



ITS Deliverable Review Procedure

Reviewers: Mary Pearson, Mark Kinkelaar, Joe Flanigan, Paul Stewart

Approvers:

Version History

| Date | Version Number | Name | Reason |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| 29 February 2004 | 1.00 | Mary Pearson | Original Document Creation |

1. Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to describe the process by which Information Technology Services deliverables that are created during a project are reviewed and approved. Approval from this process signals the deliverable is ready to support any downstream activities and is ready for acceptance.

Reviews are used to find defects prior to the implementation of the deliverable to ensure the delivery of a quality product. This includes any defect due to non-conformance to applicable standards. This procedure also identifies the process for conducting a review.

2. Scope

Reviews are conducted on all ITS project deliverables. These deliverables include but are not limited to, requirements, design specifications, implementation plans/reports, code, user documentation, and test plans.

3. Related Procedures

4. Definitions

Review - a meeting, walk-through, or inspection that is used to find defects or deficiencies through discussion, examination, or evaluation of the deliverable being reviewed. These defects are pieces of documentation or code which could cause the deliverable, either directly or indirectly, to be inaccurate or incomplete.

Author - person responsible for developing, designing, or creating the deliverable being reviewed.

Moderator - conducts and ensures a successful review.

Scribe - records the information during the review in order to document the outcome of the review.

Reviewers - persons attending the review. The scribe is also a reviewer. The reviewers are the evaluators of the deliverable being reviewed.

Review Approver - the person assigned to verify that the changes that were determined during the review were incorporated into the deliverable. This person is one of the people attending the review but can not be the author. For most reviews, the project manager will be the review approver. The review approver approves the content of the deliverable that is being reviewed such as the completeness of the design, the accuracy of the code, etc. based on the consensus of the reviewers.

5. Roles and Responsibilities

Author - Responsible for developing, designing, or creating the deliverable being reviewed. The author is responsible for determining when the material is ready for review, scheduling the review, determining the type of review such as electronic or formal meeting, selecting the reviewers, and providing the material to the reviewers prior to the review.

Moderator - Responsible for conducting and ensuring a successful review. The moderator must be able to manage the review team, provide leadership and assure discussions do not stray far from the immediate subject. If there is no moderator assigned or if this is a non-meeting review, the author will perform this function.

Scribe - Responsible for recording the information during the review in order to document the outcome of the review. The scribe must understand the terms and formats used in order to be able to properly record the results of the review. For non-meeting reviews, this is the responsibility of the review approver.

Reviewers - Responsible for evaluating the deliverable being reviewed.

Review Approver - Responsible for verifying that the changes that were determined during the review were incorporated into the deliverable.

6. Review Process

6.1. Pre-review Process

The following activities are completed in order for the review to be held.

6.1.1. Planning

All project team members are encouraged to participate in reviews to promote a good general understanding of all aspects of the product being produced by the project. There will be at least 3 participants on the review team. (The 3 includes the author.)

The majority, but not necessarily all, of the review team shall be selected from the team that is assigned to the project. For some deliverables, it may be desirable to include reviewers from outside the project team. The participants can be anyone that can validate the deliverable that is being reviewed.

If possible, the review team should consist of the person(s) that will be using the deliverable. (i.e., If the design specification is being reviewed, it is preferred that the developer programming the specification attend the review. If the test plan is being reviewed, the tester should attend the review.) If this is the initial review of a document, the project manager should also be one of the reviewers.

The author and/or project manager will determine the method for the review and select the reviewers. If the method for the review is a meeting, the author or project manager schedules the time and place. If the review is to be conducted electronically or through another method, the author or project manager determines the deadline of the submission for the comments and/or questions from the reviewers. The author or project manager then notifies the reviewers that they were selected and provide the deadline requirements.

Review materials are distributed to all reviewers in advance with adequate time allotted for preparation. Review materials consist of the deliverable to be reviewed and any supporting documentation. For example, if a code deliverable is being reviewed, then the review team should review the design specification for the code.

Distribution of the material for review will occur at least 48 hours before the review unless those assigned to attend the review agree that preparation for the review can occur in less time. If an exception is made, it is stated in the review summary. If any of the review team determines that less than 48 hours is not adequate, the review will be rescheduled with the proper amount of time allocated. (Material should be sent to all members of the project team even if they will not be part of the review.) It is preferable to limit the amount of material for review to that which can be reviewed in 2 hours.

6.2. Preparation

The participants selected to participate in the review must prepare prior to the review. Each participant will allocate sufficient time to prepare for the review. If a participant is unable to participate, they are to notify the author or project manager as soon as possible so that a replacement can be selected.

7. The Review

7.1. Review Meetings

The author opens the meeting. The author surveys all review participants to ensure that they are prepared. If adequate preparation has not been completed, the review is rescheduled. A scribe and a review approver are selected.

The author presents the material for review to the review team and addresses questions or concerns from the reviewers. The moderator will intervene only to keep the meeting on the subject or to draw out discussion from the reviewers.

The scribe records any defects or discrepancies found, and the resolution if determined during the review meeting. If there is not agreement among the review team on the defects, discrepancies, and/or resolutions, these issues are escalated to the project manager. The scribe also records any open issues, action items and the person(s) assigned responsibility for resolution. All items that were not specifically assigned will be the responsibility of the author.

7.2. Non-meeting Review

The author and/or project manager selects the review approver. The review approver also performs the scribe function. This is communicated to the rest of the review team.

The review approver collects the comments and questions from the reviewers and performs the scribe function. Questions should be answered by the author as quickly as possible, and a new schedule is given for any follow-up comments and/or questions. If questions can not be answered quickly, the author will provide a completion date to the review team. This completion date will be agreed to by the project manager.

The author will follow-up if any reviewer misses the submission deadline, or to make any reassignments if any reviewer is unable to participate.

If any open issues or action items are identified through the review process, they are recorded by the review approver, and the author is responsible for the resolution. The

resolution is verified by the review approver and then communicated to all review participants.

8. Closing

The closing process will apply regardless of the type of review that was held. At the end of the review, the scribe published the items discovered. The team then determines if another review is required based on the items that were recorded. If the team can not come to a consensus for this decision, it is escalated to the appropriate project manager. If another review is not held, the review approver will be responsible for ensuring that all defects or discrepancies were corrected and all open issues or action items were completed. If another review is required, all defects, discrepancies, open issues, and action items will be completed before the next review. The causes are investigated and appropriate corrective action applied.

The outcome of the review is documented by the scribe and distributed to all members of the review team. This outcome information includes the following:

Review date - When the review was held for meeting reviews and the deadline for comments and/or questions for non-meeting reviews.

Attendees - Who participated in the review

Scribe - Name of the person that recorded the problems found

What is being reviewed including the project or system information

Author - Who created the material being reviewed

Problems, defects, and/or open issues - List the problems, defects or open issues that were identified during the review and require resolution.

Disposition - Indicate if the review was accepted, not accepted, or the review was not completed. This can not be "accepted" if any rework other than minor changes was required. Another review is required unless the rework was minor. If the review team can not come to consensus on the disposition, it shall be escalated to the appropriate project manager.

Type of rework required - Indicate whether the rework required is none, minor, major, or complete re-write.

When the rework will be completed

9. Approval

9.1. Review Accepted - No Changes

The deliverable is approved.

9.2. Review Accepted - Minor Changes

Once the minor changes are completed, the review approver verifies that the changes were made according to the review outcome. If the changes are accepted, the deliverable is approved.

9.3. Review Not Accepted

No approval will be generated until the above process is repeated with a status of accepted.

9.4. Approved

Once the deliverable is approved, it should be stored in the project directory as completed. Any subsequent deliverables dependant this one can now be completed.

10. Post Approval Revisions

If a revision to the deliverable is required or desired after the initial review and approval, the author, the review approver of the initial review, and/or the project manager will determine if the change requires an additional review.

If another review is required, the above procedure is repeated. Otherwise, the deliverable is approved.