

Table of Contents

SA2 Deliverable Review Form.....	1
General comments.....	1
Detailed comments on the content.....	1
Detailed comments on the content.....	1

SA2 Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: EMI-1 Release Development Plans
Title: EMI-1 Release Development Plans	Doc. identifier: 2010-10-31-EMI1-DevPlans_v4.doc
Author(s): Morris Riedel	Due date: __

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: A.Aimar, JCernak	Affiliation: _____	EMI Activity/External project or Institute: SA1

Review date	21/01/2011
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

In general the document seems with a lot of copy and paste in the description of the features to be added. I am not sure the EU Reviewer will like it as it is the most important document for EMI-1. Same for which tests will be implemented to check the features.

Without more information and a bit of "care", I would not send this document to the EU reviewers.

- 2010-12-17_EMI_1_Development_Test_Plan-v0.4_MRi_aimar.doc:
2010-12-17_EMI_1_Development_Test_Plan-v0.4_MRi_aimar.doc
- 2010-12-17_EMI_1_Development_Test_Plan-v0.4_MRi__3_jozef.doc:
2010-12-17_EMI_1_Development_Test_Plan-v0.4_MRi__3_jozef.doc

J Cernak 070311: I read document it need mirror changes and clarification regarding verification of GLUE 2.0 goal M12. Details are included in report.

Detailed comments on the content

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

Jozef:

N°	Page	Section	Observations and Replies	Is Addressed?
1	5	1.1	In many documents EMI-1 is used. MRi: EMI-1 used throughout the document in a consistent manner (thus not	

ReviewEmi1ReleaseDevPlansSA2 < EMI < TWiki

			listing the other related review comments).	
2	5	1.3	Tracker is not public available. MRi: That's right. Nevertheless, I believe it is important to mention it and that it exists. Also, this document should be partly used internally, so it is ok that it is not publicly open. Ok?	
3	7	1.5	Terminology empty MRi: Overlooked. Added relevant terms to this section.	
4	8	2	Is it a personal note? MRi: Corrected to codename Kebnekaise.	
5	8	2	I propose add reference on this plan MRi: Reference added	
6	9	3.1	Explain meaning in Terminology MRi: PT has been added to Terminology	
7	9	3.1	Only Release manager is well defined. I propose remove her name from picture MRi: name removed, role kept	
8	17	5.2.1.2	Is it ok? MRi: Corrected date, thanks	
9	18	5.2.2	For reader outside project would not be clear. If a link exists add more details. MRi: Removed the info provide problem since it is very deep technical and we might be able to provide a short-term solution in the meanwhile anyway.	
10	19	5.2.2.2	Check exact form low/upper cases MRi: Done, changed to GStat	
11	28	6.1	HILA is in red. What is meaning of this? MRi: Meaning noted. HILA detail section reveals that development had stopped (because of harmonization reasons).	
12	30	7	It seems that this section is not finished. MRi: Well it is but would just copy all stuff from the Wiki to the document and that makes no sense in my opinion. A reference to the wiki is provided, ok?	

Alberto Aimar:

N°	Page	Section	Observations and Replies	Is Addressed?
1	1	Cover	In general the document seems with a lot of copy and paste in the description of the features to be added. Im not sure the EU Reviewer will like it as it is the most important document for EMI-1. MRi: Clarification questions send per e-mail (2011-02-02), no answer	
2	6	1.5	my advice: Copy some terminology from some other documents... Leaving it empty looks not very good. MRi : Added important non-technology terminologies like boards, etc.	
3	7	2	This is not an Executive Summary, see comments below... MRi: I tend to agree. However, this draft was many times rewritten meeting the needs of different people. This summary content was largely driven by Alberto Di Meglio that I just updated and adjusted. Therefore I suggest to keep it so that it fits to his needs, ok?	
4	9	3.1	Decide if you call the release EMI 1 or EMI1.0 and use the same text everywhere please. MRi: Thanks, corrected to EMI-1 used consistently and in-line with other documents I have reviewed.	

ReviewEmi1ReleaseDevPlansSA2 < EMI < TWiki

5	9	3.1	Which month. I would say "Since November 2010...." MRi: Thanks, corrected.		
6	15	4.2	Where are the global decisions about using EPEL, globus, and the general changes implemented? MRi: Right, I added EPEL and Globus to the "Reusable or External Software Products" part since the integration work plan cover the EPEL aspect in detail. Nevertheless, which other general changes you mean that I might missed? Thanks.		
7	17	5.2.1.1	The Release Plan explains how releases are build etc. but not the implementations of the feature. That is different for each feature not the same sentences everywhere. MRi: Right, added more descriptions per product mentioning development aspects.		
8	17	5.2.1.2	All the section contains the wrong 2010 date, I think was all cut and paste not an analysis of the read deadlines discussed with the PTs? MRi: Corrected. The deadlines have been discussed with PTs and also all area leaders have been informed very early in the process about this deadline.		
9	30	7	This chapter is too short and informal. I think should have a bit more text explaining the organization and responsibilities. This would essentially copy and paste all content from the Wiki pages that has been referenced. As the wiki pages are publicly accessible this is from my perspective a better solution. ok?		

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.

- 2011-02-07_EMI_1_Development_Test_Plan-v0.5_MRi_jozef.doc.docx: Second review

This topic: EMI > ReviewEmi1ReleaseDevPlansSA2

Topic revision: r8 - 2011-03-08 - 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