

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





شبكة المعلومات الجامعية

التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار





بعض الوثائق الأصلية تالفة





بالرسالة صفحات لم ترد بالأصل



Ain Shams University
Faculty of computer
and information sciences
Department of Information System



DELIBERATION PROCESS MECHANISM FOR SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT

Thesis submitted for partial fulfillment
of master degree in information system

By
Rania Abd El-Rahman El-Gohary

Under Supervision of:

Prof. Dr. Ahmed. M. Hamad
Prof. Of Computer Systems
Vice Dean for Environment and Community Affairs
Dr. Osman. M. Ibrahim
Consultant of information systems
Egyptian military forces

November 2002

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to thank *Allah* for giving me the opportunity and the strength to accomplish this work.

I'm deeply indebted to **Prof. Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Hamad** for providing the different facilities to carry out this work, for his great care, valuable advises, and helpful guidance through the work. For giving me the chance to work under his supervision.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to **Dr. Osman Mohamed Ebrahim** for planning and full supervision of this work, continuous advises, guidance and greatest help in interpretation of the results. For giving me the chance to work under his supervision, for his continuous support and for his periodic and careful evaluation of my work.

I wish to record my grateful thanks to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed .F. Tolba** (Vice president of ain shams university and Ex-Dean of faculty of computers and information sciences) and for **Prof. Dr. Mohamed .S. Abd El-wahab** (Dean of faculty of computers and information sciences) for their encouragements and their continuous care.

My grateful thanks too, to staff of faculty of computers and information sciences, who encourage me too much during the progress of the work., and to my colleagues for their continuous assistance.

Last but no means least, I am most grateful to my family, for their full support and encouragement.

Publications

Rania El-Gohary

[1] Ahmed Hamed, Osman Ebrahim and Rania Elgohary
“ A model for the deliberation process in software systems development”
Proceedings of the Conference on Intelligent Computing and Information
Systems, ICICIS, Cairo, Egypt, June 24-26, 2002, pp. 339-345.

[2] Ahmed Hamed, Osman Ebrahim and Rania Elgohary
“SUPPORTING DELIBERATION PROCESS MECHANISM FOR
SOFTWARE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT” 7th International
Conference On Intelligent Engineering Systems INES 2003, March 4- 6
Assiut - Luxor, Egypt

[3] Ahmed Hamed, Osman Ebrahim and Rania Elgohary
“SUPPORTING PARALLEL ELICITATION OF SOFTWARE
SYSTEMS REQUIREMENTS” ICEIS2003 5th International Conference
on Enterprise Information IEEE international conference in France.

[4] My thesis
Ahmed Hamed, Osman Ebrahim and Rania Elgohary
“deliberation process mechanism for software development” ain shams
university, faculty of computer and information sciences, information
systems department .

ABSTRACT

The early portion of software development process is missing automated support for many important activities that help firm up requirements and control the system design and evolution to satisfy customers' real needs.

This thesis introduces an improved formal model for requirements elicitation and evolution along with an implemented software tool based on the model. This tool with its associated database and other artifacts enabled by the model is used to capture stakeholders' criticisms to requirements and map these criticisms into the model objects to be used in synthesizing a set of open issues to be resolved.

These issues are resolved by examining and modifying requirements if necessary, and then propagating the change down in the requirements hierarchy in a consistent and controlled manner.

The issue resolution process is conducted by all relevant stakeholders supported by automated deliberation facility embedded in our software implementation of an enhanced formal deliberation model. The objects and process assist stakeholders to individually evaluate and judge different available alternatives to resolve an issue.

This outcome of the deliberation process is a change request that identify the affected requirement component in the requirements hierarchy that should be manipulated (added, changed, and/or deleted) to resolve the issue. The outcome reflects the group decision of selecting one of the available alternatives to resolve the issue.

To reach to such a decision, the software mechanism that implements our model provides each stakeholder involved in the deliberation process with the interface and the representation for him to conduct an independent and quantified judgment. The mechanism, then formally combines these individual judgment into a group decision that takes the form of a certified change request.

Our model combines, augments, and enhances well-known models that have being used by practitioners for a long time despite the defincies in each model. Throughout the thesis, we spot such defincies and show how alleviates them using our improved model.

The first of these models is issue-based-information systems (IBIS) that view a complex system development process as basically a deliberation among stakeholders to resolve the development issues.

Our model extends the IBIS model by making it more formal and hence increase it representation power. This improvement is the outcome of enriching the IBIS with more types and relationships that do not exist in the original model.

We also augmented our improved version of IBIS with a second formal model that provides automated assistance in the process of choosing for available alternatives to resolve an issue. This second model is based on our improved version of the analytical hierarchy process (AHP) that has being used in decision making by choosing among alternatives based on unbiased and quantified judgment mechanism.

Table Of Contents

Chapter	Page
1 Introduction...	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Design Rationale And Deliberation Models	4
1.3 Requirements Elicitation And Missing ...	6
1.4 Objectives ...	7
1.5 Thesis Outlines ...	8
2 Technical Background And Previous Work ...	9
2.1 Deliberation Process ...	9
2.2 IBIS And Related Models	13
2.3 Non- IBIS Models...	22
2.4 Methodological Framework And AHP Model ...	28
2.5 Comparison Between Models ...	30
3 The Proposed Q-IBIS Model. ...	31
3.1 Introduction ...	31
3.2 Supporting Stakeholder Deliberation And Judgment	31
3.3 Multi-Level Hierarchy Decision ...	38
3.4 Improvement Of The AHP.....	39
3.5 The Q-IBIS Proposed Model ...	47
3.6 The Application Of The Improved AHP...	52
4 System Implementation ...	56
4.1 Introduction.....	56
4.2 Overall Description ...	58
4.3 System Analysis ...	60
4.4 System Features...	66

4.5	System Goal	70
4.6	System Processes... ..	74
5	Case Study for Air Traffic Control Systems	77
5.1	Introduction	77
5.2	The Requirements Set	79
5.3	Synthesizing Issues From Stakeholders' Concerns ...	82
5.4	Detailed Study	88
6	Conclusions And Future Work	103
7	Appendix A&B	In Separate Volume

List Of Figures

Figure 1.1	Requirement Analysis Phases	3
Figure 2.1	Ibis Model Types And Relationships.	13
Figure 2.2	The Inquiry Cycle.....	15
Figure 2.3	The QOC Notation.....	21
Figure 3.1	An Importance Matrix M	34
Figure 3.2	The Matrix M1 And The Priority Vector.	35
Figure 3.3	Combing Individuals Judgments Into A Group Decision.... ..	45
Figure 3.4	The Proposed Model... ..	49
Figure 4.1	Systems Implementation Phases... ..	57
Figure 4.2	The Q-Ibis System Contexts	60
Figure 4.3	The Entity Relationship Diagram.	61
Figure 4.4	Combining Individuals Judgments Into A Group Decision.	68
Figure 4.5	The Individual Judgments Profile	74
Figure 4.6	State-Transition Diagrams For Issue Statuses..... ..	75
Figure 5.1	The Current State Of The Requirement Components	81
Figure 5.2	The Current State Of The Requirement Components Snapshot	81
Figure 5.3	The Stakeholders Of The System Snapshot..	82
Figure 5.4	The Issue 1 Definition Of The System Snapshot	85
Figure 5.5	The Issue 2 Definition Of The System Snapshot	86
Figure 5.6	The Issue 3 Definition Of The System Snapshot	87
Figure 5.7	The Available Alternative 1 Snapshot ...	89
Figure 5.8	The Available Alternatives To Resolve The Issue3... ..	91
Figure 5.9	The Pairwise Comparisons Of Criteria For SH4	94

Figure 5.10	The Decision Problem Hierarchically ...	95
Figure 5.11	The Intermediate Computations Snapshot	96
Figure 5.12	The Pairwise Comparisons Of Alternatives Of A Specified Issue For SH 4	98
Figure 5.13	The Stakeholders Weighted Average. ...	100
Figure 5.14	The Group Priority Vector Of The Alternatives.	101
Figure 5.15	The Change Request Snapshot	102

List Of Tables

Table 2.1	Fundamental Scales For Pairwise Comparisons...	29
Table 3.1	The Pairewise Comparison Scale	37
Table 3.2	The Exponential Scale	41
Table 3.3	Stakeholders' Weights	43
Table 5.1	The Ranking List For Five Stakeholders.	92
Table 5.2	Pairwise Comparisons Of Criteria For SH 4 ...	94
Table 5.3	Pairwise Comparisons Of Criteria And Priority Vector For SH 4	96
Table 5.4	The Composite Priority Vector Of The Alternatives	97
Table 5.5	The Stakeholders Weighted Average	100
Table 5.6	The Group Priority Vector Of The Alternatives ...	100