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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** | | | |
| *Title:* | **D1.2 “Risk analysis and risk response for Period 1”** | *Document identifier:* | **EGI-doc-2595** |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2595> |
| *Author(s):* | **Małgorzata Krakowian - EGI.eu** | *Date:* | **8 October 2015** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** | | | |
| *Reviewer:* | **Jacco Konijn** | *Activity:* | **?** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The document could use an English check. In the first section I tried as exemple to correct mainly things like the use of articles (a, an, the). But also the use of plural/singular (have/has etc).  Contentwise, the document leans on a sound theoretical background I think. This is a standard way to handle risk management in any project. It could use some more 'ready to use' templates for responsible staff to be used, and the approach in 1.3, Risk Response needs adjustment to actually address risk levels rather than impact (but I may have misunderstood the approach, I'm open to explanations).  The final section on the risk review is not the clearest.  I gave suggestions for 2 more paragraphs. The document ended quite abruptly... |
| **Response from Author:** |
| **The author will pay more attention to grammar and typos.**  >It could use some more 'ready to use' templates for responsible staff to be used, and the approach in 1.3  Currently we plan to use risk registry to report, but when needed appropriate templates will be created.  >Risk Response needs adjustment to actually address risk levels rather than impact (but I may have misunderstood the approach, I'm open to explanations).  This approach has been decided by PMB. Personally the author agrees that response should be address risk level. This will be discussed again during PMB meeting and changed when approved.  Additional section “Conclusions” has been added. |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
| Don't take my comment on the English personal. I often notice that non native speakers have typical recurring errors, depending on the mother tongue. The Finnish also forget articles in English texts all the time, as they don't have them in their own language. Curious what the situation is in Polish... |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author (correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

See my comments above.

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