



**BSC Comments on Requirements Document
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
1	General Comment				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. Security Requirements will be discussed at a later date with the IV & V group.	1

Category

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

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
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 Portal now contains a consistent look and feel requirement (section 2.1.1 of the word document and # 2.1 RTM). There is no longer an FP requirement for a back button. The general links section has been changes to site resources (section 2.1.1.11 of the word document). However these links 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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
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.</p> <p>An additional column has been added to the RTM that references the detailed requirements.</p>	2
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>This has been corrected.</p>	2
5	Cover page				<p>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.</p> <p>Cover page has been updated.</p>	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. |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
6	3	1			<p>“DataMart” is not qualified in the document. Since there will be multiple data marts in the future, the term should be qualified (i.e., “FP DataMart” to indicate the specific one(s) to which the user may link.</p> <p>All references to Data Mart have been changed and now appear as Financial Partners Data Mart.</p>	2
7	3	5			<p>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?</p> <p>An enterprise portal is no longer a requirement.</p>	4

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
8	3	5			<p>Items in the high-level requirements that do not appear in the scope listed are links to Forms 2000, Trade Associations, SFA University, Security Access Form, and the degree and definition of personalized data that will be accessible. It may be that the Security Access Form is part of the new user registration and SFA University is part of the “Conference” link but that is unclear.</p> <p>All of these items were added to the scope of the project (see Scope section of word document). There will not be personalization for Release 1 of the Financial Partners Portal.</p>	2
9	7	2.1.1			<p>Sentence is italicized; please change to match remainder of document.</p> <p>This has been corrected.</p>	3
10	8	2.1.1.8 2.1.1.9			<p>“Current Activities” page is “Current Projects” page in detail layout and RTM. Similar name confusion with “Interest Rates”, “Community Calendar”, and “Conference Registration” pages. Please make consistent across all requirement documents to avoid confusion.</p> <p>This has been corrected.</p>	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
11	8	2.1.1.10			<p>General Links lists links to be displayed on every page. “Feedback” and “Technical Help” do not appear on detail page layouts and the RTM. “Privacy”, “Security”, and “Notices” do not appear on detail page layouts.</p> <p>These links have been incorporated to the RTM. Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	2
12	10	2.1.2			<p>Text states the names of the three main FSA Financial Management Systems appear in bold text below the icons. Please modify the detail page layout to reflect this.</p> <p>Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	3
13	10	2.1.2			<p>There are a number of discrepancies between the text description of the Home Page and the actual detail page layout. Please modify so the two are consistent.</p> <p>Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	3
14	10	2.1.3			<p>There are discrepancies between the text description of the Community Members Page and the actual detail page layout. Please modify so the two are consistent.</p> <p>Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	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. |

**BSC Comments on Requirements Document
With RTM Appendix for Enterprise Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
15	11	2.1.4			<p>The text description calls for a link to “historical legislation”, the detail page layout and RTM refer to a link to “pending legislation.” Please change all references and descriptions to one or the other.</p> <p>The link to “historical legislation” has been removed from the detailed requirements document and from the RTM. This is no longer a requirement. Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	2
16	11	2.1.5			<p>The text refers to a link to the Organization Chart. Elsewhere, specific fields are specified as links but not in this paragraph. Should it specifically refer to “by clicking on ‘FP Organization Chart’” as is done in other paragraphs?</p> <p>This suggestion has been incorporated. (See Detailed Requirements Document, Section 2.1.5)</p>	4
17	11	2.1.5			<p>The text refers to a link to the Department’s employee directory but this link is missing from the detail page layout and the RTM.</p> <p>This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 8.1.5) Page layouts are no longer included.</p>	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
18	11	2.1.6			Links to FFEL, eCampus, Gear Up, and Trio sites are specified in text but do not appear in detail page layout or RTM. This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7) Page layouts are no longer included.	2
19	Starting on page 11				Layouts and RTM should have artifacts, such as web pages, in the same order as the Requirements Document, currently some are in a different order. An additional column has been added to the RTM that references the detailed requirements.	3
20	11	2.1.7			“Community Calendar” is referred to as “FSA Calendar” in detail page layout and RTM. Name should be consistent to avoid confusion. References to FSA Calendar have all been changed to Community Calendar throughout the entire detailed requirements document. Page layouts are no longer included.	2
21	11	2.1.7			The link reference is to “Conferences/Meetings/Forums”. The same link is to “Conferences” in the detail page layout and RTM. Please change to make consistent across all documents. References to Conferences/Meetings/Forums have all been changed in the RTM. Page layouts are no longer included.	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
22	11	2.1.7			Please insert “been” in last sentence ending “...forums that have posted for that date.” This has been corrected.	8
23	12	2.1.8			There is a reference to a link to “legislation that impacts rates” but there is no corresponding link on the detail page layout and RTM. Also, please change “linked” to “link” in this sentence. This has been corrected in the RTM. (See RTM, Section 10.1.5) “Linked” has been changed to “link”. Page layouts are no longer included.	2
24	12	2.1.9			There is a reference to a “link to the law” but there is no corresponding link on the detail page layout and RTM. It would also be helpful to expand on what this link means. This has been corrected in the RTM. (See RTM, Section 9.7) The detailed requirements document also provides a more detailed description about what this link will entail. (See detailed requirements, Section 2.1.9) Page layouts are no longer included.	2
25	12	2.1.10			The reference to the new user link states that it appears to the left of each form described. On the detail page layout, there is only one new user link and it is at the bottom of the page. Page layouts are no longer included.	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
26	12	2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.1.12			All three paragraphs refer to similar links for new users and current users. It would be clearer if the descriptions were consistent. For instance, two paragraphs list the URL for the current user link and one does not. The current user link is provided for all three Financial Systems and the definitions have been updated.	3
27	12	2.1.13			There is no detail page layout or RTM reference for Counseling Resources. This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 16.1 & 16.2) Page layouts are no longer included.	2
28	12				Web Pages for “About Us”, “Site Map”, and “Survey” are shown in the detail page layouts but not in the Requirements Document or the RTM. Page layouts are no longer included.	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
29	RTM Appendix Page 2	1			<p>Functionality for a Back Button on every page is specified in the Requirements Document (page 7) but not in the RTM. Although this is a standard browser function it should be included in the RTM for traceability purposes since it was specified in the Requirements.</p> <p>There is no longer a requirement for the back button to be on each page of the portal. The standard browser function will be used, but this requirement will not be documented.</p>	2
30	RTM Appendix Page 2	2			<p>The Requirements Document specifies a link to the Home Page (page 8) should appear on every page. Please include in the RTM.</p> <p>This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 2.14)</p>	2
31	RTM Appendix Page 4	4			<p>The Requirements Document specifies FSA links (page 8) that do not appear in the RTM. These are “OPE”, “Department of Education”, “Counseling Resources”, “Advisory Committee”, “Inspector General”, and “IFAP”. Please add to RTM.</p> <p>This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14)</p>	2

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 Portals – Financial Partners**

February 4, 2002

REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT COMMENTS FINANCIAL PARTNERS - ENTERPRISE PORTAL RELEASE 1						
Number	Page	Para.	Table	Fig.	Comment	Cat.
32	RTM Appendix Page 7	12			<p>The Requirements Document and detail page layout show a list of events for the week on the FSA Calendar Page. Please add to RTM.</p> <p><i>This has been corrected. (See RTM, Section 12-Community Calendar) The page layouts are no longer included.</i></p>	2
33	General Comment				<p>Personalization is listed as a high-level requirement for Financial Partners as well as Students but is not covered by the Requirements Document or RTM. Please add.</p> <p><i>There will not be personalization for Release 1 of the Financial Partners Portal. This requirement is no longer included.</i></p>	2
34	General Comment	3.1			<p>The RTM should include 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.</p> <p><i>An additional column has been added to the RTM that references the detailed requirements.</i></p>	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. |