Volume : 3 | Issue : 3 | March 2014 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Research Paper Science

Metrics For Requirement Engineering And Reuirement Tools A Comparative Study

Amit Awasthi Research Scholar, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula

Dr. R.N. Raizada P.P.N. College, Kanpur, UP

*** Rajesh Dubey** PERI, Lucknow, UP. * corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Non-programmers can use the macro feature to automate simple tasks through a series of drop down selections. Macros allow users to easily chain commands together such as running queries, importing or exporting data, opening and closing forms, previewing and printing reports, etc. Macros support basic logic (IF conditions) and the ability to call other macros.

KEYWORDS:

Introduction:

Requirements engineering community as an elicitation aid as well an indispensable tool for organizing information and supporting the reasoning process in the early design phases. Models are useful in guiding the elicitation process, uncovering problems such as conflicting requirements or misunderstandings of the domain analysis and predictive reasoning to be performed. With notations such as UML, now widely recognized as the industrial standard of the software development process, which address mainly the software design phase, it became evident that the early analysis phases could also benefit from the use of modeling support. However, the adequate abstraction mechanisms to represent uncertainty, intentionality and dependencies which are part of the real world.

This enables models to capture uncertainty in requirements, expose actor vulnerabilities and explore the social dimensions of actor interactions which are more difficult, if not impossible.

Given the wide range of issues that kids contact the company about, properties such as anonymity, confidentiality and safety of service usage became absolute requirements for all the services that the company offers.

The aim of the initial phase of the project was to get a complete picture of the organizational setting, to understand its internal and external relationships and to capture the knowledge acquired impact of introducing new technologies.

Discussion:

While the difficulties encountered in the model development process can be addressed to some extent by different modeling alternatives along with adequate scalability tool support, the complexity of the resulting models requires further analysis and new concepts to be introduced to enable efficient reasoning on them. The complete model's size depends primarily on the complexity of the domain which is invariant regardless of the methodology adopted for the model development. Creating sub-models, representing various aspects of the organizational context, reduces the model building difficulties, but at the end of the model development phase all the resulting sub-models should be merged into a single model to facilitate a comprehensive, domain-wide analysis of dependencies and design choice effects. In order to be able to perform the analysis accurately and effectively, the modeler needs to have available ways of simplifying the diagram based on the kinds of questions that are driving the analysis.

The evaluation results should be viewed as partial results for high-level intentional elements and as means for conducting comparisons between alternatives. Using the top-down model slicing concept the modeler can get a comprehensive picture of all the elements that contribute to that specific client goal.

Conclusion

The bottom-up slicing algorithm decreased dramatically the complexity of the diagram by filtering out the elements that were not related with the analysis question at hand conducting the reasoning process on the significantly simpler model slice proved to be much easier than reasoning on the entire diagram. We have seen in the previous chapter that the bottom-up slicing concept is very useful in conducting comparative analysis and reducing the complexity of large diagrams. When conducting early requirements engineering analysis, other valid analysis questions and concerns may arise. We will define the top-down model slice concept as a way of reducing the complexity of the diagrams and its associated scalability problems, while keeping a coherent view containing all the relevant information needed or the analysis. While the bottom-up model slicing concept started from a low level design decision and traced its effects on the various client objectives, the top-down starts from a high level client objective and traces downwards all the design decisions that affect that particular client goal.

As we have previously seen, scalability challenges can be successfully addressed by the top-down and bottom-up slicing concepts. When diagrams reach a certain level of complexity, they become indispensable tools for conducting the analysis. In such cases the modeler would have to resort to some of our proposed tool support solutions for the model building process, but in these situations the resulting model slices could have a relative high complexity themselves. From our practical experience we have observed that elements that are linked to the slice originating point through a long chain of weak links tend to be less relevant for the analysis than the ones who are linked more directly. Elements whose contribution to/from others is less significant can give us grounds for further simplification for our model slices based on the relative cohesion between them and the slice focal point.

REFERENCES

1. Moody, D.L., Shanks, G., (2003) "Improving The Quality Of Data Models: Empirical Validation Of A Quality Management Framework", Journal Of Information Systems, 28(6), Pp. 619 – 650. | 2. Moody, D.L., Benczúr, A., Demetrovics, J., Gottlob, G. (Eds.): (2004), "Cognitive Load Effects On End User Understanding Of Conceptual Models: An Experimental Analysis", Adbis, Lncs 3255, Pp. 129–143. | 3. Singh Raghuraj, Yadav S.M., (2000), "Requirements Engineering: A Roadmap", In A. C. W.Finkelstein (Ed): "The Future Of Software Engineering" , Ieee Computer Society Press., | 4. Kaluga, S., Ayres, P., Chang, S.K., Sweller, J., (2003), "The Expertise Reversal Effect", Educational Psychologist, 38 (1), Pp. 23-31. | 5. Yu, E., Cysneiros, L.M., (2002) "Agent-Oriented Methodologies-Towards A Challenge Exemplar" In Proc Of The 4 Intl. Bi-Conference Workshop On Aois , Toronto.. | 6. Sudhindra Bhat Security Analysis & Portfolio Management, Excel Books, New Delhi, 2008 | 7. Hhull J.C. Introduction Of Future & Option Market, Prentcie Hall, New Jersey, 1995 | 8. Mitra, S.D. & Chris Gassen Invesment Analysis And Portfolio Management, Hbj, 1981 | 9. Gup, Benton, Basics Of Investing, Ny-Wiley, 1979 | 10. Punithavathy Pandian, Security Analysis & Portfoli Management, Vikas Publication, Noida, 2008 | 11. Miller Mortion H, Financial Innovation And Market Volatility, Basil Blackell 2009 | 12. Text Of Security Exchange Board Of India (Stock Brokers & Sub Brokers) Regulation, 1992 | 13. Chitale, Rajendra P., 2010, Use Of Derivatives By India's Institutional Investors: Issues And Impediments, In Susan Thomas (Ed.), Derivatives Markets In India, Tata Mcgraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, Inida. | 14. Securities And Exchange Board Of India Report On Development And Regulation Of Derivative Markets In India (Sepetember 2012) | 15. Gorham, Michael, Thomas, Susan And Ajay Shah, 2013, India: The Crouching Tiger, Futures Industry. | 16. Ismr, Indian Securities Market: A Review, 2013, National Stock Exchange Of India Lomited, Mumbai, India. | | |