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| --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** |
| *Title:* | **Market Report on the Fishery and Marine Sciences Data Analysis Sector** | *Document identifier:* | EGI-doc-2700 |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2700> |
| *Author(s):* | **Nadia Nardi** | *Date:* | **[please fill in]** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** |
| *Reviewer:* | **Peter Solagna** | *Activity:* | **[please fill in]** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| 1. The deliverable contains really a lot of information on the fishery and marine use cases. Perhaps the amount of information non-infrastructure related is even too much, I would have preferred to read less about what the specific domain do with the data, and have more information about the data itself: how this data can be replicated, how much data in terms of bytes, etc..
2. I would like to have a ‘conclusion’ chapter where the findings are mapped into potential business cases for EGI.
 |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| Thank you for the review.Reply to Comment A – Thank you for the suggestion. EGI is relatively new to this community and is only now exploring it with EGI-Engage through this deliverable and the other two (technical) Tasks. This level of detail was chosen also to give a good background to the Sector and reflect the deliverable objectives. In a further study, use case can be taken from the high-interest domains and explored further to get details such as how this data can be replicated and how much data in terms of bytes, as you mentioned.Reply to Comment B – I’m afraid I do not quite understand how exactly you envision seeing the findings mapped into potential business cases for EGI. Do you have a framework that EGI uses to map business cases they find attractive? I am open for a further chat, feel free to contact me. Thank you. |

**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,  …) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 7 | Ex. summary | “EGI does not collaborate with fishery&marine”, actually in EGI engage there is an integration activity with the D4science use case. | DONE - I’ve changed this sentence and added more text to reflect the on-going activities in the other two tasks (JRA2.3, SA1.3). Note I describe these other two tasks on page 53 (section 6.4 The BlueBRIDGE Case).  |
|  | 7 | Ex.summary | This section should contain also a summary of the findings.  | DONE – I’ve added a paragraph |
|  | 14 | 4.2 | Please, explain from the beginning the meaning of “domains” in this context | DONE – I’ve added a footnote where I first used the word being page 6 in the executive summary. The footnote described the use of the word.  |
|  | 14 | 4.2.1 | In all these subsections there is a lot of details about the goals of the use cases, but not enough about the data: how much data, where is it physically stored, who can access to it. | COMMENT - The domains (not quite use cases as you refer to them as), are described. The domains of interest are better described in terms of data, although not always with the details you suggest. When translating the deliverable objectives this level of detail was not contemplated and cannot be produced in such a short time. This level of detail could be produced through a future collaboration.  |
|  | 17 | 4.2.1.3 | In the box: “capacity to exchange data between institutions”. What is the level of maturity of this process, does it happen already? | DONE – added a paragraph explaining the level of maturity. (page 16) |
|  | 21 | 4.2.2 | It is not clear why these domains have been excluded. | DONE - This section has been restructured. Reasons why they are excluded are now included. Now they are only listed in the body and the description has been moved to the Appendix. |
|  | 23 | 5.1 | Are the entities who “monitor and manage data” the data providers? If so, I would explicitly call them that way. | COMMENT - The data managed in the Fishery and Marine Sciences Sector is interpreted perhaps differently than what you would expect and represented in this deliverable through a chosen approach. For example, An entity (public) that “monitors and manages data” can be one that “owns” a certain type of data (for example standards) and “consumes” another type of data (national statistics to feed international databases).  |
| a | 29-30 | 5.4 | The figures are very good, but it would be better to have a description associated, to very briefly describe what the various arrows means. | DONE – Added paragraph (page 24). |
|  | 38 | 5.6 | “present conditions where EGI may find opportunities”: what are these conditions? |  COMMENT- The feel the conditions are sufficiently listed alongside the name of the domain and then further described in the findings chapter.  |
|  | 43 |  | “GIS data”, what is GIS data? | DONE - I’ve added a footnote expanding the acronym and giving a short description the first time I use the acronym (page 38). I also added it to the acronym table.  |
|  | 45 |  | OGC and INSPIRE, please reference. | DONE - Added footnote page 40 (OGC) and INSPIRE) |
|  | 53 | 6.2.1.3 | It is not clear how cloud computing can “facilitate analysis of cross-domain information through harmonization. | DONE - I’ve added additional text to the findings section (page59). Why can cloud computing facilitate analysis of cross domain information through harmonization? 1. Harmonize storage: Enable better systems (bring data to cloud -> reduce physical separation -> easier to access)
2. Harmonize processing: To enable scalable analysis (data repositories can be huge -> to combine data from two domains requires large and flexible processing capacity )
3. Harmonize reference data: New data (e.g. observations) can be harmonized to comply with geospatial or  other reference datasets (reference data on cloud  -> easier to reference -> harmonization of content)
 |
|  | 58 | 6.4 | It is not clear what the added value of this sections is. If it is an example of support to fishery-marine that could be used as a starting point, this should be explicitly written. | DONE – Clarified as suggested. (page 51) |
|  | 62 | 7 | Sentence not clear: “Data worked with is increasing global require the right technology to manage such data”. Moreover this raises the question: “Which technology?” | DONE - I’ve added additional text to the findings section (page 58). The data collected in the focus community is increasing rapidly in size (e.g. from annual national statistical datasets to individual vessel reports), detail (from landings to fully monitored fisheries), precision (e.g. from national EEZ to exact vessel locations) and media (from paper reports to video). The technology thus has to adapt to manage this rapid growth, and include web-services for reference data, statistical packages for time-series analysis, video analysis software, etc. |

**English and other corrections:**

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

Abstract: “top-up” should be “top-down”. DONE

Pg33, “at national institution” should be “at national institutions” DONE – corrected to “At a national institution level”.