Document criteria

Assumptions:

1. The US is authored from the perspective of a developer, not the PM, FA, or any other consumer, although it is best to avoid any highly technical language.  KISS method applies.
2. Any developer, present or future, should be able to use these documents to easily implement work on the MCCF TAS framework/system in a consistent manner with a high degree of quality, and a high assurance of successful testing through a test-driven-design method.
3. The intent is for ANY web designer/developer/UX-person to understand the UX, styling, and branding standards and apply them to a product, and that all content is contained within the document- i.e. links and references are a no-no, see the acceptance criteria.
4. Development of these artifacts will take multiple iterations across several sprints, so work must be decomposed accordingly.
5. All documents and artifacts will be built around a standard MCCF template, using version control and technical writing standards as established by OIT.  The template will be provided to the producer by the PMO.
6. These are categorized as living documents and are subject to revisions as standards are updated, tailored, or deprecated.
7. The US owner suggests that these be worked on sequentially starting with the Style Guide, followed by the Usability Guide, and testing Guide/SOP.
8. Much of content will be aggregated from multiple online sources including but not limited to US Web Standards site, Vets.gov playbooks, Usability.gov playbooks, etc.
9. These user stories pertain only to work relating to TAS on the GovCloud.

Acceptance Criteria (general)

1. The document is created using a standardized template and is peer reviewed.
2. Based on the standard documented, updates are provided to the relevant content area, wireframes (appendices section), and any CSS or CSS classes are identified with commented code snippet highlighted.
3. The document is versioned and version history section is updated, and the deliverable is under CM.
4. All wireframes are generic, with non-specific logos, icons, links, etc. and reviewed/approved prior to insertion.
5. Sources are referenced (acceptable formats are footnotes, in line references, or headings) on each content element
6. A section on “how to use this document” is included an updated.
7. Each iteration will show progress towards meeting the “US Owner wishlist”- which is a living list of specific criteria to be met by the final delivery as stated below.
8. Final (baselined for program wide use) deliverable should encompass:
9. Style Guide:  applicable elements of visual styling not pertaining to UX- color palettes, typography/headings, logos and icons, navigation styling, widget styling, footer styling, general layout, etc.
10. Usability Guide: applicable elements of workflow, layout, and user experience which are not related to visual styling- logical flow of page elements, standardized placement of page elements, 508 related standards, usability standards, etc.
11. Developer Testing Guide/SOP: supporting a test-driven methodology, this guide aims to explain tools and methods for testing a new TAS page, element/widget, or embedded web application at the lower levels of testing (dev-component, limited integrated, automated scenarios, peer review, etc.) prior to SQA.  In this manner, a product team developer may feel assured they have adequate understanding of how to test for elements covered in the Style and Usability guides prior to handoff, and how to report and remediate defects (the process only).  This test guide should align to the program test plans.

Acceptance Criteria (specific)

1. To be negotiated during each sprint planning/elaboration session and taken from the “wish list” until exhausted, or complete enough for consumption by developers and designers.

Risks:

None- Note that until these documents are ready, developers, FAs, and contributors can reference the individual sources of these standards from their related web sites or written documentation.