Critique on SRS for Payroll Management System
(SRS_DOC_3)

Anonymous

April 12, 2021

I felt the provided SRS had quite a few caveats and missing information. The requirements from the UI designer were not mentioned clearly and also the requests for features were slightly vague.

1. The first thing to note was that it was asking for contradictory and different system requirements. In 3.1, it requires the program to work on Windows and macOS, and then 3.5.2 asks it to be a web application to run on any operating system.

   The layouts, the application style, and the team required to make such a system will be very different if we create a desktop app and a web app. It should be hence more clearly specified.

   In my Product details documentation, I used the web browser layout.

2. The biggest issue that I felt was that there was NOT any section for the User Interface and it's requirement, without which Product Details Documentation and creating a User Guide is impossible. Without this, the UI designer and User Guide maker has no structure in mind, and it gets very difficult to create a UI in this case.

   Even listing out the headings of the different parts of the UI is not enough as very specific details are required to create a UI, which were not there

   Thus, in order to create the UI, I had to assume that the application follows the structure given in the modules section (2.2.1), and had to decide upon my own in what ways the contents of the modules will be displayed.

3. The SRS had NO information about the login procedure for a user or organization or administrator. If there is no login system then the

system is vulnerable, while if there is, the exact requirements need to be specified as we might need to ascertain extra credentials from a user while logging.

4. The SRS had NO information about the sign-up procedures for new users or organizations or administrators, and what all details are required while signing up as a User or Administrator, etc. Hence, I was not able to create a mock-up for these pages as the details were not supplied. The argument is same as above.

5. The "Reports" being requested in 2.2.1.6 have no specified format or requirements thus they could not be represented with accurate descriptions in the mock up.

6. The frontend and backend technologies being proposed in 3.1 are out of date and might be out of date with the present computer systems.

7. There is no mention of any way to make changes or update the entries, thus the system apeears to be working as a payroll viewwing and analysis system, and not a management system.

However, there were a few merits of the SRS as well:

1. The document presented its requirements in a clear and concise fashion, and were specific in what they required (except for the missing details.)

2. The Performance requirements and Design Requirements are clearly specified.