

Table of Contents

Appendix: EMI Tracker Mappings.....	1
1. RfC field mapping.....	1
2. RfC states mapping.....	2
3. SA2.3 XML mapping.....	3
4. Fields under discussion.....	4
Review Information.....	4

Appendix: EMI Tracker Mappings

This is an appendix to the Change Management Policy. It presents the mappings of the different tracking tools used by EMI product teams to track RfCs. It shows the mapping of the required field according to the Change Management Policy to the corresponding field in the PT tracker tool.

1. RfC field mapping

The following table presents the mapping of the different EMI trackers to the mandatory RfC fields:

RfC Field	Definition	ARC Bugzilla ↗	dCache RT	gLite Savannah ↗	UNICORE SourceForge ↗	StoRM Redmine ↗	MPI Trac
Unique Identifier/URL	a URL pointing to a description of the RfC. If the RfC concerns a security vulnerability the URL should point to a private page. The URL acts also as a unique identifier for the RfC.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Associated GGUS tickets	If applicable, one or more URLs pointing to GGUS tickets that have caused the opening of this RfC	✓ URL	✓ GGUS_ID	✓ GGUS reference URL	⚠ GGUS URL added in the Details field as free text.	✓	✓
Affected Product	EMI Product List as specified in DNA1.3.2	✓ Product	✓ Product	✓	⚠ Category field exists but doesn't match DNA1.3.2	✓ Affected Product	✓ Component
Affected EMI Major release	EMI major release affected by the RfC	✓ It can be mapped to an ARC release since there's 1:1 correspondence to EMI releases	✓ EMI	✓ Baseline Release	⚠	✓	✓
Affected Platforms	Whether the RfC is platform-specific and, if so, which are the affected platforms	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Priority	Immediate, High, Medium or Low	✓ 1 (Immediate) 2 (High) 3 (Medium) 4 5 (Low)	✓ Priority numerical field	✓ Immediate, High, Medium, Low	✓ 1 2 (Low) 3 4 5 (Medium) 6 7 8 (High) 9 (immediate)	✓ Immediate, High, Normal, Low	✓ Low, Medium, High, Immediate

Defect vs Feature	Whether the RfC is to fix a defect or to introduce a new feature.	✔ One severity level is feature request	✔ Two different Queues, one for defect and one for feature.	✔ Severity field exist but not sure PTs use it properly to differentiate defect and features.	✔ Defects are in the Bug tracker, New features are in the Enhancements and Improvements and Feature Requests tracker	✔ Bug vs Feature	✔ Defect VS Feature
Detection Area	The context in which the version of the component affected by the change is available. Possible values are production, testing and development	✔ Implied by release version. Development has a special release tag CVS, and Testing are release candidate versions. Everything else is Production	⚠ One possible value only: Development	✔ Bug Detection Area	⚠ One possible value only: Development	✔	✔
Target EMI major release	The target EMI major release where the RfC will be available.	✔ ARC release field it can be mapped to EMI release 1:1	✔ field can be mapped to EMI release 1:1	✔ Release	✔ UNICORE release field it can be mapped to EMI release 2	✔	✔

⚠ For the mandatory fields that are not present in the trackers by default, middlewares must provide the missing information in the XML file needed by SA2.3 to calculate metrics.

2. RfC states mapping

The following table presents the mapping of the different EMI trackers to the mandatory RfC states.

State	ARC State Description ↗	dCache State Description ↗	gLite State Description	UNICORE	StoRM State Description ↗	MPI	GitHub
Open	✔ Unconfirmed New Reopened	✔ EMI Open	✔ Open	✔ Open	✔ New	✔ New	✔
Accepted	✔ Assigned	✔ Accepted	✔ Accepted	✔ Accepted	✔ In progress	✔ Accepted	⚠ not defined
Fixed	✔ Resolved/Fixed	✔ EMI Resolved	✔ Integration Candidate	✔ Fixed	✔ Resolved	✔ Fixed	✔
Tested/Not Tested	✔ Verified/Fixed	✔ EMI Certified/Not Certified	✔ Fix Certified/Fix not Certified	✔ Separate testing tracker	✔ Tested/Not Tested	✔ Tested/Not Tested	⚠ not defined
Closed	✔ Closed (after released to production)	✔ EMI Closed	✔ Closed (after released to production)	✔ Closed (after fix committed to VCS)	✔ Closed	✔ Closed (after fixed. Then ticket reopened and closed again with tested/not	✔

						tested)	
Resolution state	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolved/Fixed Resolved/Invalid Resolved/Wontfix Resolved/Duplicate Resolved/Worksforme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Won't fix Invalid Unreproducible Obsolete	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fixed Invalid Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejected Closed (Positive State)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fixed Tested/Not Tested Invalid Won't Fix Duplicate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not defined

For the states that are not present in the trackers by default, middlewares must provide the missing information in the XML file needed by SA2.3 to calculate metrics.

3. SA2.3 XML mapping

In order to calculate metrics, SA2.3 needs to gather information from the different trackers. This is done exporting the tracker information to an XML file that follows a schema defined by SA2.3. The schema represents the required RfC fields defined in the Change Management Policy.

The following table presents the mapping of the different XML files with the existing schema defined by SA2.3 in order to properly calculate metrics:

RfC field	XML Element	ARC ↗	dCache ↗	gLite ↗	UNICORE ↗	StoRM ↗	MPI ↗	GitHub ↗
Unique Identifier/URL	UID	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Associated GGUS tickets	GGUS ticket	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not defined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not defined
Affected Product	Component	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product names do not follow DNA1.3.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product names do not follow DNA1.3.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Affected EMI Major release	AffectedEMIMajorRelease	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Affected Platforms	AffectedPlatforms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Priority	Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> But all tickets are low!	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Defect vs Feature	Severity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> But all are defects!	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Detection Area	DetectionArea	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No testing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No production or testing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No production or testing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Target EMI major release	TargetEMIMajorRelease	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Status	Status and StatusChangeTimestamps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Associated Test	Associated Test	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not defined

To be followed up:

- UNICORE reports that it will be difficult for them to differentiate between Target EMI major release and Affected EMI Major release. If this is really needed we have to understand with them how they can provide this information.
- UNICORE has problems to include the GGUS ticket information. It's suggested to mark as production those RfCs that come from a GGUS ticket since otherwise it doesn't seem feasible to

provide this now.

4. Fields under discussion

None

The following field has been renamed to `Associated Test` to make it valid for regression and functionality tests. It was already discussed and approved by all PTs. It has been added to the Change Management Policy as of v3.3:

Proposed RfC Field	Definition	ARC Bugzilla ↗	dCache RT	gLite Savannah ↗	UNICORE SourceForge ↗	StoRM Redmine ↗
Regression Test	Field indicating whether the RfC has an associated Regression Test	✔ OK to add in XML file	✔ OK to add in tracker	✔ OK to add in tracker	✔ OK to add in XML file	✔ OK to add in tracker

Comment from dCache: Regression tests will be there for all major features that EMI releases will have starting from EMI 2. For EMI 1 it won't be provided.

Review Information

The table below explains whether the information displayed in this twiki has been reviewed by the PTs, when it was the last time it was reviewed and which changes have been applied.

Tracker	Reviewed by	Date	Comments from reviewer	Comments from SA2
ARC	Oxana Smirnova	15.06.2011	Clarified the existence of some fields or how they can be known otherwise through other means.	10.06.2011: Table created 15.06.2011: Added comments from Oaxanna. 18.08.2011: Reviewed XML mappings and send feedback to SA2.3. 01.09.2011: Added info in XML files for missing fields that are now included.
dCache	Christian Bernardt	18.08.2011	Update unclear fields	10.06.2011: Table created 18.08.2011: Reviewed XML mappings and send feedback to SA2.3.
gLite	Maria Alandes	05.07.2011	No feedback from gLite EMT mailing list. I assume developers agree with mapping.	10.06.2011: Table created 18.08.2011: Reviewed XML mappings and send feedback to SA2.3.
UNICORE	Krzysztof Benedyczak	14.06.2011	Krzysztof explains why some fields are missing and how the needed info is provided by other means.	10.06.2011: Table created 14.06.2011: Added comments from Krzysztof. 18.08.2011: Reviewed XML mappings and send feedback to SA2.3.
StoRM	Michele Dibenedetto	13.07.2011	Feedback on some missing fields	22.06.2011: Table created 13.07.2011: Feedback applied 18.08.2011: Reviewed XML mappings and send feedback to SA2.3.

MPI	Enol Fernández	04.10.2011	Everything OK.	03.10.2011: Table created
-----	----------------	------------	----------------	---------------------------

- General review on 04.10.2011. Results reported in [TASK:22734](#).
-

This topic: EMI > EMITrackerMappings

Topic revision: r36 - 2013-04-09 - unknown



Copyright &© 2008-2021 by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.
or Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? use [Discourse](#) or [Send feedback](#)