MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

SUBJECT: DLSC COLLABORATIVE CM MEETING

PURPOSE: A meeting of the DLSC Collaborative CM team was held Dec. 2–3, 1999, to discuss configuration management issues.

ATTENDEES:

Debbie Clark	DLIS-BA
Pete Plassmann	DSCR-ZIP
Terry Baker	DRMS-CM
Paul Rizzo	DSCC-B
Fredrick Murphy	DESC-S
Brian Deitrich	DDC-TZ
Teresa V. Popham	DLIS-B
Dennis Parker	DSIO-JC
Jan Hansens	DSIO-JC (scribe)
Gerry Osborne	DSCP-OSIB
Susan Fahey	DDC-TZ
Gerry Howard	DSCR-ZIP
Pat Russell	DSIO-MEA
	DLSC-I (no attendee)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS:

1. Debbie mentioned that she had attended the last ITCC meeting and had given a status of the teams progress. Ms De Vincentis was very pleased. The issue was brought up about DSIO taking an active roll and participating in the team and being a voting member. The ITCC agreed that DSIO should be a voting member and that there will also be a DLSC HQ member added. The name would be provided later. Debbie will change the team's charter to reflect this addition. The team questioned if the DSIO member would be able to decide for all of DSIO combined.

2. CM Tools: Each PLFA and DSIO discussed the CM tools that they were using or had done research on.

    - DLIS mentioned that they use HARVEST for the mid-tier and LCM for the main frame. By the end of 2000 LCM and HARVEST are suppose to be merged together. UDR (Universal Data Repository System) also uses STARTEAM. It has the same functions as HARVEST but more. It was mentioned that STARTEAM was good for check in and check out but

doesn't handle source code to well. It was designed for only a small group of people to use.

- DSCC has both Visual Source Safe and Harvest. The engineers tried them for 2 weeks, didn't like and put them back on the shelf. The problems with HARVEST were the terminology used for the CM process. It was mentioned that once the tool was installed, the developers wouldn't be involved that much only the CM personnel who use the tool.

- DRMS said their WEB team developers use SCCS with a series of hand-built scripts over top of it. Hardware is not elaborate but big in configuration for the mid-tier. They use Microsoft excel and hard copy. The NT side uses SMS to monitor configuration. LAN is probably the least able to talk configuration management. They change so much. Software is maintained by DSIO-JC. Release management DSIO-JC controls the actual configuration items and DRMS controls the process.

- DSIO-J uses PC based PVCS for mid-tier for DRMS, tried Endevor for 3 months it just wouldn't give enough flexibility for the way they were set up. Computer Associates just recently bought Platinum who owns HARVEST so they are going to swap Endevor for HARVEST. COOL-GEN is used for the development environment and GUARDIAN is used along with COOL-GEN allowing flexibility to maintain the code. Both of these tools are quite complex to understand.

- DSIO-M looked at a couple - thought one was a CM tool turned out to be an engineering tool for drawings, very flexible, process easy to customize for software and hardware. They were given a demo on CLEAR CASE, which they were impressed with. Right now the vendor has total control of the software library. They don't have traditional CM control.

- DESC - a group out of Atlanta does the configuration management for the FAS baseline. DESC has no visibility at all from a configuration management point of view.

- DDC - they are associated mainly with DSS. The main purpose is to control the SCR (System Change Request) system. They don't handle software. DSIO at Ogden and New Cumberland do the coding. It's passed through Endeavor, packaged, and sent back through Info Man. DDC tests for functionality and puts the package into production.

- DSCP uses Tivoli. It's not a real formal process - not much control. The commodities work independently of each other and there are a lot of contractors involved.

It was mentioned that the policy of the ITAG mentions only certain CM tools are to be used unless you come up with a BCA. The team was encouraged to do this because the guidelines are behind and it could stifle their process for the future. Teresa mentioned that at the last meeting Tom had suggested the team's goal should be to become the Product List Group and the architecture group be the architecture. It was asked that when the team makes their recommendation for the CM tools should they get with Steve Bouchard and take a look at the guidelines as a whole. Should they suggest two types one for software change control and one

for hardware? It was suggested that when they make their comments in the ITAG draft to comment to hold this section for the DLSC Collaborative CM Group. It was mentioned that a spreadsheet on requirements and a document on how to evaluate CM tools had been done by a company this might be a good starting point. Also a study called the OVUM Study had been done on major CM tools, which might be very beneficial for the team to get a copy. DRMS will follow up on these documents. DLIS and DSIO will see if they have a self-assessment for CM tools to bring to the next meeting.

3. Project Priority List and CM Data Base: These were discussed simultaneously some of the members brought their list in order to compare the commonality of each list. The comparisons showed that there were already a couple of projects that could be shared. It was mentioned that they need to decide which projects would be entered into the CM database from the PPL. It was asked at what time should a project be entered, or if only ideas should be entered and when should one be taken out of the database. It was suggested that maybe we should have a separate area for only ideas. The idea of the data base was to be a step in the process, that before developing a project to check the data base to bounce your ideas against in order to borrow ideas from the other projects. It should be used for special projects like a publication page. There were some changes to the original plan for the CM database. DSIO-J will send the format to the members.
    - To change the name to DLSC COLLABORATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY "BUCKET".
    - Add an element for PLFA.
    - Under POC add a drop down box for phone # and e-mail address.
    - Control # be 20 characters.
    - Those who access it should have .mil or .gov as their address.
    - STATUS field add drop down box and use the 9 CM processes.
    - The full description should be only 3-4 paragraphs.
    - Team decided to use the Microsoft Access format to maintain.

4. SAMMS SCR on the WEB Demo: The team was given a demo on SAMMS Configuration Management Application. Some of the members had already seen the demo and it had been presented to Ms De Vincentis. She suggested it be shown to the DLSC Collaborative CM team. The team agreed that it was not a CM tool and that it looks good for what it was designed for - as a change-tracking tool for SCRs. It was suggested that the name be changed so it would not be confused with a CM tool. It was mentioned that if there was a way to interface the demo with some CM tools maybe it could be stream lined for us for hotlines and warm lines.   It was suggested to possibly make the demo generic to hand off to the PLFAs so they could customize to their site. The consensus was to go forward and see if projects other than SAMMS could use the system. The team suggested that someone should represent them at the next ITCC regarding this demo. Teresa will take the comments to the next ITCC.   It was suggested that the team might want to think about using SAMMS as a prototype. They will consider this for the next meeting.

5. DLSC CMB Charter Status: The team looked over the charter and some changes were made. The DDC group was added for their Configuration Management Board. It was decided to coordinate our meetings to the ITCC meetings. A question was brought up about the other DSIO sites attending. The team agreed that there is no problem with this but DSIO would only get one vote. The charter was reprinted and the two co-chairs and the two ITCC representatives signed. Teresa will take it to the next meeting for Ms De Vincentis signature. DSIO-J will contact the other DSIO sites to see if they want to attend.

6. PLFA CM Page: Not all of the PLFAs had their web sites linked to the ITCC page. It was asked what types of articles were to be put on the web site. Any document relating to CM procedures, check lists, charters, CM plans, project list and templates would be good to put out on the web. It was suggested that the rest of the team try and get their CM pages connected. It was suggested that it would be nice to see all of the PLFA logos on the Collaborative CM page. DSIO will contact the other DSIO sites to suggest that they link their CM page and send their logos. DLIS is going to separate the DLSC Collaborative articles from the DLIS page and put them on their own page. The sites will send their logos to DSIO-J.

7. DLSC Corporate CM Plan: DSCR had taken some action on the first two sections of the CM draft using the DLIS CM plan. This will be a DLSC Corporate CM plan. The team discussed the two sections and made a few changes. Decision was to refer to each area in the plan as the charter organization name. The signature pages will be the same as the charter. An appendix will be added for the charter organization names. Decision was to make the draft as generic as possible to be used for software and hardware. Suggested to add IEEE 12207 as a standard in the CM plan it was mentioned that a web site called STSC had a lot of good standards listed. DSCC will e-mail the site to the team. Each site will use their own formats as long as they use the required information. There are two web sites that are excellent for templates. DRMS will e-mail these to the team. DSCR will do a general cross-reference to the CM process from the functions in the CM draft. DSCR will finish the draft of the plan and e-mail to the team for their comments.

8. Potential Problems/Concerns: There was a couple mentioned.
   - Concern that no DLSC-I member had yet attended a meeting.
   - Need CM commitment at the PLFAs at the management level.
   - The term Configuration Management needs to be understood.
   - Concern about out relationship with the ITAG.

9. Other Discussions:
   - There were comments from management about the CM process that was approved Nov 3. The CM process was suppose to be at the DLSC level, these were the minimum requirements and that each PLFA could refine the process

to meet their needs. It was suggested to make the changes in the charter to reflect these comments.

- Discussed the Launch and Leave project, which is supposed to be used for the prototype for the CM process. The project is almost finished so DSCC will try and apply the team's CM process to the project for the next meeting.
- The ITAG change draft was mentioned and not everyone had seen it. Copies were distributed and concern was that the comments were suppose to be sent back before the next meeting which was set for Dec 7-8. DLIS will be sending comments about the draft for the ITAG meeting.

OPEN ACTION ITEMS/Updates included:

1. DLSC CMB Charter – Ms De Vencentis signature – Teresa – 12/16/99
2. DLSC CMB Charter – Contact other DSIO sites – DSIO-J – 12/10/99
3. CM Tools – Two studies will be brought for discussion – DRMS   - 01/10/00
4. CM Tools – CM Self Assessments for discussion – DLIS and DSIO-J-01/10/00
5. DLSC CM Database – Will sent out access format – DSIO-J –12/10/99
6. DLSC CM Database – Fill database format and send to DSIO-J – PLFAs and other DSIO sites – 12/17/99.
7. DLSC CM Database – Load database on web – DSIO-J – 01/10/00
8. DLSC CM Page – Set up CM page and link to ITCC CM page – PLFAs and other DSIO sites – 01/10/00
9. DLSC CM Page – Send Logos to DSIO-J – PLFAs and other DSIO sites – 01/10/00
10. DLSC CM Page – Separate DLSC CM articles from DLIS CM Page – DLIS – 01/10/00
11. SAMMs Demo – Decide to use as prototype – PLFAs and DSIO – 01/10/00
12. DLSC Corporate CM Plan – Draft sent to team – DSCR – 12/20/99
13. DLSC Corporate CM Plan – Comments back to DSCR – PLFAs and DSIO – 12//30/99
14. DLSC Corporate CM Plan – Web site STSC to team – DSCC – 01/10/00
15. DLSC Corporate CM Plan – Web site for templates – DRMS – 01/10/00
16. Launch and Leave – Brief on project using CM process – DSCC – 01/10/00

Next meeting scheduled for 8:00 AM Jan 12, 2000, to 1:00 PM Jan 13, 2000, DSCC, Columbus, OH. Topics include finalizing the DLSC Corporate CM Plan and to filter out the CM Tools that best fit the sites.

_____   _____

Deborah K. Clark (s)   DATE
DLIS CMB Chair signature

_____   _____

Pete Plassmann (s)   DATE
DSCR CMB Chair signature