

## **Vision and Scope**

Generally, the document has good content and mainly in a good format. There are, however, some things to note in this document:

- Chapters 1, 2 and 4 consist mainly of just bullet points. In a vision and scope document, where the system is given the vision and the basic framework according to a specific need, it is common to use complete sentences and paragraphs, with an addition of bullet points to support or emphasize the paragraphs.
- The content and references used in the first chapter should be based on the need for the specific market. Later in the document it is stated that this software is going to be used in Finland, and in main cities. However, in the first chapter, the need and the basis are done according to US standards, and pounds are used as a measurement. These are not in line with the Finnish standards.
- Vision statement looks great in every aspect, but seems a bit separate from the other document, as this chapter is written as a paragraph instead of bullet points.
- Assumptions and dependencies seem to focus directly on the technical side of the project. While specifying the vision, technologies are one of the aspects to be considered, other aspects include assumptions about the users, business, and the market.
- Major features are described well in a well-documented list. Scope seems to also be clear, but again, we would have wanted to see some written paragraphs about the reasons for arriving at these conclusions. Scope is also just a list of bullet points that seems clear but is a bit hard to read.
- Context diagram is done well enough, but there could be a bit more detail about the context, as the current context diagram looks like any food ordering system in general.

## **Requirements management plan**

- There are enough RE-roles and their responsibilities concerning requirements processes are well explained.
- There is decent amount of elicitation activities, and their commentary is clear. Especially the parts about interviewing stakeholders and conducting surveys were explained well, since the steps of the activities as well as different stakeholder groups were clearly presented. It was a bit unclear why the development team would have to brainstorm to “come up with requirements”, the purpose of this could have been explained better. Do they brainstorm on requirements based on surveys and interviews for example or do they just come up with their own requirements?
- Many requirements modelling activities are listed, and their purpose is explained clearly. Modelling activities seem appropriate for the project.
- Prioritization method has been agreed on and explained clearly.
- Change management roles and process was well done. Especially the process model of handling a change was very informative. The model could have had some title though, for example “process of handling a change in requirements”, and some short explanation of the main steps of the model.

## **Use case document**

- This document looks great, the use cases are diverse and present variety, presenting all the features of the use case, the language is generally very clear and unambiguous, great job. Some small defects were found that will be listed below:
- The use cases are missing some of the sections that appear in the template such as who created the use case, its date of creation and who approved it.
- All the triggers in all use cases are missing, which is the section that should describe the goal or measurable value of the use case, "why would I stakeholder perform this use case?". Some of the goals can be guessed through the description or the postconditions, but this should not have to be the case, it should be clearly stated. Therefore, the evaluation has been given a 1 in this section.
- UC1 and UC11 are missing the exceptions. UC1 which could be i.e, the application crashes or fails to open.
- The exception flow in UC5 is phrased as a requirement rather than an exception. It could be framed as "no available food providers available in local area".

## **SRS**

- Some of the nonfunctional requirements like correctness and usability could use a little broader definition on how these are measured. Mainly regarding the food listing correctness and easy to use interface.
- Overall clear and concise requirements

## **Sustainability document**

### **1. Introduction**

- Concise and straight forward introduction of the purpose of the document and the sustainable impacts the platform will have, well done.

### **2. Framework for Sustainability of Software System Design (FSSSD)**

- Good table with clear stated details. We would have wanted to see a bit more description about the reasoning of the statuses.

### **3. Goal Model**

- Lot of arrows going everywhere, also in wrong direction, so seems like it was done in a bit of rush. Also, some goals did not have any arrows going anywhere.
- Every goal should relate to a goal on a higher sustainability level, that does not happen. Maybe if there were less goals, the model could have been clearer.
- Some goals seemed very general, for example "good documentation".

#### 4. Sustainability Requirement Template

- Mostly correctly assigned dimensions and well thought explanations
- Some of the requirement dimension connections are questionable e.g., User registration, Camera access and Location data usage vs. individual sustainability. The explanation for these is the same: “User exercises rights –to share his/ her data” and considering this, sharing your information is hard to consider a right especially in a sustainable sense. These actions are more like trade-off to get access to the service or some parts of it so the dimensions of these requirements should be thought in a sense of what the functionality that requires user allowance provides for the user and what is sustainable in it.
- The table contains only less than half of the requirements defined in SRS.

#### 5. Requirements Sustainability Analysis Radar Chart

- Regarding the analysis chart, on the individual values section it is stated that reduced cooking at home will result in reduced consumption of energy and resources. This strikes as ambiguous to start with it is hard to measure whether this would be indeed an enabled outcome, the real value would not be so much that the reduction of cooking at home is what reduces the resource consumption, but rather that reducing the food waste and reusing that cooked food again is what causes the reduction of resources.
- On the environmental section, the carbon footprint will be reduced rather by the reduction of resource consumption (which appears on the 3<sup>rd</sup> level effects) rather the other way as it is here stated.
- In the social section, it is unclear what “Anybody can get food” means.