
GenericEvidence
Domain experts/customers approve the <<quality>> of the documentation of the requirements.
C_GenericEvidence
List of Domain Experts and other reviewers.
GenericEvidence.1
Reviewers are experts.
GenericEvidence.2
Review techniques are acceptably likely to uncover errors in the requirements.
J_GenericEvidence
Review techniques consists of task based inspection, using Gitlab/Github issue tracking and comparison to the existing documentation.
GenericEvidence.2.3
Reviewers approve the <<quality>> of the documentation of the software requirements.
E_GenericEvidence.1
Reviewers' resumes satisfy acceptance criteria for required qualifications, including an engineering, science or medical degree and at least 5 years experience in medical imaging.
GenericEvidence.2.1
All reviewers have submitted comments regarding the <<quality>> of the documentation of the requirements using Gitlab/Github issue tracker.
GenericEvidence.2.2
A task based inspection approach is used for the review.
GenericEvidence.3
If applicable, documentation of the requirements should be compared with any applicable superior specification (External Consistency).
J
E_GenericEvidence.2
All Gitlab/Github issues related to the <<quality>> have been addressed and signed off by the reviewers.
E_GenericEvidence.3
The task based approach is based on Kelly's Papers, so it is reliable.
GenericEvidence.3.1
The comparison among the documents has been done by Domain Experts/ customer and they approve the documents agree.
E_GenericEvidence.4
Reviewers' signature and Software Requirement Acceptance Report containing a section regarding the <<quality>> are provided.