GISELA

A N S W E R S   T O   T H E   F I R S T   R E V I E W   R E P O R T

Document Full name	**GISELA-First Review-Answers-v1.4**
Date	**25/10/2011**
Activity	**WP1 / Administrative and Technical Management**
Lead Partner	**CIEMAT**
Document status	**APPROVED**
Classification Attribute	**PU (PUBLIC)**
Document link	http://documents.gisela-grid.eu

Abstract: This document presents the GISELA answers to the recommendations and comments addressed in the Technical Review Report of the GISELA First-year Review Meeting held in Brussels on the 15th of September 2011.

Delivery Slip

	Name	Partner/Activity	Date	Signature
From	WP1	CIEMAT / WP1 - Administrative and Technical Management		
Reviewed by	Technical Board			
Approved by	Management Board		25/10/2011	B. Maréchal Ph. Gavillet S. Jalife Villalón L. A. Trejo Rodriguez R. Barbera R. Ramos Pollán

Document Log

Issue	Date	Comment	Author
0-1	30/09/11	First draft.	B. Marechal
0-2	21/10/11	WP6 contribution added	F. Brasileiro
0-3	22/10/11	New answers / comments added	Ph. Gavillet & B. Marechal
0-4	24/10/11	WP3 contribution added	D. Scardaci
1-4	25/10/11	Document updated / Final approval	F. Estrella & Ph. Gavillet / B. Marechal

Document Change Record

Issue	Item	Reason for Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The First Review of the GISELA project was held in Brussels, at the EU premises, on the 15th of September 2011. It included the following presentations from the project, all uploaded in and available from the GISELA Document Server:

- "WP1 - Overview of the GISELA status after its first year – Including Financial Matters" (B. Marechal – Project Coordinator)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/256?ln=en

- "WP2 - Dissemination and Outreach - Status Report" (H. Hoeger – WP2 Manager)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/257?ln=en

- "WP3 - User Communities Support - Status Report" (Guil. Diaz – TWP3.3 Leader)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/258?ln=en

- "WP4 - NGI / LGI Infrastructure Services - Status Report" (R. Diacovo – WP4 Manager)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/259?ln=en

- "WP5 - Network Resource Provision - Status Report" (R. Diacovo on behalf of the WP5 Manager)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/261?ln=en

- "WP6 - Infrastructure and Application-oriented Services for User Communities - Status Report" (F. Brasileiro – WP6 Manager)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/262?ln=en

- "WP1 - The CLARA Service Model and Business Plan for Grid" (L. Nuñez – Gerencia de Relaciones Académicas RedCLARA and S. Jalife – Deputy Project Coordinator)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/263?ln=en

- "WP1 - The Handover of the e-Infrastructure and VRCs support to CLARA & NRENS" (Ph. Gavillet – Deputy Project Coordinator and L. Nuñez)
  http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/264?ln=en

All due Project Deliverables, the Periodic Progress Report and the last version of the Description of Work (Annex I of the signed Grant Agreement) were made available to the Reviewers and the Project Officer in due time.

At the end of the Review Meeting, the Reviewers presented their preliminary recommendations and comments. The current document aims at providing suitable answers (in blue) to the Technical Review Report recommendations.

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

- **Executive Summary**

The project consortium has evolved towards a collaborating team committed to the project's success. They have achieved satisfactory results in the provision of a grid infrastructure to researchers in Latin America and Europe. The underutilization of resources by CLARA, due the lack of appropriate involvement in the project in the first six months has been addressed on management level by the "crash programme". However GISELA has not recovered from critical situation until now.

The quality measures to the project's success have mostly been met during the first year but need to be complemented with additional performance indicators and targeted actions to measure the project's progress towards its two main goals: (i) implementing a long-term sustainability model for the grid infrastructure and (ii) supporting with it Virtual Research Communities based on their requirements.

Overall project activities (dissemination, workshops, decision managers meetings and development of applications) are rather unfocussed and the progress report lacks to demonstrate sufficiently the rationale behind many of the actions taken and how their impact will be assessed. Again, additional success metrics or better justifications of the actions taken are necessary to increase effectiveness and efficiency of the project's activities.

The first year project progress report only partially mentions deviations and problems, and does not state clearly expected and actually achieved project results because part of it have only been copied and pasted from the Technical Annex (i.e. the achievements are described currently in future tense).

Doubts on the impact of the project mainly regard its sustainability. The reviewers see a potential risk from both sides: a) CLARA's key role in taking over the infrastructure maintenance and provision while not demonstrating the commitment that was initially planned in the Technical Annex as far as it concerns the resources allocated to the project and b) the fact that the rest of the project team seems to underestimate the value and significance of the objective of sustainability and the need to position the results of the project in comparison with competition e.g. from commercial infrastructure providers or local installations. The communication and collaboration between the project management and CLARA is so far unsatisfactory. CLARA needs to express more clearly which exploitable items are needed from the project to serve as input for a Business Plan and the project management needs to align the activities of the project more stringent towards the delivery of these exploitable items. The business plan (D1.4. due in M12) which is seen as a key document in promoting the infrastructure take-over within CLARA is still in draft form. It is rather generic and does not present the required collaboration efforts and contributions from the rest of the consortium.

The resources spent are appropriate and generally according to plan, under/over spending/commitment should be better explained in the project progress report. In particular underperformance of partner 11 needs urgent action from management (decision expected by December 2011).

GISELA answer:

The GISELA Management took note of the reviewers' assessment of the Project and will provide answers and comments related to each part of the report. The issues raised will be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan that must be delivered by November 2011.

- **Recommendations concerning the period under review**

Recommendation 1: Re-submit the 1st year project progress report including the missing tables as required in the official guidelines for the periodic reporting. In particular, the tables should include planned/spent resources per work package and per partner, as well as planned and spent resources in all costs categories (personnel, travel, etc.). All project resources should be claimed and resources not charged to the project should be indicated. If contributions through unfunded resources were made state them accordingly by specifying which of the contributed effort was funded and which was unfunded.

GISELA answer:

The missing tables have been included in Sections 5 and 6 of the revised version of Project Progress Report (PPR) (http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/272?ln=en) that has been submitted on 15/10/11.

Recommendation 2: Re-submit D1.4 Business Plan in a final version and clarify GISELA's position with regard to competitors and competing offers. Furthermore state GISELA's strategy on expected return of investment or continued spending/loss to keep the infrastructure operational. Split the document in a short public part and move the business plan details in a confidential annex or change the visibility of the whole document from "public" to "confidential".

GISELA answer:

As requested, the re-submission is foreseen on 30/11/11 and will take into account this recommendation. Moreover, the issues raised will also be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan.

- **Recommendations concerning future work**

Overall the project should focus the next year's actions towards achieving the key objective: sustainability of the infrastructure. The reviewers recommend implementing the methodology described in D3.1: plan/do/check/act. This methodology has not been correctly used in any of the project actions so far and should be put in action. In more detail the following amendments regarding the execution of the project are required for the remaining period:

Recommendation 3: Identify GISELA's key sustainability components. These components are those that are considered to contribute jointly towards GISELA's sustainability, some of them are listed here (the list is indicative and not exhaustive):

- High impact application areas
  - Identify and target researchers and policy makers accordingly
- User & user groups
  - Identify their real needs and current problems hindering the larger utilisation of current infrastructure)
- Policy makers
- Infrastructure
- Operations
- Competitive services and competitors

GISELA answer:

Even if it did not appear explicitly in the written documents (Deliverables and PPR) and during the review, the well-known methodology "*plan/do/check/act*" has been used regularly. The Crash Programme put in place by the Project Management is an example of the use of such a methodology. Anyway, the revised version of D1.4, and the PPR-like Action Plan for the 8th December Review, will list and comment the importance of all key elements of the sustainability of GISELA.

Recommendation 4: Implement urgently the plan/do/check/act methodology as described in D3.1.

> 1. Compare the anticipated progress of the project with the real situation of GISELA. Put the progress also in context of the achievements already realised using previous projects such as EELA and EELA2

> 2. Establish targets and plan actions which focus on achieving the desired values and objectives.

> 3. Regularly measure, monitor and adapt the plan.

The documentation of the implementation of this action plan must be delivered by November 2011 in a separate document. The reviewers believe that a business plan without considering the above will be opportunistic and therefore unrealistic.

GISELA answer:

See the GISELA answer to Recommendation 3 above. The PPR-like Action Plan for the 8th December Review will detail the actual PDCA implementation for the 2nd year of the project. Even if it did not appear explicitly in the written documents (Deliverables and PPR) and during the review, the well-known methodology "*plan/do/check/act*" has been used regularly.

Recommendation 5: The reviewers urge the consortium not to rely solely on the accomplishment of the stated success criteria, but to work focussed towards actual achievement of project goals and to adjust measures and success criteria accordingly. This will allow a clearer focus of work performed in each work package by enabling the team to justify their activities and measure their effectiveness. All project actions (workshops, decision makers' meetings, training events, development of applications, new user groups, enlargement of users' database, etc) should be implemented as a result of the identified, necessary actions as explained above. In this way, all such events should be justified in year 2, in terms of purpose, and achievement.

GISELA answer:

See the GISELA answer to Recommendation 3 above. Even if it did not appear explicitly in the written documents (Deliverables and PPR) and during the review, all project actions were launched on the basis of the objectives set for each step of the project, in consultation and with the agreement of all stakeholders and scrutinizing outcomes afterwards. Anyway, the recommendation will be more systematically taken into consideration in the PPR-like Action Plan.

Recommendation 6: Prepare an additional review at the 8th of December to assess the resubmitted Project Progress Report and the Business Plan (D1.4) which will also be submitted to the CLARA Management Board for their meeting in November 2011. The outcome of the CLARA management board should be also reported. This deliverable, if necessary, should change its status from 'Public' to 'Confidential' so that the Business Plan of CLARA is not open to the wide public. Furthermore demonstrate the implementation of the plan/do/check/act methodology. This review meeting should be considered as critical for the continuation and the success of the project.

GISELA answer:

The issue raised here has already been addressed above in the answer to Recommendation 2.

- **Assessment**

☐ Excellent progress (the project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period and has even exceeded expectations).

☐ Good progress (the project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations).

☑ Acceptable progress (the project has achieved some of its objectives; however, corrective action will be required).

☐ Unsatisfactory progress (the project has failed to achieve key objectives and/or is not at all on schedule).

GISELA answer:

2. OBJECTIVES AND WORKPLAN

a. Progress towards project objectives

The project has partially achieved its objectives as most of the metrics stated in DoW have been met. However the project team is reminded that GISELA's successful completion is only achieved if the overall objective of sustainability and users support are convincingly addressed and realised by the end of the project. Mere compliance with the stated metrics in the current unfocussed approach is not sufficient.

The project partners as well as CLARA who is key to the sustainability of the infrastructure, should consider this as a priority of the project and set up a clear and realistic business plan. Successful projects depend on the quality of the business plan and the targeted actions towards its implementation. Both: the business plan and the planned actions for the remaining project duration will be the focus of a follow-up project review in December 2011.

GISELA answer:

The issues raised will be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan. However we would like to add the two following comments.

We (the EELA, EELA-2 and GISELA managements) always understood that metrics are convenient means to evaluate the progress of their projects but in no way a complete method to appreciate the level of successfulness. The asset of a project is indeed, in our opinion, the final compliance to all objectives in all their aspects including some which showed up along its course. Such a view is well illustrated, in our mind, by the EELA, EELA-2 and GISELA projects.

EELA deployed a Pilot Test bed in Latin America, EELA-2 transformed the EELA infrastructure into a Production Quality one and the main GISELA objective is to handover to CLARA & Latin American NRENS the operation of the infrastructure and the support to VRCs. CLARA, a former EELA and EELA-2 Beneficiary, became a key partner in GISELA. Therefore, the GISELA and CLARA managements are focussing their action plans to guarantee the long-term sustainability of the EELA, EELA-2 and GISELA legacy.

b. Progress in individual work packages

WP1: The assessment of progress is not properly reported as some sections have been copied and pasted from the Technical Annex expressing the planned progress rather than the actually achieved progress. The problems and delays are not described in the report and even more important the taken measures to overcome/compensate them.

The major deliverable D1.4 of this WP is late and in draft form. This puts the whole project success under risk. The transition to CLARA although now planned, is not detailed and lacks substance which may lead to a failure to the major objective of the project: the sustainability of the infrastructure.

GISELA answer:

These above mentioned issues have been addressed in:

- D1.3, submitted on 07/03/11;
- The revised version of the PPR, submitted on 15/10/11 (see Sections 3.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.4.4 and 8).

They will be further discussed in:

- - D1.4, to be submitted on 30/11/11;
- - The PPR-like Action Plan document that must be delivered by November 2011.

WP2: The dissemination activities are rather unfocussed and seem at times opportunistic. The impact is questionable because of an underutilisation of the infrastructure and the existing applications. As mentioned above a rationale for the conduction of certain events and more concrete measure to assess their impact is required (e.g. rationale for decision maker meetings, workshop topics and virtual meetings; Web statistics on downloads and clicks of dissemination material; benefit of twitter account). Achieving a set of newly defined metrics should be used to support progress towards the overall project goals.

GISELA answer:

These issues will be addressed in the PPR-like Action Plan.

WP3: The progress is acceptable but the report should show the difference with respect to achievements of EELA-2. Again more relevant measures need to be used in order to monitor the WP's actions. The compilation of success stories is one way of making a case for the infrastructure within CLARA. Training follows the above mentioned opportunistic approach: There is not a user training needs analysis that guides the decision for training topics but, rather dependence with respect to the co- organisation of events with collaborating projects. Training should be considered by the project as an additional means to reach its overall objectives.

GISELA answer:

The issues raised will be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan. However we would like to make the following comment.

We considered the achievements of EELA-2 as a starting point for the WP6 activity and, in the deliverable D3.2, we listed all the legacy applications inherited from EELA-2, explaining that they should be interpreted as an "available application list" that can be requested by GISELA potentials users. We updated the metrics table, adding new measures to understand better the status of the work package. The new table can be found in the Deliverable D3.3 submitted on 07/10/11. A Training Events tentative schedule for the second year has been defined in conjunction with CLARA, trying to satisfy actual needs identified by CLARA to reach the two main project's target: sustainability and users support (see D3.3 for more details). In the first release of the GISELA Science Gateway we are going to add a section about success stories. This activity will be performed in collaboration with WP2.

WP4, 5: GRID infrastructure is satisfactorily set up and operated. A better presentation of the usage of the actual provided cores is required.

GISELA answer:

The request has been addressed in the revised version of the PPR, submitted on 15/10/11.

WP6: A number of services for supporting the applications are maintained and new ones are reported. However, the project should identify which services are required by the users and which potentially

are missing in order to extend the utilisation of the infrastructure. The project has never asked the opinion of the users and their needs.

GISELA answer:

In the deliverables produced up to now, we have not described the way we have approached the users. However, this does not mean that we do not interact with them. The services that were proposed in the DoW were fruit of our previous interaction with users during the EELA-2 project. Other punctual requests were gathered during the execution of GISELA, in particular, both in the context the WP2 and WP3 dissemination and training activities, as well as through our mailing lists targeted to users. Following a first interaction through one of these channels, the users are put in direct contact with WP6, and one-to-one communication between user and appropriate WP6 staff is established. So far, the main request for the development of new services is the Scientific Gateways that have been presented in Deliverable D3.3. These gateways aim at providing ways to simplify the access to the grid technology. Note worthily, some of the services originally foreseen also try to address this very problem from different perspectives.

This issue will be further addressed in the in the PPR-like Action Plan.

c. Milestones and deliverables

The list of deliverables needs to be updated in the project progress report.

STATUS OF DELIVERABLES			
No.	Title	Status (Approved/Rejected)	Remarks
	Project progress report	Rejected	To be resubmitted 15th October 2011
D1.1	Acceptable Use policy report and gender policy document	Accepted	
D1.2	GIZELA web site	Accepted	
D1.3	1st Intermediate activities report	Accepted	
D1.4	Business plan	Rejected	To be resubmitted 31st November 2011
D2.1	Dissemination and Outreach plan	Accepted	
D2.2	1st year dissemination and outreach results	Accepted	
D3.1	Identification of supported VRCs and execution plans for 1st year	Accepted	
D3.2	1st Year Activity Highlights on VRCs and Users Support	Accepted	
D4.1	Infrastructure Status Report	Accepted	
D4.2	NGI/LGI infrastructure services assessment of 1st year	Accepted	
D5.1	Activity execution plan	Accepted	
D5.2	Network resource provision assessment of 1st year	Accepted	
D6.1	1st Intermediate report of the JRA	Accepted	

The project has to resubmit D1.4 with minutes of the decision of the CLARA Management Board meeting in November 2011 regarding the approval of the Business Plan and following the instructions given above. This deliverable together with the action plan derived from the measurements of current status of users, applications, stakeholders, etc., will be the main topic of the intermediary review scheduled in Brussels on the 8th of December 2011.

The project has to resubmit the Periodic Progress Report, following strictly the European Commission's guidelines and therefore, including:

- Updated deliverables table with dates actually submitted/ originally planned/justification of delay if applicable

- Include a table per partner per WP on funded/unfunded PMs - Include table per partner per activity as reflected in Technical Annex section 2.4 (e.g. Travel, Personnel, etc,)

- In the summary tables of section 5, put total/claimed effort-costs

- Complement section 3.1 the self-assessment of progress as presented in the review meeting and thereby clarify what was expected vs. actual progress and achievements, also with respect to stated

goals. The explanation of under/over spending/commitment should be better explained (e.g. with respect to Partner 3 (CLARA) and Partner 11 (RAAP)).

GISELA answer:

The requests above have been addressed in the revised version of the PPR submitted on 15/10/11 (see Tables 19, 40 to 45, 48 and Section 3.1). Concerning the Travel Costs of the Project, as explained in the DoW, they have been 100% transferred to Beneficiary 8 (HLP) – see Tables 28 and 48– the remaining partners dealing only with Personnel costs.

d. Relevance of objectives

The objectives for the coming period are still relevant and achievable however considerable effort has to be put forward in (i) intensifying the collaboration with CLARA, (ii) understanding the reasons for the underutilisation of the current infrastructure and attracting new research communities, (iii) attracting policy makers which could contribute to supporting the infrastructure.

GISELA answer:

These advices will be followed during the second project-year, following the approach described in the PPR-like Action Plan and in D3.3.

3. RESOURCES

a. Assessment of the use of resources

The resources spent are appropriate and generally according to plan, under/over spending/commitment should be better explained in the Project Progress Report. In particular underperformance of partner 11 needs urgent action from management. Furthermore the significant under-spending of CLARA needs to be explained in more detail and addressed in the next year.

GISELA answer:

The request above has been addressed in the revised version of the PPR submitted on 15/10/11 (see Section 6.1).

b. Deviations

The major deviation is the critical delay in completion of the Business Plan (D1.4) and its adoption by the CLARA management board. Input/results from other WPs are needed in order to make a case for why this infrastructure is a worthwhile undertaking.

GISELA answer:

This issue will be addressed in the revised version of D1.4 and in the PPR-like Action Plan.

4. MANAGEMENT, COLLABORATION AND BENEFICIARIES' ROLES

a. Technical, administrative and financial management of the project

A "crash programme" was put in place to address pressing issues early in the project, however the quality and effectiveness of the project management must improve and needs to be more pro- active with non-responsive partners. Collaboration and communication with all the partners should be intensified in order to achieve the objectives and overcome current obstacles. Management reporting must improve significantly. The management process (as described in D1.3) has not been implemented and many activities of the WPs are not clearly focused on achieving the overall project objectives.

GISELA answer:

The above issues will be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan. However we would like to add the two following comments.

Concerning the GISELA Management pro-activity, one can always try to improve it. However it must be said that, during the reporting period, hundreds of e-mails have been sent to Partner Institution Representatives, to the Consortium, Management and Technical Boards, to the External Advisory Committee, to administrative and financial contact persons, to users, to Resource Centres managers, etc.. Skype meetings have been organised when needed and phone calls have been used. Face-to-face meeting have been suggested by the GISELA Management and some occurred, which provoked extra and unforeseen expenses. Unfortunately, permanent unresponsiveness and lack of commitment are difficult to overcome.

Management reporting has been rather comprehensive. All kinds of meetings got minutes, all attendance to events have been subject of trip reports, all available from the Document Server. Issues presenting delays and/or risks have been handled in due time with the proper action plan, e.g. the decision of the crash program at M04-M05 after the non-submission of the 1st CLARA TT Quarterly report, the notification of the delayed integration of CLARA and NRENs in D1.3: "1st Intermediate Activity Report" (submitted on 07/03/11).

b. Collaboration and communication

Collaboration and communication with all the partners should be intensified in order to achieve the objectives. Especially the collaboration with CLARA is below expectations building the basis for the expressed concerns about the project's successful completion. On page 69 of the PPR the GISELA team provides a critical self-assessment of the situation but lacks a description on the necessary steps to overcome the situation. The issue with partners under- spending and underperforming is currently not well addressed by management.

GISELA answer:

The issues raised will be addressed in detail in the PPR-like Action Plan. However we would like to make the following comment.

In Europe, EGI, partially supported by the European Commission, is trying to ensure the long-term sustainability of the impressive infrastructure inherited from EGE-III. In Latin America, we choose to handover what has been created by EELA and EELA-2 to an existing international body, CLARA, which was taking care, up to now, of network provision and not of e-infrastructures (Grid, Clouds, HPC, HTC, etc.). The issues faced were not only technical but rather political and the delay to get

ANSWERS TO THE FIRST REVIEW REPORT

CLARA fully engaged in the process has been longer than expected. Indeed, CLARA needs to get the approval of the majority of the NRENS to take such decision that implies extra funding.

c. Beneficiaries' roles

Individual beneficiaries in general worked as expected except for Partner 11 (RAAP) (lack of evidence of its committed) and partner 3 (CLARA) (late, lack of mobilisation of resources).

GISELA answer:

Both in the PPR and in its revised version submitted on 15/10/11 (see Section 6.1), the CLARA issue has been explained. Concerning RAAP, contact has finally been established on 24/10/11 and the situation should be fixed during the following weeks.

5. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF FOREGROUND

a. Impact

The project's impact ultimately depends on focused/targeted actions in a more planned way and proper measurement of effectiveness. Furthermore a clear understanding of what VRCs mean to the project team need to be developed and agreed upon. This will facilitate the support to be provided to the VRCs and the ways to target their enlargement.

The project should demonstrate the impact on the scientific community by defining metrics such as the number of active users, number of applications used on the infrastructure, number of applications available on the infrastructure, number of publications of researchers using results achieved using the infrastructure.

GISELA answer:

These recommendations have been taken into account in D3.3 submitted on 07/10/11.

b. Use of results

The credibility of the Business Plan (D1.4) is crucial to the project's success and will increase its impact.

GISELA answer:

The issue will be addressed in the revised version of D1.4 and in the PPR-like Action Plan.

c. Dissemination

As mentioned above clear measures on user take-up need to be developed and employed. Existing users and user groups should be assessed and measured, strategies to further increase them should be presented and implemented.

Furthermore the idea of a VRC-driven Website needs to be exploited as it could provide a valuable platform to the researchers using GISELA as well as the GISELA team itself to gain feedback and showcase their success. One possibility is the introduction of an area in the Website where users and GISELA partners can enlist publications they derived from using the infrastructure. The attractiveness of the Website may be enhanced by providing end users a platform to publish their success stories and case studies, a forum to collaborate and exchange opinions..

The current project Website is confusing for potential end-users, as far as it concerns locating specific information, e.g. training modules. Currently the website does not differentiate the internal project user and the external end-user. Therefore, the introduction of a VRC-driven Website was welcome by the reviewers.

GISELA answer:

These recommendations have been taken into account in D3.3 submitted on 07/10/11. The VRC-driven Website is being specified. The issue will be further addressed in the PPR-like Action Plan.

d. Involvement of potential users and stakeholders

As already stated above, the project should identify which stakeholders and users are important for its future, in terms of:

- Policy makers and

- Industrial and scientific users and user groups

For them, set a plan for which are important for the sustainability and how they are going to be reached

GISELA answer:

This matter has been partially addressed in D3.3 submitted on 07/10/11 and will be discussed in the revised version of D1.4 and in the PPR-like Action Plan.

e. Links with other projects and programmes

The interaction with CLARA/RedCLARA is very important for the region. After signing a MoU with ERINA+ it could be useful to consult them concerning appropriate measures for success.

GISELA answer:

ERINA+ has been contacted during the last EGI Technical Forum in Lyon and promised to come back to us soon.

6. OTHER ISSUES

n/a

7. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

We have taken note of all recommendations of the Reviewers and, based on them, are striving to define the necessary steps to recover from the observed delays in the achievement of the objectives of sustainability and users support. The new strategy and its first outcomes will be described in detail at the forthcoming 8th December 2011 Review.

The GISELA Management believes to have carefully followed the course of the Project, in particular with the view of detecting any deviation in real time:

- While observing, at M04, that the integration of the CLARA Transition Team was delayed and the 1st CLARA TT report was not produced, the Crash Program was immediately launched. Its report (http://documents.gisela-grid.eu/record/218?ln=en), analysing the achieved progress and the remaining issues, was communicated to the Project Officer.

- At M06, D1.3 "*The 1st Intermediate Activity Report*" was submitted. It signals and discusses the remaining worrying issues with the integration of the CLARA and NRENs partners. It also deals with the case of unresponsive and / or under-committed partners.

With the current Review procedure the difficulties faced by the GISELA Management could only be discussed at the end of the 1st year at the occasion of the Review. A slightly different methodology allowing the Reviewers to emit recommendations at M06, on the basis of the 1st Intermediate Report (of not much use otherwise) would have much helped the GISELA Management. Indeed we believe that the starting phase (typically up to M06) of projects would benefit from a short review report. In case of severe problem encountered this would support the project management to recover, as fast as possible, from partners failing to fulfil their commitments.