

# Table of Contents

<b>SA1 Deliverable Review Form.....</b>	<b>1</b>
General comments.....	1
Additional recommendations (not affecting the document content, e.g. recommendation for future work).....	1
Detailed comments on the content.....	2

# SA1 Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: D4.2.1
Title: DSA2.2.1 - QA Tools Documentation	Doc. identifier: EMI-DSA2.2.1-QA_Tools_Documentation-v1.doc
Author(s): L. Dini	Due date: 15/12

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: Ricardo Rocha	Affiliation: CERN	EMI Activity/External project or Institute: SA1

Review date	08/12/2010
Author(s) revision date	16/12/2010
Reviewer acceptance date	mm/dd/yyyy

Reviewed Document

## General comments

The document is well written and provides a nice read.

That said, its contents are short compared to what is stated in the abstract (which might be due to my ignorance on whether this document is final or will have additional content added later in the project).

1. The abstract states the document describes tools provided by SA2 to EMI, but it would be more appropriate to say that it describes an analysis made of currently used tools by PTs and the requirements coming from the teams. And that this will be the input for the selection of tools to be supported by SA2 (or at least to be integrated with the common toolchain for QA).
2. There is no reference of timescales for the next step (tool selection) or expectations on when the common system would be available - which given the duration of the project is relevant (i imagine it is defined in some other document, but i couldn't get it from this one). It could be useful also to mention time limits up to when this effort would be useful for the current project, or if the same effort and its conclusions are to be somehow kept/reused after the project is finished.
3. Section 7 is too big (the biggest in the document) to be useful when reading the document from start to finish, or compared to the contribution to the overall document, as it is not yet the list of tools to be supported. It could be better to have a shorter overview with more useful content: basic pros/cons of each tool, why these tools were pre-selected and others got dropped. And leave the multi-line tool description to an appendix, in the same style as it is done for the survey results.

*This document was due at PM2 therefore cannot include many details about the work done in the last 6 months. The aim of this first version is to give a state of the art description of the tools available on the market (before their evaluation and selection) and to describe the initial project situation. A new revision of this deliverable will be prepared in May 2011 which will include the evaluation of the tools and their selection, the progress of the last 6 months in using and integrating the tools and a time-line for the next 2 years about the evolution of such tools. -- LorenzoDini - 16-Dec-2010*

## Additional recommendations (not affecting the document content, e.g. recommendation for future work)

As it is well said in Section 3., PTs have different cultures, processes, and use different tools when approaching software engineering. Any required change on their habits, even if not fundamental, will not be naturally taken as high priority and will therefore take time to be implemented. The limited project duration

should be taken as a potential threat to the success of the task. As such, it would be nice to understand how this effort could be reused after the project is finished.

*Excellent point to be discussed. I am not sure though this deliverable is the best place to have this discussion. As far as I know the various middleware distributions do not want that the EMI infrastructure replaces their own because of sustainability issues. They will keep their own infrastructures ready to be resumed once the project is over and no continuation is planned. I would trigger this discussion at the PEB or even PTB --*  
LorenzoDini - 16-Dec-2010

## Detailed comments on the content

All in the document using change tracking.

*All tracked changes have been applied, the terminology has been also improved --* LorenzoDini - 16-Dec-2010

-- FloridaEstrella - 08-Dec-2010

---

This topic: EMI > DSA221ReviewSA1

Topic revision: r3 - 2010-12-16 - unknown



Copyright &© 2008-2020 by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.

Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? Send feedback