***SOFTWARE REQUIRMENTS SPECIFICATION***

***VALIDATION PROCESS***

***INSPECTION PROCESS***

**DATE:- 6/1/2020.**

**STARTING TIME:- 3:00 pm.**

**PLACE:- UET TAXILA , SOFTWARE ENGINERING DEPARTMENT.**

**PARTICIPANTS:-**

**AUTHOR/READER:- FASIH-UR-REHMAN-MALIK.(REQUIRMENTS ENGINEER)**

**MODERATOR:- TALHA-SALMAN.(PROJECT MANAGER)**

**RECORDER:- TALHA-USMAN.(DEVELOPER)**

**PROCEEDINGS:-**

**THE INSPECTION STARTED AT 3 pm WITH THE AUTHOR AND MODERATOR ANNOUNCING THE AGENDA. THE INSPECTION RATE WAS DECIDED TO BE 5-7 REQUIRMENTS PER HOUR. ENDING TIME FOR INSPECTION WAS THUS DECIDED TO BE 8 pm WITH A ONE HOUR BREAK FROM 5 pm TO 6 pm. THE AUTHOR THAN READ OUT THE DOCUMENT AND THE REST OF THE PARTY KEPT POINTING OUT THE ISSUES THEY FELT WERE THERE. THE RECORDER THAN READ OUT THE MISTAKES THAT WERE POINTED OUT IN THE INSPECTION AND RECORDED RECOMMENDATIONS TO SOLVE THEM BY THE APPORVAL OF THE RESPECTED STAKEHOLDERS. FOLLOWING IS THE LIST OF PROBLEMS AND THE RESPECTED RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WERE NOTED DOWN BY THE RECORDER WITH EEFRANCE TO THE DEFECTS NCHECKLIST.**

***PROBLEMS AND RECOMRNDATIONS***

1. **NO MENTION OP WHO THE STAKEHOLDERS ARE IN THE INTENDED AUDIENCE SECTION (1.3). Recommendation:- THE WRITER IS TO MENTION THE MISSING INFORMATION.**
2. **IN 2.2 PRODUCT FUNCTIONS, THE POINT 2 MENTIONS ONLY STUDENTS AS THE PASSENGERS. Recommendations:- THE WRITER IS ASKED TO REMENTION THE PASSENGERS.**
3. **IN 2.3 USER CLASSES THE CLASS STUDENTS IS AMBIGUOUS AS THERE ARE PASSENGERS MENTIONED IN THE CLASS DIAGRAM. Recommendations:- WRITER IS TO REWRITE THE CLASS NAME.**
4. **IN 3.1 USER INTERFACES POINT 6, THE INTERFACE IS NOT ONLY TO HAVE NUMBER OF STUDENTS BUT ALSO SOME OTHER INFORMATION ACCORDING TO THE USER.S NEEDS. Recommendation:- REDECIDE WHETHER THE INFO IS OKAY WITH THE END USER OR NOT.**
5. **NO MENTION OF PRIORITY LEVBEL IN SECTION 4 SYSTEM FEATURES AND FUNCTIONALITY. Recommendation:- THE DOCUMENT IS TO BE REVISITED MY THE PRODUCT MANAGER AND THE WRITER TO DECIDE THE APPROPRIATE PRIORITY.**
6. **NO MENTION OF ALTERNATE FLOWS OR EXCEPTIONAL FLOWS IN SECTION 4 FOR ANY OF THE REQUIRMENTS. Recommendation:- THE REQUIRMENTS ENGINEER MUST WORK WITH OTHER MEMBERS TO DECIDE THE ALTERNATE FLOWS AND EXCEPTIONS FOR THE REQUIRMENTS.**
7. **THERE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN A MISUNDERSTANDING IN THE SETION 4.2 WHERE THE NAME WAS SUPPOSED TO BE LOGIN. Recommendation:- REWRITE THE HEADING.**
8. **THERE IS A CLASH BETWEEN POINT 1 OF 4.3.2 AND POINT 3 OF 4.3.3 AS THE RECORD THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN REMOVED CAN NOT BE DELETED. Recommendations;- REVISIT THE REQUIRMENT.**
9. **4.5.3 POINT 3 IS AMBIGUOUS. THE LANGUAGE IS NOT APPROPRIATE AS THE SYSTEM SHOULD STOP THE VIEWING OF THE SCHEDULE OF ANY OTHER DAY BUT THE PRESENT ONE. Recommendations:- RECHECK THE MENTIONED REQUIERMENT.**
10. **THE SECTION 5.4 HAS SOME REQUIRMENTS THAT ARE NOT QUANTIFIABLE. Recommendation:- REVISIT THE DOCUMENT AND DECIDE NY THE SUGGESTION OF THE REQUIRMENTS ENGINEER, THE EXTENT OF THE MAINTAINABILITY ATTRIBUTES.**
11. **POINT 2 OF SECTION 5.5 IS UNQUATIFIABLE AND UNREAL. Recommendation:- REWRITE THE REQUIRMENT.**
12. **POINT 3 OF SECTION 5.8 IS AMBIGUOUS AND UNQUANTIFIABLE, AS IT DOESNOT MENTION THE NUMBER OF SECONDS FOR RECOVERY. Recommendation:- REWRITE THE REQUIRMENT WITH APPROPRIATE INFO.**
13. **THE REQUIRMENTS MENTIONED ABOVE ARE ALL UNQUANTIFIABLE AND HENCE UNTETABLE.**
14. **SECTION 5.8 IS BOTH OUT OF THE LAYOUT AND INACCESSIBLE. Recommendation:- RESTYLE THE SECTION.**