

Meeting Minutes - Second Meeting

Date: Wednesday 1st October 2025

Time: 13:00pm till 14:00pm

Location: Online

Attendees attended:

- Charlotte Smale-Holland (19313496)
- Ryan Hogan (19390270)
- Gauthier Lihau (19207032)
- **Gonzalez Rodrigues (19271262)** - Did not attend

Progress Since Previous Meeting (State of Actions Completed):

- In last week's meeting, we discussed who was responsible for each subsystem, the functional requirements of the subsystems.
- We have also analysed the case study as a group to find the data dependencies between each subsystem.
- Since the previous meeting, we have individually written rough documents that outline the quality requirements/attributes on each of our chosen subsystems.

Report on quality requirements:

- Each of us reviewed each other's quality attributes with a functional requirement for each of the subsystems.
- We also kept notes of each other's requirements, so that we can refer back to them when reviewing the whole Union-based system.

Ryan: Subsystem 2 - Functional Requirement UO-1

- After reviewing the quality requirements for the second subsystem, we agreed that they are generally timely and testable.
- Charlotte and Gauthier noted that the security attribute effectively addresses how encryption can be tested and verified.
- Overall, we agreed that the bullet points for the other quality attributes are well-written, professional, and appropriately aligned with the functional requirements of the management system.

Charlotte: Subsystem 1 - Functional Requirement ST-5

- Charlotte has managed to show us the draft for the quality requirements analysis covering most of the quality attributes. However, she didn't share information for the security attribute.

- In Gauthier's opinion, he thinks that I could be more specific with the scalability quality attribute, such as the locations where students are when filling out the application.
- In Ryan's opinion, the system performance requirements were well laid out with specific metrics for response time and resource optimisation, as well as concrete reliability targets once the system is operational. Overall, the quality attributes were appropriate, measurable and aligned with the system's needs.

Gauthier: Subsystem 4 - Functional Requirement SL-2

- The quality attributes that he used were testable and verifiable while targeting one functional requirement for FR-SL-2. However, in Charlotte's opinion, when he was defining the quality requirements, he was mainly targeting the non-functional requirements. The scalability section could be more detailed, such as explaining how he will ensure management with lots of traffic.
- In Ryan's opinion, Gauthier did well to mention specific security and privacy requirements as well as reliability metrics. Gauthier could, however, expand on his scalability requirements and mention specific ways to handle high-volume traffic periods.

Actions to take place after the meeting:

- Improve our draft on the software requirement analysis, based on the feedback from our group in the meeting.

Issues to be solved:

- Since we started the project, we have not faced any issues that need to be solved. Therefore, we do not need to contact the lecturer (Module Leader) for support or clarification.

Date/Time of the following meeting - Wednesday 8th October 2025 (13:00pm till 14:00pm)