



FENIX

RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

D1.1

Report on Quality Control Procedure

Work package:	WP1 Management	
Author(s):	Dirk Pleiter	JUELICH
Dissemination Level	public	
Nature	Report	

Date	Author	Comments	Version	Status
21.05.2018	Dirk Pleiter	Initial version	V0.1	Draft
26.05.2018	Dirk Pleiter	Updates based on project members feedback	V0.2	Draft
31.05.2018	Dirk Pleiter	Minor editorial update	V1.0	Final
06.07.2018	Dirk Pleiter	Updated template	V1.1	Final

The ICEI project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 800858.

© 2018 ICEI Consortium Partners. All rights reserved.



Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to define the quality control processes and provide the templates for internal verification and document review for all project results and deliverables.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
1. Quality review process.....	2
1.1 Authors.....	2
1.2 Internal reviewers.....	3
1.3 Update by authors.....	3
1.4 Approvals.....	3
1.5 Submission.....	3
2. Templates.....	3
2.1 ICEI deliverables.....	3
2.2 Internal review form.....	4
3. Appendix.....	4

1. Quality review process

1.1 Authors

The Leader of a Work Package, which is in charge of providing a particular deliverable, is responsible for defining the authors in time. These authors should follow the latest version of the templates for deliverables (see below), which are available in the following folder of the collaborative work space of the ICEI project:

<https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2619461>

The authors have to make sure that a draft for internal review is available for the internal reviewer(s) no later than 4 weeks before the deadline for the submission of the deliverable. Draft versions of the deliverable will be uploaded in an appropriate sub-folder of the following folder:

<https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2619476>

After having uploaded the draft deliverable, the authors will notify the internal reviewer(s). In case of delays, the Coordinator, the Technical Coordinator, the Work Package Leader as well as the internal reviewer(s) assigned for this deliverable should be informed as early as possible to establish a mitigation plan.

1.2 Internal reviewers

The list of internal reviewer(s) is maintained in a document on the collaborative work space:

<https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2619491>

The number of internal reviewers is 1 to 2, depending on the size of the deliverable.

The internal reviewer(s) will within 2 weeks provide a review report based on the internal review form template using the latest version as available in the aforementioned folder in the collaborative work space. After completing the review, the reviewers will upload the review forms to the same folder where the draft deliverable had been placed and notify the authors.

1.3 Update by authors

Based on the comments of the internal reviewers the authors will provide an updated version of the draft deliverable and upload this to aforementioned the folder for draft deliverables. When complete the authors inform the corresponding Work Package Leader.

1.4 Approvals

After being recommended by the internal reviewers, the Work Package Leader and the Technical Coordinator will decide on forwarding the deliverable to the Executive Board for approval. Unless a member of the Executive Board requests to proceed differently, the approval will be performed via email within at most 5 calendar days. In case an Executive Board member does not provide feedback within this period, the lacking feedback is considered to be an approval.

1.5 Submission

Once approved by the Executive Board the Coordinator will upload the final version of the deliverable to the EC portal as well as to the folder for uploaded versions of the deliverables in the collaborative work space:

<https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2619482>

2. Templates

2.1 ICEI deliverables

This template should be used by the authors of any of the deliverables. It comprises the following mandatory parts:

- Table with the main document information including information on the review process
- Table with the document history
- Executive summary
- Table of contents
- Section "Introduction"

- Section “Concluding remarks”

2.2 Internal review form

This template must be used by the internal reviewers of a deliverable to assure a consistent way of how deliverables are being reviewed. It must, in particular, include a recommendation to the Coordinator on whether to submit this deliverable to the EC.

3. Appendix

The following pages provide a copy of the following documents:

- Template for ICEI deliverables
- Internal review form template



FENIX

RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

<Insert Document Reference from DoA>

<Insert Document Title from DoA>

Work package:	<number> <name>	
Author(s):	<name>	<organisation>
Reviewer #1	<name>	<organisation>
Reviewer #2	<name>	<organisation>
Dissemination Level	<public confidential>	
Nature		

Date	Author	Comments	Version	Status
dd.mm.yyyy	<name>		V<x>.<y>	<Draft Final>

The ICEI project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 800858.



© 2018 ICEI Consortium Partners. All rights reserved.

Executive Summary

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
1. Introduction.....	2
2. <section title>	4
2.1 <subsection title>	4

Acronyms

AAI	Authentication and Authorization Infrastructure
ACD	Active Data Repositories
ACL	Access Control List
API	Application Programming Interface
ARD	Archival Data Repositories
BSC	Barcelona Supercomputing Center
CapEx	Capital Expenditure
CDP	Co-design Project
CEA	Commissariat à l'énergie atomique et aux énergies alternatives
CINECA	Consorzio Interuniversitario del Nord est Italiano Per il Calcolo Automatico
CLI	Command Line Interface
CSCS	Centro Svizzero di Calcolo Scientifico
DL	Data Location Service
DM	Data Mover Service
DT	Data Transfer Service
FPA	Framework Partnership Agreement
FURMS	Fenix User and Resource Management Services
GoP	Group of Procurers
GUI	Graphical User Interface
HBP	Human Brain Project

HPAC	High Performance Analytics and Computing
HPC	High Performance Computing
HPDA	High Performance Data Analytics
HPST	High-Performance Storage Tier
IaaS	Infrastructure as a Service
IAC	Interactive Computing Services
ICCP	Interactive Computing Cloud Platform
ICEI	Interactive Computing E-Infrastructure for the Human Brain Project
ICN	Interactive Computing Node
IdP	Identity Provider
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
JP	Joint Platform
JSC	Juelich Supercomputing Centre
LCST	Large-Capacity Storage Tier
MS	Monitoring Services
NDA	Non-Disclosure Agreement
NETE	External Interconnect
NETI	Internal Interconnect
NMC	Neuromorphic Computing
NVM	Non-Volatile Memory
NVRAM	Non-Volatile Random Access Memory
OIDC	OpenID Connect
OpEx	Operational Expenditure
PaaS	Platform as a Service
PCP	Pre-Commercial Procurement
PI	Principal Investigator
PID	Persistent Identifier
PIE	Public Information Event
PRACE	Partnership for Advanced Computing in Europe
Q&A	Questions and Answers
QoS	Quality of Service

R&D	Research and Development
R&I	Research and Innovation
RBAC	Role-Based Access Control
RFI	Request For Information
SCC	Scalable Computing Services
SGA	Special Grant Agreement
SIB	Science Infrastructure Board
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SP	Subproject
TCO	Total Cost of Ownership
TGCC	Très Grand Centre de Calcul
UI	User Interface
US	User Support Services
VM	Virtual Machine Services

1. Introduction

2. <section title>

2.1 <subsection title>

XY.

Table / Figure 1: Xy.

XY.

2.1.1 <subsection title>

3. Concluding remarks

4. References

[<ref number>] <reference>



FENIX

RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

Internal Review Form

No. and title of the deliverable	
Version number	
Author(s) (organisation)	
Reviewer(s) (organisation)	
Date of receipt	
Date of review	

Is the deliverable suitable for submission?

- Yes, without changes
- Yes, with minor changes
- No (see below)

Does the Deliverable comply with its description provided in the DoA?

- Yes
- No, for the reasons given below:

Is the content sound or have shortcomings been identified?

Is the deliverable self-explanatory or does it provide necessary references to related documents?

Is the language and style of the Deliverable clear and sound?

Which parts of the Deliverable require improvement?

Does the Deliverable correspond to the project templates?

General comments

In cases where the review process takes multiple iterations, previous iterations should be documented in the following table:

Deliverables version	Date of review	Comments