Scoring Up Guidelines

(V1 - April 6th, 2022)

This document contains the guidelines to score up a fail in the deliverable #S1. Specifically, the teams should prepare a report with Lessons learned "LessonsLearnedReport.pdf" with the analysis of the failure and the designed actions to solve the root cause and mitigate the risk in the future. In case the team successfully deliver a fine report, they could score up and obtain **up to 6% weight for the #S1 deliverable**.

Expected content of the Lessons Learned Report

The Lessons Learned Report should be a stand-alone document and should provide a comprehensive analysis of problems that caused the failure of the previous deliverable and should include ,at least, the following sections:

- Description of the method of analysis of the failure conditions.
- List of the failure conditions detected by the application of the analysis that should include, at least, the set of failure conditions identified by the Software Reviewer in the deliverable.
- Software development methodology followed and the roles of all team members in the iteration under analysis.
- For each failure conditions:
  - Origin at the technical level. For example, the incompatibility of the use of a certain technology or library with another technology or deployment infrastructure used.
  - Origin at the process level. For example, if you follow SCRUM, it is common to find problems by inadequately performing or not performing activities such as Sprint Planning, Sprint Review or Daily Scrum.
  - Error source:
    - Person/People or System who introduced or generated the specific failure condition.
    - In case of a Person/People: Role(s) in the team.
  - Error Responsible:
    - Person/People who allowed the failure condition to be part of the deliverable.
    - Role/s in the team
  - Mitigating actions aimed at resolving or mitigating the failure condition in future deliverables at both the technical and process level.
  - Classification (along with a justification of the status if not "Resolved") based on the following statuses:
    - "Resolved"

- ■ "In the process of being resolved"
- ■ "Pending analysis".

Lessons Learned Report Evaluation Rubric

The report will have three potential evaluations depending on the following criteria:

- ● ACCEPTED (100%)
  - ○ All errors that led to the failure conditions of the previous deliverable have been analyzed.
  - ○ Effective mitigating actions are proposed for all errors.
- ● SUFFICIENT (50%)
  - ○ All errors that led to the conditions failure of the previous deliverable reported by the reviewer have been analyzed.
  - ○ Some of the mitigating actions are not considered effective for all failure conditions.
- ● INSUFFICIENT
  - ○ Not all errors that caused the failure conditions of the previous deliverable reported by the reviewer have been analyzed.
  - ○ Technical mitigating actions do not solve the specific problem.
  - ○ Mitigating actions in the development process do not prevent future errors of the same type.
  - ○ Recurring errors.

In this rubric, the percentages refer to the recovery over the maximum available weight (6%). For example: A group with a FAIL on the deliverable, who submits a Lessons Learned Report that is evaluated as SUFFICIENT would have a recovered weight of 3% (6% x 50%).