

Table of Contents

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

Deliverable Review Form

Identification of the deliverable or milestone	
Project: EMI	Deliverable or milestone identifier: DNA1.1
Title: Project Quality Assurance and Progress Monitoring Plan	Doc. identifier: EMI-DNA1.1-CDSREF-Project_QA_Plan-v0_5
Author(s): Alberto Di Meglio (NA1, CERN), Florida Estrella (NA1, CERN)	Due date: PM1 (May 2010)

Identification of the reviewer		
Name: Francesco Giacomini	Affiliation: INFN	EMI Activity: SA1

Review date	20/07/2010
Author(s) revision date	10/08/2010
Second review date	13/08/2010
Author(s) second revision date	17/08/2010
Reviewer acceptance date	24/08/2010

Trivial fixes have been included directly in the document with change tracking.

General comments

The document is satisfactory. The remarks in the table below suggest some improvements.

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

None.

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

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
1	7	1.4	<p>The text describing the amendment procedure will be very similar, if not identical, for all deliverable document with this description? Probably it would be this document in fact. -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Well, not necessarily. Different documents may have different amendment procedures. For example the QA Manager as responsible for the amendments and this doesn't make sense for other documents a more complex procedure with involvement of external parties. And so on. -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p> <p>In EGEE3 we used to write: Amendments, comments and suggestions should be sent to the authors. The procedures documented Management Procedure will be followed:</p>

			<p>http://project-EGEE-III-na1-qa.web.cern.ch/project-EGEE-III-NA1-QA/EGEE-III/Procedures/DocM</p> <p>and I've never seen anything different. My guess is that authors will simply cut&paste from previous EGEE3, so I keep suggesting that providing some boilerplate for the common case would be useful. The template, maybe with a note saying that one is free to change it if the procedure for that specific this document can in fact ignore the issue.</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 13-Aug-2010</p> <p>I've made the paragraph more generic in the template and added a note that the text can be adapted i</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 17-Aug-2010</p>
2	8	1.5	<p>The acronym VV is never used</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Removed</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
3	10	3.1	<p>Is "progress factor" a technical term? is so, it should be explained.</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>No, bad phrasing for 'performance indicators'. Replaced with that.</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
4	11	4	<p>The second paragraph is truncated after "and".</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Added missing table references</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
5	11	4	<p>Second row in table 2, about Project planning and reporting: which validation method and responsib</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Made correspondence between task, method and responsibility explicit</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
6	12	4.1.1	<p>CVS is still used at CERN, not only SVN.</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Added</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
7	14	4.1.4	<p>It would be useful to have template for risk management.</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Ok, will be added to TWiki</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
8	14	4.2.1	<p>"Submission - 30" is not immediately clear. Better something like: "30 days before submission date"</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Modified</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
9	14	4.2.1	<p>The TOC of a deliverable has to be validated by the task leader and WP leader in advance. It can sim</p> <p>the PEB, without the need to involve the PO</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Slightly modified to take this into account. However, the new phrasing leaves open the issue of how</p> <p>takes before they send it to the PEB. It is assumed that it is a very brief delay</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
10	15	4.2.1	<p>Item 4), about the twiki-based review form: In practice there is no difference wrt the procedure follo</p> <p>apart that editing in twiki is a greater pain. Twiki is a better option only if it allows more interactivit</p>

			<p>author, possibly all on the same page. Otherwise the dialog form is a better option, since the reviewer can sign the form at the end of the his/her review. Moreover the dates in the dialog form, e.g. the Review Date, are better, yyyy-mm-dd</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>The choice of TWiki was to allow greater flexibility and interactivity and track the comments close to the document. I'm not very happy myself with this, personally I would only use Word change tracking, using the log table to track the document for the comments. I'm open to suggestions, but I would leave them for the next revision of the document.</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p> <p>Comments in the document don't allow much iterativity either (just imagine this discussion managed in a table, it would be fine, but it cannot just emulate the dialog form, especially if one has to respect the tabular format as used for example as suggested in the "hints on good style" (bullet on how to deal with a discussion)). Comments should be in the document for all the comments! Just imagine writing all this into that! I'm reappraising the EMI process and I will certainly continue the discussion not in the scope of this document, but what should the reviewers do?</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 13-Aug-2010</p> <p>Although TWiki is not the most comfortable tool for editing, it allows some degree of interactivity and a detailed comments table can be used to discuss each topic as needed. It is recommended to use the TWiki signatures for each comment</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 17-Aug-2010</p>
11	15	4.2.1	<p>A note on how internal reviewers are chosen would be useful</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>The following has been added: "The reviewers have to be chosen taking into account the skills and the ability to understand and critically assess the document within the context of EMI. Possibly they should be chosen by the person issuing the deliverable, with the exception of JRA1 where the extent and diversity of skills may vary within the same WP. Whenever appropriate or necessary, external reviewers should also be considered. This is particularly concerning topics of relevance in the relationships of EMI with other projects or communities."</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p> <p>That sentence is certainly worth specifying, but I was rather referring to the procedure to choose reviewers. The author suggests the WPs that should provide a review and the leaders of those WPs then identifies the reviewers.</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 13-Aug-2010</p> <p>The following note has been added: "The Work Package leader is responsible to coordinate the process of selecting appropriate reviewers. The Work Package leader must contact other WP leaders within EMI or knowledgeable persons outside EMI and ask for their input. The WP leader is requested to make sure that reviewers are selected for each deliverable at least three weeks before the due date"</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 17-Aug-2010</p>
12	15	4.2.2	<p>A link to the template for the milestone report would be useful</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Added at point 1 of the procedure</p> <p>-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
13	15	4.2.2	<p>What if the milestone is not achieved? probably the PEB should discuss and define appropriate actions</p> <p>-- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>The following has been added at the end of the section: "If a milestone is not achieved within the expected time, we foresee appropriate time for discussion during the regular PEB meeting to identify the issue and define corrective actions. Changes of plan can also be considered in case the milestone is not relevant anymore due to changed circumstances. If a relevant milestone is not achieved even after reasonable corrective actions have been defined and implemented, the issue to the CB and discuss possible interventions on the Partner(s) responsible for the milestone."</p>

			-- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
14	16	4.2.3	How should a WP contribution to the QR/PR be provided? Should the document be uploaded to twiki or other? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 Right. I forgot this. Added in the procedure that it should be uploaded to TWiki -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
15	17	4.2.3	First item: "WP leaders provides contributions 20 days before the end of the period." I suppose it's a typo -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 No, this is the procedure for the Periodic Management Reports. the contributions should describe the work for the year and have to be put together in the full official report for the EC. The entire process has to start before the report has to be sent to the EC 10 working days before the Review and at the latest 45 days after the review -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
16	17	4.2.3	End of the section, why specify here that PD and WP leaders provide presentations? Should they also provide reports? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 No. Why? The presentations for the review and the PR are different things. But I agree that this sentence is redundant. I removed it, since the review process is described elsewhere -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
17	17	4.2.4	If/when CDS supports reviews, will our review procedures change? if that's a possibility, maybe merge the two sections? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 I thought of that, however, it is still not clear whether this is indeed the case. it seems to offer this feature as an option, which is not actually fond useful. In any case, I've added a sentence about this -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
18	18	4.2.5	Who decides the authors of a publication, so that they can be all acknowledged? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 Good question. I'm not sure I have an answer. Should the PEB or PTB be involved or should this be left to the authors? It is difficult to enforce specific authors for papers concerning the detailed work of individual PTs. The PEB is responsible in the case of general overview papers about EMI -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010 Whatever, but what is in the document now ("All authors have to be acknowledged") is not satisfactory -- FrancescoGiacomini - 13-Aug-2010 I've tried to clarify this issue in the text. The main point is that the 'authors' to be acknowledge are authors who have produced some of the work described in the paper. in addition, all paper describing relevant EMI work should be reviewed by the PEB for verification and dissemination -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 17-Aug-2010
19	18	4.2.5	Include the exact wording on how to acknowledge the EC funding contribution -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 Added -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010
20	19	4.3	Provide more details on how documents should be versioned, not just "The version of the documents should be updated on revision" -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010 Added detailed description at the end of the section -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010 Good attempt, but there is something wrong at least with the first item:

			<p>The version number is composed of two (2) numbers and has the format x.y. The three numbers are version (y) and revision number (z) respectively. (emphasis mine) -- FrancescoGiacomini - 13-Aug-2010</p> <p>Fixed the inconsistency. The version number should be three, although z can be omitted if z=0 -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 17-Aug-2010</p>
21	21	5.1	<p>KSA1.1 should be reviewed/removed. See discussions on User Support in the PEB -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Can it be redefined? If we remove it, we do not have any metric about the number of incidents. We s receive. We should probably replace Service Desk with a more appropriate term, but leave the KPI -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
22	28	6.3	<p>Aren't three rehearsals a bit too much? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>In my experience, they are not enough. Take into account that the first is to get initial drafts and disc second is to work on the details and the third is to properly rehearse timing and smoothness of delive -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
23	30	7	<p>Why are deliverable review dialog forms protected? how to do this in twiki? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Indeed, no need to restrict them. In any case, TWiki has a protection mechanism based on login nam Reports for example -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
24	30	7	<p>There are probably missing links corresponding to "EU Quarterly and Periodical Report" and "EU re -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>The assumption was that CDS was going to be in place by now. For the moment I've added links to t -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
25	30	7	<p>It would be nice if https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EmiKPIs or equivalent page would be g -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Yes, but how? I will provide a template, but I don't see any way of creating the content automatically numbers and NA1 fill the TWiki pages manually -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
26	31	8.1	<p>No ODS/OpenOffice for spreadsheets? -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Added -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>
27	32	8.6	<p>About EVO: mention that we have already a room (or whatever is called) and how to access and use -- FrancescoGiacomini - 20-Jul-2010</p> <p>Added. There is no direct link to the communities, as far as I know, but I've explained where to find -- AlbertoDiMeglio - 08-Aug-2010</p>

This topic: EMI > ReviewDNA11FG

Topic revision: r9 - 2010-08-24 - AlbertoDiMeglio



Copyright &© 2008-2022 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