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The following document contains a requirement specification review for the PPALMS system application. This document is divided into the following sections:

1. A ***requirements review checklist***, which provides questions that we will ask while we conduct the review.
2. The ***requirements report*** - the things our team found within our review to be addressed. This includes how we addressed each change that we found. This report contains a ***summary of each finding along with the associated changes*** that we made to our requirements specification document.

**1. Requirements Specification Review Checklist**

* **Validity**
* Is there an overview of the system provided?
* Are the goals of the system defined?
* Is there an intended audience specified?
* **Consistency**
* Are we consistently referencing requirements correctly?
* Is formatting consistent in our document?
* Are authors clearly defined and accurate?
* **Completeness**
* Do the requirements provide a foundation for designing the system?
* Do our requirements have all possible test cases?
* Do requirements have inputs, outputs, and processes for each function?
* Do our use cases contain all relevant information?
* **Feasibility/Realizability**
* Do our documents provide required technical resources to use the system?
* Do the requirements provide details/plans for UI?
* Do the requirements allow for ease of operation for the system?
* **Testability/Verifiability**
* Are the use cases testable?
* Are we testing non-UI aspects of the system?
* Is it possible to automate the tests?

**2. Requirements Specification Review Report**

| **Location**  *Where issue was found (section/paragraph)* | **Description**  *Brief description (i.e. few sentences or less) about what the issue is* | **Category**  *Checklist category/question which led to identification of issue* | **Resolution**  *What is (to be) done to fix identified issue, or reasoning why no change needed* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Software Requirements Specification** | Missing a purpose section/overview of the SRS | Validity | Added section 1.1 to summarize the purpose of the SRS document and an overview of the PPALMS system |
| **Software Requirements Specification** | Missing a description of who the intended audience is for the SRS | Validity | Added section 1.2 to indicate who this SRS document is intended for |
| **Software Requirements Specification** | Did not define the overall goals of the PPALMS system | Validity | Added section 1.3 to highlight the purpose of the PPALMS system and why it is beneficial |
| **Use Cases**  *3.2 - 3.7* | Authors not clearly defined; all authors are included in every single use case | Consistency | Only included the primary author of the particular use case |
| **Use Cases**  *3.2 - 3.7* | Use cases not assigned to specific system requirements. | Consistency | Assigned each use case with an associated requirement. |
| **Requirements**  *5.1 - 5.7* | Authors not clearly defined; all authors are included in every single use case | Consistency | Only included the primary author of the particular requirement |
| **Requirements**  *5.7* | Requirement not referenced correctly | Consistency | Assigned Req 5.6 as the reference for the description of requirement 5.7 |
| **Use Case Diagram**  *3.1* | Use cases diagram did not contain a narrative description. | Completeness | Wrote a brief narrative describing the use case diagram. |
| **Requirements**  *5.1 - 5.7* | Requirements inconsistency in wording. (Shall, must, should, etc.) | Completeness | Change to shall for functional requirements and must for business requirements |
| **Requirements**  *5.2, 5.3, 5.7* | Requirements contained a limited number of test cases | Completeness | Added additional success and failure cases |
| **Software Requirements Specification** | Missing a description of the UI | Feasibility | Added section 2.1 to describe the plans for the UI |
| **Software Requirements Specification** | Missing a description of the required technical resources to use the system | Feasibility | Added section 2.2 to describe the hardware requirements needed for the PPALMS |
| **Requirements**  *5.7* | All test cases pertain to UI | Testability | Added a failure test case for the permutation generation but overall no change really needed. It’s fine that most of our test cases are about the UI since PPALMS is a UI forward application |

Below contains a summary of our findings and associated changes for our requirements specification review report. These changes are a part of the latest revision of our requirements document, 0.0.2.

In this revision, existing issues with the requirements specifications document were resolved and it was updated with missing or improved content. Some validity issues were identified in the document, so it was updated with the purpose of the document; who the document is intended for; and an overview of the PPALMS system, its purpose, and why it is beneficial. We also improved consistency by only including the primary author of each requirement and use case, associating each use case with a requirement, and updating any incorrectly referenced requirements. Additions were made to improve completeness including a narrative for the use case diagram, more success and failure cases, and appropriate language for functional and business requirements, as to improve feasibility by adding UI plans and hardware requirements.