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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors and Contributors** | | | |
| **Date** | **Name** | **Contacts** | **Contribution** |
| 16-03-2013 | Mário Oliveira | a21170292@alunos.isec.pt | Author |
| 16-03-2013 | Filipe Brandão | a21180276@alunos.isec.pt | Author |
| 23-03-2013 | Carla Machado | a21170460@alunos.isec.pt | Contributor |
| 30-03-2013 | Rui Ganhoto | a21170262@alunos.isec.pt | Contributor |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 1: List of Contributors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revision History** | | | | | |
| **Date** | **Description** | **Author** | **Version** | **Approvers** | **State** |
| 16-03-2013 | Creation of first draft | Mário Oliveira & Filipe Brandão | 0.1 |  | Draft |
| 16-03-2013 | Minor corrections | Filipe Brandão | 0.2 |  | Draft |
| 17-03-2013 | Changing state | Filipe Brandão | 0.2 |  | Ready for Revision |
| 23-03-2013 | Corrections according to the past progress meeting(4) | Filipe Brandão & Mário Olivera | 0.3 |  | Draft |
| 23-03-2013 | Changing State | Filipe Brandão | 0.3 |  | Ready for Revision |
| 23-03-2013 | Document Review | Carla Machado | 0.3 |  | Ready for Revision |
| 23-03-2013 | Corrections based on previous review | Filipe Brandão & Mário Oliveira | 0.4 |  | Draft |
| 23-03-2013 | Changing state | Filipe Brandão & Mário Oliveira | 0.4 |  | Ready for Revision |
| 23-03-2013 | Document Review | Carla Machado | 0.4 |  | Ready for Revision |
| 28-03-2013 | Changing State | Filipe Brandão | 0.4 |  | Ready for Approval |
| 30-03-2013 | Document Aproval | Rui Ganhoto | 0.4 |  | Ready for Aproval |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2: Version history

# Purpose

The purpose of this process is to help ensure the development of a product that satisfies the stakeholders. By using this process, the team can improve the artifacts quality thus increasing the confidence on its product.

# Inputs and Outputs

# Inputs

The input for this process will be an artifact for revision.

# Outputs

The output of this process will be the corrected artifact alongside all the documentation produced during the Revision process.

# Activities

* The Project Manager and the Quality Manager are responsible for the scheduling of the reviews of any artifact. Furthermore it’s their responsibility evaluating its importance and choosing the review method accordingly:
* High importance – Inspection:
  + Define roles (everyone but the author are picked randomly):
    - Author:
      * Just answers questions posed by the reader, and does the rework
    - Moderator:
      * Is not the author or author’s chief. Moderates all the process. Decides if the artifact is ready for inspection, chooses team, guarantees an effective meeting, checks if defects have been corrected
    - Reader:
      * Is neither the author nor the moderator. Conducts the team through the artifact during the meeting
    - Recorder:
      * Records the defects, comments and suggestions.
  + Execute the following phases:
    - Planning:
      * The author collects the artifact to be inspected plus all the related material. The moderator checks if it is complete and arranges the meeting by assigning roles and distributing the material
    - Overview (optional):
      * During this meeting the author introduces the artifact to be inspected
    - Preparation:
      * Each inspector must prepare for the meeting by reviewing the material and noting the possible defects and doubts
    - Meeting:
      * The reader conducts the team through the artifact and answers any questions from the inspectors. If a defect is found it’s annotated by the annotator. A defect is any part of the artifact that will keep an inspector from approving it
      * The Discussion should be focused on detecting defects in the artifact not criticizing the author
      * The annotator compiles all of the defect resolutions into a list. The moderator sends the list to the author
    - Rework:
      * The author corrects the defects found during the meeting
    - Follow-up:
      * The moderator confirms the corrections and finishes the inspection
* Medium importance - Walkthrough:
  + Meeting between team members where the author presents his work in a formal way
  + The author should clarify any doubts and also ensure that everyone understands the author’s work
  + A recorder must be randomly elected. It’s his responsibility the production of the revision report
  + Follow-up:
    - The author confirms the corrections and finishes the inspection
* Low importance – Deskcheck:
  + The author notifies the reviser to do an individual revision of the work done:
    - In case of documentation, since it will be hosted at Google Code and shared between the team, the author just needs to notify the reviser. The reviser should use the word comments tool or the communication platform existing in Facebook to propose the changes or any critic
    - In case of code since it will be hosted in Google Subversion server, the author just needs to notify the reviser. The reviser should use Google code comments tool or the communication platform existing in Facebook to propose the changes or any critic
* The Project manager should always have the final word about the scheduling of a new review because he needs to analyze how it will affect the project plan
* The reviser must be familiarized with the project and the artifact scope
* The revision reports will be produced according to the “Review Report Template.docx” template.

# Tools

* Same tools that were used in the artifacts production
* Facebook for communication

# Related Processes

* Project Assessment and Control Process
* Documentation Management Process

# Measures

* Review rate (total reviews/total artifacts)
* Major defects rate (major defects/total reviews)
* Minor defects rate (minor defects/total reviews)
* Defects by type of review
  + # defects/total inspections
  + # defects/total walkthroughs