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# Executive Summary

This document presents the analysis of Requirement 3 from the project Acme-ANS-D01. The requirement mandates the inclusion of a link to the planning dashboard in GitHub, but lacks clarity regarding its exact placement.

After considering multiple approaches, the team has evaluated different alternatives and determined the most appropriate solution. The proposed structure aims to facilitate evaluation while maintaining organization and accessibility.

# Revision Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Revision Number** | **Date** | **Description** |
| 1.0 | 19/20/2025 | Initial Draft |
| 1.1 | 20/20/2025 | Final Documentation Review |

# Introduction

During the requirement analysis phase, the team reviewed Requirement 3, which states:

*"Provide a link to your planning dashboard in GitHub to review the tasks, their current status, and your schedule."*

While the requirement correctly defines what needs to be done, it does not specify where the link should be placed. This lack of clarity can lead to inconsistencies across different projects, making evaluation more difficult for lecturers.

To address this issue, the team considered multiple approaches and analysed various alternatives. Based on this analysis, the proposed solution involves organizing the links in a structured subdirectory within the project repository, ensuring accessibility and clarity for evaluation purposes.

This report presents the requirement analysis, discusses the identified problem, explores alternative solutions, and justifies the selected approach.

# Contents

## Requirement Definition

**Requirement 3:**  
*"Provide a link to your planning dashboard in GitHub to review the tasks, their current status, and your schedule."*

## Problem Identification

* The requirement does not specify where the link should be included.
* Different placement strategies could impact accessibility and ease of evaluation.
* A standard location should be defined to ensure consistency across projects.

## Solution Alternatives

The team considered three alternatives to address the problem:

* Alternative 1: Include the link in the project's README file
  + Pros:
    - This makes it easy to find for anyone browsing the repository.
  + Cons:
    - The README may become cluttered with too much information, and the link might not be prominent if the file grows too large.
* Alternative 2: Create a .txt file inside each student's individual reports folder containing the link
  + Pros:
    - Maintains organization, makes the link easy to find within each student's documentation, and avoids clutter in the main repository.
  + Cons:
    - Requires each student to manage their own file, which may lead to inconsistencies if not standardized.
* Alternative 3: Place the link inside a dedicated planning folder within the repository, containing all project-related planning resources
  + Pros:
    - Keeps all planning-related documents centralized, making it clear where to look.
  + Cons:
    - It could be overlooked if contributors are not aware of the structure.

## Proposed Solution

Considering the context of this project, Alternative 2 was chosen as the best approach. This structure ensures clarity while maintaining a simple and organized way to store the links for each dashboard.

# Conclusions

The team identified that Requirement 3 lacked precise instructions regarding where the planning dashboard link should be placed. After evaluating multiple alternatives, we concluded that creating a .txt file inside each student's individual reports folder was the best solution.

This approach provides the following benefits:

* Maintains a well-structured organization.
* Ensures each student has their own file, simplifying individual assessments.
* Avoids unnecessary clutter in the main repository.

We believe this solution effectively addresses the issue while maintaining a well-organized project structure.
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