** |
| **12** | **21** |  | Section 5 lists future training opportunities might be developed from current collaboration projects. However, the section didn’t explain how to move from collaborations to the training programs, e.g., for each collaboration, briefly describe at what technical investigation stages can begin to prepare trainings, or what training can serve for different project investigation stages. | **Text has been modified to express that these are training collaborations.** |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.