Section 1

1. The model successfully produced a document (Jira ticket) related to the user story that is coherent and well-structured.

   Answer: 3 out of 5

2. Would you like to add anything?

   Answer: It is coherent: I found the information aligned with my expectations. It is structured: it follows the structure I would have expected. However, it lacks some information that could help the reader. More detail is needed.

3. The user story is clear.

   Answer: 4 out of 5

4. The user story is concise.

   Answer: 4 out of 5

5. The user story is complete.

   Answer: 3 out of 5

6. The user story is adaptable to future changes.

   Answer: 3 out of 5

7. Are there aspects of the document that would have been developed differently if it had been created by an analyst?

   Answer: 5 out of 5

8. Would you like to add anything?

   Answer: The analyst would have had more knowledge and therefore been able to go into greater detail.

Section 2

9. The model successfully produced a coherent and well-structured epic.

    Answer: 3 out of 5

10. Would you like to add anything?

    Answer: The reason is the same as in answer 2 (it is coherent and well-structured but lacks detail).

11. The epic provides a clear and complete vision of the 'Availability' functionalities.

    Answer: 2 out of 5

12. Would you like to add anything?

    Answer: The document seems like an outline listing key aspects, but it does not provide a detailed coverage of the functionality. So, I see this document more as a support.

13. The document reflects what you would normally produce manually.

    Answer: 3 out of 5

14. Would you like to add anything?

    Answer: The analyst would go into greater detail in the information generated by the model.

Section 3

15. The model correctly captured the necessary technical specifications.

    Answer: 2 out of 5

16. Would you like to add anything?

    Answer: The technical specifications are hinted at but are not fully captured in this document.

17. The technical descriptions and presented workflows are detailed enough to guide development.

    Answer: 2 out of 5

18. Would you like to add anything?

    Answer: A lack of detail does not help developers.

Section 4

19. Which of the two "Executive summaries" was produced by the model?

    Answer: 2 (correct answer)

20. Which of the two "Overview/Background" sections was produced by the model?

    Answer: 1 (correct answer)

21. Which of the two "Assumptions and dependencies" sections was produced by the model?

    Answer: 2 (correct answer)

Section 5

22. Large Language Models can provide valuable support in the requirements specification phase.

    Answer: 3 out of 5

23. How much time do you think you could save by using the model's outputs as a starting point?

    Answer: Between 15 and 30 minutes out of 4 hours.

24. In which phase(s) do you think it would be appropriate to use LLM support?

    Answer: Epic FDS generation.

25. List the negative aspects.

    Answer: Lack of information as it may not fully understand its importance and relevance.

26. List the positive aspects.

    Answer: It helps to keep a "faithful" record of what is said and might otherwise be forgotten.

27. Additional feedback.

    Answer: It trims quite a bit of information, which is why I see it more as a summary that could be suitable for an Epic FDS document.

Section 6

Using LLMs would allow me to complete my tasks faster.

Answer: Neutral

Using LLMs would improve my performance in document creation.

Answer: Neutral

Using LLMs would increase my productivity in the requirements specification process.

Answer: Agree

I find LLM support useful for my work.

Answer: Agree