
From: Marc Sauvage [msauvage@CEA.FR]
Sent: 12 June 2001 11:52
To: SPIRE-ICCDT@LISTSERV.RL.AC.UK
Subject: Requirements - Use cases Matrix



Notes_from_URDxUC.
pdf



Reqs-x-usecases-0.3.p
df



ATT654444.txt

SPIRE-SBT-COM-000718

(See SPIRE-SBT-NOT-000719 and SPIRE-SBT-NOT-000720 for attachments to this message).

Dear all,

Here is my first shot at building the relation matrix between requirements as found in the URDs and the summary-level use case. The first thing I want to say is that it was a much more complicated exercise than what I had expected. This is due to many factors among which the evolving nature of the URDs and my own inexperience with the use-case concept played a large part. Nevertheless, this is now complete (at least for version 1 which is joined in this email).

In the course of doing that I noticed many problems (inconsistencies, incompleteness, Š) that I have listed in the course of my work, and this is also joined as an attachment to this mail. I advise every URD and UC writer to check it out as there maybe something for you in there. Here I will try to summarize my findings in a way that makes more sense.

- 1 - Two UC should be removed from our list as they are superseded by already existing UC: UC-AIV050 and UC-OBS030.
- 2 - We are clearly missing uses cases describing the analysis and processing of data. As you can see from the matrix, all the data related requirements of the FTS and PHOT URD have no UC linked to them.
- 3 - We still haven't reached a safe way of making the URD evolve: I have found some inconsistencies between the list of requirements that Seb gave me and version 2 of the URD package. Since the requirement list shows more requirements than the URD themselves, that means that version 2 of the URD package is not the most recent one.
- 4 - The question of instrument simulators in the ICC shows up a number of times and reveals that we have probably not accurately covered that point in the URD. A tool that allows the checking of the safety of an instrument procedure is mentioned in the UC, as is one that produces data streams suitable for interactive analysis. This is not covered by the AOP URD.
- 5 - In the use case I could see two entities emerging that are barely alluded to in the URDs: the instrument team and the OBS maintenance team. Should we define these teams more precisely and shouldn't they place requirements on the ICC?

6 - Some use cases have little overlaps with the requirements (see my notes in the attachment). This is either because they were in fact built from a single requirement, or because they touch upon an almost new subject (e.g. ICC web maintenance, information database).

7 - There are some interfaces to define better, in particular with the MOC. When some of the software gets updated, and that impacts operation, there should be a procedure for the ICC to contact the MOC. I guess the MOC URD is not complete in that respect. Interface to the HSC when we modify AOTs.

A few minor scattered notes:

- The RIO URD should be expanded.
- A version 2.1 of the URD should be delivered and frozen for a while.
- The training UC should be expanded or we should write a use case for training of non-ICC people by ICC.
- The mission information database is a concept that should be presented in the CUS URD.
- Publication of calibration reports should be mentioned in the CAL URD.
- UC-CUS030 is not really a summary-level use-case.
- How the ICC uses the web is seen differently in the URDs and in the use-cases. This should be homogenized.
- Read the attached notes, there could be something for you.