

# Analysis Tools Requirements

Steve Fisher / RAL

# Two Documents

- A first draft of requirements from Rita Somigliana and Krzysztof Sliwa have been circulated
  - At last we have something to argue about
- An annotated copy of the requirements was circulated by Julius Hrivnac
  - He points out that a lot of the requirements are simply the graphics requirements

# Two Problems

- We need a clear idea of the scope of the Analysis Tools Domain - in particular the line between Graphics and Analysis Tools
- We need to clarify the distinction between user requirements and inter-domain requirements
  - This is a serious failing of our current set of ATLAS requirements as they are packaged by domain and mix User requirements with those which are only a consequence of the domain decomposition.

# Some details

- I think that Julius' comments are two extreme so lets take a look at the annotated version (to which I have added a few of my own thoughts)

# Why is it bad to duplicate requirements?

- By identifying a functional requirement in the analysis tools domain we are saying that this domain will provide the functionality.
  - Need to be able to see what work is to be done
- Much of the functionality identified will come from other packages. (control, graphics, user interface ...)

# How to proceed

- We need a mission statement
- We need to define clearly the boundary between graphics and analysis tools.
- We should ask the authors to remove requirements which are already in the overall requirements document
  - they may like to suggest improvements
  - to identify the User requirements (as opposed to domain requirements)
  - to distinguish between functional requirements, constraints and system properties - until such time as we have a better terminology
- We should steal the best ideas from other experiments and add them to the revised document.