

Hidden Assumptions

G-Team 1

The one hidden assumption we encountered during our modeling were all of our soft goals such as

1. readability (**rated**)
 2. organization (**rated**)
 3. usability
 4. quickly
 5. security (**rated**)
- etc

There were not specifically stated as requirements in the use cases (Scholar@UC's user stories), but they help measure the specifically mentioned hard goals so we decided to include them.

G - Team 2

1. Located on a server
2. Connected to the internet
3. Server has enough storage (**rated**)
4. Server can recover from data corruption and outages
5. Dev's know things about stuff
6. Be fast and responsive
7. Assuming that the system is intuitive enough to input data or even start a new repository (**rated**)
8. The Digital Archivist is the moderator of every repository (**rated**)

V- Team 1

1. Depositor already has content ready to upload. We are not including the generation of content or the way in which depositors acquire content to upload. (**rated**)
2. The depositor has a UC affiliation and user information in order for the manager to manage orphaned records if a depositor becomes unaffiliated with UC. (**rated**)
3. Consumers have content in mind when searching through Scholar@UC. There were a number of Consumer requirements that called for a detailed search feature with Scholar. If the search itself is detailed then it is a safe assumption that the Consumer knows what they are looking for and where they would expect to find it. (**rated**)
4. There is no time limit pertaining to Consumer permissions. Some requirements detailed assigning permissions to a Consumer from a Depositor. These had no frame of time in mind so it is assumed that no frame of time is necessary. (**rated**)
5. The manager can re-assign permissions to different users. The user stories mention a manager assigning permissions but does not explain if it can be re-

done so we took the assumption that the permissions feature is editable if needed. **(rated)**

6. Group members initially have read-only access. Write permissions have to be set later on, once they are needed and requested. **(rated)**

7. Malware that is found is reported to the manager. The user story for this case only mentions scanning records. It is assumed that there is a system that reports malware in order to decide what to do with it. **(rated)**

8. The metadata specialist compiles and updates a list of suggested headings. Repository users are to choose from that list, so it is assumed that the list is maintained. **(rated)**

9. There is an assumption that metadata is available in EAD finding aids. The use cases mention that an import button will allow the digital archivist to import EAD so we have to assume that information is always available. **(rated)**

V- Team 2

1. According to the Depositor's opinion it is important to download big files in one chunk to maintain the integrity. However, it is not necessary doing this will ensure file integrity. For example, he can still achieve the same level of integrity by downloading in small chunks. **(rated)**

2. The Repository manager assumes that ensuring the depositor controls file visibility will contribute to security by controlling the existing collection. However, even if the depositor makes his repository private, he can still add delegates.

3. Repository user assumes that he or she can manage records by managing URLs efficiently. However, the Archivist are the ones who handles the proxy services. So just by managing the URLs the repository user can't effectively contribute to the accessibility of his records. **(rated)**

4. The Archivist assumes to maintain quality assurance he only has to control the digital library. However, it is not assured that the depositor has uploaded an original file (eg: Copyright protected). **(rated)**

Disagreement between stakeholders

G- Team 1

1. Who nominated URL? (One team member modeled that Depositor nominated URL's, but another team member thought Repository User was the one who submits URL's). **(rated)**

2. Treated "Metadata Specialist" and "Digital Archivist" the same due to modelers' perceptions. After meeting with the Scholar@UC team (probably during or after the demo day), though, we realized that these two are completely different and should have been separated. **(rated)**

G- Team 2

General comment from the entire team: Every new stakeholder role adds additional complexity to the requirements and the system as a whole.

1. Several different RSS feed discrepancies in the Repository User role

2. Stakeholders were able to add unmitigated requirements willy-nilly (NN: without direction or planning) to the repository. This being that they likely have little experience using much less developing a large scale web system.

3. Overlapping abilities and jobs could in the future **(rated)**

4. Some specific stakeholders (individuals) define certain req's as more important than they should be **(rated)**

5. There is no priority level for any requirements or difficulty level **(rated)**

6. Able to change who the creator/publisher is potentially violates ownership rights which is the whole purpose of the system. **(rated)**

V- Team 1

1. The digital archivist wants to have a workflow for depositors to upload records and it says that "they archivist can monitor and approve the process", however, the digital archivist and archivist are the same person. It is unclear who the stakeholder is trying to interact with here. **(rated)**

2. Both the Metadata Specialist and Depositor can submit different records. It is unclear which records can be submitted by each team.

3. It is unclear what the approval process should be for collections. Two resources are sent from the depositor's "Add to collection" task "submission" and "collection approval". Both of these are dependencies into the "Approve submissions" task for the manager stakeholder.

4. Depositor has a "Set permission" task that is meant to speak to the ability of the depositor to set permission about what consumers can view the content. However, it was interpreted to be connected to the task of the manager to "Give submission authorization" for uploading files. **(rated)**

5. The greatest issue with connecting the Consumer model to the remaining model was connecting dependencies to it. The SR model only called for one outbound dependency that interacted with the Manager, but other models had several dependencies that needed the attention of the Consumer. To remedy this we had to alter the Consumer model to better suit the needs of the other models.

V- Team 2

1. Proxy service by archivist is hampering repository user's usability. **(rated)**

2. Restricting visibility by depositor is causing issue to repository user's accesses.

3. A repository user wants to view documents related to research where an archivist is concerned about controlling data so that the digital library isn't impacted.

4. Depositor assigns delegates to his collection, which can be a concern for the repository manager. **(rated)**

New Requirements

G- Team 1

1. Create a library of users with specific roles and responsibilities for each user to follow so that there is less confusion for requirements documenting. **(rated;merged with G-Team 2 #1)**
2. Create use cases for a Developer actor. **(rated)**
3. Create use cases for a Discoverer actor "someone who comes across the material from Google Scholar. **(rated)**

G- Team 2

1. Defined system roles and permissions for the roles
 - a. What is admin level, what does that even mean **(rated)**
2. Automatically know what you want as a user.
3. Approval queue for Digital Archivist. **(rated; merged with V-Team 1 #2)**
4. Priority for approval queue depending on make public date **(rated)**
5. Security concerns for newly uploaded files **(rated)**
 - a. Held in sandbox
 - b. Run through anti-virus before upload (NN: 'before' is emphasized)

V- Team 1

1. Manager: The manager provides a set of branding rules, because the existing hard goal "Collections are branded" depends on it. This is in the form of a resource called "Branding rules".
2. Manager: An approval queue exists for submissions. A manager wants to be able to approve submissions so we added a resource called "Approval queue" and a task called "Update approval queue" to allow that to be tracked. **(rated)**
3. Digital Archivist: A digital archivist creates a URL after accepting a nomination by a consumer. The consumer is already able to nominate a URL for a web page. Now the digital archivist has the task to decide whether to accept it and further create it.
4. Consumer: Added a hard goal requirement of being able to "Monitor new content". This was created out of the Depositor use case to "Have an RSS feed to re-use" so that a consumer can know when a specific author or author group adds new content. **(rated)**
5. Digital Archivist: Added a task requirement to "Validate Data Quality". This was created out of the Depositor need to have someone quality check the data as they add resources to Scholar@UC. **(rated)**

6. Consumer: Store Audio/Video/Imaging Information. Managers wanted to be able to receive usage statistics for views that happened on the various works present in Scholar. To create a link between Manager and Consumer it was necessary to the Consumer to be able to store that information for a Manager to alter retrieve. **(rated; merged with V2 #3)**

7. Consumer: Store Search Information. Similarly, to above, Managers desired information had no previous mention of being stored in any capacity. New tasks were created to store information for Managers to pull as desired. **(rated)**

V- Team 2

1. As a Depositor

I want to be able to upload documents by dragging and dropping in an area instead of using a browsing facility

So that I am able to upload documents quicker and conveniently **(rated)**

2. As a Repository User

I want to be able to download multiple items at a time

So that I do not have to navigate through documents to download them individually

3. As a Repository Manager

I want to be able to run and monitor reports on repository usage

So that I can analyze usage trends and frequency **(rated)**

4. As a Repository User

I want to be able to view files on the browser rather than download them

So that I do not have to download them unless necessary **(rated)**

5. As an Archivist

I want to be able to remove unwanted files which have large size, and also able to add historical file

So that I can control my digital library's size, and delete the files of the depositors who are not UC employees anymore. Also I can find my deleting actions in the historical file. **(rated)**

6. As a Repository User

I want to be able to create a new checksums every time I receive new contents

So that I can check and read the fixity information of the sent contents, and copier them with checksums information. By that I preserve the integrity of my contents **(rated)**

7. As a Repository User

I want to have option that allows me to create my Recycle Bin into my repository account

So that when I delete files or any data by mistake, or if I need some files that I deleted early I am still able to recover them again and maintain my file's integrity.