

Feasibility Evidence Description (FED)

We Are Trojans (WAT) Network

Team 01

Team members	Roles
Eirik Skogstad	Project Manager, Life Cycle Planner
Min Li	Feasibility Analyst, Operational Concept Engineer
Pittawat Pamornchaisirikij	NDI/NCS Acquirer & Evaluator, Tester
Saloni Priya	Requirements Engineer, UML Modeler
Suleyman Erten	Operational Concept Engineer, Requirement Engineer
Kamonphop Srisopha	Prototyper, UML modeler
Ameer Elkordy	IIV&V, Quality Focal Point
Punyawee Pakdiying	System Architect, Feasibility Analyst

10/29/2014

Version History

Date	Author	Version	Changes made	Rationale
09/28/14	ML, PP	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create initial a FED document from a template, updating the risk assessment section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For use VCP package submission of the project.
10/11/14	ML, PP	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish all from section 1 to 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For use VCP package submission of the project.
10/19/14	ML, PP	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated all section Make consistent with ARB and FCR presentation Some NDI was evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use in next phase (Foundation phase) To be consistent with ABR presentation
10/29/14	PP	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added more NDI/NCS analysis and evaluation Update the risk list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider more NDI/NCS to gain more information and reduce risk in development phase

Table of Contents

Feasibility Evidence Description (FED)	i
Version History	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Table of Tables	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the FED Document	1
1.2 Status of the FED Document	1
2. Process Feasibility	2
3. Risk Assessment	4
4. NDI/NCS Feasibility Analysis	6
4.1 Assessment Approach	6
4.2 Feasibility Evidence	12
5. Business Case Analysis	15
5.1 Market Trend and Product Line Analysis	16
5.2 Cost Analysis	16
5.3 Benefit Analysis	17
5.4 ROI Analysis	18
6. Conclusion and Recommendations	19

Table of Tables

<i>Table 1: Rationales for Selecting NDI/NCS Model</i>	2
<i>Table 2: Risk Assessment</i>	4
<i>Table 3: NDI/NCS Products Listing</i>	6
<i>Table 4.1: Evaluation Criteria – CMS Attributes</i>	6
<i>Table 4.2: Evaluation Criteria – DBMS Attributes</i>	7
<i>Table 5.1: Evaluation Criteria - CMS features</i>	7
<i>Table 6.1: Evaluation Results of CMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	8
<i>Table 6.2.1: Evaluation Results of Oracle DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	8
<i>Table 6.2.2: Evaluation Results of MySQL DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	9
<i>Table 6.2.3: Evaluation Results of Microsoft SQL Server DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	9
<i>Table 6.2.4: Evaluation Results of DB2 DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	10
<i>Table 6.2.5: Evaluation Results of SQLite DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	10
<i>Table 6.2.6: Evaluation Results of PostgreSQL DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix</i>	11
<i>Table 7: Evaluation Results of NDI features criteria Screen Matrix</i>	11
<i>Table 8: Level of Service Satisfiability Evidence</i>	12
<i>Table 9: Level of Service Implementation Strategy</i>	12
<i>Table 10: Capability Feasibility Evidence Table</i>	12
<i>Table 11: Evolutionary Feasibility Evidence</i>	14
<i>Table 12: Market Trend and Product Line Analysis</i>	16
<i>Table 13: Personnel Costs</i>	16
<i>Table 14: Hardware and Software Costs</i>	17
<i>Table 15: Benefits of We Are Trojans (WAT) System</i>	17
<i>Table 16: ROI Analysis Table</i>	18

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the FED Document

This document reports our analysis about the feasibility evidence of the We Are Trojans (WAT) Network project. We use risk assessment to identify and come up with a way to mitigate those risks. We will analyze NDI items and evaluate the risk if whether they fit our project.

1.2 Status of the FED Document

- Updated the risk list
- Added more NDI/NCS analysis and evaluation

2. Process Feasibility

Table 1: Rationales for Selecting NDI/NCS Model

Criteria	Importance	Project Status	Rationales
30 % of NDI/NCS features	3	3	In the We Are Trojans, we will use NDI for the forum component and a core module to manage user's login
Single NDI/NCS	1	1	We may be using more than one NDI.
Unique/ inflexible business process	1	1	The business aspects of the project are very flexible.
Need control over upgrade / maintenance	3	3	The project has to be upgraded in future after the client negotiating with the USC.
Rapid deployment	0	0	Currently we are just building a dummy system. The system initially will not be deployed.
Critical on compatibility	0	0	The system has no compatibility issue. We will built the system and then look for a web hosting for our system.
Internet connection independence	1	1	Internet connection is important, as the application developed is a web-based application.
Need high level of services / performance	2	1	High level of services and performance is important
Need high security	2	2	The system will be used only by USC students
Asynchronous communication	2	2	The system requires asynchronous communication to communicate with the web hosting.
Be accessed from anywhere	3	3	The system is an online community.
Critical on mass schedule constraints	0	0	No, the system is not critical on mass schedule

			constraints.
Lack of personnel capability	0	0	The group consists of highly competent graduate software engineers and because We Are Trojans!
Require little upfront costs	3	3	The budget for our project is \$0, as per our client specifications.
Require low total cost of ownership	2	2	Requires no cost of ownership
Not-so-powerful local machines	3	3	We have minimal cost and we also have no infrastructure right now. We will be using free left over 8 year old laptops.

3. Risk Assessment

Table 2: Risk Assessment

Risks	Risk Exposure			Risk Mitigations
	Potential Magnitude	Probability Loss	Risk Exposure	
User Risk: users may not accept to use the system even if all the specification are met by the system	7	10	70	We need to have certain level of discussion with the actual users as to whether they are willing to learn and use the new system we are developing using surveys
Users may existing prefer systems with similar features	7	10	70	Make the WAT points system stand out from competitors. Advertise our system to USC. Create surveys and evaluate users' response.
Lack of Involvement by success-critical-stakeholders: Do not understand clearly enough the success-critical Stakeholder positions	5	10	50	Further understanding of needs and system scoping is needed
Undefined Plan and Requirements: The requirements of the system are not solid, and are just partly known.	5	9	45	Consult with the clients to find more details about the unclear features, develop the prototype or graph to clarify the features, and discuss about the potential system flaws.
May not have sufficient time to create comprehensive prototypes for important parts of the system	7	6	42	Prioritize the prototyping. Use minimal effort for each prototype to gain enough information to identify the feature is feasible.
User survey may have flaws and not yield correct information about user experience.	5	7	35	Consult our clients and collaboratively develop a good user survey.
Architecture/Reuse/Non-Development Item conflict: There is no current server	4	8	32	Looking for services provided only and analyze all options if they are

available for our system. The COTS/NDI used are poorly matched. A database system may be needed in order to keep the accounts, logs and forum informations.				suitable to our conditions. Establish off-line server for using as a prototype for the clients manages to overcome the problem of interoperability.
---	--	--	--	---

4. NDI/NCS Feasibility Analysis

4.1 Assessment Approach

We will select NDIs that provide the features needed in our project, such as a forum with like and dislike functionalities, a CMS that allow the development team to specify roles for the users. We will look for the following features to make an appropriate NDIs selection

4.1.1 NDI/NCS Candidate Components (Combinations)

Table 3: NDI/NCS Products Listing

NDI/NCS Products	Purposes
CMS (Joomla, Drupal, Wordpress)	Provide general functions for manage content on website
DBMS (MySQL, Oracle, Microsoft SQL Server, DB2, SQLite, PostgreSQL)	For keeping, managing, and retrieving data storage used in the system
Webserver (PHP based)	Infrastructure for our system
JQuery	Provide DOM manipulation methods
CSS framework (ex. bootstrap, foundation)	CSS API to customize user interface on website

4.1.2 Evaluation Criteria

Table 4: Evaluation Criteria – CMS Attributes

No.	Evaluation Criteria – CMS attributes	Weight
1	Cost	30
2	Familiarity	20
3	Maturity	15

4	Compatibility	15
5	Functionality	10
6	Scalability	10
	Total	100

Table 5: Evaluation Criteria – DBMS Attributes

No.	Evaluation Criteria – DBMS attributes	Weight
1	Cost	18
2	Familiarity	16
3	Reliability	14
4	Security	12.5
5	Flexibility	12.5
6	Performance	9
7	Scalability	9
8	Support	9
	Total	100

Table 6: Evaluation Criteria - CMS features

No.	CMS Features/ Sub features	Weight
1	Forum with basic Like/Dislike system	50
2	Search function	30
3	Authentication	15
4	Online Store	5
	Total	100

*There is no Table 5.2 because there are no special feature needed for DBMS.

4.1.3 Evaluation Results Screen Matrix

Table 7: Evaluation Results of CMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	Joomla				AVG	Total	Drupal				AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4			R1	R2	R3	R4		
1 (Cost)	30	10	10	10	8	9.5	285	10	10	10	10	10	300
2 (Familiarity)	20	9	9	8	6	8	160	7	7	6	1	5.25	105
3 (Maturity)	15	10	9	9	5	8.25	123.75	8	7	9	7	7.75	116.25
4 (Compatibility)	15	9	10	8	10	9.25	138.75	9	10	8	8	8.75	131.25
5 (Functionality)	10	8	10	9	10	9.25	925	8	9	8	10	8.75	87.5
6 (Scalability)	10	10	9	9	10	9.5	95	10	9	10	9	9.5	95
Total	100						895						835

Table 8: Evaluation Results of Oracle DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	Oracle								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	3	2	2	3	5	3	9	1	3.5	63
2 (Familiarity)	16	3	6	5	6	5	4	5	10	5.5	88
3 (Reliability)	14	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	10	8.875	124.25
4 (Security)	12.5	9	9	9	9	7	8	9	10	8.75	109.375
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	5	4	7	4	7	6	8	8	6.125	76.5625
6 (Performance)	9	9	10	10	9	8	8	9	8	8.875	79.875
7 (Scalability)	9	9	10	10	10	8	9	10	10	9.5	85.5
8 (Support)	9	9	8	9	8	9	9	10	10	9	81
Total	100										707.5625

Table 9: Evaluation Results of MySQL DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	MySQL								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	10	9	10	10	10	8	10	9	9.5	171
2 (Familiarity)	16	8	8	8	8	9	4	10	10	8.125	130
3 (Reliability)	14	9	9	8	8	8	8	10	6	9.25	115.5
4 (Security)	12.5	8	9	9	8	8	9	9	10	8.75	109.375
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	8.75	109.375
6 (Performance)	9	8	9	8	9	8	9	10	6	8.375	75.375
7 (Scalability)	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	8.75	78.75
8 (Support)	9	7	8	9	8	8	9	9	7	8.125	73.125
Total	100										862.5

Table 10: Evaluation Results of Microsoft SQL Server DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	Microsoft SQL Server								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	3	3	2	3	5	3	3	5	3.375	60.75
2 (Familiarity)	16	3	5	3	3	9	3	2	10	4.75	76
3 (Reliability)	14	9	9	9	9	10	8	10	10	9.25	129.5
4 (Security)	12.5	9	9	9	9	10	8	10	10	9.25	115.625
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	5	2	2	4	9	3	8	8	5.125	64.0625
6 (Performance)	9	9	9	8	9	9	7	5	8	8	72
7 (Scalability)	9	9	8	8	8	9	7	9	10	8.5	76.5
8 (Support)	9	9	9	9	9	10	8	9	10	9.125	82.125
Total	100										676.5625

Table 11: Evaluation Results of DB2 DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	DB2								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1.125	20.25
2 (Familiarity)	16	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	1.875	30
3 (Reliability)	14	9	9	9	9	9	8	1	10	8	112
4 (Security)	12.5	9	9	9	9	9	8	1	10	8	100
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	5	2	8	1	3	2	1	8	2.75	46.875
6 (Performance)	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	1	8	7.625	68.625
7 (Scalability)	9	9	8	9	8	8	4	1	10	7.125	64.125
8 (Support)	9	9	9	9	8	8	6	10	10	8.625	77.625
Total	100										519.5

Table 12: Evaluation Results of SQLite DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	SQLite								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	10	9	10	10	10	9	10	9	9.625	173.25
2 (Familiarity)	16	3	6	7	5	2	4	7	1	4.325	70
3 (Reliability)	14	9	7	10	7	7	7	8	8	7.875	110.25
4 (Security)	12.5	5	6	7	6	8	7	10	10	7.375	92.3125
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	5	9	9	7	7	7	9	8	7.625	95.3125
6 (Performance)	9	3	6	6	6	5	6	10	6	6	54
7 (Scalability)	9	6	5	6	5	5	6	8	6	5.875	52.875
8 (Support)	9	5	8	8	5	5	6	10	5	6.5	58.5
Total	100										706.375

Table 13: Evaluation Results of PostgreSQL DBMS attributes criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	PostgreSQL								AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8		
1 (Cost)	18	10	9	9	10	9	8	8	9	9	162
2 (Familiarity)	16	3	8	6	9	1	3	2	2	4.25	68
3 (Reliability)	14	9	9	8	9	8	7	3	9	7.75	108.5
4 (Security)	12.5	8	9	8	9	8	8	4	10	8	100
5 (Flexibility)	12.5	8	9	9	9	8	8	5	8	8	100
6 (Performance)	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8.125	73.125
7 (Scalability)	9	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8.125	73.125
8 (Support)	9	7	6	7	7	5	7	10	7	7	63
Total	100										747.75

Table 14: Evaluation Results of NDI features criteria Screen Matrix

No	W	Joomla				AVG	Total	Drupal				AVG	Total
		R1	R2	R3	R4			R1	R2	R3	R4		
1(Forum)	50	8	9	5	5	6.75	337.5	8	8	6	6	7	350
2(Search function)	30	8	8	8	10	8.5	252	8	7	8	7	7.5	225
3 (Authentication)	15	10	10	10	10	10	150	10	9	10	9	9.5	142.5
4 (Online Store)	5	8	9	8	9	8.5	42.5	8	8	9	9	8.5	42.5
Total	100						782						760

4.2 Feasibility Evidence

4.2.1 Level of Service Feasibility

Table 15: Level of Service Satisfiability Evidence

Level of Service Win Condition	Rationale
LOS-1: The system shall not be down more than 24 hours in one month.	Almost all of the web services available right now can achieve this level of service easily. Moreover, our project can have maintenance at night so that it will not cause the system to be down more than 24 hours.

Table 16: Level of Service Implementation Strategy

Level of Service Win Condition	Product Satisfaction
LOS-1: The system shall not be down more than 24 hours in one month.	Product Strategies: Apache, MySQL, Joomla CMS
	Process Strategies: Prototyping, Analysis and evaluate NDI, NCS
	Analysis: We will find a list stable web hosting to use, then the most time consume that can cause the system down in only migration with will depend on migration plan

4.2.2 Capability Feasibility

Table 17: Capability Feasibility Evidence Table

Capability Requirement	Product Satisfaction
CR-1: Start/Edit/Delete a thread: Users are able to start/edit/delete threads	Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery
	Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.
	Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.
CR-2: Calculate the WAT points: The	Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery

system should correctly calculate three types of WAT points.	<p>Feasibility Evidence: Firstly, we will make prototype by come up with algorithms to handle WAT points system. Show the prototype to our client to gain more information about the WAT points then refine the prototype until it satisfied our clients which make need to make some survey to get feedback from real users. then create the WAT point system based on feedback and continue gain more feedback from our client to make sure we are not misunderstand anything.</p> <p>Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.</p>
CR-3: Like/Dislike: Users are able to like or dislike threads and posts	<p>Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery</p> <p>Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.</p> <p>Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.</p>
CR-4: Make a post: Users could post on the thread.	<p>Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery</p> <p>Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.</p> <p>Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.</p>
CR-5: Redeem the gift card: Users could use the usable points to redeem the gift card	<p>Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery</p> <p>Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype. Show the prototype to our clients and real user. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients and real user.</p> <p>Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.</p>
CR-6 Automated useless threads/posts deletion: The system is capable of deleting the useless threads/posts	<p>Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery</p> <p>Feasibility Evidence: This capability might not fully develop, as we can discuss with our client to show alternate options that can use in our system that is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detect high ratio between dislike and like on threads and posts • The threads/posts age is longer than 1 month. • Notify the suspicious threads/posts to the maintainer and let him justify that the threads/post is useless or not

	Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.
CR-7 Automated notification: The system is able to notify the users the number of likes/dislikes/posts on their threads and posts and recent events.	Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery
	Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.
	Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.
CR-8 Create/Edit/Delete the event: The maintainer is able to create/edit the event on the event activity board.	Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery
	Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.
	Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.
CR-9 Categorize the threads	Software/Technology used: Joomla, Joomla plugin, MySQL, Bootstrap, Webserver, JQuery
	Feasibility Evidence: We will analyze and evaluate Joomla plugin that is the most suitable to use with our system. Then use the plugin as the base code to modify and adjust to create prototype to show to our clients. Then we will modify this feature based on the feedback of our clients.
	Referred use case diagram: Figure 3 in SAAD file.

4.2.3 Evolutionary Feasibility

Table 18: Evolutionary Feasibility Evidence

Evolutionary Win Condition	Rationale
ER-1: Data Integration	The clients will negotiate with the USC to integrate the system with USC system/database. Therefore, the team may need to integrate the WAT system with the USC system.

5. Business Case Analysis

Benefits are added to the program model:

Assumptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USC students need a central platform to connect, share, and like information with each other • Reward point system will work as the important incentives for users to join the network 			
Stakeholders	Initiatives	Value Propositions	Beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers • Maintainers • Clients • Gift/Book stores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the system • Monitor the system • Advertise the system to USC community • Partner with schools • Negotiate deals with on-campus bookstore/gift store 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase camaraderie between Trojans • One-stop shop to answer any USC related queries • Increase communications between students across schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USC students • USC alumni • USC faculties
Cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development costs • Maintenance costs • Advertising/Marketing costs • Web server, Web hosting, Domain name 		Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of active users in “WAT” network increases. 	

5.1 Market Trend and Product Line Analysis

Table 19: Market Trend and Product Line Analysis

	Joomla
Market Trend	Joomla is one of the most widely used CMS systems in the market, even though it's popularity has decreased the last five years.
Product Line	There are many plug-ins available to integrate with Joomla

5.2 Cost Analysis

5.2.1 Personnel Costs

Table 20: Personnel Costs

Activities	Time Spent (Hours)
Development Period (24 weeks)	
Valuation and Foundations Phases: Time Invested (CSCI577a, 12 weeks)	
Client and team: Meeting via email, phone, and other channels [3 hrs/week * 12 weeks * 2 people]	72
winwin sessions [2 winwin session * 1 hours * 2 people]	4
Architecture review boards [1.5 hours * 2 session * 2 people]	6
Development and Operation Phases: Time Invested (CSCI577b, 12 weeks)	
Client: Meeting via email, phone, and other channels [3 hrs/week * 12 weeks * 2 people]	72
Architecture Review Boards and Core Capability Drive-through session [1.5 hours * 2 session * 2 people]	6
Deployment of system in operation phase and training - Installation & Deployment [5 hrs * 2 times * 2 people] - Training & Support [5 hrs * 2 times * 2 people]	40
Total	200

5.2.2 Hardware and Software Costs

Table 21: Hardware and Software Costs

Type	Cost of COTS
Ownership cost	0
Maintenance cost	0
Hardware	0
Total	0

5.3 Benefit Analysis

The benefits of the project are

- **Increase camaraderie between Trojans**
- **One-stop shop to answer any USC related queries**
- **Increase communication between students across school**

Table 22: Benefits of We Are Trojans (WAT) System

Current activities & resources used	% Reduce	Time Saved (Hours/Year)
Total		

5.4 ROI Analysis

Table 23: ROI Analysis Table

Year	Cost	Benefit (Effort Saved)	Cumulative Cost	Cumulative Benefit	ROI
2014	194	0	0	0	-1
2015	0	Unknown	0	Unknown	

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Currently, we have evaluated Joomla and Drupal as our NDI. This conclusion was drawn by doing a comparative evaluation between Joomla and Drupal based on the following criteria:

- Cost
- Functionality
- Compatibility
- Functionality
- Scalability
- Familiarity

Drupal and Joomla were selected as NDI for comparative study as these CMS provide the following features:

- Forum with basic Like/Dislike system
- Search Functionality
- Authentication
- Online Store