# **Task 3 – Post-Mortem Report**

This document presents a detailed analysis of software requirement analysis activities conducted by Team 26. The first artifact we created during the analysis is a vision document. Following is the discussion in details:

**1.** Questions and answersfor the elicitation artefacts used in this delivery:

1. **What was the advantage of this technique based on your experience in this assignment?**

* The questionnaire was quick, efficient and cost-effective way to gather the basic requirements considering the amount of given time.
* Formulation of the questionnaire and possible answers enforces a better understanding of the problem domain through background study.
* This technique enabled us to diversify the question pool and solution proposals thorough team discussion.

1. **What was the disadvantage of this technique based on your experience in this assignment?**

* It was difficult to narrow down the top or important questions.
* Does not provide an opportunity for clarifications and or incorporate new ideas.
* Required to have sufficient domain knowledge to come up with good questions.
* Predetermined answers to the questionnaire have higher chances of influencing the end user.

1. **How efficient was the technique, i.e. how good requirements did it help uncover given the time it took to use?**

* This technique helped to understand the fundamental components and the overall working of the system.
* Accurately capture the user’s expectations.
* It ensured that the features map well corresponding user requirements.
* It enabled us to get insights about the problem domain in a fairly short amount of time.

1. **In which situations would you use this technique in a future project?**

* Questionnaires can be used in simple, straight forward projects where all the stakeholders have sufficient domain knowledge.
* Better fit for projects where there is limited time to gather the requirement set.
* It can also be a good technique to enhance existing projects.

1. **In which situations would you not use this technique in a future project?**

* This technique cannot be used alone for complex projects; however, it can be used in combination with other elicitation techniques like interviews, prototyping etc.
* It may also not be suitable in projects where the stakeholders do not have sufficient domain knowledge and have vague requirements/ideas.

2. Summarize how much time was spent (in total and by each group member) on the steps/activities involved as well as for the delivery as a whole. Be honest with the time spent, as this information will in no way be used for any grading. For more details related to commit history and logging of this delivery-1, please see Appendix A to Appendix E.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Sub Task | Apoorv | Divya | Manik | Nikhil | Sakib |
| Background Study | - | 40 mins | 120  mins | 30 Mins | 35 Mins | 60 Mins |
| Elicitation Artifacts | Communication | 140 mins | 120  mins | 120 Mins | 120  Mins | 80 Mins |
| Documentation | 150  mins | 120  mins | 180 Mins | 120 Mins | 120 mins |
| Review | 150  mins | 150  mins | 120 Mins | 80 Mins | 60 mins |
| Vision Document | Communication | 140  mins | 150  mins | 120 Mins | 120 Mins | 120 Mins |
| Documentation | 150  mins | 160  mins | 120 Mins | 70  Mins | 150 Mins |
| Review | 140  mins | 180  mins | 180 Mins | 180  Mins | 60 mins |
| Postmortem Report | Communication | 40  mins | 40 mins | 60 Mins | 60  Mins | 60 mins |
| Documentation | 25  mins | 60 mins | 60 Mins | 30  Mins | 60  mins |
| Review | 30  mins | 30  mins | 60 Mins | 60  Mins | 40 mins |

**3. In addition to the material seen in class, what other techniques did you apply for completing this delivery?**

1. **Which techniques worked well**

* Brainstorming among the team members.
* Splitting more coarse-grained tasks to smaller manageable tasks.
* Peer review

1. **Which techniques did not work?**

* We tried to use google docs making draft and paper review with critiques and comments but finally ended up using GitHub for better logging purposes.

**4. How did you work together as a group in the project? What worked well, and what did not work during your interaction(s)? What would you do differently in the future?**


* **Collaboration**: Used Git hub and Google Docs to collaborate and maintain versions. Going forward, Latex in combination with GitHub can be used to better track and log changes.
* **Communication**: Zoom meetings and WhatsApp group for offline group chat. Planning to try Microsoft teams in future.
* **Reviews**: Reviews happened online during meeting. In future, planning to perform offline/individual reviews and discuss only the outcome/comments during the meetings.
* **Management**: Peer monitoring and contributing in pair helped has manage the tasks. A time tracking tool named Toggl was used to track time for zoom meetings and tasks. Using multiple tools for the same tasks (like google doc and git) made us inefficient in the beginning which was later addressed and streamlined using minimum set of tools. We plan to introduce Kanban/SCRUM style agile management process for future deliverables

.

**Appendix**

**Appendix A**

Detailed time tracking report of delivery-1:




**Appendix B**

Draft vision document collaboration and peer review, discussion history on google drive: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/15c1B_ef7tt7FsPsOrMb_wkE0L4OtvFiz/edit>

**Appendix C**

Final vision document report collaboration logging history on GitHub at a glance:

<https://github.com/sakibshuvo/SOEN-6481-SRS/commits/master>






Fig-1: team collaboration




Fig-2: Team logging history

**Appendix D**

Requirement elicitation for task-1 collaboration and peer review history on google drive:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IljewF2ti_bijVXjqJgKjdT_azW3vl_lS0HLSR1wrS8/edit?ts=5efc0147#heading=h.7ik6ac3oskyt>