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Document Reviewed: Software Requirements Specification (SRS)
Date Reviewed: Monday February 8, 2010
Participants/ Roles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Role played:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All members of Team RRAMM in section 3 of CPE308</td>
<td>Reviewers, created and discussed issues lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA Manager of Team Los Chivos (Andy Nunes)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members of Team Los Chivos</td>
<td>Team members, discussed issues list, took corrective action on issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure: The facilitator contacted all reviewers on Saturday February 6, 2010 informing them the SRS document was ready to be reviewed and requesting that they begin creating their issues lists. All reviewers typed individual issues lists and brought them to the formal meeting on Monday February 8. The facilitator facilitated a short, concise formal meeting on Monday with all participants present and asked the reviewers to present their issues in categories according to what section of the SRS document they were associated with. Among each category, issues were listing in order of importance, starting with major issues first. The facilitator typed each issue as it was brought up, and made sure that issues were clear to team members. The facilitator then finalized the compiled issues list and sent it to all team members. Action items were created where necessary and team members addressed and corrected issues in the sections of the SRS they had written.

Compiled Issues List:

General/Uncategorized:
• Grammatical errors (i.e. first line)
• Major features: two timers mentioned – same timer?
• Jump from 4.3 → 2.0 (fix numbering)
• 6.1: No hardware interface (put mouse and keyboard)
• update TOC (specifically for Vision and Scope)

Vision and Scope:
• must give one or two sentence description of what game actually does (stated too specifically and spread out)
• needs major revision
• not going to make revenue
• list for two items? Use bullets?
• operating environment should explain conditions in which customer will be using product

Functional Requirements:
• specify who is doing what actions (i.e. system deals cards)

Quality Requirements:
• don't use words like should (i.e. modifiability)
• Don't use '<' symbol in modifiability
• Revise portability requirements

Platform Constraints:
• justify this in engineering analysis
• portability: take out 95/98
**Informational Constraints:**
• use state transition diagram for data model

**Data Dictionary:**
• distinguish each entry more clearly
• make two visually separate tables
• in deck and set, number must be superscript

**Engineering Analysis:**
• second issue is numbered as 3
• list disadvantages where not listed (more complexity for unlisted one)
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