

Table of Contents

Deliverable Review Form.....	1
General comments.....	1
Additional recommendations (not affecting the document content, e.g. recommendation for future work).....	2
Detailed comments on the content.....	2

Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: D2.2.1
Title: DNA2.2.1 Training Plan	Doc. identifier: EMI-DNA2.2.2_v0.5.doc
Author(s): K. Cassidy	Due date: 28/10/11

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: M. Riedel	Affiliation: JUELICH	EMI Activity/External project or Institute: NA3

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

05/10/11 ToC comments [▶](#) 05/10/11 ToC comments [▼](#)

(1) more forward looking events # section about next period would be better as a plan, not only 'the next period' # e.g. EMI technical conference 2012 - what should be trained there # another example might be a training at OGF34 in Oxford, etc. # many other events at least roughly planned for whole 2012 (and as EMI ends in 04/13 maybe even until then)

(2) Lessons learned from Training activities and users # user survey feedback at the end seems to be not very much information # perhaps there is the possibility in the progress section, but much more lessons learned from existing trainings would be good # e.g. component CREAM, A-REX, UNICORE has been used in 5 trainings and still 50% users are not satisfied with its usage # what can we change until EMI 2&3 in this respect

(3) Coverage of components in training section # it would be nice to have a section to understand which components are affected overall by training activities # in the moment that might be covered in progress, but perhaps in an inadequate degree to have the overview # e.g. while I assume that the CE's are used very much, I believe less training is performed of setting up authZ policies with ARGUS for example

(4) Follow-up # once a training is performed, the user uses the components - or not, why? # we need to understand if they do and in this case how # a follow-up with training end-users after 3 months or so would be fruitful and could be one sub-section # it seems to be more work now, but it is also essential for our sustainability # furthermore, reviewers might ask 'training - so what?' - what was the impact of the training: new regular users?

(5) Permanent training infrastructure # we work with FutureGrid to establish a permanent training/testbed with EMI components # this should be mentioned in the plan # FutureGrid offers also the possibility to put slides/training material on their website for these testbeds # Contact me to get more information once you put a section about this into your document

11/11/11 From Kathryn [▶](#) 11/11/11 From Kathryn [▼](#)

1. Which OGF - fixed - OGF34
2. Missing title - no, title was removed but OpenOffice did something funny with the formatting. I've fixed it now.
3. "Test bed" changed to "testbed" throughout
4. Reformat table to be on one page - done
5. details of testbed used for training added

6. Table moved to section 4.2.6 - now appears on single page
7. 2010 changed to 2011
8. Too many repetitions of "and" - reworded.
9. Remove duplicate "had" - done
10. table header and first column left-justified to fix formatting
11. Description column removed
12. Feedback survey reformatted a bit, it is meant to reflect the formatting of the web-based form from which it was created, so I don't want to change it too radically. However, it displays quite differently in OpenOffice and Word. I have fixed the worst parts now, hopefully it is ok.
- 13, 14. reformat tables to stop word-wrap - done
15. "-" is a comment. I know it's a bit pointless but I thought it was best to include all comments verbatim here anyway.

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 and Replies	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.

This topic: EMI > DNA222ReviewMR

Topic revision: r7 - 2011-11-15 - unknown



Copyright &© 2008-2020 by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.

Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? Send feedback