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**INDIVIDUAL TEMPLATE**

**Reading Summary and Questions and Answers**

**Rules – please note these carefully:**

* Submission filename MUST be: “**Last-name First-name” “Group”<id>\_”Chapter” (or reading) <id> (e.g., Blogs Joe\_Group 3\_Chapter 2)**
* This template must be used for ONLY ONE chapter (or reading) at a time. For the second item of reading, if any, please use another copy of this template.
* **PLEASE compress multiple files (one file/chapter) using standard (e.g., Windows) compression that can be uncompressed on a Windows machine with simple clicks. Please do not use unusual/fancy compression tool; your template won’t be graded and you will be penalised.**
* **Submission to be done on OWL as per the deadline set.**
* **EMAIL SUBMISSION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED AND WILL INCUR PENALTY.**
* **Use of template is mandatory**: submission of text made outside the template will result in a zero mark.
* **Altering this template (meta-items) will incur a penalty.**
* Submission format is **MS WORD only** **(not PDF)**. PDF files will incur a penalty.
* The source of the answer captured from the chapter must be accurate or closest to the context (e.g., Chapter #, Section or sub-section #, page number, etc.).
* The question must be properly and fully specified, and easily understandable. Cryptic text or grammatical errors will be penalised – no appeals accepted.
* The question must not be so general or non-specific to apply to non-specific answers.
* The answer (text identified from chapter) must be an important point, not something trivial or highly specific to a context.
* Answer from the book must be copied “as-is” from the text (**reference** to chart/table/figure/etc., in the reading is permitted and encouraged). Cryptic text or grammatical errors will be penalised – no appeals accepted.
  + *If in doubt about the quality or acceptability of your text, you will have one chance to have it reviewed by the instructor for “live” feedback. No emails please.*
* Assessment of your submitted template will be done sometime before the end of the term. Please do not expect marks of your submission every week!
* There will be no “remake” of the summaries (e.g., for improving the mark). It is a one-time submission and assessment. Late submissions will not be accepted.

**Part 1: Summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group member’s name**: Yulun Feng **Group No**: 2 |
|  |
| Please write the **full reference** of the reading in the WHITE box below.   * + Chapter #, Chapter title (or article title if appropriate).   + Book title   + Author(s)   + Publisher   + Book edition, Year of publication   (Example shown below; overwrite on that space.) |
| Chapter 7: Requirements elicitation  *Software Requirements, 3rd ed.*  Weigers and Beatty  Microsoft, 2013 |
| Please write in the WHITE box below an abstract of the reading in **50-75 words**. |
| Chapter 16 explores the critical process of setting priorities for software requirements, emphasizing the importance of distinguishing between essential and non-essential features for timely and value-driven project execution. It delves into various prioritization techniques, illustrating how to balance stakeholder needs, project constraints, and resource allocation effectively. The chapter also addresses common challenges and misconceptions in prioritization, offering practical solutions and frameworks to ensure that development efforts align with core business objectives and deliver maximum value. |

**Part 2: Questions, Answers and Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| Please create **THREE** important **Question-Answer-Comment sets** from the given reading:   * State your question succinctly. Add more lines as needed. * State <LOCATION of answer in the book (e.g., section #>: <as-is answer EXACTLY from the book> ; please indicate whether a hardcopy or ebook ‘cause the page numbers are not the same. * State your Comment related to the answer; this is mandatory.   **NOTE: The following will be penalised: a cryptic question; inaccurate copying of the answer; a trivial point; “too specific or small detail”; missing or trivial comment; etc.. Informative, insightful, or key concept/idea, question, answer, and comment are expected.**   * + Actual chart/table/figure/etc. must NOT be given in the text below, but you may site its location in the reading by giving precise specification. |
|  |
| For staff use only:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **(1)**  **QUESTION: How does prioritization aid in managing stakeholder expectations and project constraints in software development?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P315 – Some prioritization pragmatics> Various stakeholders need to participate in prioritization, representing customers, project sponsors, project management, development, and perhaps other perspectives. You really need one ultimate decision maker when stakeholders can’t agree. A good starting point is for the prioritization participants to agree upon a set of criteria to use for judging whether one requirement has higher priority than another.**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment).**  **Prioritization plays a pivotal role in software development by effectively managing stakeholder expectations and aligning project deliverables with available resources. It helps in identifying which requirements are essential for the project's success and which can be deferred, ensuring that the team focuses on delivering high-value features within the constraints of time and budget. This process not only facilitates better resource allocation but also aids in mitigating the risks associated with scope creep, where projects expand beyond their original objectives, often leading to delays and budget overruns. By establishing clear priorities, teams can navigate conflicting demands, make informed trade-off decisions, and maintain a strategic focus on the project's core objectives, thereby enhancing the likelihood of successful project outcomes and stakeholder satisfaction.** |
|  |
| For staff use only:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **(2)**  **QUESTION: What are the practical challenges in implementing the MoSCoW prioritization method, and how can they impact project outcomes?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P321 – MoSCoW> It doesn’t offer any rationale for making the decision about how to rate the priority of a given requirement compared to others. MoSCoW is ambiguous as to timing, particularly when it comes to the “Won’t” rating. “Won’t” could mean either “not in the next release” or “not ever.”**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment):**  **The MoSCoW method, while popular for its simplicity, faces practical challenges that can affect project outcomes. One major issue is its potential ambiguity, especially regarding the 'W' category, which can lead to confusion about whether a requirement is deferred to a future release or excluded entirely. This lack of clarity can result in misaligned expectations among stakeholders and the development team. Additionally, the method's subjective nature can lead to prioritization being influenced by the most vocal stakeholders rather than objective business needs, potentially skewing the development focus away from truly critical features. Effective application of MoSCoW requires clear definitions and consensus on what each category signifies, coupled with a disciplined approach to ensure that prioritization reflects the project's strategic goals and delivers maximum value.** |
|  |
| For staff use only:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **3)**  **QUESTION: In what ways does the prioritization process using the $100 method help clarify stakeholder preferences, and what are its limitations in requirement prioritization?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P321 - $100> If one requirement is three times as important to a stakeholder as another requirement, she would assign perhaps nine dollars to the first requirement and three dollars to the second.**  **<ebook>< P321 - $100> However, Davis (2005) points out several ways that participants can “game” the process to skew the results. For instance, if you really, REALLY want a particular requirement, you might give it all 100 of your dollars to try to float it to the top of the list. In reality, you’d never accept a system that possessed just that single requirement, though. Nor does this scheme take into account any concern about the relative amount of effort needed to implement each of those requirements. If you could get three requirements each valued at $10 for the same effort as one valued at $15, you’re likely better off with the three.**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment):**  **The $100 method introduces a tangible and interactive approach to prioritization, engaging stakeholders in allocating a finite 'budget' to various requirements based on their perceived value. This exercise not only reveals the relative importance stakeholders place on different features but also encourages a deeper discussion about the reasons behind their choices, fostering a shared understanding of project priorities. However, the method's simplicity can also be a limitation, as it may not adequately capture the complexity of trade-offs between different requirements, particularly when factors such as implementation cost and technical risk are considered. Moreover, there's a risk of stakeholders 'gaming' the system by allocating all their funds to a few pet features, which may not align with the overall project objectives. Despite these challenges, the $100 method can be a valuable tool for facilitating stakeholder engagement and gaining insights into their priorities, provided it is used judiciously and in conjunction with other more comprehensive prioritization techniques.** |