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| In general this is a well presented review on the progress of the development of the operations tools. I have a couple of general comments.   1. When dependencies are described, please can an assessment of risk and mitigation be included. This need not be in great depth. 2. Please could an assessment of expected priorities and timescales be included consistently across all tools when describing Future Plans? It has been done well for some (e.g. GOCDB) but others read like a wish list without an understanding of importance. 3. There is a section missing from the ARGO that needs inclusion   A few minor comments are included in track changes (as are these general comments) |
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