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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 17: Validating the Requirements  *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 17 focuses on the process of ensuring software requirements accurately represent the intended system capabilities and meet stakeholder real needs. It points out the importance of systematic reviews and inspections. Also, it involves various stakeholders to ensure completeness, feasibility, and verifiability of requirements. The chapter discuss methods such as informal reviews, formal peer reviews, risk analysis, and prototyping in detail, emphasizes their roles in identifying defects.** |

**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: What is the author’s role in the inspection?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P336 - Planning> “The author and moderator plan the inspection together. They determine who should participate, what materials the inspectors should receive prior to the inspection meeting, the total meeting time needed to cover the material, and when the inspection should be scheduled.”**  **<ebook><P338 - Rework> “The author should plan to spend some time reworking the requirements following the inspection meeting.”**  **<ebook><P338 – Follow-up> “In this final inspection step, the moderator or a designated individual works with the author to ensure that all open issues were resolved and that errors were corrected properly. Follow-up brings closure to the inspection process and enables the moderator to determine whether the inspection’s exit criteria have been satisfied.”**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment).**  **The author's role during the inspection of software requirements is complex, and it is vital for understanding the thoroughness and effectiveness of the software development process. The author's involvement in planning, reworking, and follow-up stages emphasizes the continuous effort needed for validating and refining the requirements. This point is valuable as it brings to light the iterative nature of requirement validation and the critical role of the author in this process, which directly impacts the success of the software project. Understanding these mixed responsibilities can lead to better practices in requirement inspections, ultimately resulting in more reliable and efficient software development.** |
|  |
| For staff use only:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **(2)**  **QUESTION: How to determine a project is acceptable or not?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P347 – Validating requirements with acceptance criteria> “Customers need to assess whether a system satisfies its predefined *acceptance criteria*. Acceptance criteria—and hence acceptance testing—should evaluate whether the product satisfies its documented requirements and whether it is fit for use in the intended operating environment.”**  **<ebook><P347 – Acceptance Criteria> “Defining acceptance criteria is more than just saying that all the requirements are implemented, or all the tests passed. Acceptance tests constitute just a subset of acceptance criteria.”**  **<ebook><P349 – Acceptance Tests>”** **Some acceptance testing might be performed manually by users. The tests used in user acceptance testing (UAT) should be executed after a set of functionalities is believed to be release ready.”**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment):**  **The question about determines the acceptance of project is crucial as it is not only about implementing all requirements or passing all tests. Acceptance criteria provide a comprehensive evaluation of the system's fulfillment of requirements and its fitness for the intended environment, emphasizing the importance of user involvement in the testing process. This holistic view, including user acceptance testing (UAT) after functionality is deemed release-ready, ensures that the system not only meets technical specifications but also user expectations and practical business needs. The chapter elaborates on these aspects, emphasizing the importance of user-centric testing and detailed, practical acceptance criteria in assessing project acceptability.** |
|  |
| For staff use only:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **3)**  **QUESTION: What should be taken into consideration when choosing participants of validation?**  **ANSWER:**  **<ebook><P333 - Participants> - “Ensure that you have all of the necessary people in an inspection meeting before proceeding. Otherwise you might correct issues only to find out later that someone important disagrees with the change.”**  **<ebook><P334 - Participants> “The author’s manager normally should not attend an inspection meeting, unless the manager is actively contributing to the project and his presence is acceptable to the author.”**  **<ebook><P341 – Large inspection teams> “However, large review teams increase the cost of the review, make it hard to schedule meetings, and have difficulty reaching agreement on issues.”**  **COMMENT (also include where possible: an \*example\*, citation, justification, etc. -- to support your comment):**  **The selection of participants for validation is a critical aspect of the inspection process, balancing inclusivity and efficiency. The excerpts highlight the importance of including all necessary stakeholders to avoid conflicts or disagreements later on. Excluding the author's manager, unless they are directly involved in the project, is recommended to maintain an environment conducive to open discussion and feedback. The caution against large review teams addresses the practical challenges they pose, such as increased costs, scheduling difficulties, and the potential for protracted decision-making. These considerations underscore the need for a well-thought-out composition of the review team, ensuring it is both effective and manageable.** |