

Table of Contents

SA2 Deliverable Review Form.....	1
General comments.....	1
Modifications based on the SA2 Review.....	1

SA2 Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: DJRA1.2.1
Title: DJRA1.2.1 - Data Area Work Plan and Status Report	Doc. identifier: EMI_DJRA1.2.1-draft-6.docx
Author(s): Patrick Fuhrmann	Due date: __

Identification of the reviewer	
Name: A. Aimar, M. Alandes Pradillo, J.Cernak	Affiliation: CERN EMI Activity/External project or Institute: SA2

General comments

General comment on the whole document: this plan is by far the best of the ones reviewed until now.

Please check that your document follows the guidelines and examples available here that Maria has added (now that we have seen that the plans needed these guidelines). SA2 is glad to clarify the guidelines and support the authors of the document (not in writing it) just contact us.

<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/AreaWorkPlanTPL>

A. Aimar 07/02/2011: I had a look at the document and the changes are fine with me. As Patrick implemented most of the comments and explained those who he could not do for me it is fine as the document is now.

- EMI_DJRA1.2.1-draft-7-SA2.docx: EMI_DJRA1.2.1-draft-7-SA2.docx

Modifications based on the SA2 Review

Thanks for the indeed very detailed review. It definitely improved the quality of the document significantly. In more detail :

- Terminology section : I added all abbreviations and terms which are not clear from the text to the *Terminology table* as suggested by the reviewers.
- References : I added references to EMI and non-EMI (Hadoop, iRODS, TSM..) products to the *reference table*.
- I added references to presentations to prove certain statements (e.g. "SRM, lessons learned", by Markus Schulz, Amsterdam Jamboree)
- I added a better description of DPM inline and a reference to gLite which contains even more information and I added a picture on how DPM works. I however think that this document is a deliverable and not a product reference guide.
- For most of the products, I added who and how many sites/communities are using it. For some I didn't (for political reasons) and we should leave it that way.
- I replaced the ARC picture with one which is more 'data' oriented.
- I added more information (which I got from Oliver) to the gLite picture.
- I added a more detailed description what exactly the dCache picture wants to tell us.
- I added the supported protocols to all SE's. In some cases the protocols were already listed but in a section above or below.
- I better described what I mean with the possibility to allow EMI to become a drop-in replacement for industry products. (has as well be requested by Morris)
- I have been more specific when talking about "standardization bodies" : OGF and IETF.
- I essentially fixed each of the 'yellow' 'orange' and 'blue' remarks.

Bits and pieces which I didn't correct and won't :

- I didn't correct some comments like "Be more specific" because that is actually the part we have to work on. So I just can't tell now on how we will solve certain issues.
- I did not go into details on UNICORE and the picture. I however added a link on the UNICORE atomic services, which should be enough. This document can not replace reading appropriate product specifications. My opinion is that it is already doing too much in this direction.

The V1.1 has been uploaded to the DJRA1.2.1 deliverable page.

This topic: EMI > DJRA121ReviewSA2

Topic revision: r5 - 2011-02-11 - unknown



Copyright &© 2008-2022 by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.
or Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? use [Discourse](#) or [Send feedback](#)