| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Start Date:** 2023-04-02 | |  | |
| **Project Name:** IMTSquare - AnyChange Software | | **Number of Pages:** | |
| **Product Name:** AnyChange Software | | **Product Definition:** AnyChange is a web scraping and analysis tool | |
| **Roles:** | **Review Leader:** | Code Busters | |
| **Reviewers:** | 1. Ezgi Özkan | 2. Kadir Kılıçoğlu |
| 3. Tuğçe Sözer | 4. - |
| **Review Materials:** | * Vision (V) * Glossary (G) * Use Case Model (U) * System-Wide Requirements (S) * Risk List (R) * Project Plan (P) * Work Items List (W) * Next Iteration’s Plan (N) * Iteration Plan (I) | | |
| **Total Number of Errors:** | | | |
| **Assessment Status:** | ACCEPTED   * As It Is * With Rework | REJECTED   * Review Again | |

| **ERROR TYPES** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Error Type Number** | **Error Type Definition** | **Number of Errors Found** |
| 1 | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc.) | 15 |
| 2 | Inconsistency with standards | 4 |
| 3 | Uncertain | 14 |
| 4 | Incorrect | 5 |
| 5 | Inapplicable | 2 |
| 6 | Internal Inconsistency | 8 |
| 7 | External Inconsistency | 3 |
| 8 | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | 23 |
| 9 | Oher | 8 |
| **TOTAL** | | **82** |
| **Importance Types** | **Importance Type** | **Number of Errors Found** |
| 1 | Little | 25 |
| 2 | Medium | 38 |
| 3 | Important | 19 |
| **TOTAL** | | **82** |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | G | Definitions | 3 | N/A | 9 | Little | Definitions and explanations are not clearly separated, it’s hard to read. | Under Review | Have a 2-column table or make definitions bold. |
| 2 | I | 2. High-level (HL) objectives | 3 | 21-22-23 | 8 | Little | The followings are not listed in work items list  ● Basic infrastructure of the backend side  ● Generate ideas for Python-web interface  ● Creation and approval for high level design ideas for architecture | Under Review | Provide these as work items as well in work items list document. |
| 3 | I | 1. Key milestones | 3 | 4th record in the table | 6 | Medium | In the milestone "Initial version of the code - core features", core features are not clearly defined in neither this document nor work items list document | Under Review | Provide clear description of core features and list them concisely. |
| 4 | P | 1 Project organization | 3 | 31 | 3 | Medium | Inconsistent team/unit/position names with respect to the stakeholders defined in Vision document (Section 3.1 Stakeholder Summary) | Under Review | Provide position names in Vision document which are not available there. |
| 5 | R | Risks | 2 | N/A | 9 | Little | Full text in cells are not visible until expanded. | Under Review | Expand cells to fit in all text. |
| 6 | R | Risks | 2 | 5 | 6 | Medium | Probability hasn't changed after mitigation. | Under Review | Update the probability properly after mitigation. |
| 7 | R | Risks | 2 | 7 | 4 | Medium | The mitigation of poor implementation is not correct. | Under Review | Poor development practices can be mitigated by promoting good CI practices, static code analysis, unit/functional and integration testing practices, peer review culture, etc. |
| 8 | R | Risks | N/A | N/A | 9 | Important | Overloading the website your app is scraping with too many requests, can slow down the site or even cause it to crash. | Under Review | Provide a mitigation strategy for this risk |
| 9 | R | Risks | N/A | N/A | 9 | Important | Some websites have specific terms of service agreements that prohibit scraping | Under Review | Provide a mitigation strategy for this risk |
| 10 | R | Risks | N/A | N/A | 9 | Important | If the data in the website is not regularly updated, your app may extract inaccurate or outdated information | Under Review | Provide a mitigation strategy for this risk |
| 11 | S | 2. System-Wide Functional Requirements | 3 | 19 | 4 | Medium | None of the listed items are functional requirements. | Under Review | Update the section with proper system-wide functional requirements. |
| 12 | S | 2. System-Wide Functional Requirements | 3 | 21 | 2 | Medium | Storing login information is for auditing purposes or regulatory compliance rather than ensuring user security. | Under Review | Update the reasoning like "..up to last 6 months to comply with auditing and regulatory compliance requirements". |
| 13 | S | 2. System-Wide Functional Requirements | 3 | 23 | 3 | Medium | What is meant by "open-source licensing"? There are many types of open-source licensing where some restricts commercial usage. | Under Review | Elaborate on the specific licensing type which allows commercial usage. |
| 14 | S | 2. System-Wide Functional Requirements | 3 | 34 | 3 | Little | Since an external authentication system is going to be used, why is this requirement listed here? | Under Review | Update the section with proper system-wide functional requirements. |
| 15 | S | 2. System-Wide Functional Requirements | 3 | 36 | 2 | Little | Does ICTA act as a purchasing gateway, or does it provide any regulations for purchasing systems. | Under Review | Add the relevant regulations if this was intended. |
| 16 | S | 3.1. Usability | 4 | 41 | 7 | Important | Conflicts with UC1 | Under Review | The registration step must clearly state the case that usernames are always emails. |
| 17 | S | 3.1. Usability | 4 | 41 | 7 | Important | Conflicts with UC1 | Under Review | Will a password be requested during registration? UC1 requires a password, but it is not required by the usability requirement. |
| 18 | S | 3.1. Usability | 4 | 44 | 3 | Little | Since this is basically an analysis system, what is meant by "..allow users to edit their order related information."? | Under Review | Elaborate what is meant by "user order". |
| 19 | U | N/A | N/A | N/A | 9 | Medium | Overall styling inconsistencies across the document leading to confusion. | Under Review | Standardize each use case with consistent subsections and numbering. |
| 20 | U | N/A | N/A | N/A | 9 | Medium | Missing ToC - Table of Contents making it hard to jump to any use case | Under Review | Add a ToC enabling easy navigation for the reader. |
| 21 | U | Use Case Model | 3 | 12 | 4 | Medium | Switching to a premium account does not have direct relation with an external Banking System actor. | Under Review | Change to “include” relation with the “Manage Payment Information” UC. |
| 22 | U | Use Case Model | 3 | 12 | 8 | Important | Missing “Subscribe” feature from the Vision document. | Under Review | The “Subscribe” feature is defined in the Vision document for v1.0 but this feature is no included in the UC model. |
| 23 | U | Use Case Model | 3 | 12 | 8 | Important | Missing “Offline Usage” feature from the Vision document. | Under Review | The “Offline Usage” feature is defined in the Vision document for v1.0 but this feature is no included in the UC model. |
| 24 | U | Use Case Model | 3 | 12 | 8 | Medium | Missing connection between the “Login to the system” UC and the external “Authentication System” actor. | Under Review | There must be a connection between authentication related use cases if an external authentication system actor is defined. |
| 25 | U | Use Case Model | 3 | 12 | 6 | Medium | Missing UC for premium users to downgrade their account. | Under Review | If there is a UC for standard users to switch premium account, there must be a similar use case for premium users to downgrade their account. Rater, it’s better to have a common use case like “Manage Own Account”. |
| 26 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 22 | 5 | Medium | Registration with only a username and password is inapplicable. If the username is intended to be the email, it must be stated explicitly in the “Special Requirements” section. | Under Review | Registration requires at least a valid email. |
| 27 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 23 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of "user name" | Under Review | The correct usage is "username" |
| 28 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 29 | 1 | Little | Grammatic error of “Standard” | Under Review | The correct spelling is “Standard” |
| 29 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 29 | 1 | Medium | The model describes an external authentication system actor, which is missing in primary actors. | Under Review | Add the external “Authentication System” actor. |
| 30 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 32 | 8 | Medium | "Main Success Scenario" header is missing. | Under Review | Add the "Main Success Scenario" header. |
| 31 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 32 | 7 | Medium | No interaction described for the “Authentication System”. | Under Review | The “Authentication System” actor must be the main interactor to validate and persist credentials. |
| 32 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 35 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of "user name" | Under Review | The correct usage is "username" |
| 33 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 39 | 8 | Little | Missing failure condition | Under Review | Use case should be updated |
| 34 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 44 | 8 | Medium |  | Under Review | Either add alternative flow for failure condition, or add a dedicated section. For instance it is not clear what happens if the system does not validate the username uniqueness? |
| 35 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 53 | 1 | Little | Spelling error of “Standart” | Under Review | The correct spelling is “Standard” |
| 36 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 54 | 8 | Medium | "Main Success Scenario" header is missing. | Under Review | Add the "Main Success Scenario" header. |
| 37 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 61 | 8 | Medium | "Extensions" header is missing. | Under Review | Add the "Extensions" header. |
| 38 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 61 | 6 | Medium | If the username was intended to be an email, how can a user forget her username and request it back from the system to her email? Otherwise, on UC-1, the email of the user was not requested during registration. | Under Review | Registration requires at least a valid email. |
| 39 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 61 | 3 | Medium | "User enters e-mail and clicks on log in." User should enter password too. | Under Review | Use cases should be updated |
| 40 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 64 | 1 | Little | Spelling error of “adress” | Under Review | The correct spelling is "address" |
| 41 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 67 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of "user users" | Under Review | The correct usage is "user's" |
| 42 | U | Use Case UC3: Manage Personal Information | 5 | 82 | 1 | Little | Spelling error of “Standart” | Under Review | The correct spelling is “Standard” |
| 43 | U | Use Case UC3: Manage Personal Information | 5 | 88 | 2 | Medium | Why are phone number and address information required? It is against the GDPR. | Under Review | To comply with the GDPR either add the Special Requirements section to explain why extra fields are required, or remove all unnecessary fields. |
| 44 | U | Use Case UC4: Manage Payment Information | 5 | 101 | 2 | Important | The use case does not cover PCI compliance which is a must for sensitive payment information. | Under Review | By regulation, all payment information must be processed through PCI compliant steps |
| 45 | U | Use Case UC5: Switch Premium Account | 6 | 131 | 3 | Medium | It is not clear if the payment information is fetched from previously saved credit card, or the payment is completed ad-hoc. | Under Review | Elaborate if the previously saved card is going to be used, in that case add it to preconditions, otherwise clearly describe payment steps. If only credit card payment is allowed explain this under the Special Requirements section, otherwise add extensions for various payment options. |
| 46 | U | Use Case UC5: Switch Premium Account | 6 | 139 | 6 | Medium | It should be stated in the preconditions that the credit card information is registered | Under Review | Use case should be updated |
| 47 | U | Use Case UC6: Monitor Products | 7 | 163 | 5 | Medium | It is not practical to list products only by alphabetical order. There must be at least a category and seller filters. | Under Review | If the user needs to monitor products |
| 48 | U | Use Case UC7: Manage Notification | 8 | 197 | 3 | Medium | Not clear full instruction set or the valid expressions of the instructions. | Under Review | The instructions are not clearly elaborated, list them one by one and explain the valid expressions for each of them under subsequent sections. |
| 49 | U | Use Case UC8: Search Product | 8 | 224 | 3 | Medium | Not clear filtering options. | Under Review | The filters are not clearly elaborated, list them one by one and explain the valid expressions for each of them under subsequent sections. |
| 50 | U | Use Case UC8: Search Product | 9 | 241 | 3 | Medium | What if the product is not found? This extention should be added to use case. | Under Review | Use case should be updated |
| 51 | U | Use Case UC9: Manage Product | 9 | 247 | 3 | Medium | Not clear product attributes. | Under Review | The product attributes are not clearly elaborated, list them one by one and explain the valid expressions for each of them under subsequent sections. |
| 52 | U | Use Case UC9: Manage Product | 9 | 277 | 4 | Important | 2B.2c. describes update and remove actions, in this case the Extension does not apply for Remove operation. | Under Review | Seperate update and remove operation alternative flows. |
| 53 | U | Use Case UC10: Request Support | 10 | 282 | 8 | Little | A support request generally requires a category. | Under Review | Add a category field to the Request Support form. |
| 54 | U | Use Case UC11: View Historical Data | 10 | 304 | 8 | Medium | Missing time period constraint. | Under Review | Beside validation rules there must be a time period constraint for such historical searches, otherwise the overall system will be affected negatively. |
| 55 | U | Use Case UC12: Manage User Questions | 11 | 325 | 8 | Medium | A support request requires a status, otherwise it will not be clear if it is a pending request, or a new one, or a reply, or etc. | Under Review | Add status to requests and add relevant steps for status update interactions. |
| 56 | U | Use Case UC12: Manage User Questions | 11 | 325 | 6 | Medium | UC-10 describes how to submit a "Support Request" but UC-12 describes how to answer "User Questions" which are basically different things. | Under Review | Either describe "Support Request" and "User Question" as interchangeable terms in the Glossary document, or update UC-12 as "Manage Support Requests" |
| 57 | U | Use Case UC13: Manage Users | 11 | 348 | 4 | Important | A normal user should only be onboarded through registration as described in UC1. | Under Review | Correct the use case to cover only system users and add steps how to generate credentials. |
| 58 | U | Use Case UC14: Manage User Roles | 12 | 376 | 8 | Medium | Can a normal user be modified as a CSS for example? | Under Review | Elaborate modifiable user roles under Special Requirements |
| 59 | U | Use Case UC1: Register to System | 4 | 29 | 6 | Important | "Premium User" is stated as one of the primary actors for this use case, but in order to be a "Premium User" from stratch there is no additional step or use case. | Under Review | The user can select the registration type at the beginning. If so, there need to add extension to this use case. If not, that is, as stated in UC-5, if the user can switch the registration type after registered as "Standard User", then UC-1 has an inconsistent flow for "Premium User" since it asks the user for registration info. |
| 60 | U | Use Case UC2: Log in to System | 4 | 68 | 8 | Little | Missing flow step | Under Review | It needs to resume from the 3rd step of the main flow. |
| 61 | U | Use Case UC4: Manage Payment Information | 5 | 107 | 6 | Medium | "Standard User" is stated as one of the primary actors for this use case. Since "Standard User" is assumed to be the ones with free subscription, there is no need for them to manage payment information. | Under Review | "Premium User" and "Standard User" definitions and abilities are need to be described explicitly. |
| 62 | U | Use Case UC5: Switch Premium Account | 6 | 141-148 | 8 | Medium | Missing the step of getting payment information from the user | Under Review | There is no step for user to enter credit cart information in the use case. |
| 63 | U | Use Case UC5: Switch Premium Account | 6 | 153 | 8 | Important | It is stated that there are 2 types of user, premium and standart. This use case describes to switch from standart to premium. So it is not clear that what options are provided and supposed to be selected in step 3a | Under Review | Provide the options clearly or eliminate step 3a. |
| 64 | U | Use Case UC6: Monitor Products | 7 | 181 | 3 | Important | It is not clearly described in which scope these products are kept (in session or page)  Also, In step "3a. User wants to remove products.", removal process is supposed to be clarified as well | Under Review | Provide the scopes of adding and removing a product |
| 65 | U | Use Case UC13: Manage Users | 11 | 348 | 8 | Important | The purpose of the use case is not understood. It is not clear which users the administrator manages and for what purpose | Under Review | Provide the purpose of managing users and list the user types that can be managable. |
| 66 | U | Use Case UC14: Manage User Roles | 12 | 376 | 8 | Important | The purpose of the use case is not understood. It is not clear which user roles the administrator manages and for what purpose | Under Review | Provide the purpose of managing user roles and list the role types that can be managable. |
| 67 | V | 2.1. Problem Statement | 3 | 22, 32 | 1 | Little | Comma needed after "However" | Under Review | The correct usage is "However, ..." |
| 68 | V | 2.1. Problem Statement | 3 | 24 | 1 | Little | Comma needed after "e.g." | Under Review | The correct usage is "e.g.," |
| 69 | V | 2.1. Problem Statement | 3 | 38 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of “can not” | Under Review | The correct usage is “cannot” or “can’t” |
| 70 | V | 2.1. Problem Statement | 3 | 39 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of “can not” | Under Review | The correct usage is “cannot” or “can’t” |
| 71 | V | 2.1. Problem Statement | 3 | 22-30 | 3 | Medium | Too much detailed information which are not directly related with the problem | Under Review | It is better to state the problem briefly that your software is intended to solve . This statement should be concise and specific, and should explain the problem in a way that all stakeholders can understand. |
| 72 | V | 2.2. Product Position Statement | 5 | 53 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of comma in "inflation, and" | Under Review | The correct usage is "inflation and" |
| 73 | V | 2.2. Product Position Statement | 5 | 52-54 | 3 | Medium | The sentence is not clear "This software will also be used by sellers who claim to protect their customers against inflation, and give them the informed customer base they aspire to have. " | Under Review | Replace unambigious sentence with a concise one, since it is not understood clearly |
| 74 | V | 3.1.Stakeholder Summary | 6 | 71 | 1 | Little | "E-commerce platforms will offered to beta test the software" | Under Review | E-commerce platforms will be offered to beta test the software. |
| 75 | V | 3.2. User Environment | 8 | 89 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of “can not” | Under Review | The correct usage is “cannot” or “can’t” |
| 76 | V | 3.2. User Environment | 8 | 90 | 1 | Little | Wrong usage of “can not” | Under Review | The correct usage is “cannot” or “can’t” |
| 77 | V | 3.2. User Environment | 8 | 89-90 | 3 | Medium | The sentence is not clear "The web scraping activities can not be used in any area/vehicle restraining data transfer as web scraping can not be performed. However offline use will be available." | Under Review | Replace unambigious sentence with a concise one. |
| 78 | V | 4.1. Needs and Features | 8 | 95 | 8 | Important | In the "Product Position Statement" it is clearly stated that the proposed solution "is a web scraping and analysis tool". Though, there aren't any needs or features described either for web scraping nor analysis. | Under Review | Add relevant needs and features to achieve web scraping and analysis capabilities. |
| 79 | V | 4.1. Needs and Features | 8 | 95 | 8 | Important | Are the features stated as to be released in release 1.0, planned for all users?(consumers, sellers, ecommerce platforms) | Under Review | Clearly state the users who will be able to use these features at the end of release 1.0 |
| 80 | V | 4.1. Needs and Features | 9 | 95 | 9 | Little | Since the features are not grouped in order of releases, it is difficult to track while reading. | Under Review | Group the features in order of releases, so that readers can understand which features will be available at the end of a specific release. |
| 81 | V | 4.1. Needs and Features | 9 | 95 | 8 | Important | The feature "Users can use offline features, downloaded files and so on" is not explicitly defined. | Under Review | Provide offline features clearly. |
| 82 | W | WIL\_Iteration\_1 | N/A | N/A | 8 | Important | Work items are missing. | Under Review | Only iteration 1 work items are listed. Try to describe your work items as much as possible.Because there is a work item stated as "Produce iteration plan for iterations 1&2", hence it is expected to see the work items for iteration 2. |