Table of Contents

TD Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: DJRA1.4.1
Title: DJRA1.4.1 - Infrastructure Area Work Plan and Status Report	Doc. identifier: EMI_DJRA1.4.1_draft_v3.doc
Author(s): Laurence Field	Due date: __

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: Balazs Konya	Affiliation: LU	EMI Activity/External project or Institute: TD

Review date	mm/dd/yyyy
Author(s) revision date	mm/dd/yyyy
Reviewer acceptance date	mm/dd/yyyy

Attach the reviewed document to the deliverable page, put here a link

General comments

Please find my review comments for the DJRA1.4.1 Infra area workplan below. Can someone please copy it to the relevant wiki page?

The items collected do not have the same importance, some of them are trivial to fix, others may require more substantial effort. I leave it up to the author to decide which one he wants to address. This deliverable is unfortunately pretty late and i see no reason to delay it even further.

cheers, Balazs

DJRA1.4.1 review by Balazs Konya 19/10/2010.

reviewed version: v0.3, taken from the deliverable page

* page 5, terminology: ARC stands for Advanced Resource Connector and not "A-synchronous" ☺

LF: Fixed, please check

BK: OK.

* page 8 "3. Status":

The infra area is actually also responsible for the containers (ARC HED and Unicore containers). Please add that to the enumeration (after Virtualization & Clouds)

LF: I disagree, these containers do not fit into the Infrastructure Area as it is currently describe.

BK: You can disagree, however the containers, according to the DoW and the Product Team table are under the infrastructure area. You may raise the issue of moving these components to some other area, however as of Today these do belong to the Infra and should at least be mentioned in the workplan, just as i suggested.

Similarly, please add a short paragraph describing the ARC Container and the UNICORE Service Hosting PTs.

* Page 12 "3.6 Virtualization & Clouds"

This section is supposed to describe state of the ART in Virt and Clouds area. Instead of doing it, it presents some text copied over from the Dow "...virtualization activity is going to be addressed within EMI ...:"

This is a completely irrelevant text for a state of art. Please try to find a better text from the Dow or from somewhere else. The state of the art should not describe plans.

LF: Fixed, please check

BK: OK.

* page 13 "PLans ARC LDAP-based Infosys Development"

There are several places where the due date is set as "n/a". Which looks very strange in a workplan. Please fix it. As if i saw Mattias Ellert's mail with dates. Please re-ask Mattias for the proper dates.

LF: Fixed, please check

BK: OK

* missing from the document:

I was not able to find even a slight mentioning of the planned work around the EMI Service Registry. There is already an EMI Registry PT that will be active during the first year. Please include this PT into the infra area workplan.

LF: I disagree as at the writing, there was no plan. We have set up a task force in the meantime.

BK: I copy here my comment from our mail exchange "EMI partners are already spending efforts on the EMI registry, there is a relevant objective for year 1: to come with a design. Therefore, the infra area first year workplan should contain the EMI Registry product team under the planned work. If nothing else, just write that the team is collecting requirements, investigates how the new service could fit into the EMI landscape, prepares a design."

BK 10/11/10: I am not completely happy with the v7 and the answers i got, nevertheless i can live with it. I leave it up to Laurence to decide if he considers any of my open issues worth to be taken into account. Just for the records, here are the problematic items (copied from the wiki): > * page 8 "3. Status":
> *The infra area is actually also responsible for the containers (ARC HED and*
> *Unicore containers). Please add that to the enumeration (after*
> *Virtualization & Clouds)*
> *LF: I disagree, these containers do not fit into the Infrastructure Area as*
> *it is currently describe.*
>
> *BK: You can disagree, however the containers, according to the DoW and the*
> *Product Team table are under the infrastructure area. You may raise the*
> *issue of moving these components to some other area, however as of Today*
> *these do belong to the Infra and should at least be mentioned in the*
> *workplan, just as i suggested.*

> * missing from the document:
> *I was not able to find even a slight mentioning of the planned work around*
> *the EMI Service Registry. There is already an EMI Registry PT that will be*
> *active during the first year. Please include this PT into the infra area*

> workplan.
> LF: I disagree as at the writing, there was no plan. We have set up a task
> force in the meantime.
>
> BK: I copy here my comment from our mail exchange "EMI partners are already
> spending efforts on the EMI registry, there is a relevant objective for year
> 1: to come with a design. Therefore, the infra area first year workplan
> should contain the EMI Registry product team under the planned work. If
> nothing else, just write that the team is collecting requirements,
> investigates how the new service could fit into the EMI landscape, prepares a
> design."

BK 25/11/10 I can accept v0.8. In this version Laurence added the EMI Registry objective, thus addressed my main pending wish. I don't have any pending critical issue. There are things i still don't like but those are not critical.

Additional recommendations (not affecting the document content, e.g. recommendation for future work)

Detailed comments on the content

Note 1: The reviewers must list here any observation they want to track explicitly and that require interaction with the authors
Alternatively all changes must be listed in the document itself using Word change tracking features (if you use Word)
Note 2: These comments have to be explicitly addressed by the authors and the action taken must be clearly described

N°	Page	Section	Observations	Is Addressed?	
1	xx	x.y	Sequence of comments and replies separated by twiki signature and date		
2					
3					
4					

Any other modification, spelling or grammatical corrections, etc must be done directly in the document using tracked changes or similar mechanisms that allows the authors to identify which correction is suggested.

-- FloridaEstrella - 20-Oct-2010

This topic: EMI > DJRA141ReviewTD
Topic revision: r5 - 2010-11-26 - unknown