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| *Reviewer:* | **Kostas Koumantaros** | *Activity:* | **PMB** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| In General this document reads like and EGI Inspire deliverable and should be updated to relflect the changes in EGI Engage with a lot less Partners involved in operations.The 1st part compares the evolution of the infrastructure from 2014 to 2016 but this is a PY1 Report on the evolution of the EGI Operations Infrastructure thus the comparison should be between PM0 (March 15) to PM12 (February 16).In general the evolution of operations should be highlighted not the the infrastructure itself, as it right now far too many pages deal with the evolution of the infrastructure and only towards the end the focus is switched to Operations itself..Minor comments are highlighted in the document. Also I didn’t not comment on the language used as it is still a draft but it desperately needs to be proof-read once or twice to be improved. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| Thanks for the review.**In General this document reads like and EGI Inspire deliverable and should be updated to relflect the changes in EGI Engage with a lot less Partners involved in operations.**It is a document that describes the infrastructure. It is correct that it should focus on the evolution, but a reader non familiar to EGI cannot appreciate the evolution without the previous years data.I have stressed more that sites operations are not part of the project, as opposite to InSPIRE.**The 1st part compares the evolution of the infrastructure from 2014 to 2016 but this is a PY1 Report on the evolution of the EGI Operations Infrastructure thus the comparison should be between PM0 (March 15) to PM12 (February 16).**This is a report on the evolution of the production infrastructure. Which should indeed focus a lot on the Engage work, but again the evolution of an infrastructure is better viewed from an high. On top of that for some of the data we simply did not have a granularity that allowed to start in March rather than January.**In general the evolution of operations should be highlighted not the the infrastructure itself, as it right now far too many pages deal with the evolution of the infrastructure and only towards the end the focus is switched to Operations itself..**Infrastructure data takes a lot of space with charts and tables, but in the end what the first section is about is: how many resources do we have and how they are used. Consider that there is no other document, that I know about, in EGI that highlights the disciplines and VO activities.  |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
| **Last but not least if the numbers in the document are correct there appears to be a trend of increase of HEP consumption which should be identified especially why we are loosing non-hep users/usage****Perhaps we should add a graph with Inter NGI usage.**If feasible I will add such chart. Currently accounting portal does not provide an quick way to produce a chart out of the inter-ngi usage. |
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**English and other corrections:**

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