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**Comments & usage guidance [remove after creation of the document]**

* This document is a template for creating a service design and transition package (SDTP).
* The template provides a structure to be applied for defining and documenting a SDTP, which will be:
	+ Part 1 is to be initially completed by the service proposer as input to the SSB for analysis and decision taking to plan/extend the EGI service portfolio service.
	+ Once approved by the SSB to move forward, Part 2 is to be completed for service implementation and communication to relevant parties.
* The final SDTP serves as a record regarding the current state of the service, which is to be periodically updated.
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#

# Part 1 Initial information

# Service Overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Service Name | [name of service] |
| General description | [high-level description of what the service does and functionality included]*i.e. Grid Compute: A service that allows to run computational tasks on high quality IT resources, accessible via a uniform/standard interface and supporting authentication/authorisation based on a membership within a virtual organisation. Grid Compute services are federated together from hundreds of providers across Europe and beyond offering seamless access to computing capabilities with integrated monitoring and accounting.*  |
| Customer of the service | [a customer commissions the service provider to receive the service, doing so on behalf of a number of users (see below) – specify the organisation type/category of the service e.g. NGI; RI; Resource Provider] |
| User of the service | [specify the user type/category of the service e.g. large research groups; individual researcher; site admins] |
| Service Owner | [who is overall responsible for the service; role is preferred over individual person + organisation e.g. EGI.eu Chief Technology Officer] |
| Service Provider | [organisation providing the service e.g. EGI.eu; specific EGI federation member] |
| Contact information (external) | [specify the contact point for the service “customer->service owner” e.g. mailing list or generic email preferred over individual i.e. operations@egi.eu] |
| Contact information (internal) | [specify the contact point for the service “federator->federation member delivering the service” e.g. mailing list or generic email preferred over individual i.e. argo-ggus-support@grnet.gr] |
| Service Status | [retired; active; planned] |
| Service Category | [services are typically grouped by category or service type e.g. choose any of the following[[1]](#footnote-1) or propose new] |
| Service agreements | [specify the type of agreement(s) defining the service levels e.g. OLA, SLA, UA, MoU – provide link to existing agreement(s) if available or agreement template] |

# Business Case

The following business case has been developed to support informed decision-making with respect to the extension or change of the service portfolio from a strategic perspective:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Best case | Average case | Worst case |
| User profile(pains/gains) | [Describe what the (potential) users are trying to get done in their work, the problems they are trying to solve, or the needs they are trying to satisfy.][Describe anything that annoys the users (pains) before, during and after trying to get a job done or simply prevents them from getting a job done. e.g. frustration for lack of understanding on how services perform, costs too much (time/money), difficult to understand how it works, lack of trust][Describe the outcomes and benefits (gains) the users want e.g. flatter learning curve, lower cost of ownership, save time/money/effort, less investments, lower risk, better quality, makes them look good, increase in power/status] |
| Value Proposition(pain relievers / gain creators) | [Describe how exactly the service alleviates specific user pains (provided in the user profile)] e.g. produce savings in terms of time/money/effort, fix underperformances, eliminate risks that users fear/barriers][Describe how the service will produce outcomes and benefits (provided in the user profile) e.g. create savings in terms of time, money, effort; make users' work easier, help make adoption easier] |
| Demand assessment | [describe what is the full market potential (all user types / categories and size) and most likely uptake possible] | [describe somewhere between the best and worst case scenario] | [describe the minimal uptake of the service e.g. only by EGI federation; 1 user group] |
| Assumptions(about market uptake) | [what assumptions need to be made to expect the best case scenario e.g. EC policy supports it; no commercial alternative; high user friendliness will equal mass uptake] | [what assumptions need to be made to expect the average case scenario e.g. requested by multiple user groups ensuring some uptake] | [what assumptions need to be made to expect the worst case scenario e.g. service design is high quality and will be supported at least internally] |
| Expected organisational impact on the service provider | [in the best case scenario, what organisation changes would need to be made to support the demand e.g. additional staff, expanded data centre, no impact] | [in the average case scenario, what organisation changes would need to be made to support the demand e.g. additional staff, expanded data centre, no impact] | [in the worst case scenario, what organisation changes would need to be made to support the demand e.g. additional training of staff, no impact] |
| Expected Cost | [provide an estimate of the resources required to develop and maintain the service in the best case e.g. human effort; financial investment] | [provide an estimate of the resources required to develop and maintain the service in the average case e.g. human effort; financial investment] | [provide an estimate of the resources required to develop and maintain the service in the average case e.g. human effort; financial investment] |
| Expected Revenue | [what revenue types will the provider obtain in return for the investment described above and possible estimates e.g. direct payment(s); funding; in-kind contribution | [what revenue types will the provider obtain in return for the investment described above and possible estimates e.g. direct payment(s); funding; in-kind contribution | [what revenue types will the provider obtain in return for the investment described above and possible estimates e.g. direct payment(s); funding; in-kind contribution |
| Risks | [what are the organisational, technical, financial, market and/or legal risks associated to the service provider e.g. inability to scale to demand | [what are the organisational, technical, financial, market and/or legal risks associated to the service provider e.g. competitor offers better / cheaper service | [what are the organisational, technical, financial, market and/or legal risks associated to the service provider e.g. technology is not mature and stable enough to deliver required customer levels |
| Constraints / limiting factors | [describe the factors that may limit or hold back the success of the service e.g. size of the market; demand in the market; availability of supply; competition; availability of finances; quality and skills of employees] |

# High-Level Service architecture and Components

## Logical service architecture

[describe the service delivery model e.g. as-a-service; as-a-software/product]

[describe the building blocks of the service – if possible, introduce a high-level architectural diagram]

## Service Components

[A service component is a logical part of a service that provides a function enabling or enhancing a service

Note 1: A service is usually composed of several service components.

Note 2: A service component is usually built from one or more configuration items (CIs).

Note 3: Although a service component underlies one or more services, it usually does not create value for a customer alone and is therefore not a service by itself.]

### Enabling service components

[Minimum set of service components that make the service available]

### Enhancing service components

[Any additional service components that improves the service, however, the service would still run without them, even if at lesser quality]

## Integration and dependencies

[Describe other existing services or service components to which integration will be required for this service. What dependencies does this service have?]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Part 2 FuRther Information

# Service specification

# Service requirements analysis

Following, the results of the service requirements analysis:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Requirements | Weight |
| Functional and technical service requirements |  |  |
| Availability, continuity and performance-related service requirements |  |  |
| Security and data protection-related service requirements |  |  |
| Usability-related service requirements |  |  |
| Organisational service requirements |  |  |

# Technical service architecture

Topics to be considered:

* Environmental architecture
* Network infrastructure
* Hardware
* Software / applications
* Information

# Service acceptance criteria

The service acceptance criteria are based on the results from the requirements analysis and listed in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Acceptance criteria | Critical? |
| Functional and technical acceptance criteria* Functionality to be effectively provided by the service
* Other
 |  |  |
| Availability, continuity and performance-related acceptance criteria |  |  |
| Security and data protection-related acceptance criteria |  |  |
| Usability-related acceptance criteria |  |  |
| Organisational acceptance criteria* Criteria for effective communication
* Criteria for effective user or support staff training
 |  |  |

Critical acceptance criteria according to the above table are regarded as show-stoppers. That means that, if any of the critical acceptance criteria is not achieved, the deployment of the service to the live environment will be delayed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of unachieved critical acceptance criteria preventing deployment | 1 or more |
| Number of unachieved non-critical acceptance criteria preventing deployment | [Insert number] |

# Service transition plan

Following the service transition plan for the new or changed service:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Phase | Activities and timing | Responsibilities (RACI) |
| Specification, negotiation and agreement |  |  |
| Development and procurement |  |  |
| Testing |  |  |
| Early life support |  |  |
| Regular operation |  |  |

1. https://www.egi.eu/services/catalogue/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)