

BlueBRIDGE - Project Deliverable #659

D6.3 : Blue Economy VRE Specification: Revised version [16]

Sep 11, 2015 07:45 PM - Franco Zoppi

Status: Closed	Start date: Nov 01, 2016
Priority: Immediate	Due date: Dec 31, 2016
Assignee: Leonardo Candela	% Done: 100%
Category:	Estimated time: 0.00 hour
Sprint: WP06	Editor: Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos
Dissemination Level: PU	Reviewer: Pasquale Pagano
Lead beneficiary: 11 - CITE	
Deliverable Type: OTHER	
Description This deliverable presents a revised version of the requirements, the specifications and the design of the solution that assembles the Blue Economy VREs.	
Related issues: Related to BlueBRIDGE - Project WP # 654: WP6 - Supporting Blue Economy: VREs... Closed Oct 01, 2015 Feb 28, 2018	

History

#1 - Dec 01, 2015 03:07 PM - George Kakalettris

- Related to Project WP #654: WP6 - Supporting Blue Economy: VREs Development [Months: 1-30] added

#2 - Jan 18, 2016 10:56 AM - George Kakalettris

- Assignee set to Michalis Nikolopoulos

#3 - Jul 07, 2016 01:27 AM - George Kakalettris

- Assignee changed from Michalis Nikolopoulos to Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

#4 - Nov 07, 2016 01:15 PM - Leonardo Candela

- Editor set to Gerasimos Antzoulatos

#5 - Nov 07, 2016 01:16 PM - Leonardo Candela

- Reviewer set to Pasquale Pagano

#6 - Nov 07, 2016 01:20 PM - Leonardo Candela

- Editor changed from Gerasimos Antzoulatos to Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

#7 - Dec 12, 2016 04:06 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

Should I be the author of an equivalent docx file to the ones saved on the workspace under ../D6.X Blue Economy VRE "description"?
On the previous deliverables (D6.1, D6.2) i was just a contributor and i can not find a folder D6.3 Blue Economy VRE Specification Revision yet under the WP6 Blue Economy > Deliverables.

#8 - Dec 12, 2016 04:48 PM - Leonardo Candela

D6.3 is a deliverable having lead beneficiary CITE, while D6.1 had lead beneficiary UOA and D6.2 had lead beneficiary I2S.

Of Course, D6.3 is a revised version of D6.1 Dunno what was the policy used to define authorship in the previous reports, BTW D6.3 is a new deliverable and producing it is a duty of CITE. I do not see any harmful issue here.

In case you can not lead this activity please reassign the ticket to the right person.

Re the lack of folder, you can create by yourself.

#9 - Jan 03, 2017 09:30 AM - Leonardo Candela

- Priority changed from Normal to Immediate

#10 - Jan 03, 2017 09:32 AM - Leonardo Candela

- Status changed from New to In Progress

#11 - Jan 10, 2017 06:06 AM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

- % Done changed from 0 to 90

- Assignee changed from Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos to George Kakalettris

George can you please confirm that the D6.3 docx uploaded on the workspace is ok? Shall I then break it down in two parts for the wiki?

#12 - Jan 10, 2017 05:27 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

- Assignee changed from George Kakalettris to Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

I re-assign it to me to complete/edit the most recent version of the D6.3 docx.

#13 - Jan 23, 2017 01:09 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

- % Done changed from 90 to 100

- Assignee changed from Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos to Pasquale Pagano

- Status changed from In Progress to Sent to Reviewer

Docx file created and saved in the workspace and Redmine wiki pages added under the Blue Economy Deliverables Tree. Please review. Sorry for the delay.

#14 - Feb 06, 2017 07:59 PM - Pasquale Pagano

- Status changed from Sent to Reviewer to Under Revision

Dear @bdimitrako@cite.gr, first let me apologise for the delay.

I started the analysis of the D6.3 but I stopped immediately and I need your help

- document to review.
In the folder I found several documents. I started from BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.2_clean.docx but then I noticed that BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.0.docx was uploaded after version 1.2 Please clarify which version I have to review by putting a link to the document to review.
- content of the document
This is a revised version but reading it I was not able to understand what is new and what is the same content as in the past. What was changed in the specification? It must be evident what you changed and the reasons for the changes.
The Executive Summary must clarify how to read this document. For example, it is reported "This first full version of the deliverable covers several major use cases"
I don't understand if here you are referring to the D6.1 or to the current status that you are reporting with D6.3.
I was expecting immediately something like "This first full version of the deliverable COVERED several major use cases ..." ... In this version we added this, removed that, ...
- content of the wiki
The content of the wiki is unclear as well. I looked at the history of the page to understand the differences but this cannot be the approach. You are revising a specification and it must be clear what was added, what was modified and which part planned in D6.1 have been removed.

Please let me know how to read it and let the readers of the document understand how to read it by changing the executive summary.

Thanks

#15 - Feb 07, 2017 09:07 AM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

Dear [@pasquale.pagano@isti.cnr.it](mailto:pasquale.pagano@isti.cnr.it),

The docx file to be reviewed is BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.2_clean.docx

In my browser i see that the latest update for this file is 19 Jan 03:35 PM 2017 and in a chronological order is after the 10 Jan 06:53 AM 2017 that appears as the last update of the earlier version BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.0.docx.

By that info you can derive that your first bullet is not true. I do not know if for some reason we are seeing different timestamps for the files.

I can make a commented version to note the changes but if you want me to rewrite the deliverable in the way you described i will need some time. In my understanding i thought that i should include e.g. the use cases covered before and that i should "complete" or enrich the cases with the new so that i would have a complete VRE specification.

Yes it is true that it is not instantly clear what is new and i am sorry for the trouble i put you through. I had not fully understood the purpose of the doc at that time.

On the wiki side i just broke down the docx into two pieces and filled the pages accordingly always based in the logic implied by D6.1's wiki.

Thanks for the guidance and the feedback

#16 - Feb 07, 2017 04:13 PM - Pasquale Pagano

Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos wrote:

The docx file to be reviewed is BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.2_clean.docx

ok, clear.

In my browser i see that the latest update for this file is 19 Jan 03:35 PM 2017 and in a chronological order is after the 10 Jan 06:53 AM 2017 that appears as the last update of the earlier version BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v1.0.docx.

My mistake since i did not notice AM and PM ...

I can make a commented version to note the changes but if you want me to rewrite the deliverable in the way you described i will need some time.

It is needed to make clear the differences and I am afraid that you need to change the deliverable. If possible, you could edit the Executive Summary and clarify that

- this new version replace entirely the previous one
- the main changes are in the specifications reported in section xy and for each of those changes you highlight what has been modified.

In my understanding i thought that i should include e.g. the use cases covered before and that i should "complete" or enrich the cases with the new so that i would have a complete VRE specification.

in this case you could highlight that new use cases reported in section xz have been added.

Yes it is true that it is not instantly clear what is new and i am sorry for the trouble i put you through. I had not fully understood the purpose of the doc at that time.

On the wiki side i just broke down the docx into two pieces and filled the pages accordingly always based in the logic implied by D6.1's wiki.

If you change the document, than you can easily apply the changes to the wiki.

What do you think?

Thanks for the guidance and the feedback

#17 - Feb 07, 2017 04:38 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

Pasquale Pagano wrote:

What do you think?

It is on my immediate tasks list.
Hope to close it before the end of this week.
You have been very helpfull and thorough.

Thanks

p.s. I think I have drained too much of your energy... There is a 9 day difference between the dates :)

#18 - Feb 15, 2017 05:29 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

Dear [@pasquale.pagano@isti.cnr.it](mailto:pasquale.pagano@isti.cnr.it),

New version uploaded. BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v2.0.bd.docx

In the current version I have edited the executive summary and have used some bookmarks from the executive summary to the main body of the deliverable in order to make it easy for the reviewer to find and undestand the changes. Minor typographic changes have been done but i have not logged them (e.g. removal of hidden hyperlinks to the wiki etc).

Please do communicate your opinion on the result.

I am also available via skype in case we need to communicate faster.

Thanks

#19 - Feb 16, 2017 08:36 AM - Pasquale Pagano

Thanks for the new version. I am currently in a meeting. I will review it next Monday.

#20 - Feb 22, 2017 07:13 PM - Pasquale Pagano

- Assignee changed from Pasquale Pagano to Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

- Status changed from Under Revision to Reviewed

I reviewed the deliverable. I think that the Executive Summary is very well done and it allows to understand the changes in the document.

Going through the document I have the following comments:

1) Section 1.4.1, point 1.

"During the Site selection at the Site Management portal, the system could provide to the end-user the capability to automatically choose the oxygen and current ratings for the specific region. This information will be provided via the connection in the above web sites."

I believe that the identified data sources should be imported in the infrastructure and the system should provide a really automatic way to choose those parameters for the specific region. I invite you to take this improvement into consideration in the development of the use case.

2) Section 1.5 Implementation Plan

The implementation plan does not seem to be up-to-date. Differently from the previous point (just a suggestion), this table should be revised at least to report the activities that have been completed.

3) Section 2.1 Use cases

Differently from Section 1.1, this section lacks an introduction that briefly present the different use cases. It could be worth to add this introduction

4) Section 2.5 Implementation Plan

The implementation plan seems to be up-to-date but the lack of the due date for some of the activity makes not clear the overall implementation plan. It should be completed with such due dates and verified.

I consider the above points 2) and 4) as mandatory points for the approval. Point 3) is a highly recommended since it will simplify the reading.

Thanks for considering my comments. If you accept the comments and change the document, please report the link to the modify version and change the status to "Feedback Processed".

#21 - Feb 23, 2017 10:12 AM - George Kakaletis

I think there is some issue with having the implementation plan in this deliverable. The implementation plan is to be released by end of March. D6.1 got the plan due to a later update (before review time). So it should not be in D6.3

As it has been already reviewed though, I suggest the following:

The implementation plan included in D6.3 should be marked as tentative with an indication of an upcoming release.

@bdimitrako@cite.gr could you possibly consult with @dkatris@cite.gr who has a recently updated plan?

#22 - Feb 23, 2017 12:36 PM - Dimitris Katris

@gantzoulatos@i2s.gr Can you please consider to include the first suggestion of the reviewer in the development plan

#23 - Feb 28, 2017 04:13 PM - Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos

- Assignee changed from Charalampos Dimitrakopoulos to Pasquale Pagano

- Status changed from Reviewed to Feedback Processed

Dear @pasquale.pagano@isti.cnr.it

We accept the comments and I changed the document. The MoDiFied document is saved in the workspace under D6.3 Folder as "BlueBRIDGE_D6.3_M6_FullDoc_v2.1.bd.mdf.docx"

In this document a small paragraph in the executive summary has been added to present the changes after your feedback.

Comment 1: Content has been communicated.

Comments 2 and 4: Implementation plans updated (due dates are filled for all the activities that didn't have one). The implementation plans were marked as tentative, though.

Comment 3: An introduction has been added.

Thank you for the feedback.

#24 - Mar 06, 2017 03:55 PM - Pasquale Pagano

- Status changed from Feedback Processed to Sent to QAO

First of all let me thank you for applying all the changes I suggested. The resulting deliverable is very well-done.

I corrected the name of the reviewer, still assigned to Leonardo, and I generated the PDF and MSWord for the QAO.

You can find the documents at:

PDF: <https://goo.gl/edszOd>

MsWord: <https://goo.gl/7y7EKc>

#25 - Mar 06, 2017 03:56 PM - Pasquale Pagano

- Assignee changed from Pasquale Pagano to Leonardo Candela

#26 - Mar 08, 2017 11:23 AM - Leonardo Candela

- Status changed from Sent to QAO to Sent to Mgmt for Approval

#27 - Mar 16, 2017 05:02 PM - Leonardo Candela

- Status changed from Sent to Mgmt for Approval to Mgmt Body Approval

#28 - Mar 16, 2017 05:03 PM - Leonardo Candela

- Status changed from Mgmt Body Approval to Closed

Deliverable submitted to EC

A copy is on the workspace

<https://goo.gl/tto4af>