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| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2699> |
| *Author(s):* | **Eise van Maanen (FAO), Anton Ellenbroek (FAO)** | *Date:* | **2016.03.13** |
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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** | | | |
| *Reviewer:* | **Mariusz Sterzel** | *Activity:* | **SA2.9** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| I have reviewed version 8 of the document. Surprisingly, document is still in its draft form. From the comments I assume several other contributions have been planed but the authors did not succeed in getting the contributions in time. In this form I recommend substantial revision of the planned contributions. Decide whether those shall be somehow included or not.  IMHO a little too much has been spent in chapter 4.1 (legal). Those could be just a links to a general material with more focus on actual issues in fishery & marine sector. Data structures & size shall be extended. I do not think less than a page explains in details the real problem in the field.  In chapter 5 I lack a more detailed description pf the stakeholders, i.e. how to distinguish which are so to say “head” users and which “long tail” ones? Do they need the same services? Do they have got the same requirements?  Chapter six is of the main importance as it analyses the barriers in the domains. I find the group of reviewed persons short but more or less “representative”.  Chapter 7 – one slide is just not enough. I assume this is place for the more detailed use case… But it needs to be explained in detail or removed. I would suggest extend this chapter anyway…  Chapter 8 – it is a good start but needs to be augmented with actions at least. Good summary though  Chapter 9 needs to be written… |
| **Response from Author:** |
| * **Chapter 4:** The focus of the specific deliverable is on legal interoperability; thus, we have opted to provide the detailed background on various legal interoperability aspects compared to other types of interoperability such as technical and semantic (which are also mentioned in the appropriate sections of the deliverable). * **Chapter 5:** There are different levels and types of data stakeholders in the fishery and marine ecosystem described in the specific deliverable. We have made an effort to ensure the representation of both high-level and low-end data stakeholders, ranging from global networks and initiatives to national ones. We acknowledge that in some cases more detailed description might be needed; however, given the existing restrictions regarding the deadline for the delivery and the overall length of the document, we needed to narrow this part of the deliverable. * **Chapter 6:** Effort was put into including people with different backgrounds and expertise among the interviewees, in order to provide a different perspective on the specific topic. A higher number of interviews was initially planned for this deliverable; however, due to the unavailability of a number of potential interviewees, this number was lower in the final version of the deliverable. * **Chapter 7:** This chapter was elaborated with feedback obtained directly from people involved in the BlueBridge project. * **Chapter 8:** This chapter was elaborated with additional input while a relevant table was also included, including a list of proposed actions to address the issues identified, as suggested. * **Chapter 9:** This chapter was left blank in the previous versions of the deliverable as we needed to reflect on the final findings and other outcomes of this work. In this final version of the deliverable, the chapter has been developed and elaborated in order to include the major conclusions extracted from the report. |
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**English and other corrections:**

English quite good. Final check shall be done after the document reaches final form.

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