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**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The content comes from different sources and neither the writing has been harmonised nor the English corrected. Some sentences barely make sense. I have spotted a few but a more complete work has to be done.From a more general point of view, I do not see any plan in this document, which is more a state of the art of what is currently available for several user communities. What is the overall plan for EGI-Engage as a project of for EGI as an e-Infrastructure?I think we need to have a more policy-oriented section about what we want to promote and to do to allow these users communities to comply with their obligations.MoBrain, for example, clearly states they don’t have any mechanism to make the data available during the decade for which they are supposed to ensure the data availability. Are we willing and are we ready to provide such facility?It could be the seed of the European Open Data Cloud we are promoting and earnestly desire. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| The language was improved. With regards to the concept of a “plan”, the document structure is based on the guidelines provided by the EC (see Annex 1):<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf>This is an initial version and should be improved in future iterations. The scope of this document is only data produced/collected by the EGI-Engage project. MoBrain will not generate data within the EGI-Engage project, but from other projects for which the obligations around DMP are being considered (see Section 2.5.1.1).Concerning the suggestion to add a policy oriented section, this is a good idea, nevertheless the discussion need to be developed firstly within WP6 so that requirements or opportunities are better formalised in future iterations of this document. There is a more general area about how EGI can better support the development of DMPs and related services for the served communities. I consider this aspect out of the scope of this document. This experience can serve as a pilot to better understand needs and opportunities. This could be a discussion for the UCB to then identify needs and feed into the SSB. |
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