GovTool Git(Hub) workflow proposal

by example

User story

As a team leader

I want to coordinate delivery of features to staging,

so they can be reviewed by product owners.

Case study

- Two features are ready.
- Only one is picked to be delivered.
- The picked feature is reviewed and QA tested.
- The picked feature end up on staging/preprod to be further received by PO.

Scenario #1

current workflow

• 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- **featB** has to be rebased to actual **develop**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- To deliver to **test** we need to:
 - create a branch from **test**,
 - cherry-pick featA commits,
 - merge to **test**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- test-candidate is created.
- To deliver to **test** we need to:
 - cherry-pick featA commits,
 - merge to **test**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.

- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- test-candidate is created.
- Commits from **featA** are cherry-picked.
- **test-candidate** is merged after a review to **test**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- test-candidate is created.
- Commits from **featA** are cherry-picked.
- **test-candidate** is merged after a review to **test**.
- QA tests are performed on **test**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to **develop**.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- test-candidate is created.
- Commits from **featA** are cherry-picked.
- test-candidate is merged after a review to test.
- QA tests are performed on test.
- To deliver to **staging** we need to:
 - create a branch from staging,

 - merge to **staging**. 0

cherry-pick **test** commits, test-candidate test staging featA featB develop

- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is merged after a review.
- featB has to be rebased to actual develop and featB is merged after review to develop.
- A decision is made to deliver only **featA**.
- test-candidate is created.
- Commits from **featA** are cherry-picked.
- **test-candidate** is merged after a review to **test**.
- QA tests are performed on **test**.
- To deliver to **staging** we need to:
 - create a branch from **staging**,
 - ← cherry-pick test commits,
 - merge test into staging,
 - merge to **staging**.

CAVEAT: In this simple scenario we don't have to cherry pick commits, but it is an edge case!

-0 -0-0

develop

Scenario #1: current workflow - risks

• Every **decision to pick** only some selected **features** from the pool of all available features **leads to cherry-picking** of either regular commits or merge commits.

staging

test-candidate

test

featA

featB develop

- Cherry-picking creates a potential of human error (missing parts of a feature, dependencies, etc.)
- A pull request crafted by cherry-picking features has to be reviewed because of the above.
- The source branch (like branch "develop" in example) is never a continuation of the target branch (like "test"), it is a fork. Therefore the cherry-picking is necessary.
- This burdensome process is repeated on three different stages of the current workflow: develop > test, test > staging and staging > beta.
- Testing on reviewed features is on hold until the test-candidate is merged, thus tasks are in limbo state where they are completed, but not yet tested.
- There is a possibility that some cherry-picks will cause conflicts that has to be resolved by person with a knowledge not only in the git tool, but also in a domain, language, frameworks, libraries, etc.

Scenario #2

proposal

• 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- At this point the **featA** is ready to be deployed on preprod (aka staging).



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featA** is merged to **preprod**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- **featA** is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featA** is merged to **preprod**.
- **featB** is reviewed.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featA** is merged to **preprod**.
- featB is reviewed.
- **featB** is deployed to be QA tested.
- At this point the **featB** is ready to be deployed on preprod (aka staging).

PR#1 featB #testB featA #testA preprod

- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featA** is merged to **preprod**.
- featB is reviewed.
- **featB** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featB** is merged to **preprod**.



- 2 developers are working on 2 different tasks.
- featA is reviewed.
- **featA** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featA** is merged to **preprod**.
- featB is reviewed.
- **featB** is deployed to be QA tested.
- **featB** is merged to **preprod**.
- ...

Scenario #2: proposal - risks

• Every **decision to pick** only some selected **features** from the pool of all available features **leads to cherry-picking** of either regular commits or merge commits.

featB

#testB

featA

#testA

preprod

- Cherry-picking creates a potential of human error (missing parts of a feature, dependencies, etc.)
- A pull request crafted by cherry-picking features has to be reviewed because of the above.
- The source branch (like branch "develop" in example) is never a continuation of the target branch (like "test"), it is a fork. Therefore the cherry-picking is necessary.
- This process is repeated on ONE stage of the workflow: staging > beta.
- Testing on reviewed features is on hold until the test-candidate is merged, thus tasks are in limbo state where they are completed, but not yet tested.
- There is a possibility that **some cherry-picks will cause conflicts** that has to be resolved by person with a **knowledge not only in the git tool**, **but also in a domain, language**, **frameworks, libraries, etc.**

Scenario #2: proposal - benefits

- Pull requests are merged only when fully reviewed and tested.
- The preprod branch is a place to start development from.
- No need of cherry picking anything to deliver work to QA nor PO.
- By utilising tags QA can trace their work by referring to a certain points in preprod history.
- Less PRs to review.
- Less points where human error can occur.
- Less engagement needed of the competent developer to formulate push-candidates.



