

# Table of Contents

<b>PO 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

# PO Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: D5.7.2
Title: DJRA1.7.2 - Software Development Quality Control Report	Doc. identifier: DJRA1.7.2-TOC.pdf
Author(s): A. Ceccanti	Due date: 190411

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: F. Estrella	Affiliation: CERN	EMI Activity/External project or Institute: NA1

Review date	mm/dd/yyyy
Author(s) revision date	mm/dd/yyyy
Reviewer acceptance date	mm/dd/yyyy

Attach the reviewed document to the deliverable page, put here a link

## General comments

This is a well written document. Please take these comments as suggestions to further improve this already well-written well-presented report.

1. Please provide %s whenever possible
  - 3.3.1 Most PTs provided a test plan
  - 3.3.3 Unit tests are mandatory for all the EMI software components
  - 3.3.5 Most PTs included deployment and configuration reports
  - 3.3.6 Certification
  - 3.4 Some PTs did not convert the documentation to PDF
  
2. It should be made clear in the document when the QC work being done is outside the scope of JRA1 or in collaboration with SA1 or SA2  
 eg Chapter 4 "The QC review was coordinated by Giuseppe Fiameni and shared among five persons (Maria Alandes Pradillo, Claudio Cacciari, Andrea Ceccanti, Jozef Cernak and Giuseppe Fiameni)"
  
3. Fully compliant 30%. Are the figures for those missing 1 or 2 or 3 criteria available? It may show better %s (this is in addition to the overall percentage of 30%)
  
4. ETICS statements: see fw-ed email from Alberto and Lorenzo
  
5. Conclusions:
 

" Quality is not perceived by PTs as a crucial aspect of their development work and the policies defined by SA2 are often considered useless bureaucracy. "

are you referring to quality broadly or specifically to certain criteria? looking at the results of individual criterion, it is may not be necessary to make such sweeping statement?

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

## Detailed comments on the content

**Note 1:** The reviewers must list here any observation they want to track explicitly and that require interaction with the authors

Alternatively all changes must be listed in the document itself using Word change tracking features (if you use Word)

**Note 2:** These comments have to be explicitly addressed by the authors and the action taken must be clearly described

N°	Page	Section	Observations and Replies	Is Addressed?
1	xx	x.y	Sequence of comments and replies separated by twiki signature and date	
2	9	3.1	"the updated version of EMI configuration and integration policy and the introduction of the new dependency resolution mechanism in the 1.5 version of the ETICS client" can you please include the reason/rationale behind the change in policy and ETICS changes if these changes were necessary or critical or part of EMI strategy we should mention it and not leave room for misinterpretation.	
3	9	3.2	"Most components required radical changes in the way their packages were structured in order to comply with the EMI packaging policy" idem #2  "86% of the packages provide buildable source RPMs" how many buildable source RPMs we have on day 1 010510? if this is a notable highlight, we should report it as such	
4	10	3.3.4	"The status of regression testing for EMI components is monitored by SA1 QC activity and will not be covered in this report." Would you be able to check with SA1 and include a one-line status of the regression testing?	
5	10	3.3.6	Second paragraph not finished	
6	12	4	"Maria Alandes Pradillo, Claudio Cacciari, Andrea Ceccanti, Jozef Cernak and Giuseppe Fiameni" Can you add their roles and activities eg Maria Alandes Pradillo (SA2 QA team or something)	
7	13	4.1.1	Tabella->Table	
8	17	4.2	Suggest to remove "are not really promising and"  useless bureaucracy->unnecessary bureaucracy  Provide tools to QC->SA2 to provide tools to QC (?)	
9	18	5	"better communication between SA2 and JRA1 is recommended in order to increase awareness in PTs of the quality process."-> better communication between the quality assurance and development teams...	

Any other modification, spelling or grammatical corrections, etc must be done directly in the document using tracked changes or similar mechanisms that allows the authors to identify which correction is suggested.

-- FloridaEstrella - 25-May-2011

This topic: EMI > ReviewDJRA172PO

Topic revision: r1 - 2011-05-25 - 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](#)