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| *Reviewer:* | **Kostas Koumantaros** | *Activity:* | **PMB** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| they seem to be rather short without much explanations why these extensions are needed e.g some sort of use case to be documented (eg. add a uml diagram or something)  also for D4.3 its unclear what the response of an OCCI interface would be in this scenario also some implementations may support resize only of specific attributes of a VM and I see no way of specifying that or at least providing an error response to the user. For example synnefo does not allow to change the size of the system disk but ony the number of cpus and/or size of ram.  Last but not least usually in order to resize a running VM a CMF needs to shutdown - resize and reboot the machine I didn’t see this documented in the deliverable (is it true for openstack/opennebulla or do they have ability to resize a vm on the fly.) |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| Regarding the use cases: The documents have been augmented with a description of the use cases. They are illustrative enough, so we think that a diagram is not needed.Regarding the D4.3 support in the implementation: The specification does not assume resizing disks. Only CPU and RAM, so Synnefo is covered. The specification further says that resizing is done in a provider-specific way, so Synnefo can do whatever they consider as the best approach. This has been stressed in the deliverable, as it was only covered in the standard draft. The same applies for the stop-resize-start chain, as this is something implementation specific. Regarding the response towards the user, this is covered in the OCCI standard, that mandates that, for any operation or action, proper HTTP error codes should be used to report any error back to the user. This has been clarified in the deliverable as well. |
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