# SW Requirements Review Document

## Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | 16/08/2021 |
| **Effort** | 2 Hours |
| **Room/Location** | Virtual |
| **Review Status** | Open |
| **Review name** | Act2.1\_GuerreroMarentes\_Vicente.docx |
| **Method** | WT |
| **Release** | 1.0 |
| **Responsible** | Marco Antonio Mares Mejía |
| **Project** | Door Control Module |
| **Reason of Review** | Initial Release |

## Comment List

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Reference** | **Comments / Actions** | **Classification (E)rror/Risk / (R)emark** | **Responsible person/Planned date for completion** | **Completion(Name/Date)** |
| 1 | Matrix Documentation | The traceability matrix doesn’t have the information cells filled. / Fill the Name of the project, Reference documents and Reviewed by cells. | R | Vicente Guerrero Marentes / 17/08/2021 |  |
| 2 | Properties and comments section | The document doesn’t have any properties nor comments. These are required to complement the requirements. / Write all the corresponding properties and comments. | E | Vicente Guerrero Marentes / 17/08/2021 |  |
| 3 | Concise | Several requirements are not concise, this is they shall refer to one system requirement. / Split the biggest requirements into smaller objects. | R | Vicente Guerrero Marentes / 17/08/2021 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |  |

## Check List

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Description | OK / NOK / NR | Comment | Responsible person /  Planned date for completion | Status |
| 1 | Have all identified stakeholders been considered? Have all identified sources of requirements been considered (e.g. list of used documents/inputs)? | OK | The system requirements document only mentions one stakeholder and it ‘s being considered. |  | Close |
| 2 | Can the stakeholder requirements be considered as “mature enough” to perform this review (requirements are no more in a “draft” status)? | NOK | There are still some errors at the stakeholder requirements document. |  | Open |
| 3 | Is the behaviour on all major events described (check within your project for the relevant major events)? | OK |  |  | Close |
| 4 | Are implementation requirements described (e.g. EEPROM calibrations, flash calibration, tuning variables)? | NR | None of this information is mentioned in the stakeholder requirements document. |  | Close |
| 5 | Can the feature be configured? If yes: Is it described how this is done? | OK | The traceability matrix doesn’t define any methodology to implement the features. |  | Close |
| 6 | Are the resolution/max min values/default value of data determined? Are the resolution/max min values checked against supplier recommended values if available?  Are the tolerances of data determined (e.g. all timer-values have a tolerance of +/-10%)? | OK | No tolerances are mentioned in the stakeholder requirements document. |  | Close |
| 7 | Are all debounce times (e.g. inputs, failure conditions …) determined? | Ok |  |  | Close |
| 8 | Is behaviour on power modes, resets, priority taken into account? | OK |  |  | Close |
| 9 | Has the functional analysis been performed?  - Is it clearly defined what has to be realized in SW / EE / ME? | NR | The traceability matrix is only for SW requirements |  | Close |
| 10 | Are all stakeholder requirements completely derived in system requirements? | OK |  |  | Close |
| 11 | Are all product variants considered for all requirements?  (Yes -> OK) | OK |  |  | Close |
| 12 | Is specification up to date according to closed items from “open item list”? Or is the proceeding for these open items defined? | NR | This is not defined in the stakeholders requirements document |  | Close |