

Sent: Fri 11/20/2020 2:46:43 PM

Subject: RE: Eerste opzet reactie naar GISAID

Received: Fri 11/20/2020 2:46:44 PM

Response to GISAID V2 20201120-CAR mn GH.docx

Dear all, on request of 5120 I looked at your letter with a 'legal' eye. It is good that you only point at some ambiguity in their sharing agreement and off to discuss this. At the same time you offer a chique alternative for what might be called an over-the-top reaction.

So for this instance I have only made a few semantic suggestions and think the text is very oke. That being said I have 1 more principle question: why is only RIVM mentioned and not also AMC?

If there is no objection of which I am not aware: I would suggest to mention AMC in the first paragraph besides RIVM. The text about contributing at GISAID need not be altered, at least not for RIVM.

And I would like then to suggest to sign with the 4 names + institutes (behand the name of author). That gives a stronger feeling.


Let me know when I can do more Best

RIVM Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu

5.1.2e | 5.1.2e

Centrum Infectieziektebestrijding | (T) 5.1.2e | (M) 5.1.2e

Postbus 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven



2 - 4

dubbel