

TEAM C

PostCardBuddy

Project Experiences

Authors of this document:

Emma Albertz
Caroline Brandberg
Linnéa Claesson
Billy Johansson
Johan Ju
Jacob Mejvik
Carl Rynegardh

Contents

1	Background	1
2	Methods and Techniques	1
2.1	Elicitation	1
2.2	Specification	1
2.3	Validation	2
2.4	Prioritization	2
3	Reflections	2
3.1	Elicitation	2
3.2	Specification	2
3.3	Validation	2
3.4	Prioritization	2
4	Personal Statements	2

1 Background

During the first week, and the work for release one, we have worked to figure out who our stakeholders are and what they would like to see from our system. We have used a lot of different elicitation techniques and tried to keep requirements at a fairly high level, goal- or domain-level. Finding requirements through different elicitation techniques have been the highest ranked priority for release one.

2 Methods and Techniques

2.1 Elicitation

We techniques we have used have been inspired by "Software Requirements Style and Techniques" chapter 8, written by Soren Lauesen. The figure 8.2, page 338, has been of great help in choosing appropriate elicitation techniques. For release one we used the techniques: Brainstorming, Questionnaires, Prototypes, Focus groups, Document studies, ask suppliers and stakeholder analysis. !!!!! j- THIS , Har vi gjort allt detta? /newline Brainstorming: To come up with different functions we at first used brainstorming writing down the functions we could come up with. During the brainstorming session we also thought about, and extended, the specification and function given to us after the first week.

Questionnaire: The questionnaire contained functions that we came up with during the brainstorming session. Persons answering were asked to grade functions with grade 0-5, where zero stood for not interesting and five for very interesting. We also added a field for age to see if we could make out a difference in the interest of different functions between ages, stakeholders.

Prototypes: As we are time constrained, we decided to already create prototypes. Three of us made our own prototypes. As we are early in making requirements it was only about coming up with ideas for the graphical design of the app. In order not to affect the ideas of each other we designed them in isolation. Prototypes is a suitable technique for our product because of that we are specifying an application for end users. It helps the elicitation process by having users say "Can I do that here" when they test the prototype.

Document studies: As there already is an app on the market for sending physical postcards having a look at its featured seemed like a good idea. This was first done after brainstorming and thinking of functions of our own so that we would not kill our own creativity. Also, creating the same app over again does not seem like a good idea, referring to business goal such as that it should be able to create revenue. By studying the already existing app we hope to find ways to make it better. We have not put down a lot of effort in this yet. This will probably be done more thoroughly for release 2.

Focus group: Should be added.

Stakeholder analysis: Should be added.

2.2 Specification

Context diagram: A context diagram will be used because of its strengths to be easy to use at validation and verification. The diagram gives a good over-view of the system, both for the use of the client but also for the developers.

2.3 Validation

Prototypes: The prototype gives our customer a unique opportunity to validate how our product match their expectations. We are trying to contentiously adapt the prototype to our customers needs and new features so that it becomes a good reflection on where the project is going.

2.4 Prioritization

3 Reflections

3.1 Elicitation

Prototypes: We found an easy to use program for constructing prototypes that have worked very well for us. When we made many individual prototypes we discoverer that it also worked as practical brainstorming where we found features in the prototypes.

Questionnaire: Figure 1 present the result of the questionnaire, which 38 persons have answered. To get answers from that amount of people was no problem, but it still gave a start of what the users were interested in. The result of this is that the functionality "Share postcard on social media" was not important and "Suggestion for GPS-based images" was appreciated. This will be considered under release 2. The result also shows that the desired functionality didn't change that much depending on the age.

Document studies: The already existing app is easy to use and slim. It does not contain a lot of functions but there are enough. Most of the basic functions we have been thinking of are already implemented. However, there are definitely some functionalities that could be of use that is not implemented. Also, the library of images is not very big and GPS based images depending on your localization only work in Sweden and Denmark.

3.2 Specification

Context Diagram: The first context diagram created is presented in PMv2. The first diagram is very limited and contains too little information to understand the system. The updated diagram is presented in release 1 of the report System Requirements. The biggest problem creating a context diagram is that it should be big enough to present important details, but small enough to be able to get a over-view of the system. Therefore it is very important to think through which components it should contain, and which should be left out. This difference is often personal, which we noticed during the creation of release 1, which led to some discussion. The most time of the discussion were spend talking about if the back-end should be presented and how the functionality that is used within the mobile should be presented.

3.3 Validation

3.4 Prioritization

4 Personal Statements




Figure 1: Result of the questionnaire on the desired functionality in PostCardBuddy