Concordia University

Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering

SOEN 6481: Software Systems Requirements Specification

Instructor: Dr. Rodrigo Morales
Summer 2020
Team 18

Post Mortem Analysis
Smart Home + System

Team Member	Student ID
Tushar Jain	**40094872**
Neda Kalantari	**40150261**
Qing Li	**40082701**
Mohammad Alidadi	**40077244**
Neelofer Shama	**40121559**

GitHub Repository: https://github.com/M-Alidadi/Team18

Post Mortem Analysis

1. From the elicitation artifacts used in this delivery, answer the following questions:

1.1 What was the advantage of this technique based on your experience in this assignment?
1. We found the questionnaire very useful. Since each of the questions is given a short context the answers are more accurate. We acquired some of the subjective information.
2. The questionnaire was a good compliment to the other elicitation techniques that we used for example background study.
3. Were able to make sure that the end-user (Smart Home+ client) and the stakeholders have the same idea about the project.
4. Were able to elicit the requirements with low resources and remotely.

1.2 What was the disadvantage of this technique based on your experience in this assignment?
1. It is asking only a limited amount of information without adequate explanation.
2. End-Users may read differently into each question and therefore reply based on their own interpretation of the question.
3. It takes a lot of time and effort.

1.3 How efficient was the technique, i.e. how good requirements did it help uncover given the time it took to use?
1. Questionnaires allow us to acquire subjective information promptly, remotely and from many people in a relatively short time.
2. More specifically, 70% subjective questions are appropriately answered with full details and 30% subjective questions are simply answered with yes or no by the customer within 24 hours.
3. Extracting most of the detailed and useful requirements from customers and users in less than 24 hours is relatively efficient.

1.4 In which situations would you use this technique in a future project?
1. In case there is a need for an efficient way to collect information from multiple stakeholders quickly.
2. When we need informal checklists to ensure fundamental elements are addressed early on.
3. When we need to establish the foundation for subsequent elicitation activities.

1.5 In which situations would you not use this technique in a future project?
There are a lot of scenarios where these techniques might be very useful and crucial even. But, there are certain situations where these might not be helpful even disrupt the whole project.
For example,

1. In time critical situations these kinds of techniques are not helpful as they take a lot of time to gather and then analyzed by the stakeholders.
2. In situations of confidentiality and secrecy these kinds of techniques can hamper the access and security protocols. For example - military projects.
3. Also, in projects where there is no primary end user these techniques would be redundant.
4. In situations where the changes are rapid these techniques will cost more time and money.

2. Summarize how much time was spent (in total and by each group member) on the steps/activities involved as well as for the delivery as a whole. Be honest with the time spent, as this information will in no way be used for any grading.

Team Member	Activity	Time Spent
Tushar Jain	➔ Overview & Delegating Tasks ➔ Formatting VD & Post-Mortem Report ➔ ProofReading VD & PostMortem Report ➔ VD Introduction (Section 1) ➔ VD Stakeholder Summary (Section 3.1) ➔ Post Mortem Questionnaire (Section 1.5) ➔ Post Mortem Activity Summary (Section 2)	➢ 5 hours ➢ 2 hours ➢ 3.5 hours ➢ 1 hour ➢ 2.5 hours ➢ 1 hour ➢ 3 hours
Mohammad Alidadi	➔ Scheduling Tasks ➔ ProofReading VD Report ➔ VD Positioning (Section 2.1) ➔ VD Other Product Requirements (Section 5) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 1.1) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 4)	➢ 2 hours ➢ 2.5 hours ➢ 2 hours ➢ 5 hours ➢ 1 hour ➢ 1.5 hours
Neelofer Shama	➔ Research for Reports ➔ ProofReading VD Report ➔ VD Assumptions & Dependencies (Section 4.2) ➔ VD Alternatives & Competition (Section 4.4) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 3.1) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 3.2)	➢ 4 hours ➢ 2 hours ➢ 3 hours ➢ 2.5 hours ➢ 1.5 hours ➢ 1 hour
Qing Li	➔ Research and References ➔ ProofReading PostMortem Report ➔ VD Product Position Statement (Section 2.2) ➔ VD User Environment (Section 3.2) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 1.3) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 4)	➢ 3 hours ➢ 2 hours ➢ 2.5 hours ➢ 2 hours ➢ 1 hour ➢ 1 hour
Neda Kalantari	➔ Scheduling Meetings ➔ ProofReading PostMortem Report ➔ VD Product Perspective (Section 4.1) ➔ VD Needs & Features (Section 4.3) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 1.2) ➔ PostMortem Questionnaire (Section 4)	➢ 3 hours ➢ 1.5 Hours ➢ 1.5 hours ➢ 3 hours ➢ 1.5 hours ➢ 1 hour
Total Time Spent (Collectively)		**68.5 Hours**

Analysis: From the table we can propose the following conclusions :
1. All the tasks were completed well before the deadline.
2. Every member was assigned adequate tasks.
3. The team completed every task with utmost dedication and well before time and did more than what was asked.

3. In addition to the material seen in class, what other techniques did you apply for completing this delivery?

Many other techniques were used for completing this delivery. Some of them are:

1. Domain Analysis
2. Scenarios
3. Viewpoints
4. Introspection
5. Observation
6. BrainStorming
7. Requirements Workshop

3.1 Which techniques worked well?
1. **Domain Analysis:** It helped in identifying patterns and common points in the competitors and existing solutions.
2. **Scenarios:** It helped in understanding the edge cases.
3. **Brainstorming**: It helped in thinking of unique solutions to needs of the stakeholders.
4. **Requirements Workshop:** With this technique we were able to discuss the analysis we had done individually.

3.2 Which techniques did not work?
1. **Viewpoints:** A lot of effort went into it but could not conclude the non functional requirements using this technique.
2. **Introspection:** Some of the requirements that we gathered with this technique were different from the ones we received from the Stakeholders.
3. **Observation:** Not able to observe the actual execution of existing processes by the users without direct interference.

4. How did you work together as a group in the project?

The group worked really well during this phase of delivery:

1. The group worked together by participating in virtual meetings and used online messaging services like Slack and Whatsapp.
2. The meetings were used efficiently to discuss the project and divide responsibilities between team members while ensuring that everyone had similar workload.
3. In addition, team members were encouraged to mention any section of the project that they had difficulty with which allowed others to provide assistance.
4. Many tools were used during the course of the project. Some of them are:
   a. Zoom - which was used to hold online meetings.
   b. Whatsapp - which was used to coordinate meeting times and group activities allowing all team members to stay up to date with the status of the project.
   c. Google Docs - which was used to compose the reports, which made it easy for group members to work on different sections of the report simultaneously. When all sections were completed, team members reviewed the work of others and provided feedback.
   d. Github - which was used as a control system to track changes in the files and major deliveries.
   e. Slack - which was used for virtual communication with the team members as well as the stakeholders.

4.1 What worked well, and what did not work during your interaction(s)?

Various techniques were used during our interactions but some of them worked well while some did not do well.

- ❖ Some of the techniques that helped the team achieve the goals faster are listed as follows:

    1. Team members were able to express their thoughts on different subjects without being judged.
    2. We worked in pairs to increase productivity.
    3. We increased the number of meetings but kept them short and efficient.
    4. During Zoom meetings we divided and shared the workload evenly among team members.
    5. We did extensive research on the subject and related projects.
    6. We discussed our understanding of zoom meetings.
    7. Extensive research was also done to provide us with extensive background on the topic.

- ❖ The techniques that were not helpful are listed as follows:

    1. We tried dealing with different ideas as they were presented instead of documenting them which sometimes caused confusion.
    2. Scheduling tasks and meetings were done as per the need which sometimes caused issues with availability and coordination.
    3. Any modifications needed were discussed in virtual meetings without documenting which resulted in confusion and lack of coordination.

4.2 What would you do differently in the future?

1. We can grade each other's participation and contributions throughout the different phases of the project.
2. Summarize our discussions and especially our decisions and send them to online discussion so that we can refer back to them in the future. This includes a list of who has agreed to do what.
3. We can complete a checklist regularly in order to monitor and improve how effectively our group is working.
4. We will make sure that we design our question with more care and essentially get the answers that we are looking for