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Abstract: Currently, it is crucial to develop software within the time frame given. Agile software development methodologies offer methods to develop a system in term of time and cost saving but has been criticized for not offering software quality management (a.k.a Non-Functional Requirement, NFR) properly. An empirical case study has been conducted used to find out the need of a traceability approach for NFR change impact in most of Agile software methodology (TANC). TANC is improved and further evaluated by using expert survey analysis method. Based on the results of the expert survey analysis TANC has been proven to fulfil the characteristics of the criteria that needed to be a traceability approach in Agile Software Development for tracing NFR change impact. Thus, this proves that TANC offered better way to trace change impact during the agile development process.


I. INTRODUCTION

Traceability approaches and methods have been applied in traditional software development processes such as waterfall [31] and model driven [29] and later started to be introduce in Agile software development projects [6] also. As a result, many researchers have done their researches on agile and traceability [18], [1], [12]. There are some researches that have started to create traceability models and techniques in various Agile software development model such as Scrum [11], [21], [4], [19], FDD [25] and AUP [14]. However, these established traceability techniques in Agile only support the functional requirements, not the NFRs [20]. Furthermore, some researches state that traceability is not compatible with extreme programming (XP) processes [27], [15], [28], [18]. There are many traceability models [2], [5] concept [9], [8] and mechanism [17] that have been proposed in NFR but not one of them are specifically addresses issues in agile-based projects.

However, the issues have not discussed in specifics and categories manner. Therefore, below are the discussions about the specific issues that covered in the coming section.

In fact, after doing intensive literature review on the traceability and Agile projects [10], there are a few main issues that are related to traceability approaches and Agile environment with respect to requirements change impact. Therefore, in this research, the main focus is the problem related to traceability of NFR in Agile projects. First, the focus of main issue is requirements change impact. The requirements change impact could be decomposed to a few sub issues that are propagation issue and consistency issues. In addition, the scope of these two main sub issues are specified in security and performance tracing. Propagation issue have been addressed by a few researchers [32], [7], [33], [3] but mainly the propagation approaches are used in relation to model based or object-oriented based (Chen and Chou, 1999). These approaches are not compatible with Agile process development because they lead to redundancy of traceability process flow. It means that the propagation techniques in most existing traceability is heavy weighted documents, time consuming and repeating flows. Then, another issue is inconsistencies [24], [22]. This issue is important too and must be considered in this research. The issues are that, when changes happen, then the team could track back to see which requirements are affected. The reason is due to the Agile software development environment that always accepting changes during development force the traceability approach must be systematically planned so that it could consistently update the traced and changed artefacts.

Next issue is adaptiveness. This issue is concerned with whether the traceability approaches are compatible with most Agile process development models. This reason is Agile software development that has many processes models such Scrum and FDD. In addition, these models differ by processes, documentation and project scope. In order to simplify the task of a developer, a traceability approaches must be designed to fit most of the Agile software development models. The traceability approaches must be flexible in terms of documentation (features or user stories) and the order of phases that could be fit based on the current Agile projects condition. In addition, there are some researches on NFR traceability techniques in Agile software development recently.
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There are NFR traceability techniques that discussed in Scrum [13], FDD [16], and general for Agile software development models [26] but there quite some unresolved issues and weaknesses in those techniques. By looking each one of these issues, we can lead to develop a quality software by solving and tackling each of these problems with traceability approaches, TANC [37]. Besides that, the merge between traceability in NFR with Agile software development environment is difficult, due to definition of NFR that do not have any quantitative satisfaction criteria to measure such as User Acceptance Testing (UAT).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sections 3 presents the detail about TANC Expert Analysis by ranking the TANC approach with 5 point of Likert Scale and run a statistical analysis using Kendall’s coefficients of concordance and p-value for TANC. Lastly, Section 4 presents the conclusion of this study.

II. TRACEABILITY MODEL

Basically, TANC is composed of four main components, Strategic, Create, Maintaining and Using trace phase. Figure 10 depicts the order of decisions on how to use TANC in order to trace NFR. It starts with Strategic trace phase where the process of requirement components elicitation from Agile Information Model (AIM) such as user stories and Quality Agile Information Model (QAIM) such as security and performance features, that is used during Create trace phase. Then, create trace phase is where all the trace artefacts are created, trace link are defined and stored in Traceability Information Model (TIM). After Create trace phase, during software development iterations [23], Maintaining trace phase are executed where TIM are updated based on the progress of the development. If there is a need for change, then, the process goes to Using Trace phase. In this phase, TIM storage is used to trace which user stories and NFR affected while changes happen during the development.

![Final Version of TANC](image)

**Fig. 1 Final Version of TANC**

III. QUALIFICATION OF PANELLISTS

The demographic information for each expert is presented in Table 1 which summarize the knowledge and expertise of the panel. The experts included practitioners and academics that had experience and knowledge in the area of Agile Software Development and/or Requirement Traceability.
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Table. 1 Experts Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>No of Expert</th>
<th>No of Experience (Years)</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Range 0-7</td>
<td>6-Developer, 3-Tester, 4-Scrum</td>
<td>Range 0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average 2.153</td>
<td>Master/Project Manager</td>
<td>Average 1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academicians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the distribution of experts that involve in the Expert Survey Analysis method. As for the practitioners, they have the range of 0 to 7 number of years’ experience in Agile software development and the average of years’ experiences of this practitioner are 2.153 years. Meanwhile, for the academicians, one of the academicians has her years’ experiences in the domain knowledge of Traceability within 3 years and the other has her years’ experiences in the domain knowledge of Agile software within 3 years. Then, the range of total Agile development projects involvements are zero to five projects and the average number of Agile development projects of this practitioners are 1.46 projects.

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS ON TANC’S SUCCESS CRITERIA

The panellists were asked to rate the fulfilment of criteria for TANC, from ‘not at all agree’ to ‘completely agree’ for each requirement. This was done using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘not at all agree’) to 5 (‘completely agree’). In order to measure the level of consensus among the experts for the listed criteria, Kendall’s coefficient of concordance (W) was used to measure in the survey as the TANC is ready to be ranked. The values are as presented in Table 2. Kendall’s coefficients of concordance (W) reached 0.368 and the p-value reached 0.000 (0.000988) for third round (Table 16 is extracted from Microsoft Excel software). Thus, the results of the third-round study were found statistically significant (p-value < 0.05) and consistent.

Table. 2 Kendall’s coefficients of concordance and p-value for TANC criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k (the number of questions)</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m (the number of expert)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (Kendall’s coefficient of concordance)</td>
<td>0.368968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Sq (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>36.15889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df (Chi Sq distribution)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.000988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 3 Level of consensus among the experts for the listed criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 3, a total in 15 experts, consist of 13 practitioners and 2 academicians rated TANC based on 7 types of criteria. The first criteria is Change impact (C) and the mean value is 4.33, the second criteria is Multipath (MP) and the mean value is 3.80, the third criteria is Redundancy (R) and the mean value is 3.60, the fourth criteria is Adaptability (A) and the mean value is 3.67, the fifth criteria is Granularity (G) and the mean value is 3.93, the sixth criteria is Propagation (P) and the mean value is 3.80, and the last criteria is Evolvability (E) and the mean value is 4.13. The overall mean value of all the criteria is above 3, which is acceptable. Then, the data collected from each round was analyse using statistical methods. The mean value for each criterion in the model was calculated to measure the satisfaction rate. This result indicates that majority of the SAR satisfied the TANC model.

V. CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

The result of the Expert Survey Analysis provided the reliability that the refined approach was acceptable for the expert. Almost positive feedback received by the experts. It shows that TANC is considered acceptable approach based on the focus issues. However, TANC still needs to be enhanced in order to improve the change impact trace technique.
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