

Table of Contents

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

Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: DNA2.1.1
Title: Collaboration Programs	Doc. identifier: EMI-DNA2.1.1-CDSREF-Collaboration-Programs-v1.1
Author(s): Diana Cresti (NA2, INFN)	Due date: PM1 (May 2010)

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: Alberto Di Meglio	Affiliation: CERN	EMI Activity: NA1

Review date	12/08/2010
Author(s) revision date	09/12/2010
Reviewer acceptance date	16/12/2010

Reviewed document

EMI_DNA2.1.1_v1.1_ADM.doc

General comments

The current version of the document gives only limited information about the collaboration programs. It lists a number of potential collaborating partners, but lacks a more detailed description of the overall collaboration strategies, the individual collaboration programs, the communication channels and instruments and especially the expectations and long term vision. There should be less focus on individual projects and more information about the EMI aspects of establishing collaborations programs. There should also be some description of how the collaboration outcomes are monitored in order to fulfil the stated expectations. The reader should not be left with hanging questions of the type: "Ok, you will do this, and so what?"

The document is a in places a bit unbalanced towards EGEE, there is little mention of ARC and UNICORE and their existing or planned collaboration partners.

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

The first instance of this series of deliverables should be a plan, while the following instances should report on the execution of the plan and the achievements, in addition to any revision or improvement on the original plan.

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

Note 2: These comments have to be explicitly addressed by the authors and the action taken must be clearly described

Note 3: All replies below by -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010

All comments are also tracked in the document itself for easier handling.

N°	Page	Section	Observations and Replies	
----	------	---------	--------------------------	--

			Is Addressed?	
1	5	1.1	<p>The text states that a full list of collaborations will be put on the web site. Where is it? It would be better to have it in place before submitting the document and put here the actual link, also because the document also states that there are continuing collaborations inherited from previous projects</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>I removed this text for this iteration of the deliverable.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p> <p>Well, the point was not really that the document mentions a page that doesn't exist, but the fact that the page doesn't exist. Removing this from the text is good for the deliverable, but doesn't completely solve the issue. This should not stop releasing this deliverable, but we should have on the web site as soon as possible a page listing the existing collaborations, of which we have already quite a few</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 16-Dec-2010</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	5	1.2	<p>Revise description of section 3 after we clarify in more details what the program is about</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Done</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	6	1.4	<p>The person allowed to amend the document should not be a generic author , but a precise role, like the NA2 WP Leader or the Dissemination Officer . The author may change. That s why in my opinion a generic amendment rule referenced in all documents doesn t work. Every deliverable has specific owners and rules</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4	7	2	<p>I m not sure this Executive Summary really summarizes the document. An Exec Summary should describe in plain terms the key points of the document in the same order as they appear in the text and describe the main pre-conditions and expectations. In principle, it should allow a person to tell what s in the document without reading it. In this case, I m not sure I could be able to talk about the content of the doc just by reading this. The usual length of a standard ES is about 1/10 of the length of the doc, therefore you can extend it to a full page</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>I wrote a new Executive summary.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p> <p>Ok, although I'm a bit surprised by the statement "EMI is also hoping to be the launching pad for the creation of a stable provider of comprehensive DCI services which integrate new related technologies such as Cloud and Desktop Grid services.". Is EMI doing this integration? This sounds more a task for EGI</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 16-Dec-2010</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5	7	2	<p>Why saying that the categorization is a matter of convenience? The categorization has a specific purpose, to create the right frameworks for</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

			<p>different entities to work with us. There will certainly be exceptions, but this should not be just for convenience, but to clearly identify the right targets, the right communications channels and the expected outcomes for each type of collaboration</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Completely rewritten this part.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	
6	8	3	<p>I would not say "collaborations at Month 1". This is our plan and must define the collaboration strategy for the rest of the project even if it will certainly be revised and adjusted as we go. The document is not about describing the names, which can change, but rather the concepts, strategies and expectations, which should change less frequently</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Ok, rewritten.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	✓
7	8	3	<p>Same as before. This is a plan. It must describe what we want to do, how we want to do it, what we plan to give and what we expect to get. It must be more than a statement of intention</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Ok, see new Section 3.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	✓
8	8	3	<p>Before moving into the description of the collaboration categories, I suggest to put everything into context. You should describe what is the reason to establish collaborations, what types of targets we have identified, how the collaboration programs will be managed and monitored, etc, etc. After that, you will be able to state why we have defined the three collaboration categories and proceed to describe them in details</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Ok, see the executive summary and the introduction to Section 3.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	✓
9	8	3.1	<p>I'd like to see more high-level details on what this category of collaboration is about, how it will be managed, what are the expected results, what communication channels will be used, etc. After that you can give specific examples and mention EGI and the others. For the moment, this section is a list of projects, but it doesn't say anything about the collaboration program itself</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Ok, see new sect 3.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	✓
10	8	3.1.1	<p>You mention "exceptions". What exceptions? If you state this, you should also clarify what the issues are and what actions are being taken to solve them</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>Ok, rewritten</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	✓
11	9	3.1.2	<p>Remove "Networks", we do not have any specific relationship I can think of for the moment</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p>	✓

			Ok. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	
12	10	3.2	Same comment as for the previous category. I'd like to see a description of the collaboration program and its mechanisms and expectations, rather than a list of projects or communities -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 Ok, see new sect 3. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
13	10	3.2	You state that EMI will inherit the existing collaborations. This is unclear. When? Which ones? Are there MoUs in place already? Will existing MoUs be extended -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 I rephrased this part, see section 5. I did not mention any current MoUs. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
14	10	3.2	"Several NA2 tasks have specific plans to organize events". Where are these plans described? Mention the relevant deliverables or web pages where this is described -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 I removed references to this, aside from what is in the notes on the DCI roadmap. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
15	10	3.2.1	I don't really see any continuing collaborations here. Some of these projects have ended and so far after three months into the project I haven't heard of any collaboration action. As we have discussed, it's probably better to remove the wording "continuing collaborations" as the title of a specific section unless you can give practical information about how the collaborations have been migrated to EMI and how they are now organized -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 Ok, removed. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
16	11	3.2.2	As for the other two categories above. Describe the collaboration program, not the individual projects -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 Ok, removed the projects, the program itself is introduced in sect 3. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
17	11	3.2.2	The content of this section is too specific. You should talk about the ESFRI projects in general, not about a single topic. ELIXIR is described in excessive details, there is no mention of fundamental communities like WLCG or FUSION -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 Ok, section is more general now. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓
18	13	3.3	Please refer to the separate document sent to the PEB that describe this program and its expectations -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010 I incorporated the contents of that document in section 6. -- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010	✓

ReviewDNA211ADM < EMI < TWiki

19	14	4	<p>This section doesn't really say very much. It should describe the next steps: how will the programs be put in place? How will they be monitored and reported in future deliverables? What are the next steps?</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 12-Aug-2010</p> <p>OK, new conclusion provided.</p> <p>-- DianaC - 09-Dec-2010</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	----	---	---	-------------------------------------

This topic: EMI > ReviewDNA211ADM

Topic revision: r5 - 2010-12-17 - AlbertoDiMeglio



Copyright &© 2008-2021 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