

Criticality scale: 1: not critical, 5: very critical		Validation checklist of Traffic-o-meter with comments from group D	v 2.0	
		Emma Holmberg Ohlsson, Martin Richter, Hannes Johansson, Johan Mattsson, Fredrik Åkerberg, Alexander Nässlander, Philip Holgersson, Mattias Eklund		
Contents Check	Observations - found and missing	Problem?	Criticality	Fix?
Customer and sponsor	Missing	Missing stakeholders.	5	Added brief description about each stakeholder together with their goal requirements.
Background		More detailed description of the background to improve understanding of the context and the system.	3	Improved background section to increase clarity.
Authors		Missing email.	-	Added the group's email to the requirements specification
Date				
Table of contents		Missing indention for quality, domain etc. These should be subsections not sections. (right now, it looks like there are two sections for domain level requirements and vice versa)	5	Fixed from not dividing quality requirements into different levels.
All levels of requirements				
Definitions of terms and concepts		Not very much introduction to the document. As an example, a list and description of the stakeholders would be nice for example under "client relationship"	3	
Business goals	Too few	There are some business goals but not too many and not very explained	2	This was deemed not important as well as our clients being responsible for the business model.
Trace goals → requirements	Missing	The requirements are there, but there is no tracing between them and goals what so ever.	4	Goal-domain tracing added. Elicited new goals using this technique.
Trace requirements → goals	Missing	See above for comment.	4	
Data: Data Model contents		Add terms describing the entities and explanations of the relations? Why can a timetable have multiple lines of transportation? Can a Stop be at multiple locations at once? Can a single location have multiple stops?	5	We clarified the definitions to explain more about the relations to the other entities. We did not add an explaining text to the data model since we consider the definitions to give this information now
Functional requirements: Domain-level requirements e.g. tasks	Found	Poorly structured, the indents could be overlooked	3	This is the structure that reqT offers for task at the moment. We have chosen to use reqT for the project.
Product-level events and functions	Found	Found but also under domain level requirements (example FastestTrip under 5.2.2.5, wrong placement?)	3	We consider FastestTrip to be correctly placed under domain since it is a feature that the system should be able to offer and not specifically what parts the product should do.
Design-level requirements e.g. prototypes or comm. Protocols	Found	It would be good if it was clarified if the images were examples of how it could be designed or how it should be designed. Also, there are no tracing to the virtual windows/mockups in the requirements. Could easily be added, example: The blabla should be designed as in mockup figure 8, or the data blabla could be represented as in virtual window figure 3.	3	Requirements for the mockups and virtual windows are now present with references to the figures
Spec of non-trivial functions		Not sure what this refers to?	-	

Special cases:				
Stress cases	Contains two requirement, requestCapacity and Refresh time.	No information on time required to calculate a trip?	4	Added a quality requirement concerning the time it takes to calculate a trip
Power failure, HW failure, configuration	Missing, matrix of reliability only.		2	Deemed not important and HW is considered to be out of scope for this project.
Use cases dealing with special events or errors	Missing use cases		2	This was ranked not important and we consider it being out of scope for our project.
Quality requirements:				
Performance	Missing completely.		4	In the document but under other name, "Refresh time".
Capacity, and accuracy	Missing completely.		4	Fixed, requirement requestCapacity. Accuracy is included in efficiency in SRS.
Usability				
Safety and security				
Reliability		You may want to add req. for correct computing of fastest trip.	3	We consider this an implementation issue and leave it to our client to define the quality for this.
Availability	Same as reliability?		-	
Fault tolerance				
Maintainability	Missing requirements.		3	This was prioritized low according to quality grid and therefore no requirement for it.
Portability	Missing requirements.		3	Requirements for iOS and Android moved to feature requirements.
Reusability	Missing requirements.		3	This was prioritized low according to quality grid and therefore no requirement for it.
Interoperability	Missing requirements.		3	This was prioritized low according to quality grid and therefore no requirement for it.
Installability	Missing completely.		3	This is deemed to a later issue and for the developers to consider.
Other qualities events or errors		Missing explanation to matrix.	4	Added comments after going through exercise results and discussion.
Other deliverables:				
Documentation	Missing.		3	We were interested in knowing if this was important for our clients. However, this will be for a later stage of the development.

Installation	Missing.		2	See previous comment
Data conversion	Missing.		2	See previous comment
System operation	Missing.		3	See previous comment
Support and maintenance	Missing.		2	See previous comment
Glossary:				
Domain and product terms		Very lightweight, add more information explaining the terms, such as Timetable, Geographic location, location.	5	Renamed some terms and added more details in the definitions.
Structure check:				
Unique ID for each requirement		Some requirements use camelCase, some PascalCase and some use space.	2	Fixed so all use PascalCase
Verifiable requirements		Requirements in section 5.2.2.7 are hard to verify. Example: "all bus lines" ? this could be better specified	4	Updated requirements to make them clearer and verifiable
Purpose of each requirement				
Example of ways to meet requirement				
Text explanation of diagrams, ets.	Missing (e.g. data diagram and quality matrix).	Context diagram missing complete description. According to Johan Linåker it should be possible to cover the picture and still be able to understand the diagram according to the description.	4	Quality matrix is updated with description. Context diagram now has describing text. For the data model we have clarified the definitions instead so that the data model should be more understandable.
Importance and stability	Missing	Stability requirements not found	3	Considered an implementation issue and something for the developers to consider.
No duplicate information		Would be easier to find duplications if there were some tracing between the requirements	-	
Consistency checks				
CRUD check: Create, read, update, delete all data	Missing	User: missing information about creating/deleting users	3	We have clarified that the user is at an abstraction level where we have not designed that there should be an account. Therefore we do not at this stage consider that there should exist features for creating and deleting users.
All events handled by task or function?				
Task and message data in data model?	Found	Message data missing in data model	4	When asked to clarify, the client considered not important.
Virtual Window data in data model?		Walking distance?	2	Deemed not important as they don't illustrate final version.

Virtual window support all tasks?	Found for user application, missing for statistics?	It is mentioned in the app that it should collect statistics, however there are no virtual windows for this.		Considered not important for client and something to take into account in a future release. 3
Contents Check	Observations - found and missing	Problem?	Criticality	
Reviews				
Goals and critical issues covered?				
Requirements justified?		"Why" exists on some places which is great, could maybe be added in some more requirements, for example feature MaxDistToStop and so on		Added why to the last feature requirements. 3
Risk assessment	Missing	Could not find any risk assessment		We deem that this is out of the scope for the project. 2 And that is not prioritized.
High-risk areas improved	Missing	See above comment		2 See previous comment
Requirement Quality Check				
Does the requirements design or give suggestions of solutions?				
Does multiple requirements describe the same or similar needs?		Not found but could be found by tracing between requirements.. :)		
Can some requirements be grouped to a single requirement?				
Can any requirement be split into several requirements?				
Is it possible to satisfy the requirements with the available technology?				
Is it possible to test all requirements?		See comment on "verifiable requirements" under structure check		
Are all requirements independent or do you have to examine other requirements to understand them?				
Are the requirements unambiguous?		5.2.2.3 ChangeNameOnDestination: is changing the name on a destination and giving the destination an alias/nickname the same thing? Feels unambiguous		5.2.2.3 and some other clarifications made. However, there might still some unambiguous requirements but this would need more feedback from our client. 2
Have other similar requirements been evaluated?		If this is not the same thing as "Does multiple requirements describe the same or similar needs?" then we did not understand this one		
Is any information redundant?				
Is any other information missing?	Missing	Missing references to images in section 5.4.2. It would be nice if the images referred back to requirements as well		3 Fixed for final release.
Are any requirements missing?		Missing requirement for login, but there is however a requirement stating that you should be able to access settings from multiple devices. How would this be possible without login?		We consider this to be a design level issue. Therefore we only have the mentioned requirement. 4