



**ALLSEEN  
ALLIANCE**

## **Core Working Group Meeting**

**16.04 Post-Mortem**

The contents of this document, and the interfaces described, and all the information herein, are the result of collaborative discussions by the Core Working Group. This summary documents the final consensus of the team.



**Reminder:  
This call is being  
recorded**

# Antitrust Compliance Notice

- AllSeen Alliance meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of AllSeen Alliance to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of and not participate in any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.
- Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at AllSeen Alliance meetings and in connection with AllSeen Alliance activities are described in the AllSeen Alliance Antitrust Policy. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of AllSeen Alliance, feel free to contact Lee Gesmer or Andrew Updegrove, of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to AllSeen Alliance.

# Agenda

- Participants provide:
  - What went well
  - What could have gone better
  - What can be done to make things go better

# Marcello Liroy/QCE

- **What went well?**
  - Made the dates
  - First release with OSU support
    - Interactions were smooth
  - Communication went well
- **What could have gone better?**
  - Stronger vision for what core of release was
  - Getting Sec2.0 out of Dev Preview
- **What can be done to make things better?**

# Josh Spain/Affinegy

- **What went well?**

- Got solid, stable release on time

- **What could have gone better?**

- Not enough attention paid to documentation
- Missed on iOS support and Sec2.0
  - Feedback was that this was mostly out of our control, and really driven by lack of staffing
- Didn't get changes requested by other WG done
  - This was a communication problem – WG not aware until it was too late to act on it

- **What can be done to make things go better?**

- Include documentation review to test pass (specifically build and tutorial)
- More focus on highest priority @ expense of others
- Communicate at certain points (esp. early) in the release cycle to other WGs to insure they make known important JIRA issues.
  - Add a label or use priority/severity to help track/filter these issues so they are in our field of view.
    - Issue here is probably that we are not curating the backlog effectively or frequently enough

# Arvind Padole/Microsoft

- What went well
  - Overall transition to OSU went well
  - success that we were able to transition release testing to the Alliance
  - Sticking to the process, and the overall engineering rigor has been good
  - Communication is really good – happy with WG meeting, and the fact that we up the triage meetings close to the release
  - Collaboration, and friendliness is well appreciated
- What could have gone better
  - QCE/Qeo transition was disruptive: would be good to find ways to minimize the impact of these transitions
  - Core foundation of the ASA needs to be funded by the alliance: they are critical to everyone, and minimizes
    - This would include having the committers.
- What can be done to make things go better

# Dan Mihai/Microsoft

- What went well
  - Both OSU and Affinegy came up to speed well – solid contributions
  - MSFT contributors taking over much of the work that was traditionally by QCE
    - MSFT benefited as they have deeper knowledge, got for ASA
- What could have gone better
  - Unfortunately the loss of QCE/Qeo
  - Need to scrutinize changes even in feature branches earlier: e.g. string change branch
    - Need to manage these changes better
  - Biggest issue with String stuff was that we were over confident with Jenkins pass (Way V/Microsoft)
- What can be done to make things go better
  - On string changes should have done some of the actual test plan on branch before the merge(Way V/Microsoft)
  - For feature branches should file Jira bugs for issues we know of even on those branches
    - Seeing some success with this on the IPv6 branch already



# Various: OSU interaction

- What went well
  - Overall interaction was really good
- What could have gone better
  - On the platform test pass, it would be helpful to see what is passing and what is failing
  - Not clear to pull how to get the test result information
- What can be done to make things go better

# Actions

- **Marcello:** check with Ry what Jira options are available under current license, confluence
- **Marcello:** add the bug bar raise dates to the release plan table
- **Carrie:** set up a test strategy meeting with Core WG to make sure that we know what is there
- **Carrie:** do test link demo close to release testing so that stakeholders can see what is going on
  - Also send periodic test reports on the status of release testing
- **Arvind:** define contents of test report – send to Carrie and cc mail list



# Thank You

Follow Us On      

- For more information on AllSeen Alliance, visit us at: [allseenalliance.org](http://allseenalliance.org) & [allseenalliance.org/news/blogs](http://allseenalliance.org/news/blogs)