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Deliverable/Milestone review form

|  |
| --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** |
| *Title:* | **Quality Plan for Period 1** | *Document identifier:* | **D1.1** |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | **[please fill in]** |
| *Author(s):* | **[please fill in]** | *Date:* | **[please fill in]** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** |
| *Reviewer:* | **Yin Chen** | *Activity:* | **[please fill in]** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The report structures a quality management plan, defining scopes, methods, and processes to ensure EGI-Engage to produce quality outputs. The plan seems based on a third party defined standard framework “Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition”. It needs proper assessments of the generic framework against the specific case of the EGI-Engage project, evaluating against quality requirements for EGI-Engage and the cost of quality management. For example, it describes a comprehensive review process in page15, although it likely results in higher-level quality products, without efficient tool or management means, such a process can be very costly. In principle, the more constrains defined in the quality management processes, the higher-level quality is likely to be achieved, the more costly it becomes in management. We need to think hard how to simplify the process and reduce the management costs, while ensuring high quality of project products at the same time. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
|  |

**Additional comments**

*(not affecting the document content e.g. recommendations for the future)*

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author(correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **5** |  | When mention **“**This document defines how the quality process for the project EGI-Engage will be implemented to ensure that the project outputs are delivered **fit-for-purpose”.** The purpose of quality processes shall alsoaim to **satisfy the quality requirements for the project.** | **corrected** |
| **2** | **5** |  | When mention, **“**This document will be **reviewed** …**”** it’s better indicate, to be **reviewed by whom** to clarify the responsibility. | **Removed, this information is provided later** |
| **3** | **5** |  | When mention, “This document will be reviewed on yearly basis to meet **changed** conditions or **objectives** during the project’s life span”. **Is the change of the project objectives or the quality management objectives? Neither of these seems shall be changed too much.**  | **Removed, agree that project objectives are not likely to change.**  |
| **4** | **5** |  | **When mention, “**according to Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition**”, it’s better to give reference.** | **corrected** |
| **5** | **5** |  | **When mention, “**the **goals** of Quality Management are**”, are these the general goals defined in Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition, or specified in EGI-Engage**? | **corrected** |
| **6** | **5** |  | **When mention, “**It contains three processes**”, again, are these processes defined in Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition, or specified in EGI-Engage? Does it mean, we are fully adopting Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition**? | **corrected** |
| **7** | **6** |  | **When mention, “…** creation and maintenance of EGI-Engage Quality Plan**”, rather than only gives a link, it’s better to give a brief explanation when and how this quality plan is made, summarise what the contents it includes.** | **corrected** |
| **8** | **6** |  | **When mention, “**Quality plan will be **reviewed** and report on quality status **”, it’s better to explicitly indicate the plan will be reviewed by whom to clarify responsibility, and give some explanation/examples/reference what quality status is talking about.** | **corrected** |
| **9** | **6** |  | **When mention, “**D1.1 Quality plan forPeriod 2**”, it’s better explain when is period 2.** | **This is official name of the deliverable**  |
| **10** | **6** |  | **When mention, “**Activity Managers**” and “**Activity Management Board **”, at the first place in the doc, it’s better to give definition/reference.**  | **Rejected, definition is in the same sentence when AMB is mentioned.**  |
| **11**  | **6** |  | **When mention, “**Project outputs**”, it shall also include software/tools/services, training events, workshops. Here only mentions the review of documentation forms of project outputs, how to review other types of project outputs?** | **Rejected. Software/tools/services are deliverables/milestones of the project. D/M doesn’t mean document.**  |
| **12** | **7** |  | **When mention, “It** has representation from all the work packages**”. Is not clear what “it” indicates.** | **Corrected**  |
| **13** | **7** |  | **When mention, “**lessons learned registry**”, don’t know what this is.** | **corrected** |
| **14** | **8** |  | **When mention, “**All outputs produced by staff activities within EGI-Engage (funded and unfunded effort) **must** be recorded so that it can be reported by the project**”, “MUST”,”MAY”, “SHALL”, in standards give different obligation force. To achieve “MUST” level obligation would request higher cost in management.** I would suggest we use “SHALL” in this context. It is likely to be difficult/costly to manage the “completeness” of the human actions listed in this sub-section without an efficient ICT system. | **corrected** |
| **15** | **8** |  | **When mention, “**Mailing list…”, do we archive all the exchanging emails? | **Yes, each mailing list has archive but I don’t think this is part of this deliverable.**  |
| **16** | **8** |  | **For other project communication and outputs, such as project deliverable, Training materials, group working spaces/file folders for sharing information, do we have management plan? What is the backup policy?** | **Rejected, EGI wiki is mentioned as place for collaboration pages and information sharing. Backup policy is not part of this deliverable.**  |
| **17** | **8** |  | **2.1.1, what happen if there is no suitable template to use?** | **Rejected, this should be mentioned on the webpage but not here.**  |
| **18** | **9** |  | **2.1.3, it’s better at the beginning briefly explain why fitSM is chosen to be used by EGI-Engage: is it according to proposal agreement?**  | **Corrected** |
| **19** | **9** |  | **When mention, “**During FedSM project lifetime …**”, it’s better give details when is that**? **What’s happen when FedSM project comes to the end**? **Who maintain the standard, who has the authority for the explanation of the standard?** | **Corrected** |
| **20** | **9** |  | **When mention, “…**will be applied to software being produced by **the** project**”, which project? EGI-Engage or FedSM?** | **corrected** |
| **21** | **10** |  | **When mention, “**The development activities within **the** project will augment capabilities of existing open source software**”, again, it’s not clear which project referred to, EGI-Engage or FedSM.** | **corrected** |
| **22** | **10** |  | **When mention, “**Access to documents is linked to the EGI single sign on (SSO) system**”, will it better to explain basic rules for access control?** | **Rejected, This is explained in 2.2.4** |
| **21** | **11** |  | **When mention, “**This is the **version number** generated by the document repository for the particular repository identifier**”, do we define any control of versioning? E.g., when is + 0.1 and when is +1.0?** | **Corrected** |
| **22** | **17** |  | **When mention, “**an Activity Manager who ensures that all participants in the activities defined a list of metrics that will provide progress status against the activity**”, it is not clear whether all participants in one activity to define one list of metrics for that activity or each participant in that activity to define one list for them to achieve**? | **Corrected** |
| **23** | **17** |  | **When mention, “**The Activity Manager will control that the defined metrics are Specific**”, Should the Quality Manager to assist on this or to give the final quality assessment? What action will be taken when the target goals couldn’t achieve? Some form of assessment reports may be needed.**  | **Corrected** |
| **24** | **17** |  | **When mention, “**driven by the **Project Office** and the Activity Managers**”, there are a lot of roles referred by this document, it’s better to give definition/reference at the first place when mention them.** | **Corrected** |
| **25** | **18** |  | **The link “**<http://www.egi.eu/about/egi-engage/metrics.html> **”, seems unable to open**  | **Is under construction, will be ready before submission**  |
| **26** | **20** |  | **What is the frequency for review or assess the activity metrics?** | **“**Metrics are gathered and reviewed every 6 months as part of report process. These are reported in intermediate and periodic reports, together with an analysis.**”**  |
| **27** | **20** |  | **The table only indicates polarity of the each measure. Do we also concern the speed of changes? Shall we also indicate target numbers to be achieved or risk threshold to warn the dangers?** | **Rejected. Target numbers are not necessary for activity metrics. Speed of change is irrelevant – there is no project constrains in terms of speed.**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.