

Comments on “2. Implementation” and NA1

- It will be useful for the project to have a specific visibility in the NA1 of the HEP SSC. This is more important now when the different activities are "shared" across SSC. The size of the HEP contribution should be reflected in the level of responsibility. I propose to have this under CERN
- In addition I do not understand the FTE breakdown
 - In particular the 15 PM for EGI.org. I think this is not needed. We will invest in some months to coordinate with EGI as mentioned later on in the text.
 - What is the role of the other 2 partners (other than CNRS)? On the 3rd (EGI) I have already commented.
- The project office is a management tool and does not really belong to the TMB
- The Quality coordination task is not defined. We can use the same wording we had in EGEE3 and get rid of it altogether
- Common Services are not really defined to the detail we need. Since we will have all SSC, we should assume that these activities will be represented (via SSCs) and coordinated at the level of TMB
- 2.1.1.4 description (Project Office) does not match the picture in page 62
- p.64: The Financial Issues paragraph misses a bullet, I guess...
- p.64: The voting mechanism in the PMB needs discussion. Counting institutes it is not in the project interest. It will boil down that the number of users, usage, impact etc... will not be taken into account as it should be.
- p. 65: TMB
: No-consensus issues should always go to the PMB
- We should eliminate the potential conflicts Activities/subSSC. How:
 - SSC in the PMB, Activities in the TMB?
 - Do not like because the project should be technically driven by the user communities and not self-referential
 - Activities reporting (no vote) to/via the Project Coordinator

- This is after all his/her role
- 2.1.3 section
 - WLCG should be mentioned in here. It provides also access to OSG etc...
 - APS is Tapas?
 - Where is the training SSC
 - What is CUE?
 - Remove StratusLab
 - Should we mention SAFE or simply mention SA4?