

# CCB Decision Summary

Thursday, July 15, 2004

## Requests Covered

Requests Covered					
Submitted To CCB by	Request Title (Task Headline)	System / Subsystem	User Impact (Severity)	Request ID	Request Status (Task State)
Al Damico	JDBC/JDK patch upgrades	Operational Environments / Core eRA Environment		CQERA00018909	CCBSubmitted
Daniel Fox	Enhancements to Document Service	Other / Document Service	3 - High	CQERA00019229	CCBSubmitted
Daniel Fox	Scanning Bridge Logs	IMPAC II / Scanning		CQERA00019329	CCBSubmitted
Dan Hall	Demo Facility Requires Testing Environment Upgrade	Commons / Commons Demo	2 - Very High	CQERA00019525	CCBSubmitted
Dan Hall	Add Change Password Page to be placed under Content Management Control in 2.7 Release of Commons	Commons / Commons		CQERA00019526	CCBSubmitted
Mike Goodman	Re-baseline requirements for iteration-1, to fix mapping problems	ERA DCIS Bridge	None	CQ19570	Walk-in item

## Request and Decision Summary

CQERA00018909

### 1. Summary

Task Id: CQERA00018909  
Submitted to CCB by: Al Damico  
Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-07 00:00:00  
Request Description (Task Headline): JDBC/JDK patch upgrades  
Severity:  
System: Operational Environments  
SubSystem: Core eRA Environment  
Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date): 2004-06-23 00:00:00  
CCB Approval Counts: 0  
**CCB Decision: Approved**

#### Notes:

Al Damico noted that after some discussion with Operations and Architecture staff, it was decided that it was best not to do patchwork on the RDBMS (Relational Database Management System) at this time, especially given the forthcoming 10g upgrade. Since the patch upgrade request to RDBMS was approved at a previous CCB meeting, this is to remove it.

### 2. Description and Justification

#### Description:

Perform JDBC, JDK upgrades as indicated in attached upgrade forms.

**Justification:**

Patch upgrades to JDBC, JDK and the RDBMS were approved in a prior CCB meeting. However now based on timing and the forthcoming 10g upgrade it does not seem worthwhile to go through an upgrade cycle for the RDBMS to 9.2.0.5 so this is being removed from the request.

**3. Level of Effort**

Impacted Group	LOE Time	Accessor
Analysis	0	
Development	0	
Integration Test	0	
Acceptance Test	0	
Operation	24	

**Overall Impact Assessment**

No impact

**4. Associated Defects**

Defect Id	Defect Headline

**5. Associated Sub Tasks**

Task Id	Task Headline

**6. Associated Issues**

Issue Id	Issue Headline

**CQERA00019229**

**1. Summary**

Task Id: CQERA00019229  
 Submitted to CCB by: Daniel Fox  
 Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-07 00:00:00  
 Request Description (Task Headline): Enhancements to Document Service  
 Severity: 3 - High  
 System: Other  
 SubSystem: Document Service  
 Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date): 2004-07-12 00:00:00  
 CCB Approval Counts: 0  
**CCB Decision: Approved**

**Notes:**

Daniel Fox noted that a bug is causing all document processing jobs lining up for the NT generators to reflect the same priority, regardless of the specified priority given to each document. In addition, some PDF machine names are missing from the jobs queue for documents that are being converted to PDF. Both bugs need to be investigated and fixed. While the task is slated to be completed as soon as possible, Committee chair Donna Frahm said the completion dates need to be firmed up to ensure the system is tested adequately.

**2. Description and Justification****Description:**

see attached tickets

**Justification:**

1. The job priority determines when the priority for processing the documents by NT Generators. The job priority is different for various documents based on business needs, and is stored in line with descriptions of various documents. At the time of job submission, the job priority needs to propagate into the jobs queue for the NT generators to pick up. Unfortunately, this does not work, and all jobs in the queue get the same default priority regardless of the specified priority for each document type. This is a bug and needs to be fixed.

2. The PDF Machine names is occasionally missing from the jobs queue for documents that are being converted to PDF by the NT Generators.

**4. Level of Effort**

Impacted Group	LOE Time	Accessor
Analysis	20	
Development	72	Peter Ly
Integration Test	0	
Acceptance Test	0	
Operation	0	

**Overall Impact Assessment**

1. Regression test File Upload from eSNAP and IAR applications (eSNAP priority is set higher) and monitor Jobs Queue to see which ones get picked up faster.

2. Verify that machine names are consistently propagated into the Jobs Queue for each job.

**4. Associated Defects**

Defect Id	Defect Headline
CQERA00019231	Job Priority is not propagated into the Jobs Queue
CQERA00019334	PDF Machine Names in the Jobs Queue is missing

**5. Associated Sub Tasks**

Task Id	Task Headline
CQERA00019232	Archive old document processing jobs

**6. Associated Issues**

Issue Id	Issue Headline
----------	----------------

**CQERA00019329****1. Summary**

Task Id: CQERA00019329  
 Submitted to CCB by: Daniel Fox  
 Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-07 00:00:00  
 Request Description (Task Headline): Scanning Bridge Logs  
 Severity:  
 System: IMPAC II  
 SubSystem: Scanning  
 Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date): 2004-07-19 00:00:00

CCB Approval Counts: 0  
CCB Decision: Approved

**Notes:**

Scanned images for 398 grants and Type 5 2590s files are being logged into the same files for different dates, creating problems in allocation. There is a need to create two separate log files, one each for 398 grants and Type 5 2590s files. There is also a need to change the location of the log files from where it is to a new location specified by Operations. A task member also pointed out a typo in the file naming convention, which should read: a) 398s—  
YYYYMMDD\_398\_SCANNED.TXT.

## 2. Description and Justification

**Description:**

Current logs that generate from Scanning Bridge log information into the same file for different dates, making the allocation of status and problems very complex. This enhancement is to the bridge software to do the following with the log files:

1. Have two separate log files, one for 398 grant images; another for Type 5 2590s files.
2. Put log files into newly created /documents/logs/image\_processing on the SAN
3. Use the following file naming convention:
  - a) 398s - YYYYMMDD\_388\_SCANNED.TXT
  - b) 2590s - YYYYMMDD\_2590\_SCANNED.TXT

**Justification:**

see Ticket description.

## 5. Level of Effort

Impacted Group	LOE Time	Accessor
Analysis	5	
Development	30	Peter Ly
Integration Test	0	
Acceptance Test	0	
Operation	0	

**Overall Impact Assessment**

Regression test Bridge that brings Scanned 2590s and 398s.

## 4. Associated Defects

Defect Id                      Defect Headline

## 5. Associated Sub Tasks

Task Id                      Task Headline

## 6. Associated Issues

Issue Id                      Issue Headline

**CQERA00019525**

## 1. Summary

Task Id: CQERA00019525  
Submitted to CCB by: Dan Hall  
Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-13 00:00:00  
Request Description (Task Headline): Demo Facility Requires Testing Environment Upgrade  
Severity: 2 - Very High  
System: Commons  
SubSystem: Commons Demo  
Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date):  
CCB Approval Counts: 0  
**CCB Decision: Approved**

### Notes:

Dan Hall noted that the testing environment for Demo Facility releases should reflect the production environment. There have been myriad problems because the two have been out of sync. This task would require Operations to create a new Demo Facility instance. Hall said that this is not needed until the September/October timeframe but he is requesting it be done now so they have no problems in the future. A committee member suggested creating the same environment for development too; the committee agreed.

However, the committee deferred the discussion on whether or not to make the staging environment up to the same level as the production environment. If this were done, the Demo Facility could be tested in Staging instead of the Integration test environment. Jim Tucker, Operations and Architecture will review the purpose of the Staging environment and devise a plan for improvements.

## 2. Description and Justification

### Description:

Demo Facility in Test is confirmed to use a separate Schema instead of a Separate Instance, which is how Demo Facility is deployed in production. As such we have seen evidence of numerous system related bugs related to this problem in every Demo release. This task requests that Demo Facility Test and Dev databases be setup as a separate instance instead of a separate schema.

### Justification:

In preparation for upcoming Demo Facility releases, Demo Facility must use a separate database instance in Test and Dev, similar to production. We have identified system bugs in these environments which were caused by this atypical setup. Therefore, for the next release of Demo we ask OPS to setup a new instance for Demo Facility prior to the next Demo Facility release.

## 6. Level of Effort

Impacted Group	LOE Time	Accessor
Analysis		
Development		
Integration Test		
Acceptance Test		
Operation		

### Overall Impact Assessment

100 Hours of Operations Time - Rich Ashley

#### 4. Associated Defects

Defect Id	Defect Headline
5.	Associated Sub Tasks
Task Id	Task Headline

#### 6. Associated Issues

Issue Id	Issue Headline
----------	----------------

**CQERA00019526**

#### 1. Summary

Task Id: CQERA00019526  
Submitted to CCB by: Dan Hall  
Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-13 00:00:00  
Request Description (Task Headline): Add Change Password Page to be placed under Content Management Control in 2.7 Release of Commons

Severity:  
System: Commons  
SubSystem: Commons  
Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date):  
CCB Approval Counts: 0  
**CCB Decision: Approved**

##### Notes:

Two Change Password pages are creating confusion among Commons users because the text is written for internal users even though these are shared pages. This task will migrate those pages to Content Management Control, where the text will be updated. The change will be made with the scheduled release of Commons 2.7 CQ18103 in October (with testing in early September).

#### 2. Description and Justification

##### Description:

The Change Password Pages ADM1013 and FRW0015 is causing confusion with Commons Users because the text is written for the internal community even though these are shared pages. To alleviate, this enhancement will place the ADM Change Password page under Content Management Control allowing us to update the text according.

All content above the text "Change Password Form" (see attached screen shots) should be placed under Content Management control for both of these pages. Additionally, the text on the pages stating "Old Password" should be changed to "Current Password" . This update is in Commons Supplementary SPec Version 1.39 tagged with BASELINE\_COMMONS\_2.7

##### Justification:

We have received Multiple Complaints on the shared Change Password Page from external users and have fielded many help desk calls. It is relatively simple for us to add this page to Content Management Control with the release of Commons 2.7 CQ18103 scheduled for October to alleviate this problem.

#### 7. Level of Effort

Impacted Group	LOE Time	Accessor
Analysis		
Development		

Integration Test  
Acceptance Test  
Operation

#### **Overall Impact Assessment**

Development - 4 hours - Ramesh Nagella  
Testing - 7 hours - Sikder Islam

#### **4. Associated Defects**

**Defect Id**                      **Defect Headline**

#### **5. Associated Sub Tasks**

**Task Id**                      **Task Headline**

#### **6. Associated Issues**

**Issue Id**                      **Issue Headline**

**CQERA00019570**

#### **1. Summary**

Task Id: CQERA00019570  
Submitted to CCB by: Michael Goodman  
Date Submitted To CCB: 2004-07-15 00:00:00  
Request Description (Task Headline): Re-baseline of mapping requirements for iteration 1  
Severity: 2 - Very High  
System: IMPAC II  
SubSystem: DCIS Bridge  
Recommended Timeframe (Target Test Deploy Date): 2004-07-13 00:00:00  
CCB Approval Counts: 0  
**CCB Decision: Approved**

#### **Notes:**

Unit-testing for iteration 1 of the eRA DCIS Bridge ran into a technical glitch because original mapping requirements were not working when live data was fed. Some mapping requirements were easy to fix while others had to be deferred to iteration-2. The task involved 32 hours of design and development and involved minor changes to the baseline requirement.

#### **2. Description and Justification**

##### **Description:**

Rebaseline of iteration 1 mapping requirements, due to data integrity issues uncovered during unit test.

Changes have all been applied to PVCS version 1.2 of the following artifact:

ERA\_IMPACII / dcis / docs / artifacts / 2.requirements / Supp Spec / eRA DCIS Bridge Data Mapping.xls

The specific data mapping changes are summarized in the "Revision History" tab of this spreadsheet, all recorded on date 7/7/2004.

**Justification:**

Data integrity issues were uncovered during the unit-testing for iteration 1 of the eRA DCIS Bridge. Upon analysis, it was determined that these issues could only be resolved by updating the mapping requirements. Some mappings required more extensive analysis; therefore the change was to defer the mapping in question to iteration 2. Others were easily remedied however so these mappings were retained in iteration 1 and revised to resolve the data integrity conflicts. Listed below is a very brief synopsis of each issue and its resolution. The latest version of the mapping document is now checked into PVCS, under the file name and version number referenced in the associated ClearQuest ticket for this CCB request.

1. Convert DCIS mod number to numeric before storing in eRA
2. When converting DCIS num\_offers\_recd to eRA's offers\_received\_count, use new decoding algorithm to convert the DCIS alpha value to its numeric eRA equivalent.
3. When converting DCIS co\_determination\_bus\_size, decode values "S" to "Y" and "O" to "N", before storing in eRA's small\_bus\_certified\_code column.
4. Mapping of DCIS sub\_k\_plan\_require column to eRA's subcontract\_plan\_code deferred to iteration 2. No quick resolution to data integrity problems could be devised for practical implementation during iteration 1.
5. Mapping of DCIS handicapped\_dollars column to eRA's budget account code 2112 has been dropped altogether, from all iterations. No such budget account exists in eRA anymore, and besides that DCIS stores zero in this field for every record it has. It is evidently no longer used.
6. Mapping of DCIS solicit\_procedure column to eRA's solicitation\_code column is deferred to iteration 2. Value domains for the two systems have changed substantially and require more extensive analysis than would be practical for a quick iteration 1 resolution.
7. Mapping of DCIS procurement\_action column to eRA's action\_code and appl\_type\_code is deferred to iteration 2. Data model and value domain issues prevented quick resolution for iteration 1.
8. When converting DCIS sbir\_research\_code to eRA's sbir\_topic\_code, strip off leading zero from DCIS field if four characters long (eRA only allows three characters and when present, the fourth character in DCIS is always a leading zero).
9. Mapping for eRA serial\_num column is now derived via an algorithm for iteration 1. More extensive analysis will be performed during iteration 2 to devise a reliable algorithm to parse serial\_num from the DCIS contract number.
10. Mapping for eRA task\_num column is also derived via an algorithm for iteration 1. More extensive analysis will be performed during iteration 2 to devise a reliable algorithm to parse this number from DCIS order\_num field.

**8. Level of Effort**

<b>Impacted Group</b>	<b>LOE Time</b>	<b>Accessor</b>
Analysis	8	Michael Goodman
Development	32	Peter Ly
Integration Test		
Acceptance Test		
Operation		

#### **Overall Impact Assessment**

The changes that defer mappings to iteration 2 had no measurable impact on software development, since these only required existing code to be removed or commented-out. The mappings that remained in iteration 1, where the mapping was revised, did have some impact on development time but since they led to a far better success rate for iteration 1 mappings (from 10% to 70% as a result), the investment was well worth the cost in terms of producing a useful iteration for test.

Impact on test appears to have been nominal, since any detailed test plans based on these mappings were just being formulated when the changes were introduced. The integration test engineer was informed of the resolutions as soon as the developer was informed, so that test artifacts would be in harmony with this CCB and associated requirements re-baseline.

Impact on users is zero, since iteration 1 is purely a test iteration. The first delivery of code for the production environment is not scheduled until the end of iteration 2, at the very earliest. Adjustments to the iteration 1 baseline therefore have no user impact, particularly since none of the deferred items was deferred past iteration 2.

#### **4. Associated Defects**

<b>Defect Id</b>	<b>Defect Headline</b>
------------------	------------------------

#### **5. Associated Sub Tasks**

<b>Task Id</b>	<b>Task Headline</b>
----------------	----------------------

#### **6. Associated Issues**

<b>Issue Id</b>	<b>Issue Headline</b>
-----------------	-----------------------