

The two articles, *The Science Gateways Community Institute at Two Years* and *Lightning Talk: The Science Gateways Community Institute – Supporting Communities to Achieve Sustainability for Their Science Gateways*, both discuss the purpose of the Science Gateway Community Institute. The first explains the inner workings of the organization, while the latter discusses the SGCI from the sponsor's perspective.

*The Science Gateways Community Institute at Two Years* discusses the purpose of the SGCI in the development of science gateways as a business. The article breaks the SGCI's learning from operating science gateways down into six key pieces: incubator, extended developer support, scientific software collaborative, community engagement and exchange, workforce development, and management. The incubator refers to consulting services provided to participants, which can range from the standard teaching to intensive tutoring. According to *The Science Gateways Community Institute at Two Years*, tutoring services can both improve the experience of the participants and are surprisingly efficient as a method. The extended workforce development aspect encourages gateways to support free developers who show promise in their work and can aid in the goals of the gateway's institution. This is done through a process of application for support followed by the gateway's support in the form of consultation and finances on the condition that developers deliver the desired product. This allows the gateway to grow its personnel and populate it with talented personnel while supporting lesser known developers. The scientific software collaborative aspect refers to creating a communal tool that accommodates the needs of clients looking for gateways and supports the needs of gateway developers. This need is fulfilled through the development of an app that allows users to discover potential gateways to participate in and gateway developers to obtain the necessary equipment for the development of their gateway as well as test that gateway in the same space. The community engagement and exchange aspect refers to engaging not only with the general public, but the scientific community as well. Gateways should not only engage with the wider community, but also bring experienced personnel to the table to allow beginners to learn from their experiences. The workforce development aspect refers to developing the next generation of personnel. Development is done by identifying skilling participants and improving both their technical and non-technical skills. The final aspect, management, compels gateways to take a more entrepreneur approach to running their gateway. This means using the core beliefs of a business and utilizing free resources to achieve its objective. In summary, the SGCI advises gateway developers to rethink their processes and to run their gateways with methods more in line with businesses.

*Lightning Talk: The Science Gateways Community Institute – Supporting Communities to Achieve Sustainability for Their Science Gateways* takes a look at the SGCI in the eyes of a gateway developer. The article explains the core tenets of the SGCI, being the incubator, extended developer support, scientific software collaborative, community engagement and exchange, workforce development, and how they are crucial to a potential gateway developer. The article encourages the SGCI's approach of aiding gateways as a way of staving off the disillusionment that scientists go through after a project has run its course.

The two articles share a common point of encouraging the development of science gateways. The first article does so by providing a model to follow and illustrating the benefits of creating a science gateway. The benefits are shown in the explanations of the key ideas of how to run a gateway and in the early successes in Cosmic Squared and Qubes. The second article encourages prospective developers. It explains why projects like science gateways fail and how the SGCI can prevent such scenarios from occurring. However, the two are very different in their approach in encouraging others.

The two articles differ in their approach in attracting prospective developers. The first article's approach is to deconstruct a gateway into what the gateway needs to provide and what needs to be provided to the project for it to run smoothly. It is not focused on attracting new developers. Instead, the first article is meant for gateway developers who have already decided to create a science gateway. On the other hand, the second article is meant to attract new developers by showing where projects like gateways fail and how the SGCI can prevent such.