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| **Response from Author:**  |
|  |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author(correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
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|  | 29 | Conclusions | What is the workflow/timeline for the final definition of the capability, and the implementation of the interfaces? An estimation is needed. |  |

**English and other corrections:**

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

Pg 8, “Serious circumstances” I suggest “case of incidents in the current sites”

Pg 18, “Notice that the application” -> “Note that the application”