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**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| 1. The core idea of marketplace paradigm should be the discovery, competiveness, and trade of the services instead of the price only. Description at page 5, “We think that this can be done using a marketplace concept, where free and paid resources can be listed and discovered.” should take this into account.
2. Marketplace should be a service model, instead of just a “concept” !
3. Maketplace model could also facilitate complicated application implementation by available services with less cost. It’s the typical way to see farther by standing on giant’s shoulders. The benefits described on page 6 should include this as well.
4. Thinking in the way of ebay-like or TripAdvisor-like services for applications and software services is a good point for the promotion of marketplace model. Apple’s AppStore and Android Google Play should be the most successful model to get software and applications. Why there is no such model for open source software? This should be one essential perspective in pursuing the marketplace solution.
5. When evaluating software or a solution, people usually like to know what problem could be resolved by the software in what way/quality/cost. User’s comment or evaluation is a necessary reference in today’s primary app stores. Use case/success story/user evaluation should be included in the essential features of a Marketplace in Section 5.3. Simple metrics such as number of download over time would be also helpful.
6. In terms of software reliability and the maturity, the first creation time and the time of latest update of the software should be also described.
7. In terms of business model, again the Apple and Google and other primary market leaders should be analysed. The point why the current business models of the market big players could not provide our needs could be the advantage of EGI Marketplace solution.
8. Scientific applications range from simple application to complicated workflow. Requirements survey from the user community is necessary for the design of Marketplace. For example, the theoretical model behind is also the key to the selection. Another typical case is that when I have requirement to finish the processes A+B+C, solutions for A, B, C, A+B, B+C, and A+B+C are all available in the Marketplace, if it’s possible to get all these information at a time when I submit the right search? When there are multiple solutions for A, B, or C, could I get the enough information (or any information I need) to make the right decision?
 |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| 1. I very much agree with this comment. Increasing competiveness is mentioned 6 times in the document. Pricing of resources is mentioned only 3 times (mostly in requirements). The statement “We that this can be done using…” refers to competiveness and discovery, so I think it is covered. I also changed “price” to “cost” in one place now too. I am not aware of cases where resources are traded, so this was not mentioned.
2. This is a good point. The focus of this document was more on the business model side and to start gathering requirements. The service model will be developed in the next deliverable as part of the detailed design. In order to ensure it is remembered to add this I have added it into the first line of the conclusions that a “robust service model” is needed. We have done some modelling of this, but I was not happy with the diagrams.
3. I have added a line referring this to now on page 6 as the list item in the list. It is something we have in mind (e.g. issuing of persistent identifiers, linking of things across resources/services, but we did not explicitly mention it in the document. It is good to include it to be sure if is in the detailed designs.
4. This is an excellent point. This is what we tried to address in the business model development, as we feel the business model for the marketplace as a service platform could help drive it in this direction. In our thinking we have a concept of an appstore in the marketplace, but that is part of the detailed requirements document being worked on.
5. This is mentioned in Appendix 1 (02.01.09), user story 3, and section 5.3. Unfortunately it is done in more of a list format in these cases so it is easily missed. It will figure prominently in the next document. It is listed as #7 by prioritizations from the surveys with 50% agreeing.
6. This is very good point. I have added this into section 6.1.1 in the user story and the detailed requirements (01.02.03). I think it is important, but I think fits best in those lists.
7. I think the business model analysis helps provide the answer and is one of the factors for a consortium based approach for the business model. The main problem is that Google, broker based, etc. where profit is an incentive have a bias against free services or services that cannot pay them a fee (e.g. national facilities, local resources, consortium resources). I have included more information in section 8.3 to try and address this.
8. I agree with your statement here, these are things that are being factored into the detailed requirements for the filtering and searching. Things such as proximity, users of that resource also used X, etc. To make it useful we need to make the filter contextual to the user, not just a list or the drowned information. The right answer should float to the top of the list.
 |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |
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**English and other corrections:**

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

1. Not sure the “Open Access” at the first paragraph of page #6 is necessary to be in capital.

DeFL: Corrected.