|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 25.04.2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: Vendomatic | | | | Number of Pages: 2 | | | |
| Product Name: Vendomatic | | | | Product Definition: Software to improve vending machine experience/workflow | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | All QA/QC | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Tolga Muratdağı* | | | *3. Taylan Işıkoğlu* |
| *2. İsmail Şimşekoğlu* | | | *4. Murat Kandaz* |
| Review Materials: | * *Glossary (G)* * *Use Case Model (U)* * *Project Plan (P)* * *Work Items List (W)* * *Iteration Plan (I)* * *Next Iteration Plan (NI)* * *Test Cases (Tc)* * *Test Script (Ts)* * *Architecture Notebook (AN)* * *Design (D)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  \_\_\_ as it is  \_x\_ with rework | | REJECTED  \_\_\_\_ review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | |  | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | |  | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 1 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | |  | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | |  | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | |  | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | |  | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 8 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | |  | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 9 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| L | | Little | | | | 2 | |
| M | | Medium | | | | 6 | |
| I | | Important | | | | 1 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 9 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Ts | Resuts and Decisions for all UCs | Various | Various | 3 | Medium | Results and Decision parts for all three use cases (UC-1, UC-8, and UC-9) are empty so there is an uncertainty about whether tests are made or not (although some of the core competencies mentioned in the tests are clearly seen in the PoC’s, not all of them are clear). |  |  |
| 2 | Ts | 1.1 | 4 | Table | 8 | Medium | The test steps of the extension scenarios presented for UC-1 in the Use Case document are not given. |  |  |
| 3 | Ts | 2.1 | 6 | Table | 8 | Medium | The test steps of the extension scenarios presented for UC-8 in the Use Case document are not given. |  |  |
| 4 | Ts | 3.1 | 8 | Table | 8 | Medium | The test steps of the extension scenarios presented for UC-9 in the Use Case document are not given. |  |  |
| 5 | P | 2 | 4 | - | 8 | Medium | Project organization structure is not given in the project plan. Also considering the vision document the organizational structure (matrix / functional / project-based) and reporting lines are unclear.  This correction from Iteration 1 has not been made in the project plan. |  |  |
| 6 | I | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 | Important | Relevant section and subsections in Iteration 2 Plan are not updated at the end of this iteration. |  |  |
| 7 | Tc | Preconditions for all UCs | Various | Various | 8 | Little | System should be available as a precondition. |  |  |
| 8 | Tc | Postconditions for all UCs | Various | Various | 8 | Medium | Extension scenarios should also be tested (see comment no 2-4). As a side note, these also should have been discussed in relevant Descriptions. |  |  |
| 9 | Tc | 3 | 4 | 25 | 8 | Little | “Description” header is missing. |  |  |