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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:* | **Jesus Marco**  | *Activity:* |  **LW CC, and others.** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The document is well written and structured. However it is quite large and complex, and maybe the use of annexes could help to make a shorter main document. After reading the document I am not sure what is the connection with “exploitation” (not to say “sustainability”), and this is a key factor to focus dissemination and outreach.Also I don’t know where the training effort-connection is considered. And this is key: the FedCloud framework is VERY DIFFERENT when compared to the Grid framework, and most communities need extensive training/integration effort. This effort should be done jointly with other projects if possible.Another important point is that the document does not make an estimation of the feasibility of the approach proposed, i.e. if the project has enough resources to address all the (many) tasks proposed. Along this last line, the section 4, on engagement strategy, is terribly ambitious. I really think that somebody has to prioritize (and filter) all possible new activities, under the light of a successful exploitation of the resources. We cannot support many unstructured or simply inadequate initiatives, but how to define that? Is there a way to evaluate those proposals and also to estimate if they can be supported? We need that. I can comment on my experience: we wasted (literally) a lot of time to support an international SME requiring Windows on FedCloud to discover after one year that they would not pay a minimum to use the resources nor even allow any diffusion of the experience. This is, we needed a business plan BEFORE investing already trying to establish it. What will happen with SMEs engagement? And with long tail? So I will not comment further on section 4. It is very nice, but I think an estimation of how to accomplish all those activities in a sustainable way is needed, and surpasses the scope of this deliverable.More specific remarks/comments: -(Internal) Communication is key in a project with so many partners. To my experience this is very hard, as there are few events where people meet, and in particular have time to understand what others do, and appreciate it. At least an internal strategy for identifying key people and promoting that they are well known by all partners, is needed. At the same time promoting also that they participate in international events as part of the EGI-Engage “team” could strength their personnel engagement. Other ideas to promote young/bright people ideas should be considered (example: prize in contributions to EGI events). -Join forces with other projects (like INDIGO) for technical contributions, at different events, and not only for training, also for policy events when possible. FINAL REMARK: at the end, our main stakeholders are ERA actors, and in particular ERA authorities. A plan is needed, and in such way that they cannot refuse to get involved. This means likely involving other political actors at national or parliament level. Why not? |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| **About the sustainability vs exploitation, this document focuses mainly on the former by identifying the types of results and ways to disclose them to possible audiences. The discussion on the exploitation and business models will be done in a later phase of the project****EGI has recently published its training plan that includes detailed actions for the March 2015 – Feb 2016 period. This includes several joint training activities with other EC projects exactly to maximise the reach out to beneficiary scientific communities. The plan is available at <http://go.egi.eu/trainingplan>.**  |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
| I know it is hard for this deliverable, but an executive summary is needed... no reviewer will read 52 pages. Sergio: we’ll try to add it during the PMB review |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author(correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **5** | **1** | **What is the connection with Exploitation?** | Dissemination combined with exploitation will be reported in the annual report as specified by H2020 rules. Here, we only report the strategy for disclosing the project results (dissemination). The explotation is out of scope for this document in this initial phase |
| **2** | **7** | **1** | **The first objective of internal communication should be to assure that the consortium knows itself and who does what.** **Also, do not mix objectives and actions (or rephrase).**  | **Clarified as suggested** |
| **3** | **8** | **2** | **Why should be communication oriented to NEW stakeholders?** **This should be outreach/dissemination, according to previous definitions.** | **Agreed - that is why this activity is mentioned as a support to outreach/dissemination.** |
| **4** | **8** | **5** | **The blog, and in general all other activities, should be measured. What is the measure used?** **Also I would like to suggest that the blog is more publicized and regular EGI-Engage members are invited, so they are forced to know it. I also find it very formal, seems like an “official” blog , while it is said it is an “informal” platform...** | **The text includes this suggestion already. Measurement: Blog metrics are being collected by the Comms team.**  |
| **5** | **10** | **table** | **Where is training here?** | **Training is part of outreach – this is a table of Publications** |
| **6** | **10** | **2** | **Please, use only acronyms when it makes sense. Replace CT for Communication Team, CT is not a reasonable acronym. Similar for others.**  | **Done** |
| **7** | **11** | **2** | **Even if EGI-Engage will not have so much technical development side, it is important to keep an active participation (jointly with other projects), thematic workshops in Amsterdam are ok but should be open to other projects.**  | **Clarified in the text** |
| **8** | **11** | **6** |  **Include a reference to Concertation Meetings in the list of events in 2.3.2** | **Added** |
| **9** | **14** | **2** | **3.2.2.1 Does EGI-Engage have a list of experts/potential speakers to promote to the policy events? Are they known by NGIs and by NGIs funding agencies? Do those speakers know what is EGI-Engage policy?** | **Revised to clarify that the dissemination channels are the EGI-Engage collaboration board and EGI council.** |
| **10** | **17** | **1** | **EGI AppDB is key to FedCloud success. But this requires a “reputation”, built on the user experience . Does this exist? Who will review this is working properly? Is there any tool to help to decide if an APPDB solution is useful or adequate?** | **There is no centralised review of entries for most of the items that are registered in AppDB. What exists is:*** **Commenting and rating facility for users to provide feedback on items.**
* **A few core Virtual Appliances are maintained by EGI.eu (from EGI-Engage) following strict quality cirteria.**

**The EGI Marketplace activity (EGI-Engage JRA1.2) may include quality control on items. The scope of the EGI Marketplace currently under discussion.**  |
| **11** | **18** | **1** | **I start to get confused: is this dissemination or is this exploitation? One should refer to the exploitation or to the sustainability model if it (or a plan) exists.****In general I find sections 3.2.2.2-3.2.3 and 3.2.4 too complex to follow in the context of a Dissemination strategy. And even more 3.2.5...** | **I’ve simplified it, hopefully now it is more readable** |
| **12** | **43** | **3** | **Add a reference to Concertation Meetings, also to the “classification” in groups proposed.** |  |

**English and other corrections:**

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