★ N **CPE656TL-9** Created by Corey 18 Sep 2015 14:15   🏷 **PeerReview**

Review Configuration Management Draft

The team needs to review the material proposed for configuration management and provide feedback so that we can have versions in place.

Priority: **Normal**
Type: **Task**
State: **Fixed**
Assignee: **Rashad**
Subsystem: **ProjectProgress**
Fix versions: **Sprint 1**
Affected versions: **Unknown**
Fixed in build: **Next Build**
Estimation: **?**

Updated by Corey 12 Oct 2015 15:26   📎

Comments (11)   History

Corey — 18 Sep 2015, 14:54

Thanks again Rashad for doing the draft of the document. I will attach my comments in the review a review version, but to recap. I think that is looks good, but I have the following.
COMMENT: We probably want to include details on what a formal versus informal review looks like.
I think that an informal review should be defined as a review where feedback is provided to the author, but not record is kept about the details of the feedback.
As far as the formal review, I think we need to clearly state how that is going to work as practices.

What do you guys think about using YouTrack issues to capture reviews / team approval?

We can develop some form of Test Template to include in the description or as a comment, so that we know where to look to see the outcome.

COMMENT: I think that the project meeting summaries should be in a separate document. We probably need a template for this as well. I suggest that we can basically have it answer the questions we had already mentioned for what we want out of a status meeting.
I'm not sure how we want to organize formal interviews with the customer. We probably want to date that and save it in the repository and that's it.

COMMENT: We need to describe who is responsible for audits? Will that be the configuration manager as well?

COMMENT: Releases. I think that we should be able to email the customer and ask for him to respond

back to acknowledge that what is in the release document looks good. We can then print to PDF his response and save that for the approval. I think that version should start becoming formal after the first release to the customer. From there, changes must be formal and be toward a new version. That version is finalized after it follows the configuration management process and is approved by all of the team / is released to the customer.

A full product release should be a group of all of the work products that are included as part of the system expected for the customer to use. We can double check with Dr. Kulick, but I think pretty much the project description, requirements spec, design document, test plan, test description document, user manual, and navigation software components, will basically constitute a release. If testing fails or for some other reason, he rejects the delivery or we need to make an additional delivery of that group, that will be another release.

We can use the tags in git to mark releases. I also recommend that we use tags to mark versions.

For a product release, it is typical that you create a new branch to act as the baseline. I think it makes sense for us to work from the main branch until we get close to delivery and from there we should create a branch to prepare for delivery. We then tag the version that we intend to release. and point releases subsequently get tagged.

If this was an ongoing project, then any future additions to the system would be worked out of the main branch.

We also need to be sure to have in the test plan the mention that we have to make sure that corrections made in the release branch are propagated to the main branch.

Corey — 23 Sep 2015, 14:39

DEFECT: The table at the top of the plan needs to have a Figure label. Also it is missing the Moderator Role in the table. The Roles section is missing a description of the responsibilities of a Project Manager. It may seem obvious, but the document needs to make clear what our team expects of every role.

Rashad — 28 Sep 2015, 06:25

Think I addressed most of these issues. I've attached another draft with some additional changes. Please review and make changes/additions if you want to.

Corey — 01 Oct 2015, 01:53

Your changes look great. I have a little more feedback.
DEFECT:
Create figures demonstrating step by step how to add a new document and how to update an existing one.

Corey — 02 Oct 2015, 03:57

To elaborate, I think that we need to describe how to create an initial version of a document from genesis to it initially being put into GitHub. (Add a new document).
For updating a document, it should describe the steps that it takes to get a document that already exists in GitHub to be modified as a change in GitHub.

Corey — 05 Oct 2015, 22:53

DEFECT: According to Dr.Kulick, he requested that we include the version information for the tools that we have selected to confirm to the plan.
DEFECT: We should also include any special settings or configurations that we used with our tools.

Rashad — 07 Oct 2015, 04:22

This issues are duplicated in the Review Team Operation plan

Corey — 10 Oct 2015, 19:39

Attached is my feedback from the latest version

Corey — 10 Oct 2015, 20:23

DEFECT:
List work products under change control.

Corey — 10 Oct 2015, 21:30

DEFECT: List Canvas as a tool for Product Delivery in Configuration Management in the Tools section.

Corey — 12 Oct 2015, 15:22

Attached is the version that will be the first release. I have corrected all defects listed above as well as done the following:
Added a title page, revision history page, and table of contents. I have also created a description of how specifically we can make software changes. It basically involves us created feature branches per developer and having the developer place changes for review before they get pushed from the feature branch to the mainline branch we use to create releases from. We can of course change this, but I wanted to go ahead and include this section so that we can release the first draft. I also did a few minor spelling/grammar corrections and improved formatting of the document.
Feel free to post any feedback on this edition. We can do a point release if needed based on feedback.