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Deliverable/Milestone review form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** | | | |
| *Title:* | Long tail of science platform deployment report | *Document identifier:* | **Not indicated** |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | **Not indicated** |
| *Author(s):* | **EGI.eu** | *Date:* | 07 December 2015 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** | | | |
| *Reviewer:* | **Romier Geneviève, CNRS** | *Activity:* | **WP2-WP5-WP6** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| Globally I think that the tool works but there are issues with the presentation, we miss explanations and messages at different steps and we miss the link with the EGI website.  The user doesn’t know what the criteria used to validate the requests are. I think simple criteria should be given.  The help and the different documents referred such as the VO AUP are often wiki pages or docx documents that are not relevant for end users of the long tail of science. There are inconsistencies in the documents and explanations.  The users should see a simple interface with well adapted and consistent documents and help. They do not have to know they are considered as LTOS. They are users of this service. The gateways have to be presented as services (tools or services with functionalities), the presentation has to be focused on what can do the user with the services and not on why we built them.  Details are given in the review document. |
| **Response from Author:** |
|  |

**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,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Executive summary** | *“LTOS” is not defined* | **corrected** |
|  | **5** | **introduction** | *“Individual researchers or small research groups with limited” The sentence is not finished.* | **finished** |
|  | **5** | **Introduction** | url of source code is not provided | **added** |
|  |  | 2.1  schema | The schema represents users and support teams as male persons. This doesn’t give an equal opportunity image of the users and the support team. A representation with male and female persons would give an image better consistent with the gender plan included in D1.1 | **corrected** |
|  |  | **2.2.** | Unity is a major piece of the LTOS platform. It should be useful to give its context. Who is maintaining it? Who is managing this software evolution and its roadmap? What is its license? How can we ensure that Access.egi.eu will always integrate with it if there are evolutions? Is the risk taken into account?(or is there no risk and why?) | **Information added** |
|  |  | 2.2 | Science gateways  There are requirements for the gateways. It should be better to shortly explain that or to give a link where requirements are detailed. | **Science gateways are not under direct responsibility of the LTOS, requirements at the moment are relevant for the integration with the access.egi.eu** |
|  |  |  | <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Dashboards/6458/LTOS%20requirements>  I was not able to see the page (error message). Perhaps due to RT rights? | **Probably yes, unfortunately I think there is no way around it.** |
|  |  | **3.1** | Several RT tickets are not closed. It seems strange to explain they have been implemented and the tickets are already open. | **Very good point, the team is under the processing of cleaning RT during the writing of the document.** |
|  |  | **4.1** | The workflows of the user request could be explained in the https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Long-tail\_of\_science page. “How can you access the platform?” is too simple. | **What type of information would you expect? The pages have been kept simple to provide what was thought to be the necessary information without discouraging the users with too much text. Is a step-by-step guide necessary in your opinion?** |
|  |  | **4.1** | “User should accept the VO AUP.” is inconsistent with the web page (General Use Policy) and the document (Acceptable Use Policy and Conditions of Use  of the EGI Platform for the Long-tail of Science) |  |
|  |  | **4.1.1** | “The user needs to ask for resources describing the purpose of their research.” I propose something like  The user needs to ask for resources meeting the needs of their research. | **I edited:** The user needs to ask for resources meeting the needs of their research, and the purpose of the research. |
|  |  | **4.1.2** | As the review is also a workflow review (or a step by step review), it would be easier if the structured view would be organised in a same way. I hope my explanations are accurate enough to understand at which step I was when the comments came up. | **Thank you, this is one of the first deliverable providing a software review, and we are still in the learning process.** |

**English and other corrections:**

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