Data Conservancy IRD Use Case Review Document

Summary:

IRD as a team will create the Use Case review document at the conclusion of the every Use Case review, or in some instance a set of Use Case reviews. The document should be reviewed by the product owners, before the story creation meeting. The document is not intended to be a list of stories to be created, but should instead be a framework from which the stories can easily be written and prioritized. This document is intended to be small and concise, and not burdensome on IRD.

Key Parts:

- Use Case Details
- High Level List of Functional and Technical Requirements
- Task List for Each Requirement
- Outline of Required Task Ordering
- Reduction of Scope and Limitation

Introduction Use Case Details

This section should contain all relevant information about the use case, such as use case URL, identifier, etc. also the Product Owner responsible if one exists. This section should also include a brief summary, or copy/paste of any communication that took place while reviewing the use case.

Part 1: High Level List of Functional and Technical Requirements

In this section of the document IRD should provide a list of all the functional requirements of the use case, as they interpret it. This section should also include any technical requirements that are required for the use case. This list of requirements is intended to be exhaustive; no requirement of the system should be assumed or considered implicit. This section should be reviewed by the product owners to ensure that IRD and Product Owners have the same view of the requirements, and that all needs of the use case are satisfied. This section should also include any research topics that need to be performed prior to a requirement being specified. In conjunction with the research topics a list of open items, that will be either eliminated or turned into requirements, should be specified.

Part 2: Task List for Each Requirement

This section of the document will break down all of the requirements captured in section one, including the requirements of the system. It's important to note these tasks don't necessarily need to correspond to a story card, although they can if IRD sees fit. These tasks should be the basis of discussion at the story creation and pointing meeting. Research topics should also appear as tasks in the list. Each task should include the acceptance criteria required in order for the task to be considered complete by the product owners.

Part 3: Outline of Required Task Ordering

Once the tasks list is completed IRD should then make an attempt at ordering the entire list of tasks, even those deemed to be out of scope, based on dependency ordering. This ordered list should set the foundation for IRD and the Product Owners to correctly order the cards in the backlog, to limit the amount of shuffling that needs to be done as IRD progresses through the cards. Consideration should be given to tasks that can happen in parallel and tasks that will allow for minimal team participation. It's suggested that IRD uses a naming scheme for the tasks that allows for easier reordering instead of listing tasks alpha numerically. Once cards are written the naming scheme should be replaced by a set of identifiers to make it easier to later link cards back to this document. As an example the identifier could be the card numbers themselves. In addition the card numbers and titles for each task should be provided under the task name/identifier. Each card should list the definition of done for that card along with any performance criteria that was specified during the story writing meeting. This information should also appear in the cards themselves, however this document will be considered the source if any disputes arise about whether a card is complete.

Part 4: Reduction of Scope, Limitations, and Research Outcomes

This section should be completed after the meeting to review the task list and draft stories. The purpose of this section is to document the list of all tasks that have been deemed out of scope by the product owners. It should also serve as a place to document any functional and technical constraints or limitations that are a result of the removal of tasks. Each out of scope task should list the reason it was determined to be out of scope, if one exists, as well as the limitations it causes. If there were any research topics associated with the use case their outcomes should also be listed in this section.

Sample Use Case located in Contour:

Downloading all Data in a Collection

The collection splash page should have a download link to download all data in a collection. Link should be available to collection depositors, and instance administrators only. Data should be downloaded in a zip file, with a folder for each data item, and all data and metadata files included in each file. All metadata for the collection should be in a folder in a top level folder titled metadata.

Example Document

IRD Use Case Review:

Use Case Details:

Product Owner: John Doe
Use Case ID: UC-DCS-1234
Use Case URL: www.contour.com/sample
Use Case Title: Downloading all Data in a Collection
Use Case Review Date: 12/12/12
Use Case Summary: The product owners would like be able to download all files from a collection, into one archive file (tar, zip, tar-gzip).
IRD Members: Jane Doe
Use Case Communication:

1. High Level Requirements

- Functional Requirement: Add download link to the collection splash page.
- Functional Requirement: Add service to build directories from data items and populate file structure.
- Technical Requirement: Need ability to write zip packages.
- Research: Determine the best library to use for writing compressed packages.
- Open Issue: Depending on the library chosen some work may need to be done to get the data in the format needed by the library.

2. Task List

- Research the best library to use for writing compressed packages. (St. Bernard)
- Update UI to include a download link on the collection splash page. (Bulldog)
- Update Collection Service to group all data from a collection. (Dachsund)
- Create Service for building data item tree into file hierarchy. (Beagle)
- Update Package Extractor to write zip file archives (Retriever)
- Update Pacakge Extractor to write tar file archives (Poodle)

- UI Element to select File Type (Boxer)

3. Task Ordering

Group 1
St. Bernard

Group 2
Bulldog, Poodle

Group 3
Dachsund

Group 4
Beagle

4. Reduction of Scope, Limitations and Research Outcomes

It was decided at the story writing meeting, we would currently only support writing out tar files. So at this time the step of writing out zip files is out of scope. As a result of this the system will only write tar files at the completion of this use case, and further work will need to be done to support other files types.

Out of scope Tasks:
Retriever – Due to supporting only tar files package extractor does not need to be updated to support the writing of zip files.

Boxer – Due to supporting only one file type it was determined that the step of creating a UI element to select file type was no longer needed.
The research determined it was best to just use the standard java libraries for writing to archives.

Use Case Review Template

IRD Use Case Review:

Use Case Details:

Product Owner:

Use Case ID:
Use Case URL:
Use Case Title:
Use Case Review Date:
Use Case Summary:
IRD Members:
Use Case Communication:

1. High Level Requirements

To be completed at the time of reviewing the Use Case.

2. Task List

To be completed at the time of reviewing the Use Case.

3. Task Ordering

To be completed at the time of reviewing the Use Case.

4. Reduction of Scope, Limitations and Research Outcomes

To be completed after the story creation and pointing meetings.

Out of scope Tasks:

Change Log:

0.0.2:

- Moved document to google docs from word.
- Added comment in task section about included acceptance criteria for each task.

0.0.1:

- First Draft