Requirements Review Report

Document Reviewed: SRS for Log Analysis Framework (Loafr)
Revising Version: 1.0 (revised to version 1.1)
Conducted by: Team 21 - Alex King, Rami Dyab, Adisesh Viruru, Matthew Zhang
Date: 02.28.2022

All review specifications are in reference to the Team 21 Requirements Review Checklist
Checklist: Included on the final page of this document

Review Findings:

Location	Description	Category	Resolution
Section 4 All Requirements	Requirements did not refer to a Product Function	Validity	Revised all requirements. For all requirements that handle a product function defined in section 2.2, to make the requirement traceable, we added the product function number the requirement refers to.
Section 2.2 FUNC-5	Product functions did not mention Interactive Mode.	Completeness	Added Func-5. Since the Product Functions did not mention the user requirement of an interactive mode, the product functions were incomplete. We added FUNC-5 to the product functions.
Section 4.3 Req-11	The requirement before just said that the search will occur in the background, but did not explain how and what the user will see during that time.	Completeness	Revised Req 11. We explained that a loading message shall appear for the user while looking for data and that the system will use the keywords to compare the relevant data.
Section 4.4 Req-16	Req 16 was somewhat conflicting with Req 15 since Req 15 described saving data every 100mb but Req 16 said everything will be saved again if an error occurs, which is inconsistent with what was said in Req 15.	Consistency	Revised Req 16. Instead of saving everything that has been logged again, if an error occurs, everything that is on the buffer stage of being saved, it will save that only. There is no need to have to save everything again if REQ-15 allows the processor to save every 100mb.

Section 4.6 Req-21	Requirement stated that the system shall retrieve data, but does not explain how and from where data will be accessed.	Completeness	Revised Req-21. Added details on how the system will retrieve information and where it will access it from.
Section 4.1 Req 4.12	Added a description about how the sorting would operate during batch processing mode as we had a description for interactive but not batch	completeness	Added the said description so that sorting would be more clear
Section 4.6 Req 4.6.1	Lack of clarity in the log data	Validity	Adjusted the description to explain how input data would be handled.
Section 4.4 Req 4.4.2	Adjusted the description of batch processing to match the requirement given of using the interactive mode to access the data	Validity	Remove the mention of creating a data report that would be presented instead of matching the requirement of stating that it will be accessed through interactive mode.
Section 4.4 Req. 4.4.2	The requirement needs clarification on what is meant by 'completion'	Completeness	Separate the first sentence into two. Then further explain 'what is completing'.
Section 4.7 Req-26	Requirement described that a user will be able to delete a logged file but did not state how user will do that	Completeness	Revised Req-26. Explained the process that the user will take to delete a logged file.
Section 4.8 Req. 4.8.1	The requirement's description of data time-stamps is a design implementation more than a requirement.	Validity	Remove the mention of data time-stamps and adjust the language accordingly.
Section 4.8 Req 4.8.1	The requirement's use of the term 'window of time' is not well defined enough	Completeness	Add a full definition of 'window of time' in Appendix A and refer to it in 4.8.1
Section 4.3 Req 4.3.1	Unclear wait time for search query	Testability/Verifiability	Added estimated wait time for search query to complete
Section 4.2 Req 4.2.2	Unclear wait time for filter query	Testability/Verifiability	Added estimated wait time for filter query to complete
Section 4.1 Req 4.1.2	Unclear wait time for sort query	Testability/Verifiability	Added estimated wait time for search query to complete
Section 3.2	Hardware requirements not specifically defined	Completeness	Provided specific hardware (processor, ram, storage) requirements

Section 3.1	Unclear how much time is needed for a user to become accustomed and familiar with Loafr	Completeness	Provided estimate of how much time the user should expect to dedicate in order to use all Loafr features
Section 5.3	Security protocols unclear	Completeness	Included specific security protocols when logging in to use Loafr
Use Cases	Missing description of queries	Completeness	Added description for each query and included examples of how queries can work by themselves or with combination of other queries
Section 4.4 Req 4.4.3	No handling of edge cases (missing error handling)	Testability/Verifiability	Included procedure for if error occurs

Summary of findings:

While conducting our review, we found that there were many requirements and definitions that were incomplete. This included vague wording that left interpretation up to the developer or information that was left out of the requirement descriptions. We also noticed that some of the user requirements were not properly defined. We were able to go through the requirements and link them to product functions to make sure that all product functions were linked to at least one requirement. We also found that some of the requirements we had were too ambiguous to test. This includes not having quantitative value to test requirements or not addressing edge cases. However, the original requirements were feasible and did not require us to remove any requirements that did not seem reachable.

Team 21 Requirements Review Checklist:

Validity

- ☐ Are all user/customer needs met by a requirement?
- ☐ Does the user/customer have a need for this requirement?
- ☐ Is each requirement traceable to a product function (Section 2.2)?

Consistency

- ☐ Does the requirement contradict another requirement?
- ☐ Are related requirements distinct enough from each other?
- ☐ Is the requirement repeated elsewhere in the document with a different description/constraint?

Completeness

- ☐ Are there any areas of the requirements description that leave room for interpretation?
- ☐ Does the requirement have important information left out of its definition?
- ☐ Are there any user needs that are not addressed by a requirement?

Feasibility/Realizability

- ☐ Is it realistic to meet the requirement in the given amount of time (will the requirement take too long to meet)?
- ☐ Is the requirement able to be met with the technological constraints?
- ☐ Is the requirement attainable (Able to be programmed)?

Testability/Verifiability

- ☐ Are ambiguous words like 'fast' backed up by a qualitative value test?
- ☐ Does the system properly handle all input cases (specifically edge cases)?
- ☐ Can the final product be tested to see if the requirement is met?

Other

- ☐ Is the language used consistent with other requirements?
- ☐ Are the requirements grammatically correct and use proper language to impose requirements (shall and will instead of should, etc)?