

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document  
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portal - Students**



February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS STUDENTS PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
1	General Comment				<p>There are no Security Requirements included in the document. This applies to RTM as well. The only mention of security is a link to a security information page, which is presumably informational only.</p> <p><a href="#">Security requirements have been included in section 2.1.1.7 of the Detailed Requirements Document and requirements 1.10-1.15 in the RTM.</a></p>	1

Category

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Comment requires immediate resolution.             | 5. Comment has been resolved with developer.    |
| 2. Comment requires resolution to meet exit criteria. | 6. Comment discussed with developer/still open. |
| 3. Design quality or style suggestion.                | 7. Recommendation for future improvement.       |
| 4. Question about the document.                       | 8. Typo, spelling, or minor wording changes.    |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document  
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portal - Students**

**February 4, 2002**

<b>REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS STUDENTS PORTAL RELEASE 1</b>						
<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Para.</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Fig.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Cat.</b>
2	General Comment				<p>The Detailed Requirements documents for both the Students and Financial Partners should be compared with each other for consistency and the requirements updated accordingly where appropriate. Currently, there are discrepancies between the two. For example, the Detailed Requirements for FP has a "Consistent Look and Feel," requirement for a "Back" button and Students does not. FP has "General Links" and Students has "Quick Links." They should be as consistent as possible to help ensure that the sites have a common look and feel and that there is consistent application of requirements.</p> <p><i>Students now contains a consistent look and feel requirement (section 2.1.1 of the word doc and # 2.1 RTM). There is no longer an FP requirement for a back button. The quick links section will not be labeled as such on the portal screens. It is simply the terminology that has been used to describe the function of these links.</i></p>	1

Category

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Comment requires immediate resolution.             | 5. Comment has been resolved with developer.    |
| 2. Comment requires resolution to meet exit criteria. | 6. Comment discussed with developer/still open. |
| 3. Design quality or style suggestion.                | 7. Recommendation for future improvement.       |
| 4. Question about the document.                       | 8. Typo, spelling, or minor wording changes.    |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document  
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portal - Students**

**February 4, 2002**

<b>REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS STUDENTS PORTAL RELEASE 1</b>						
<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Para.</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Fig.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Cat.</b>
3	General Comment				<p>It is difficult to trace the requirements contained in the high-level requirements to the detailed requirements or those contained in the RTM. A numbering system or cross-reference would resolve this discrepancy. (We will prepare an IV&amp;V RTM and will provide updates to our comments.)</p> <p><a href="#">An additional column has been added to the RTM that references the detailed requirements.</a></p>	3
4	General Comment				<p>A dynamic date is used for “Last Updated” date in the document footer. This date is updated every time the document is accessed and will lead to confusion. “Update date” should be hard coded and changed whenever a modification is made.</p> <p><a href="#">This has been corrected.</a></p>	3
5	General Comment				<p>The NSLDS link is discussed in the requirements document but there does not appear to be a corresponding link in the requirements detail or RTM.</p> <p><a href="#">This link is no longer a requirement.</a></p>	1

Category

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Comment requires immediate resolution.             | 5. Comment has been resolved with developer.    |
| 2. Comment requires resolution to meet exit criteria. | 6. Comment discussed with developer/still open. |
| 3. Design quality or style suggestion.                | 7. Recommendation for future improvement.       |
| 4. Question about the document.                       | 8. Typo, spelling, or minor wording changes.    |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document  
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portal - Students**

**February 4, 2002**

<b>REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS STUDENTS PORTAL RELEASE 1</b>						
<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Para.</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Fig.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Cat.</b>
6	General Comment				Cover page of deliverables should be consistent in displaying administrative information. Preliminary Design displays Author, Last Modified By, Creation Date, Last Updated, and Version. Requirements should be modified to display similar information.  <a href="#">Cover page has been updated.</a>	3
7	General Comment				The High Level Requirements are posted in every document and this leads to having to maintain this list and control the changes in multiple documents. In addition, the version of the requirements stated in the "High Level Requirements" Document includes new technology (specifically wireless) in the first sentence under "Scope" beginning "Build an enterprise portal infrastructure to enable ..." but does not appear in the Requirements Document. Has this been dropped as a high-level requirement?  <a href="#">An enterprise portal is no longer a requirement.</a>	3,4
8	13	2.1.6			Returning to School section is still TBD.  <a href="#">This section is no longer a requirement.</a>	1

Category

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Comment requires immediate resolution.             | 5. Comment has been resolved with developer.    |
| 2. Comment requires resolution to meet exit criteria. | 6. Comment discussed with developer/still open. |
| 3. Design quality or style suggestion.                | 7. Recommendation for future improvement.       |
| 4. Question about the document.                       | 8. Typo, spelling, or minor wording changes.    |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document  
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portal - Students**

**February 4, 2002**

<b>REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS STUDENTS PORTAL RELEASE 1</b>						
<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Para.</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Fig.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Cat.</b>
9	22	3.1.3.2			The wrong web page is displayed in this section. Current Borrowers should be displayed, but the Student Aid page was inadvertently placed in this section. Please correct this oversight.  <a href="#">Page layouts are no longer included.</a>	1
10	RTM Appendix General Comment	3.1			The RTM should include additional columns to assist with traceability e.g., a column for design document and test cases where the requirement is tested. Otherwise it is simply a requirements list or matrix.  <a href="#">Column has been included.</a>	3
11	RTM Appendix Page 2				Suggest that Personalization Requirements be a category and not included in the General Functionality Section. Also the requirements for the Personalization do not appear to be detailed enough e.g. information required, login access, requirements for password etc.  <a href="#">These requirements are outlined in the Students Detailed Design Document.</a>	3

Category

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Comment requires immediate resolution.             | 5. Comment has been resolved with developer.    |
| 2. Comment requires resolution to meet exit criteria. | 6. Comment discussed with developer/still open. |
| 3. Design quality or style suggestion.                | 7. Recommendation for future improvement.       |
| 4. Question about the document.                       | 8. Typo, spelling, or minor wording changes.    |