

Plan and Requirements analysis

Requirements analysis documentation – Group Component 5%

Initially, the team needs to elicit and analyse the project's requirements. Even if a project is being developed in an agile fashion, it is important to establish the initial requirements. These should be established in collaboration with key stakeholders.

Note that the plan and requirements will almost certainly change later.

For instance,

- The group needs to do further research to determine the final requirement(s) in an area.
 - Currently, a requirement can be to do research.
- If the team and product owner decide that other aspects are more important or time does not permit the implementation of all requirements.
 - Consequently, it is a good idea to rank the requirements, e.g., using MosCow prioritization or a similar method.
- They might also change in the future because you made mistakes.
 - Get agreement from the tutor/product owner.
 - Maybe changes are something to reflect on in your individual report.

The requirements should be documented in this assessment and defined. They should be categorised (e.g. functional vs non-functional) and analysed, for instance,

- What is the impact of the requirements?
- Are there conflicts between them?
- How feasible are they?

The group also needs a plan of how to achieve these requirements. Wherever possible make it of SMART (**S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, **T**ime-bound) components and goals. Notice, that aspects where further research is needed can also be specified using SMART components and goals.

The documentation is submitted as a group report. It is expected to be at most two A4 pages. It may be longer, but it might be penalized if it is repetitive.

The plan and requirements analysis documentation is worth 5% of the final mark. It will be marked according to the below:

5% (A-Level):

- The requirements (reqs) have been gathered with stakeholders.
- The reqs are defined to a level sufficient to understand what a successful end product is.
- The reqs are categorised and prioritised.
- The documentation is simple/concise and describes the reqs so they are measurable, testable, and actionable.
- The plan is wherever possible SMART

4% (B-level):

- The requirements (reqs) have been gathered with stakeholders.
- The reqs are defined to a level sufficient to understand what a successful end product is. Some areas might be missing.
- The reqs are categorised and prioritised, but might have a few mistakes.
- The documentation describes the reqs, making them mostly measurable, testable, and actionable.
- The plan is mostly SMART

3% (C-level):

- The requirements (reqs) have been described.
- The reqs are defined for an end product, although it might have a flaw that could prevent it from being a successful end product.
- The reqs might be categorised and prioritised.
- Aspects of the plan are SMART

2% (D-level):

- Some requirements (reqs) have been described, but the analysis is seriously flawed or lacking detail.
- There is evidence of a plan.

1% (E-level):

- What has been described is not a requirement analysis or a plan.

0% (E-level):

- Nothing was submitted.

