SRS DRAFT REVIEW ON GROUP 07

Checked by Group 08

E.A.K.A. Edirisuriya (L)

L. A. R. H. Perera (DL)

H.R.C.S. Sampath

W.P.A. Lavanya

H.K.C. Perera

M.R.F. Faideena

Overview of the

Employee welfare Fund Administration system

Group No. 7

Outline

The SRS report and the project proposal of the Employee Welfare Fund Administration system was the prime sources of this review. We have carefully analyzed the SRS report and highlighted the places where revision is required.

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
Organization and Structure of the Documentation		
1	Standards	**Have appropriate requirements documentation standards been followed?** ▪ Document standards have been followed partially. ▪ Inapplicable subsections have not cited in the report and its inapplicability is not described.
2	Standards	**Are all figures, tables, and diagrams labeled and referenced?** ▪ All necessary the figures, tables and diagrams are included. ▪ References are not included for every item.
3	Standards	**Are all terms and units of measure defined?** ▪ All the terms are defined in glossary. ▪ Measures are defined within each subsection.
4	Standards	**Are all requirements written at a consistent and appropriate level of detail?** ▪ Core requirements are detailed in a perfect manner.

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
		▪ Secondary requirements (hardware requirements, memory and site adaptation) are not descriptive.
5	Standards	**Are individual requirements rated (or ranked), with descriptions of priority provided?** ▪ Core requirements are highlighted from the other requirements but not ranked or prioritized.
6	Unverifiable	**Do the requirements provide an adequate basis for design and system test?** ▪ The requirements provided are adequate for design and implementation of the system.
Completeness and Correctness		
7	Correctness	**Are all internal cross-references to other requirements correct? [For modifiability, minimize cross-references.]**
8	Incomplete	**Are all classes of users described? Are the user characteristics described?** ▪ User's class and characteristics are not described. ▪ But user roles are specified.
9	Incomplete	**Does the specification include all known customer or system needs?** *Are all the tasks the user wants to perform specified?* ▪ The tasks the systems must perform are specified in the system.
10	Incomplete	**Does each functional requirement specify input and output, as well as function, as appropriate?** ▪ Input and output requirements are mentioned but not specified adequately.
11	Incomplete	**Have all dependencies on other systems been identified? (Applications or application interfaces, databases, communications subsystems, networking, etc.)** ▪ All the dependencies are identified and described properly.
12	Incomplete	**Are user documentation and training requirements addressed?** ▪ User documentation has been addressed.

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
		▪ Training procedure or schedule is not mentioned.
13	Incomplete	**Are the hardware and software environments specified?** ▪ Hardware and software requirement has specified.
14	Incomplete	**Have all derived requirements been included? (those implied by the system or software requirements, generally constraints on development or verification)** ▪ Yes, Functional requirements derived from using use case diagrams ▪ Non-Functional requirements have derived from user interviews.
15	Incomplete	**Has full life cycle support been addressed, including maintenance?** ▪ Full life cycle of system development has been addressed excluding maintenance. ▪ They have mentioned that maintenance phase will be outsourced because it will be out of the project schedule.
16	Incomplete	**Are any design or implementation constraints described?** ▪ All the necessary constraints for the design and implementation have enumerated.
17	Incomplete	**Are all reliability, recoverability (business continuity), and performance requirements properly specified?** ▪ External qualities of the software product have not been properly described.
18	Incomplete	**Are all security requirements properly specified?** ▪ Yes, all the security and confidentiality requirements and restrictions have specified properly.
19	Incomplete	**Are all safety requirements properly specified?** ▪ Safety requirements have not been mentioned.
20	Incomplete	**Have all data privacy requirements been included?** ▪ Data privacy requirements have not been separately characterized but it reflects from the security requirements.

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
21	Incomplete	**Are time critical functions identified, and timing criteria specified for them?** ▪ Yes, All the major operations of crediting debiting funds have highlighted as time critical functions.
22	Incomplete	**Have any regulatory, legislative, or standards-driven requirements been addressed?** ▪ Data model, authorization and some processes are have abstracted legislatives and standards of the organization. ▪ But those abstractions were not referenced or characterized.
23	Incomplete	**Have all quality attributes (characteristics) been properly specified (i.e. efficiency, flexibility, interoperability, maintainability, portability, reusability, usability, availability)** ▪ Efficiency, interoperability and maintainability are reflected from the SRS outline. But other attributes are not stated.
24	Interface	**Have the human interface requirements been addressed? Are they correct?** ▪ They have been focused the user interface requirements with high priority. ▪ All the interfaces and their intensions have been described. ▪ Human user interface was designed considering operational convenience and simplicity.
25	Interface	**Are all external hardware, software, and communication interfaces defined? Are they correct?** ▪ Software and communication interfaces have been described but not the hardware interfaces.
Consistency and Clarity		
26	Inconsistent	**Does the specification agree with all relevant higher level documents?** ▪
27	Inconsistent	**Are the requirements free of duplication and conflict with other requirements?** ▪ Since they tried to isolate requirements there is a less chance of represents duplication.

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
		▪ Not detected by this insight.
28	Inconsistent	**Is each requirement written in consistent, clear, concise language?** ▪ System and user requirements have been cited using clear and simple English language which is ease the understanding of the document by users, owners and developers.
29	Ambiguous	**Does each requirement have only one interpretation? If a term could have multiple meanings, is it defined?** ▪ Since there requirements have been highly isolated requirements do not mean multiple or different interpretations.
30	Unverifiable	**Is each requirement verifiable by testing, demonstration, review, or analysis?** ▪ Yes, Requirements are verifiable by review, demonstration, review and analysis.
31	Unverifiable	**Are there measurable acceptance criteria for each functional and non-functional requirement?** ▪ Functional requirements can be measurable in aspect of performance, efficiency, effectiveness and reliability. ▪ Non-functional requirements cannot see a measurable criterion.
Traceability		
32	Interface	**Is each requirement uniquely and correctly identified?** ▪ Yes
33	Interface	**Is each requirement traceable to its source (including derived requirements)?** ▪ The main sources such as use case diagram, user requirements have been provided. ▪ But not all the requirements are traceable.
Special Issues		

ID	Defect Type	Items to Examine
34	**Other**	**Is each requirement in scope for the project?** Yes
35	Other	**1.** **Are all requirements actually requirements, not design or implementation solutions?** Yes they are requirements
36	Other	**2.** **Are the time-critical functions identified, and timing criteria specified for them?** Yes, But timing criteria is not specified.
37	Other	**3.** **Are all significant consumers of scarce resources (memory, network bandwidth, processor capacity, etc.) identified, and is their anticipated resource consumption specified?** No, Hardware specification and environment was not described
38	Other	**4.** **Have internationalization issues been adequately addressed?** No