

## **Process models and Awareness in SCM**

Xi Luo  
Jordy Noom  
Jaap ter Woerds

### **Points of discussion**

The paper contributes to the state-of-art knowledge of awareness in SCM by explicitly taking the development process into account. Like the authors in the paper state, awareness information alone does not help developers to prevent making combined inconsistent modifications. Display of too much information can even cause a *cognitive overload*. The authors claim that if developers have a continuous overview of relevant development activities, problems of combined inconsistent modifications can be detected and solved in the development phase.

The authors introduce a distance metric which helps determine the relevance of other developer's changes. Distances are determined by the partitioning of developers into (hierarchies of) groups. Distances are used in a cooperative policy to effectively limit the amount of information that is displayed to developers and thus promote the scalability of the awareness system with respects to the total number of developers.

Garcia and Estublier's system builds on well known concepts and can be easily extended to build more complex topologies. Therefore, the system can be learned and applied relatively easy in developing organizations.

Garcia and Estublier only present the infrastructure of the awareness SCM system Celine. Since the effectiveness of the whole systems lies in the proper definition of groups, workspaces and policies, extra effort has to be put in the project start-up phase. If the structuring of workspaces is not done properly, the distance may be a too coarse-grained metric (e.g. only distances of one or two). The possible configurations of workspaces of developers are in fact already limited by the architecture of the system under development.

Furthermore, the authors claim that concurrent engineering, change control and business models cannot be addressed in a single formalism without really giving a sound argumentation.