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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 |

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 |

Table 2: Version history

# Purpose

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

# Inputs and Outputs

# Inputs

An artefact for revision.

# Outputs

Artefact corrected followed by the produced documentation during the review.

# Activities

* The Project Manager or Quality Manager are responsible to schedule de reviews of any artefact and determine its importance choosing a 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 work product is ready for inspection, chooses team, guarantees an effective meeting, checks if defects have been corrected
    - Reader:
      * Is not the author nor the moderator. Conducts the team through the work product during the meeting
    - Recorder:
      * Annotates the defects
  + Execute the following phases:
    - Planning:
      * The author collects the work product to be inspected, plus all related material. The moderator checks if it is complete, and arranges the meeting, by assigning roles and distributing material
    - Overview (optional):
      * During this meeting the author introduces the work product to be inspected
    - Preparation:
      * Each inspector prepares by reviewing the material, and noting the possible defects and doubts
    - Meeting:
      * The reader conducts the team through the work product, and answers any questions from the inspectors. If a defect is found, it is annotated by the annotator. A defect is any part of the work product that will keep an inspector from approving it
      * Discussion is focused on detecting defects in the work product, 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 author presents his work through a formal way
  + The author should clarify any doubt and ensure that everyone understands author’s work
  + Must be elected a recorder (randomly) to produce 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 team, the author just needs to notify the reviser. The reviser should use the word comments tool or communication platform existing in Facebook to propose the changes or any critic
    - In case of code, since will be hosted in Google Subversion server, the author just needs notify the reviser. The reviser should use Google code comments tool or communication platform existing in Facebook to propose the changes or any critic
* The Project manager always has the final word about the scheduling of a new review because he needs to analyse how it will affect the project plan
* The reviser must be familiarized with project and artefact scope
* The revision reports will be produced according to template “Review Report Template.docx”

# Tools

* Same tools used in artefacts production
* Facebook for communication

# Related Processes

* Control and assessment process

# Measures

* Review rate (reviews/artefacts)
* Major defects rate (major defects/reviews)
* Minor defects rate (minor defects/reviews)
* Defects by type of review (defects/inspections , defects/walkthroughs)