

Analysis Report

Guillermo Rodríguez Narbona (Student #4)

Delivery 1



Acme AirNav Solutions, Inc

Group Number: C1.066

Repository: <https://github.com/mquirosq/DP2-C1.066>

Members:

María Quirós Quiroga, marquiqui@alum.us.es
Guillermo Rodríguez Narbona, guirodnar@alum.us.es
Ignacio Mora Pérez, ignmorper1@alum.us.es
Daniel Herrera Urbano, danherurb@alum.us.es
Alejandro Parody Quirós, aleparqui@alum.us.es

February 20, 2025

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Revision History	3
1 Introduction	4
2 Requirement 2	4
3 Conclusions	5

Executive Summary

In this report, the requirements analysis process for the individual requirements of student #4 (Guillermo Rodríguez Narbona) in the first delivery of the Acme AirNav Solutions project will be discussed.

Only one of the requirements (requirement 2) caused problems when trying to understand it. Therefore, it is the only one that will be discussed in this document. Different solution alternatives will be covered for the problem, and the rationale behind the choice made regarding which one to implement will be explained.

Revision History

Revision	Date	Description
1.0	2025-02-19	Initial version
1.0	2025-02-20	Added reference to group requirements analysis document

1. Introduction

The aim of this report is to discuss the requirements analysis process followed for the individual requirements of student #4 of the Acme AirNav Solutions (Acme ANS for short) project.

After reading through the full catalog of individual requirements provided for student #4, I concluded that the majority of the requirements made their objectives and the process to be followed in order to achieve them abundantly clear. Only one of the requirements (requirement 2) caused any doubts and is hence the only requirement being discussed in this report.

Therefore, the structure of the report will be the following: there will be a single section per analyzed requirement, containing a reproduction of the statement of the requirement, an explanation of the issues arising from its analysis, a description of the different alternatives considered and the reasoning behind the final choice made.

Finally, each section will also contain a link to a thread in the virtual learning platform forum in which the doubts faced are presented to the professor in charge of the subject, together with the different alternatives considered and the proposed solution, in order to obtain their validation regarding the final solution to be implemented.

2. Requirement 2

Requirement 2 of the individual requirements catalog for the fourth student stated the following:

“ Provide a link to your planning dashboard in GitHub to review the tasks, their current status, and your schedule. ”

When analyzing said requirement, I found trouble with understanding the way in which said link shall be provided in the deliverable. After discussing it with the rest of my group, who were facing similar concerns, we considered the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1: Including the link as part of the Chartering Report.
- Alternative 2: Including all the necessary links in a single file.
- Alternative 3: Including the link in a text file stored in a subdirectory of the **reports** directory that contains all of the individual reports of a particular student for this delivery.

Alternative 1 presented similar issues to alternative 2, in that both of them would result in having multiple team members edit the same file (potentially concurrently) in

order to include or modify the link to their respective planning dashboards, which would complicate the version control of the file in which to include the links.

Alternative 1 would also potentially make the links more difficult to find, as they would be located inside a report that is several pages long, while alternative 2 also had the drawbacks of deciding where the file would be located (which would also potentially make it more difficult to find the different links) and also potentially making the evaluation process more difficult by not separating the individual links.

Therefore, the team as a whole settled on alternative 3 as a general convention, as it allowed us to separately store each student's link inside its own text file, thus making the process of finding each student's particular link easier while still allowing to separately modify each link in case of necessity without having various concurrent modifications to a single file.

As we found the same issue with group requirement 3 [1], which is also very similar to individual requirement 2, team member Ignacio Mora (student #1) presented the results of the analysis of the group requirement to the subject professor in the course forum. The thread in which this was discussed resides in the following link: EV forum thread.

As the issue being treated is the same and the requirement from which it arises is also very similar to the one being discussed in this report, this thread should also be suitable for this particular case. In it, the professor validated the solution alternative we decided upon as a team.

3. Conclusions

The requirements analysis process is crucial to any project, as it might uncover the potential flaws in them or, as was the case for this requirement, ambiguities regarding the process to be followed when implementing them.

In the case of this delivery, the process was made easier by the similarity of the analyzed requirement with one of the group requirements (as well as the presence of similar individual requirements for the other students in the group), enabling team discussions regarding the different solution alternatives to consider and which one to decide upon.

Having this decision be consistent within the team as a whole was extremely important, as it allowed us to have a more consistent repository and organization.

The involvement of the subject professor, who considered the results of our deliberations and approved our chosen solution alternative, was also plenty helpful, as it allowed us to validate the results we obtained and gave us confidence in the solution we agreed upon.

References

- [1] Team C1.066, *Analysis Report for Delivery 01*, 2025. Included in project delivery.