**Requirements Review Response**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Fix/Response** | **Done** |
| **Major Findings** | | | |
| 1.1 | Agree | Added user story #11. | Yes |
| 1.2 | Agree | User stories 3 & 4 both say interior map, change one to exterior and reword both. | Yes |
| 1.3 | Disagree | The current campus map is not a competitive product because we are extending it. It is the same product. | Yes |
| 1.4 | Agree | Remove user story #7. I didn’t redo the numbering of the user stories because the current numbering is used throughout the requirements. | Yes |
| 1.5 | Disagree | This is not a requirement for our project. It is a low-priority feature, but is essentially just a call to Google maps. | Yes |
| 1.6 | N/A | Yes this list is available, it is returned by the API. No, we can’t personally change this list. | Yes |
| **Moderate Findings** | | | |
| 2.1 | Agree | Fix the word most to something less general in user story #6. The application doesn’t modify paths; it will return a new one | Yes |
| 2.2 | Agree | Redefine what “lower quality content” means. It is a flag to the API and just returns less data. System constraints underwent a complete refactoring. | Yes |
| 2.3 | Agree | Need to remove add waypoint from popup in the 3rd UI mockup. We have noted the defect and adjusted our current designs. | Yes |
| 2.4 | Agree | The use cases are not numbered by priority, we need to add priorities to them (HIGH-MEDIUM-LOW). | Yes |
| 2.5 | N/A | Very similar to 2.1 | Yes |
| 2.6 | Agree | Should re-word the last two sentences of the project summary | Yes |
| 2.7 | Agree | The priorities were listed differently; they have been updated to reflect this. | Yes |
| 2.8 | Disagree | Removed user story #7 in the response to 1.4. The issue doesn’t really make sense as well. | Yes |
| 2.9 | Agree | Need to reword constraints so they don’t sound like solutions. | Yes |
| 2.10 | N/A | The reviewing team didn’t see the interactive UI mockup in action, only the screen shots. | Yes |
| 2.11 | Agree | Need to change interior map viewing and campus path finding to “includes” on the use case diagram. | Yes |
| 2.12 | Disagree | Feels like they are adding use cases here. | Yes |
| 2.13 | N/A | The “select a widget” text wasn’t actually there, just bad timing for a screen shot. Once again they didn’t see our interactive UI mockup. | Yes |
| 2.14 | N/A | It is implied any functionality on campus maps we will also implement because we are the same product. | Yes |
| 2.15 | Disagree | Seems like a question and not an issue. Implementation details don’t belong in user stories. | Yes |
| **Minor Findings** | | | |
| 3.1 | Agree | Fix the wording of “error” in some of the use cases. Error should mean something went wrong. | Yes |
| 3.2 | N/A | Invalid issue, they seem to have overlooked our use cases. | Yes |
| 3.3 | Disagree | This is an implementation detail. | Yes |
| 3.4 | Disagree | This is no issue at all it is possible with a call to the API. This is another low level implementation detail. | Yes |
| 3.5 | Agree | Removed user story 9b. | Yes |
| 3.6 | Agree | Should change to full path to is rendered in X seconds in the use cases. | Yes |
| 3.7 | N/A | This information can be grabbed from an API call or grabbed from the server. | Yes |
| 3.8 | Agree | We have already got out IP agreement issue fixed. | Yes |
| 3.9 | Agree | Clearly define what disabled means in the glossary. | Yes |
| 3.10 | Disagree | Just a preference of theirs for writing style. | Yes |
| 3.11 | Agree | Fix the definition of “Outdoor Path”. It is just a copy and paste of indoor path. | Yes |
| 3.12 | Disagree | We don’t have control over this. The API does offer a mobile flag, which will be used from mobile devices. | Yes |
| 3.13 | Agree | Modify the definition of campus. | Yes |
| 3.14 | Disagree | Image was depreciated. Shouldn’t have been seen by the other team. | Yes |
| 3.15 | Agree | Our current UI has been updated to reflect this. Not worth making the change to the interactive UI. | Yes |
| 3.16 | Agree | User story #1 could be re-worded and b should be removed. | Yes |