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|  |
| --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** |
| *Title:* | **First release of the operational tools** | *Document identifier:* | EGI-doc-2679 |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2679> |
| *Author(s):* | **Cyril Lorphelin Christos Kanellopoulos David MeredithDaniel Kouril**  | *Date:* | **[please fill in]** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** |
| *Reviewer:* | **[please fill in]** | *Activity:* | **[please fill in]** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| Being D3.4 a software deliverable, the document is correctly concise providing links to the relevant release notes and repositories. The “feedback on satisfaction” sections lack of more information about the testing done, at least with links. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
|  |

**Additional comments**

*(not affecting the document content e.g. recommendations for the future)*

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
| Not a comment for the authors, more on the template used for this document. I could not find in the deliverable template the type of deliverable. For the benefits of the project reviewers, who ultimately will approve or not this deliverable, I would describe the type of the deliverable in the very first page of the document. |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| N° | Page | § | Observations | Reply from author(correction / reject,  …) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 7 | 1.2 | “only 2 critical dependencies”, I would explain the meaning of critical dependencies with more details, since it is subject to reader’s interpretation | Done in the document |
|  | 9 | 1.3.1.2 | Plase, add more information about the history feature. | Done in the document |
|  | 10 | 1.3.2 | “Review of the architecture”: was it a review, or a re-development? | Done in the document |
|  | 12 | 1.5.1 | What is the integration with perun for? From where is the requirements coming? | https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=10111 |
|  | 1.5.2 | 12 | “Cloud working group”: federated cloud task force and EGI Operations | Done in the document |
|  | 2.4 | 18 | Please describe in this section how the new releases of the compoutation engine are automatically tested. | 2.4 is the the “feedback on satisfaction” section. This section has been agreed to be to be provided by EGI.eu and NOT by the tool developers. In Annex I there is description of the development process, which mentioned that the Continuous Integration process includes the successful execution of all unit tests. |
|  | 22 | 3.5 | Why Engage is funding EUDAT requests? |  A. EGI has an informal agreement with EUDAT to merge/record all requirements for both EGI and EUDAT together to prevent forking and maintain interoperability. Tiziana was originally involved with this. I believe it is therefore valid that we include this here.  |
|  | 23 | 4.2.1 | The architecture is not describing the deployment scenarios of this tool. Is the goal to provide this tool as a service, or should the sites deploy an instnacE? | The current goal is to provide the tool as a service, ideally integratedwith global services (like AppDB). However, the tool implements the veryfirst version of the framework which will be evaluated further to seewhat is the most suitable deployment model. |
|  | 23 | 4.2.1 | “new images available”, please specifiy which images are tested, what defines an image as “available” | Secant reads the list of templates to checks from standard cloudmanagement platform (Opennebula at the moment). The way how therepository is populated varies based on local configuration. Thevmcatcher tool is commonly used to retrieve information about VM butother mechanisms are possible. |
|  | 24 | 4.2.2 | Isn’t the tool querying for the virtual machine images the AppDB? If yes it should be a dependency. | Secant doesn't fetch VM's directly, it depends on local configuration, see above. |
|  | 24 | 4.3.1 | Being a new product, perhaps this section could contain more features implemented | List added in the document |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.