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| **Identification of the reviewer** |
| *Reviewer:* | **Diego Scardaci** | *Activity:* | **JAR1** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| 1) The type of this deliverable is "DEM: Demonstrators, pilots, prototypes, plan design" and according to its description"This deliverable provides a first implementable draft of defined interactions between federated Cloud resource providers coordinating the relocation of a suspended virtual appliance from one provider to another."it should present/describe a plan design. Instead, the document has the structure of a normal report. Actually, the plan design is described in section 4 and 5 but it is not clearly stated that this is the design.I would suggest to explicitely write (in the executive summary, in the introduction) that the focus of this document is the plan design. I would suggest to create a section named "plan design" with the contents of current sections 4 and 52) The executive summary should summarise the whole deliverable and highlight the main achievements (the design!). Its lenght should be 1 page.3) In my opinion the use cases that are motivating this design should be described before the analysis. The analysis should be driven by the use cases.4) The use case section is quite poor. The 2 described use cases don't motivate enough the need for the development of this migration feature. For example, it would be nice adding a use case related to relocate a VM close to some datasets. I don't see any requirements coming from end-users, it seems more a technical work. A link with real use cases should be described.5) In the technical analysis, there is a detailed description of different kind of migrations. The current use cases don't motivate this analysis: why are we studying the different types of VM migrations? To achieve what? Which is the driven use case e.g. for live migration? The author spent several pages to describe live migration, why?6) According to the DoA this deliverable should "provides a first implementable draft...". Has been the proposed design discussed within the FedCloud TF? If yes, what is the outcome? Has been approved? Is it really implementable according to the different tech providers of the federation?7) What is the implementation roadmap agreed with the FedCloud TF? An implementation roadmap (with dates) is needed to demonstrate that we are not only doing a theoretical work. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
| Please, find the responses to each of the points raised below:1. We have rearranged the document, following the reviewer suggestions, expanding the executive summary and stating clear where the design is, putting together sections 4 and 5
2. The executive summary has been extended accordingly.
3. We have moved the use cases before the analysis.
4. We have added an additional use-case. However, we do not have enough input from the user communities regarding this new functionality. We have stated in the text that new use cases may benefit from this functionality whenever it is ready.
5. The analysis is needed to justify why the other options are technically discarded, even if a use case would hypothetically require it. Live migration cannot take place, as well as warm migration, as EGI-Engage does not have enough effort for implementing such functionalities even if required, therefore this needs to be discussed in the document.
6. This has been discussed with the CMF and OCCI developers, and a tentative plan has been agreed and proposed in the document.
7. See 6.
 |

**Additional comments**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author(correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

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