
Subject: Re: Issue tracking...

Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Fri, 28 Jan 2011 13:28:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Back to the topic of issue tracking

I am quite new to this, so I would like to make sure I get some things right. So my idea about typical flow of things is this:

- 1) Report a bug/task/feature. It's state is "New".
 - 2) Someone makes a decision if the issue is worth the work/necessary/good idea and sets it to "Approved".
 - 3) Someone assigns the issue to themselves and starts working on it. The state changes to "In Progress".
 - 4) Assigned person (optionally?) reports progress.
 - 5) When it is ready, the issue state is changed to "Ready for QA" and is reassigned to someone responsible who checks if it is OK.
 - 6) Issue is either "Closed" and changes committed or it is assigned back to the person who worked on it, to continue at step 4) with state "In Progress".
- Few consecutive steps can be possibly merged.

Is that correct? Few things are still unclear to me, though in most cases the "common sense solution" is probably correct. Like who can approve an issue (can I approve issue I reported?) or who to ask for QA (Mirek in case of new features, original creator of changed code in other cases?). Are there any other rules we should follow?

Honza
