

17.6 Generated File Review Rules

[Go To Top](#)

[Return to Git and Review Workflow](#)

Generated files require special review discipline. Reviewers should be able to distinguish source changes from generated outputs and confirm that generation occurred through the approved workflow.

When a change includes generated [Artifacts](#), the pull request should identify:

1. Source definitions that triggered generation.
2. Generation command or script used.
3. [DDS](#) product or generator used.
4. Generator version, where relevant.
5. Target language or output type.
6. Output directory.
7. Validation performed after generation.
8. Whether generated Artifacts should enter Git for this Baseline.

Reviewers should not treat generated code as the source of architectural truth. [IDL](#) source files, catalogues, [Configuration](#), architecture documents, and handbook sections define the governed meaning. Generated code projects that meaning into implementation form.

If generated files change without corresponding source-definition changes, reviewers should ask why. Possible explanations include generator version changes, output format changes, regenerated stale files, or accidental local generation differences. The team should resolve the cause before accepting the change.

If source definitions change but generated Artifacts do not change where expected, reviewers should ask whether the developer forgot to run generation or whether the generated Artifacts are intentionally not tracked in Git.

© 2026 Dido Solutions, Inc. and Jackrabbit Consulting, Inc.

From:
<https://wiki.didosolutions.com/> - **Dido Solutions, Inc Wiki**

Permanent link:
<https://wiki.didosolutions.com/fxdemo/05-part/17-git-and-review-workflow/17-6-generated-file-review-rules/start>

Last update: **2026/08/12 15:48**

