

# QuestionnaireCritiqueBea

## Instructions

Follow the script instructions and record the information in the designated table cells. You may wish to make notes below the questions.

## Initial Analysis:

Item	Information/Response
<b>Date:</b>	MM/DD/YYYY
<b>Requirement # unique id</b> <SemConOps Initiative>.<analysts initials><requirement number> e.g. Init1dbw1 (eventually linked to Use Cases)	important for traceability and linking
<b>Originator/Customer's Name:</b>	the submitter is already listed in the master list. In cases where the submitter is not the person we really need to talk to because they submitted on behalf of someone else, I think it would be better to add the other person(s)' name(s) and email to the master list, rather than in here. My suggestion: delete this row, and use master list "submitter" column instead. We could rename that column to "originator/submitter"
<b>Originator/Customer's Company:</b>	Question: Would it be better to have this next to stakeholder entry from post interview?
<b>Summary of requirement initial analysis, by Reviewer:</b> (as unambiguously as possible, describe who ( <a href="#">List of Actors</a> ) is interacting with the system, what the business goal is and how the system might support the actor's ability to achieve their goal)	The updated description that asks for (1)actor, (2)business goal and (3)how to achieve it is better. The summaries that are written now cover all three elements. Alternative option: We could also ask them as three separate questions, but then we will lose the narrative flow.
<b>Recommended Next Step</b> Enter one: Follow-up interview, Observe, Use Case Template (text), Use Case Model (formalized/UML diagram), Group Discussion, Prototype, Waiting Room	Let's delete this, because we have this in the activities column of the master list.

## Interview

Item	Script / Question	Information/Response
1	Hello, my name is NAME. I am calling you today because NCI and caBIG are working toward a new and improved version of the semantic infrastructure to better <b>support integration scenarios</b> . Our first step was to organize requirements collected over the past year. Your organization has expressed a requirement/need for BRIEF STATEMENT OF USER REQUIREMENT. This has been identified as potentially a critical component to support application/data and service integration, and we need more information in order to enable us to meet this requirement. <b>Do you have about 30 minutes to talk about this?</b>	In real life this will not go exactly as written here, but having this item in the questionnaire serves as a reminder to introduce oneself and to give a short background on why we are calling. And to explain where and how the information will be used before asking the following questions.
2	What do you do? What are your goals for the next year? Why are you doing this?	This question gets to the business goal and could be worded more directly like this: Suggestion: What is your business goal and how can the system help you achieve it?
3	In interacting with the caBIG infrastructure, do you have any solution integration needs? If so, what are they? Have you envisioned new ways of interacting with existing or new parts of the semantic infrastructure? (prompt to elicit changes/new ways of using the infrastructure)	good question
4	Are there any business changes you are assuming we will be able to deal with? (prompt to elicit changes/new ways of using the infrastructure)	good question
5	Are there any capabilities you are expecting to be available to support your needs? (prompt to elicit expectations/dependencies)	good question
6	Do you use any of the existing software/services? If so, what do you like or dislike about it? (if related to existing capability)	good question
7	If this requirement is met, what would be the benefits? If you do not have it, what would be the negative impact? (prompt to elicit benefits/value - will help to prioritize)	similar to question 11 about how satisfied and how it impacts originator's work
8	If, for any reason, we were not able to create that solution, do you think there might be another way to solve this issue? Can you think of an alternative solution? (prompt to elicit alternative solutions/workarounds) (to be prepared by the Requirement Analyst)	good question
9	Would you agree that we can summarize your requirement like this? (Summarize one requirement in 2-3 lines and read back to interviewee for confirmation.)	good question

10	How important is this requirement to the interviewee? <i>Required: Customer Priority /Annotation requirement Analyst</i> (Provides concrete assessment of the relative importance for the requirements specification)	good question
11	On a scale from 1 to 3 with 1 being "not satisfied" to 3 "completely satisfied", how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the product if this requirement was met? <i>(Relative rating/ranking of how satisfied or dissatisfied interviewee would be if this requirement were met/not met)</i>	How useful is this information? Most people will say that they are expecting to be satisfied when their request is fulfilled. Perhaps need rewording to get to the point of how exactly the fulfillment of requirement will affect their daily work.
12	Are there other requirements that you would like to share with us? I'd be more than happy to call you back another time, or if you have another 10 minutes, please share other issues you can think of. (prompt to elicit any hidden - potentially higher priority requirements if they exist)	important question
13	Who else should we talk to in order to elicit more information about this need?	Rewrite this question to include notion of who else can we talk to to validate your requirement?
	<b>For specific service enhancement or requirement from Forum entry:</b>	
14	Can you or someone else give me a step-by-step description of how you would describe the expected performance/behavior of the software in order for you to feel that your requirement is met? (Required: Fit Criterion - will help us create test cases and user acceptance criteria - to be prepared by the Requirement Analyst)	good question
15	Forum Link:	We have this in the master list (topic column). Do we really need it again here?
16	URLs (optional):	All links should be listed in the column "requirement links" in the master list, so this item can be deleted.
17	References (optional):	Again, can these be listed in "requirement links" in the master list, so that this item can be deleted?

## Post Interview - ongoing throughout development of use cases:

Item	Description	Information/Response
<b>Stakeholder Community:</b>	Enter appropriate category of stakeholder from Primary Stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Software and Application designers and architects</li> <li>Software and Application engineers and developers</li> <li>Scientific and medical researchers</li> <li>Medical research protocol designers</li> <li>Clinical and scientific research data and metadata managers</li> <li>Clinicians</li> <li>Patients</li> <li>Medical research study participants</li> <li>Broader Stakeholders: caBIG® Community WS NIH projects and related commercial COTS vendors (caEHR, SDO's (HL7, CDISC); International Collaborators (e.g NCRI, cancerGrid, China), Government and regulatory bodies (FDA, CDC, ONC)</li> </ul> <a href="#">(link to view SemConOps Stakeholders description)</a> .	I would like to see this information next to the company name and the actor category. Suggestion: Rather than splitting questionnaire in 3 sections, split it in 2. One is the first and last part combined (Initial Analysis and Post Interview), the other is the interview script which may not be used for each topic.
<b>Requirement Type (required)</b>	Analyst's assessment of the most appropriate category/type of requirement ( <i>no need to ask interviewee</i> ): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Functional:</b> Fundamental or essential to the product - describes what the product has to do or what processing is needed</li> <li><b>Nonfunctional:</b> properties the functions must have such as performance, usability, training or documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Project constraint:</b> schedule or budget constraints</li> <li><b>Design constraint:</b> impose restrictions on how the product must be designed, such as conformant to ISO 11179, utilizes 21090 or is able to work on a particular type of device</li> <li><b>Project driver:</b> business-related forces such as descriptions of stakeholders or purpose of the product/project</li> <li><b>Project issue:</b> conditions that will contribute to the success or failure of the project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	At one point we had discussed moving this categorization of functional vs. non-functional into the master list. If we do, we'll be able to sort by it and we can delete it here. How important is it to be able to sort by it? It's my impression that almost all topics are talking about functional requirements, but I may be wrong.
ConOp Initiative(s) Requirements Analyst /Business Analyst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select most appropriate initiative: (click for descriptions)</li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 1 - Distributed, federated metadata repositories and model repositories and operations</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 2 - Automated generation of metadata from line-of-business artifacts</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 3 - Rules management and contracts support (behavioral semantics)</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 4 - Semantics support for W3C service oriented architecture resources</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 5 - HL7 CTS II/ OMG MIF compliant federated terminology services</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 6 - Controlled biomedical terminology, ontology and metadata content</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 7 - Assessment of semantic unification of compositional and derivational models</a></li> <li><a href="#">Initiative 8 - Other</a></li> </ul>	Let's delete this, because we have this in the activities column of the master list.
<b>High Level Use Case Summary)</b> Requirements Analyst /Business Analyst	Please write a short descriptive narrative use case; the steps or activities in this use case are usually the things the user wants to accomplish with the system (user/actor's goals).	Do we need this here, or isn't it part of the use case template?

<b>Use Case Linkage (required)</b> <i>Business Analyst</i>	Which use case(s) is this requirement linked to? (should follow Use Case numbering scheme < <i>SemCon Ops Initiative</i> >.< <i>analysts initials</i> >< <i>requirement number</i> >.< <i>use case number</i> >, for example Init1dbw1.1, Init1dbw1.2, Init2dbw2.1, 2.2, etc.	The link to the use case(s) is in the master list under "requirement links". Let's delete this item here to avoid entering the same information in two places.
<b>Conflicts / Dependence s(required)</b> <i>Requirements Analyst / Business Analyst</i>	Are there any conflicts with other requirements / use cases?	good question, but I wonder how a requirement analyst or business analyst would know unless the conflict is with a requ./use case that he/she worked on herself.
<b>Next Step (required)</b> <i>(Requirement Analyst / Business Analyst)</i>	After reviewing the results of the interview, the forum, and all other materials related to this requirement, the analyst should recommend the next step, then attach the Tiny Link (on the Info tab) for this page to the <a href="#">Semantic Infrastructure Concept of Operations Initiatives - Requirements Master List</a> table.	Let's delete this, because we have this in the activities column of the master list.