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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** | | | |
| *Title:* | **D2.1 “Communications, Dissemination and Engagement Strategy”** | *Document identifier:* | **EGI-doc-2489-v3** |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | **https://documents.egi.eu/document/2489** |
| *Author(s):* | **Sergio Andreozzi; Sara Coelho; Sy Holsinger; Gergely Sipos - EGI.eu** | *Date:* | **15 June 2015** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** | | | |
| *Reviewer:* | **Geneviève Romier, CNRS** | *Activity:* | **NIL/ WP2/WP5/WP6** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The document is really long and I’m not sure it is necessary. Particularly several long explanations are really similar to the EGI-Engage proposal and could perhaps be resumed. This could help to better see the work already done since the beginning of EGI-Engage.  The list of actions to be realised is very impressive and ambitious and I see risks:   * Too much work and a few resources to do it. * A lot of work to be done not in the framework of EGI-Engage (NGIs for example) ; * A risk of dispersing   Priorities could be better given to take into account the few available resources according to the large quantity of actions. |
| **Response from Author:** |
| **We agree that the document is long, in particular because it contains the engagement strategy; we decided to have a single deliverable for the different areas so it is a side effect of merging different concepts.**  **We added an introduction in section 5.1 explaining the source of resources and the logic for the priorities.** |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author (correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 6 | example | It is not very easy to understand concerning platform Y that is created at the end of the 3rd paragraph but cited in the second one.  I propose “The Dissemination activity advises on the license that should be applied to Platform Y,…” -> “The Dissemination activity advises on the license that should be applied to potential derived Platforms ,…”  Not sure the example is needed | Fixed.  Are examples ever needed? (this is a rhetorical question) They can however, be very harmful and I believe this is not the case. |
|  | 5 and 7 | Intro A and 2 | Intro A and 2 paragraphs are very similar but the order of the items are different. The 2.2 paragraph is both 2) and 3) of the 2 paragraph introduction. I propose to reorganise the order and the numbers to have similar organisations easier to read. | Done |
|  |  | 2.1 | A short paragraph explaining that the EGI-Engage branding is closely linked to the EGI branding and why should be a good introduction. | Added |
|  |  | 2.1 | As “EGI-Engage will accelerate advancements within the European Grid Infrastructure (EGI) in …” and because EGI-Engage will build on the results of EGI-Inspire I think we could explain that all branding need to be close. | As above |
|  |  | **2.1** | **“**No dedicated design will be created for the project.”  Should be explained | **As above** |
|  |  | 2.1 | The 5 note is not on the right page (next one) | Apologies |
|  |  | 2.2.1 | “The EGI website is a repository…” give the url. | Done |
|  |  | 2.2.2 | This paragraph seems to be for internal and external publications. To be merged with 2.2.3? | No.  Internal publications are the ones we publish. This is what is described in the table.  External publications are published by other people (e.g. iSGTW, CONNECT)  I will clarify this in the text. |
|  |  | 2.3.2 | The table is not at the right place. Should be just at the end of the “policy events” bullet. | Done |
|  |  | 3.2 | A short global introduction to introduce the parts should be useful | Not addressed for lack of time. We may do it during the PMB review |
|  |  | 3.2.2.2 | The chapter describes EGI policy, EGI bodies and workflows. It is difficult to understand what is related to EGI-Engage in this. A short explanation should be useful. | Clarified the policy part. The workflow was better related to section 3.2.3; moved |
|  |  | 3.2.3.3 | “EGI-Engage software code, tools and interfaces will be published under a license of "CC-BY" type” is not true. See the agreed version of consortium agreement | **Fixed** |
|  | 19 | 3.2.5.1 | “Currently only 50% of research is freely accessible to the public[[1]](#footnote-1), resulting in measurable loss to the knowledge-based SME sector and slowing down innovation in general[[2]](#footnote-2).”  The sentence is related to publications not to data. The referenced article is also related to publications.  But the chapter is related to data. I think this example is not really relevant. | Removed |
|  |  | 3.2.5.2 | The content of this part is different from the related content in the grant agreement. For example, no mention of green or gold access in the grant agreement. This can not be different. | **Consortium Agreement problem** |
|  |  | 3.2.5.3 | A shorter chapter should be better: CA is a legal document and I think very difficult to resume it correctly. I wonder if this chapter is useful. A CA is mandatory and nothing is original in our CA. | **Consortium Agreement problem** |
|  |  | 3.2.5.4 | idem | **Consortium Agreement problem** |
|  |  | 4 | The engagement seems almost the same as at the end of EGI-Inspire. I do not understand why it is not different, taking more into account that several targets (long tail of science or SME for instance) are included now in the EGI-Engage activities and clearly part of other WP. These actions of the other WP are listed in 5. I would like to better see what is in the scope of the WP and how it is linked with the other work packages. It is probably only a question of wording and unnecessary repetitions. | EGI-Engage – similarly to EGI-InSPIRE – provides support for core EGI activities, including the implementation of the EGI Engage Strategy. This strategy did not change because of ending EGI-InSPIRE and start of EGI-Engage, and this is the reason of no change (only progress) with the Engagement activities.  Despite being a WP2 deliverable, section 4-5 of the document covers the engagement activities facilitated by several WPs of EGI-Engage and also non-project activities in the NGIs. (Again because EGI-Engage includes resources for core EGI activities, such as coordination in the EGI community.) |
|  |  | 4.3 | “Check that this is up-to-date.”  Is is a mistake? | Yes. Sentence was removed. |
|  |  | 4.3 | A lot of tools are listed but we do not know if they are managed, used, useful…or if there is a plan to study that. | Yes, these are managed and used. Services are added or removed as needed. |
|  |  | 5.1.2.2 | I wonder if this part is necessary. It’s WP6 work. | Despite being a WP2 deliverable, section 4-5 of the document covers the engagement activities facilitated by several WPs of EGI-Engage and also non-project activities in the NGIs. (Again because EGI-Engage includes resources for core EGI activities, such as coordination in the EGI community.) |

**English and other corrections:**

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