Evaluation of the SRS
Team
Yellow
Team Members
Satish Venkatesan
Hitesh Jasani

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?

Good. External interfaces include 3 files and a VT100 display. While your text description worked, a picture would have been nice. Later you specify more details on the 3 files.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?

Command line is quite complete. You assume that the user knows that items in brackets ([]) are optional; it may be a good idea to spell this out. You give an example of a command line - good. You have given a summary of the commands to follow - good. As we mentioned in class, this need not necessarily be described down to the actual command verb in the SRS - just a statement of what the command will do. Keep asking the question as to if the command verb is really a requirement. Command descriptions are quite complete.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?

Yes, I really like the pictures of the displays. As I mentioned in class, it may be good to generate a SUM and place this information into it, making a SUM a second statement of requirements.

3.3 Entity relationships complete?

Your diagram is at the proper level of abstraction for an SRS. Very clear - good.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?

Yes, your data flow diagram is quite good. I compared the ERD with the DFD, however, and found several minor differences in nomenclature between the two - "CS Parts Component Code" vs "CS Parts Components Library Data Files" for example. This inconsistency should be corrected. The DFD was complete with respect to the ERD - you did not omit any item on the ERD in the DFD if it should indeed be there as a data source or sink. Your data dictionary start was also good, but not always complete. Restrictions on the length of "Text" and "Command" were not noticed, so I could not tell if they were unlimited or simply omitted.

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?

Fine. Some of these items (e.g., a PC C++ compiler is needed) may be risks. Humor in 3.5.2 is funny but out of place (imagine a stranger reading this).

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?

Fine.

3.7 Design constraints complete?

Fine.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?

Fine.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?

You noted that the NIHCL is available - but you did not check it out! If you did, you would have found that it does not work correctly and is incomplete. What does the CS Parts library (in Ada) have to do with reducing your risks? I don't see a relationship.

4.1 Qualification methods complete?

Fine. You did not specify the error conditions to be tested against (movement before the first screen, for example). Should you have to specify this as well? Perhaps ... perhaps not.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

I did not note any signfiicant deficiencies.

3. Other Comments

Your list of acronyms is too extensive - many acronyms you did not use are here.

Very good job overall. You should be quite pleased. This was clearly a significant amount of effort on your part. I feel that most any design team would be able to work from these requirements.

Evaluation of the SRS
Team

Team Members
Rajan Prasad
Weiqing Huang
Stephen Andrew

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?

Good. External interfaces include the VT100 display and keyboard, a database for CS Parts, a defaults file, and a formatted output file.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?

Command line is quite complete, but it is assumed that the reader knows something of a "conventional" notation for optional parameters and selection parameters. No attempt was made to explain the [text] and {text} forms in the syntax of the command. A command summary is given, which is always good. The SRS specifies in detail the command names and the options; as we discussed in class, this may or may not be an actual requirement - often it is a design decision.

The details of each command appear complete. More design decisions are creeping in, however: on page 6, for example, the statement in the second sentence of the first paragraph under 3.2.1 is "index consists of a line for each file, package, ..." and smacks of a design decision as opposed to a requirement. Much of the detail for these commands should appear in a SUM instead of an SRS.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?

I saw many textual descriptions of the outputs to the user at various points, but no pictures. I still have no idea what the displays will actually look like -- a design decision? Perhaps so.

3.3 Entity relationships complete?

Good. Some wording is a little awkward, however: "Browser Program sends CS Parts to the Console" is clearly not what is intended.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?

Nearly so. The ERD showed an interface to the Operating System, but this interface did not appear in the DFD. It should have. Your names between the ERD and DFD were consistent - good. The beginnings of the data dictionary were fine.

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?

Fine.

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?

Fine.

3.7 Design constraints complete?

Fine.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?

Fine.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?

While the statement about the schedule is true, what can be done to fix the problem? Have you looked into the impact of reusable components? No mention.

4.1 Qualification methods complete?

Fine, but no checks are identified for error conditions, such as invalid options on the command line or invalid commands while inside the program.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

I don't have a picture of your screens yet.

3. Other Comments

Your list of acronyms includes acronyms you did not use. It should be trimmed down.

Good job, overall. It is clear you put a lot of work into this SRS.

Evaluation of the SRS
Team

Team Members
Jody Combs
Dave Curl
Joe Hoover
Ken Richards

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
A picture would have really been nice on the Scope page. Overviews are greatly enhanced by pictures.

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?
A little too short. You did not mention that the display is a VT100 display, that the keyboard generates ASCII (as opposed to EBCDIC characters), what the target operating system(s) is (are). Many details omitted. Hope a designer does't go off designing this for an IBM mainframe with EBCDIC! You did include some information in the scope, but this section is explicitly set aside for this information. In some environments, a designer would not even look at the scope or any other part to pick up external interface details.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?
As we mentioned in class, the fact that you did not name the commands is fine. You chose to leave this issue as a design detail.

Details on what the commands do if they fail are omitted. For example, under 3.2.2, the document states what will happen if a component is found but not if it is not found. Do we get an error message, a display of the contents, a display of the first screen? I can't tell from your writeup.

Error conditions are continually omitted. In 3.2.3, for example, what happens when we page before the first or after the last component? Does it wrap around or give an error? I can't tell.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?
Nothing presented, so I have no idea of any requirement except for VT100 in this area. Do we have 80 or 132 column displays? What are the contents of the prompt line? No idea.

3.3 Entity relationships complete?
Fine.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?
Very good. A second-level DFD shows things nicely with less "business" in one figure. Your data dictionary is not bad.

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?
Fine.

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?
Fine.

3.7 Design constraints complete?

Fine.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?

FIne.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?

Fine. What were done to reduce these risks? No indication.

4.1 Qualification methods complete?

Far too little detail. This tells me almost nothing of the tests planned or how I as a customer would determine if you had done the work satisfactorily.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

Far too many things, as mentioned above. It is acceptable, largely because drafting an SRS the first time is quite difficult.

3. Other Comments

This SRS really needs quite a bit of work.

Evaluation of the SRS
Team
Green
Team Members
Phil Barona
Dallas Marks
Carol Rollins
Colin Vogt

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
A picture is always good in the overview. None here.

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?
Fine. The description of the default file smacks of design, but could be construed to be laid out in order to truly meet some requirement of the customer.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?
The overview is good.

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?
Fine. As we mentioned in class, naming the commands in the SRS is a good idea, but may better belong in the SUM. They could be a requirement, however, due to compatibility with other programs, but they often aren't.

You covered the situation of an invalid command - good.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?
Very good. I like you screen display design. You left off screen width, however (80 or 132).

3.3 Entity relationships complete?
Fine. Entities are reasonably complete and the relationships are OK. It is not a usual practice to identify the author of a particular part of the document, but OK.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?
Good tracking to the ERD. Fine. It is not a usual practice to identify the author of a particular part of the document, but OK. You data dictionary looks fine. You did your homework on the layout of a pager2 file!

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?
Fine.

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?
Fine.

3.7 Design constraints complete?
Fine.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?
Fine.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?
Fine, but no suggestions on how to reduce the risks. Also, no evaluation of CS Parts or NIHCL (if you are using Ada or C++).

4.1 Qualification methods complete?
Fine, except that you did not discuss executing any invalid commands or command lines as part of qualification.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
It seemed complete.

3. Other Comments
Your list of acronyms is too long - include only acronyms used in the document.

Overall, a good job.

Evaluation of the SRS
Team

Team Members
Chris Roesener
Xianghone Liu

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
Nice to see a picture in the Scope. Good.

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?
Not complete. No mention of the print files as in the SDP. Rest is fine.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?
Good overview, including a list of commands and a sample display. As mentioned in class, the placement of the commands in an SRS is an issue with the customer, but this is fine.

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?
Yes, this looks quite complete. You also included what happens when invalid commands are issued - good.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?
I like your display in the opening of this section - good.

3.3 Entity relationships complete?
Fine. Looks complete. Some misspelling ("diplays" instead of "displays"). Good to see a first cut at a data dictionary.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?
Fine, but many of the names do not track with the names in the ERD. If they have one name in one diagram, they should have the same name in the other.

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?
Fine.

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?
FIne.

3.7 Design constraints complete?
Fine, but not all the platforms for target are mentioned. "Design constraints" refers to constraints the software must face, not constraints the designer must face in his environment (such as Sun4). The SDP called for UNIX and PC.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?
Fine.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?
Fine, but no mention was made as to how to address these risks. Have the NIHCL parts been checked out, for instance?

4.1 Qualification methods complete?
No, not complete at all. Looks like it was omitted.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
No testing information was present at all. Qualifications were missing.

3. Other Comments

Your pages were somewhat out of order on pages 8, 9, 10, and 11. They should have been corrected before the customer saw them.

This was clearly a lot of work for you ... good job overall.

Evaluation of the SRS

Team

Blue

Team Members

Wing Chung
Tom Clary
Bill Kilgallon

1. What Did Your SRS Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?
Lacks a picture in the Scope section. Pictures are always good to give an idea of what is to be done at a glance.

3.1 CSCI external interface requirements complete?
Not complete -- no mention of the formatted output file or the external data files.

3.2 CSCI capability requirements complete?
Fine.

a. Commands permitted from the user complete?
Nice to see a good overview. As we mentioned in class, the specification of command details is often not found in the SRS unless the customer had a good reason to place them there, but this is fine. I really like the detail of your pictures.

I like the inclusion of error condition information in your description of the commands - good. Your coverage of invalid commands is fine.

b. Displays presented to the user complete?
Quite good.

3.3 Entity relationships complete?
Fine. Seems complete.

3.4 CSCI data element requirements complete?
Looks fine, with the beginning of a data dictionary (also good). Your data store names do not match exactly the names used in the ERD - they should.

3.5 Adaptation requirements complete?
Fine.

3.6 Sizing and timing requirements complete?
Fine.

3.7 Design constraints complete?
Fine.

3.8 Human performance/human engineering requirements complete?
Fine.

3.9 Risk assessment complete?
Very good. You are the only team to describe in any detail what you plan to do to reduce your risks.

4.1 Qualification methods complete?

A little too brief. Also, you did not discuss the trial of erroneous commands or commands to test error conditions.

2. What Did Your SRS Not Tell Me About What You Are Going To Do?

Very complete - no problem.

3. Other Comments

Your list of acronyms should be reduced to only the ones you use.

Overall, a very good job. Shows a lot of effort - good work.