Individual Requirement Assessment

Team ECHO

MINOR/MAJOR/CRITICAL

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Specific Requirement | Defect | Severity |
| 1 | Cover | “Web site” is listed here as two words. The Oxford English Dictionary 2015 allows for “website” to be spelled as one word only, without the space between “web” and “site.” http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/website?q=web+site | Minor |
| 2 | Page 1 | Page 1 should come after the ‘Contents’ page, according to the 15th Edition of The Chicago Manual of Style. The ‘Contents’ page should have no number. | Minor |
| 3 | Page 1 | The document is listed as V1.1. Records of V1.0 and of the present V1.1 are not given in the “Revision History” table. Resultantly, no entries exist for “Description”, “Author” and “Comments” for these records. | Critical |
| 4 | Page 1 | The acronym ‘SRS’, found in the footer for page 1, is not properly expanded beforehand. The style-guide advises that acronyms be fully expanded on first use. It is noted that “System Requirements Specification” is provided on the cover page, yet the acronym is not expanded alongside. | Minor |
| 5 | Cover | The date given on the cover page is: 2/12/2015. This date may be a misprint, inasmuch as it has not yet come to pass; or it may be that the American date system is being employed. Having regard to the Northern Irish remit of the company, it is assumed here that the U.K. date convention should be employed instead. | Major |
| 6 | Page 2 | The ‘Table of Contents’ references “2.2 Product Functions”; “2.3 User Characteristics”; and “2.4 General Constraints” as being on page 3. These sections do not feature on page 3; they are missing from the document proper. This may give way to errors in the future, for they may not not fit in the given space at all, which could have the effect of changing the pagination for the rest of the document by shifting the other sections down. | Critical |
| 7 | Page 2 | Amongst the testing team, the ‘Table of Contents’ page’s numbering is different for various members of the team. | Critical |
| 8 | Page 2 | The ‘Table of Contents’ specifies “1.3 Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations” for page 3. This is inconsistent with page 3 proper, which specifies “1.4 Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations”. | Critical |
| 9 | Page 2 | After the word “Acronyms” in the part denoted 1.3, there is a comma. This serial comma is standard in the U.S.A. but is optional in U.K. English. Its use here is cautioned insofar as the serial comma can give rise to confusion (for example: Eats, shoots and leaves vs. Eats shoots and leaves.) | Minor |
| 10 | Page 2 | Numbering issues inhabit the ‘Table of Contents’ page: correcting these will require revision of the document whole. | Critical |
| 11 | Page 2 | The sections marked as “Navigation”, “Home” and “Registration” each require the word “page” after them, to achieve consistency with “Login page”, “About page”, “Forgot Password page”, “Ordering Pizza page”, “Schedule page”, “Order receipt page” and “My Account – reset password” page. | Major |
| 12 | Page 2 | The “Non-Functional Requirements” has subsections in the document proper—3.2.1 to 3.25—that are not listed on the ‘Table of Contents’. | Critical |
| 13 | Page 3:  1. Introduction | The second sentence reads “Fireband” and then “Web development company”. Fireband is inconsistent with the name “Firebrand” listed on the cover. Related is the use of “Web development company” after Firebrand, which is inconsistent with the name “FIREBRAND WEB DESIGN” as provided on the cover page. | Major |
| 14 | Page 3:  1. Introduction | The first sentence reads: “This Software Requirement Specification”. The title for the document, and the turn of phrase that recurs throughout the rest of the document, is “Software Requirements Specification,” carrying an ’s’ after “Requirement.” | Minor |
| 15 | Page 3:  1. Introduction | Sentence one reads “for the Pizza IT.” It may better read “Pizza IT Company” to marry with the title page. On the other hand, maybe the title page is wrong and the company is, as the logo suggests, just Pizza IT. | Minor. |
| 16 | Page 3:  1. Introduction | Second sentence uses “in order to”. The sentence wording here does not clarify whether the requirements are listed in order—i.e. in logical sequence—so that design can be enabled; or if they are listed simply to enable. | Minor. |
| 17 | Page 3:  1.1 Purpose | There is ambiguity in the word “includes”, inasmuch as it does not exclude others. It is uncertain whether there exist others who comprise the intended audience. | Minor. |
| 17.5 | Page 3:  1.1 Purpose | For the sake of transparency and certainty, “representatives” of Pizza IT and the Firebrand Company should be clarified and detailed. | Minor |
| 18 | Page 3:  1.1 Purpose | “Fireband” does not align with information given elsewhere in the document, which largely refers to “Firebrand”. Linked is the use of “company”, which similarly conflicts with the cover page’s naming convention. If “company” is permissible, it serves to confirm whether or not “company” is to carry a capitalised “c”, instead of the lowercase found in 1.1. | Minor |
| 19 | Page 3:  1.2(2) | “The company targets Computing students at QUB.” This contravenes the “necessary” testing category if it is reads as a wish. Flowing from this is lack of feasibility as a testing requirement: the testing team cannot assess concretely the success of how the website targets those students. | Major. |
| 20 | Page 3:  1.2 | Scope is broken down into (1) and (2): this is inconsistent thematically with the rest of the document. Product Perspective, by way of comparison, lets points of a joined theme flow one after another under the appropriate rubric. In the case of “Scope”, point 2 elucidates point 1 and defines it—it is not a disparate objective and is not atomic. The numbering implies that the two are distinct. | Minor. |
| 21 | Page 3:  1.2(2) | There is a return space entered on point (2) between “for” and “later.” This is a formatting error. | Minor |
| 22 | Page 3:  1.2(2) | “The company targets Computing students at QUB.” QUB is an acronym that has not been expanded hitherto, contravening the review checklist. | Minor |
| 23 | Page 3:  1.4 | Acronyms listed elsewhere in the document, such as SRS, are not consolidated here. The section is dedicated in part to acronyms and so the absence of some of the document’s acronyms is highlighted here in case this is an oversight. | Major |
| 24 | Page 3:  1.4 | “1.4” is the section number, but it follows from section 1.2; this is a point of contrast with the ‘Table of Contents’, which refers to “1.3”. 1.4 does not flow naturally from 1.2 and this is determined to be incorrect. |  |
| 25 | Page 3:  1.2(1) & 1.4 | The Oxford English Dictionary lists “website” as one word, not two; the document reads “web site”. |  |
| 27 | Page 3:  1.2(2) & 2.1 | “Pizzas” is spelled with a capital in the first sentence of 2.1 and in the first sentence of 1.2(2), when it should be lowercase, having been used as a common noun mid-sentence. | Minor |
| 28 | Page 3:  2.1 | The document references other e-commerce fast food websites: this is vague. It is queried what can be assumed from this description insofar as test team members find pizza fast food websites to be very different from general sites because of customization options. The team classifies this requirement as ambiguous and untestable as a result: without specific metrics, the team does not have a barometer to determine if the site is similar to many other fast food e-commerce sites. | Critical |
| 29 | Page 3:  2.1 | There is contravention of the team’s testing category of a requirement needing to be implementation-free: the team cannot test that payment is made when the customer calls to collect. It is spotlighted here that charging a customer when he or she calls to collect increases the security risk of no payment being proffered at all, in the event of a bogus order. No provision is made for this risk in the “Security page” section of the document. |  |
| 30 | Throughout | Website sections not in italics so far. Contravenes style guide. Every website section not covered. |  |
| 31 | Page 3 | If 2.2 to 2.4 were added in to the document, it is considered that they could well push the rest of the pages down—and this would cause contents pagination issues for the rest of the doc to fix. | Critical |
| 32 | Page 4:  4.1.1 | Whereabouts in the header is the logo? What size is it? What is the logo? Unclear, and difficult to measure as a result. |  |
| 33 | Page 4:  3.1 | 3.1’s sections are numbered wrongly: 4.1.1 is listed instead of 3.1.1, and this pattern persists until 3.2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 34 | Page 4 | All Functional Requirements subheadings should be numbered down the 3 scale to mirror Non-Functional Requirements. i.e. Website pages should be 3.2; Navigation 3.3, and so on. |  |
| 35 | Page 4 | Position problems. |  |
| 36 | Page 4 | Remove “the” in “the today’s” date. |  |
| 37 |  | Minor - Full stop missing at the end of 4.1.2. |  |
| 38 | Page 4 | 4.1.3 - Major - Ambiguity: what constitutes appropriate validation? How much? More definition. |  |
| 39 | Page 4 | 4.1.4 - “May” identified as weasel word in lecture—ambiguous. Either a web page must have a title or the pages that do are specified. |  |
| 40 | Page 4 | 4.1.4 – “May” problem. |  |
| 41 | Page 4 | 4.1.3 – “all user input”; untestable. |  |
| 42 | Page 4 | 4.1.4 – What title? |  |
| 43 | Page 4 | 4.1.5 - There should be a colon after “the following functional web pages”. |  |
| 44 | Page 4 | 4.1.5 – Inconsistency with page titles. Chiefly Order and Receipt and Login. |  |
| 45 | Page 4 | 4.1.5 – Website sections should be in italics. |  |
| 46 | Page 4 | 4.1.5 - Ambiguous: “My Account - rest password” should be framed as “My Account” and “Reset Password” or “My Account, from which to access Reset Password.” Reset Password perhaps warrants capital starting letters to mirror the others. Apply change to 4.1.6. and 4.1.35. |  |
| 47 | Page 4 | 4.1.6 - Missing full stop at end of “rest password.” |  |
| 48 | Page 4 | 4.1.6 – Wrong names. Do you want Ordering Pizza, or what? |  |
| 49 | Page 4 | 4.1.7 - Ambiguous. What is a “common navigation area”? Define further. Difficult to implement with definition. Positioning unclear. More general detail needed altogether. | Critical |
| 50 | Page 4 | 4.1.8 - Minor - Should be a colon after “the following pages”. |  |
| 51 | Page 4 | 4.1.9 – Conflict. Security issue. Not atomic; needs split up. First line and second line, 4.1.8. and 4.1.9. all have this problem. “Order” page should only be available if user logged in; direct conflict with what came previously. 4.1.9 the same. | Critical. |
| 52 | Page 4 | 4.1.9 reads - “shall be able to direct navigate”. Should read “directly navigate.” |  |
| 53 | Page 4 | Log page. What is log page? Not listed on contents. | Critical |
| 54 | Page 4 | Register should be Registration. | Major |
| 55 | Page 4 | 4.1.10 - Critical - “directly navigate to the Manage page.” The Manage page does not exist in the document proper nor in the contents. | Criticla |
| 56 | Page 4 | 4.1.10 is not atomic; the requirement starting “In addition” should be a separate point in and of itself, being unrelated to the rest of 4.1.10. | Major |
| 57 | Page 4 | Where do you log out? | Major |
| 58 | Page 4 | 4.1.11 - Critical. Very likely a misspelling here, or at the very least lack of atomicity by virtue of contradiction. Forgot password is said only to be directly accessible from Logout page. No logout page is mentioned in the contents or spec itself. Moreover, it contradicts the requirement in Login page below which is supposed to include direct link to FP. |  |
| 59 |  | 4.1.11 - Spelled is “Forgot password”; the page proper is entitled “Forgot Password”, with “p” being afforded a capital. |  |
| 60 |  | Also a page; so needs italics. |  |
| 61 |  | 4.1.11 - Minor and likely not operatively dangerous, but “may” has been frowned on before and should be clarified with specifics or with the word “must”. Context gives an impression of the correct reading—but it’s not worth the risk. |  |
| 62 | Page 5 | Login “to”. Remove the word “to.” | Minor |
| 63 | Page 5 | 4.1.12 – Please give what constitutes valid username and password here. Or reference to the valid username section and valid password section. | Major |
| 64 | Page 4 | Navigation has a colon of a different font and size. This occurs throughout document. |  |
| 65 | Page 5 | Now we’re missing colons after all subheadings. |  |
| 66 | Page 5 | Should be “of” six characters. |  |
| 67 | Page 5 | More detail needed for characters: text; alphanumeric. Specify. |  |
| 68 | Page 5 | Need maximum length on password. |  |
| 69 | Page 5 | 4.1.14 - full stop missing at end. |  |
| 70 |  | 4.1.14 - “Register” should be replaced with “Registration” to marry with the subsequent subheading and references in the rest of the doc, specifically 4.1.5 which also reads “Registration.” |  |
| 71 |  | 4.1.14 – see contradiction in 4.1.11 |  |
| 72 |  | 4.1.15 - Incorrect: “The system shall enable registered users to register” does not make sense. Perhaps it intends to say “unregistered” users. | critical |
| 73 |  | 4.1.15 - Appropriate error messages and validation should be shown to the user if required. |  |
| 74 |  | 4.1.15 – first name and last name needed—as separate sections. |  |
| 75 |  | 4.1.15 – Completely untestable. |  |
| 76 | General | Whole document is not properly justified. Some sections are; some aren’t. |  |
| 77 | 4.1.15 | What is the error message; validation is completely untestable: not quantifiable. There’s no metric; no definition. Subjective. | Major |
| 78 | 4.1.15 | 4.1.15 - Necessary requirement violated: clearance given for two separate email addresses, when only a valid unique should suffice. Possible contradiction afterwards if the mistake survives. |  |
| 79 | 4.1.16 | Appropriate message”. WHAT IS APPROPRIATE? |  |
| 80 | 4.1.17 | “including” doesn’t clarify parameters. Does it mean “limited to”? or not? | major |
| 81 | 4.1.17 | Should “Welcome” have capital? |  |
| 82 | 4.1.18 | Contradicts number 4.1.17—links to Registration and Contact on 17 but nothing about Login. Which of the two pages do they want. |  |
| 83 | 4.1.18 | Page should be after “Home”. | Minor |
| 84 | 4.1.18 | Pizza should be lowercase. | Minor |
| 85 | 4.1.8 | About page should be in italics, as per standardization. | Minor |
| 86 | 4.1.8 | Is the textual information on the company something we should be investigating ourselves? There’s repetition there, you see, so we want to know if we can question that—it negates the whole purpose of the “About” page. But that’s conjectural. | Major, possibly. |
| 87 | 4.1.20 | Should the address of the company be given here. Style , zoom, location. |  |
| 88 | 4.1.20 | About should be in italics. |  |
| 89 | 4.1.20 | “Google” should be in caps. | Minor. |
| 90 | 4.1.20 | Critically, there’s only one way to collect pizza. | Critical |
| 91 | 4.1.20 | No full stop. | Minor |
| 91 | 4.1.20 | Is the link going to appear on this page or a new one; interactive or static? |  |
| 92 | 4.1.20 | Perhaps the map would be worthwhile having on the Contact page, too. You would expect it. Please clarify. |  |
| 93 | 4.1.21 | Second website does not have http:// |  |
| 94 | 4.1.21 | New tab/window—which one is it? |  |
| 95 | 4.1.21 | About page should be in italics. |  |
| 96 | 4.1.21 | Should “section” be included in the inverted commas? |  |
| 97 | 4.1.21 | Colon after ) after Window. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 98 | 4.1.22 | Contacts should have capital letter. |  |
| 99 |  | Colon after “details” |  |
| 100 |  | Spaces after the colons for Support, Marketing and General. |  |
| 101 |  | Two new lines between email and address sections. |  |
| 102 |  | Address; should be 18 Malone Road and then new Line Northern Ireland, then post code. |  |
| 103 |  | For phone, there should be a space after both main and after hours before +44. |  |
| 104 |  | Should all of this be in italics? |  |
| 105 |  | Contact Page should be in italics. |  |
| 106 |  | After Hours? The system is supposed to be 24/7. What does After Hours mean here? |  |
| 107 |  | Perhaps have colons after Phone, Email and Address. |  |
| 108 |  | Do we want a map here? We indicated above that this might be ideal. People need to know where this place is, or else the system is uncertain. |  |
| 109 | 4.1.23 | Unclear: user e-mail clients. A lot of people use online e-mail. When you hit a link and get Outlook client or something, fewer people use that, these days. It’s outdated. It should probably just be e-mail address to copy to e-mail client. It might be worth keeping in place, but students do not seem wont to use it. |  |
| 110 |  | Unnecessary two spaces between email and message. |  |
| 111 |  | Contact page in italics. |  |
| 112 |  | Can we test this? There are many different email clients. Untestable. |  |
| 113 | 4.1.24 | “as soon as possible” is untestable. Vague. |  |
| 114 |  | Italics for forgot password page. |  |
| 115 |  | Appropriate validation is defined, but including should be replaced with “the following validation.” |  |
| 116 |  | Why is there such a big gap between FP and Ordering? |  |
| 117 |  | Poor security, even with the included validation. The same password should not be sent out; the system itself should send out a random code. Once user types that in, the user should be prompted to change password. |  |
| 118 |  | This is a requirement. The sentences after “appropriate validation” should comprise a separate requirement. Structurally uneven. |  |
| 119 |  | “recognized” is American spelling but should that have an “s” instead? |  |
| 120 | 4.1.25 | Ordering Pizza page  the subsections here all refer to the “Ordering page.” Afford it the full “Ordering Pizza page” title to keep the document consistent. |  |
| 121 | 4.1.26 | Ordering page in italics. |  |
| 122 |  | Whatever pizza you order, there’ll be an image. But if you add and take away toppings, the image will be the same—it’s hard to have that many permutations. Other websites have that functionality and you asked to be consistent with other fast food. |  |
| 123 | 4.1.26 | First time we hear about shopping cart. That should be identified beforehand. Is it a page in and of itself, or is it a pop-up? |  |
| 124 | 4.1.26 | It doesn’t state how the toppings are selected. Do you use a button, combo box, drop down box, image, etc. |  |
| 125 | 4.1.26 | Ordering page, again, inconsistent with Ordering Pizza page. |  |
| 126 | 4.1.26 | “a” shopping cart? Does this imply we have a remote one up at the top of the page, like a widget, or is it a separate page. |  |
| 127 | 4.1.26 | “a” user. Throughout, we have “the”. This is inconsistent, but is it permissible? |  |
| 128 | 4.1.27 | superfluous space between 4.1.26 and 4.1.27. |  |
| 129 |  | 4.1.27 - bad English; not clear, concise: “cost for an individual item and an extras”. |  |
| 130 | 4.1.27 | Italics for ordering page. |  |
| 131 | 4.1.27 | Cart should be called shopping cart. |  |
| 132 | 4.1.27 | “any” extras instead of “an” extras. |  |
| 133 | 4.1.27 | Items and pricing list doesn't exist. They should be listed properly. | Critical |
| 134 | 4.1.27 | There’s implied here that we should know a lot of detail about the company, but we can’t. What happens if prices change? |  |
| 135 | 4.1.27 | i.e. should possibly by e.g. i.e. indicates preclusion of other extras. E.g implies more. If this is a pizza company, it could be anticipated that there are more extras than just toppings. If toppings are the only toppings then i.e. is strictly correct. But if the implication is that the only extras are just toppings, then the sentence is perhaps too prolix; there is no need to comment of extras—just say toppings. If you intend to add more extras, note that i.e. will need to be expanded—or changed to e.g. |  |
| 136 | 4.1.28 | Should say “shopping cart.” |  |
| 137 |  | View total cost? Where and how? Separate tab to the side? More detail needed. |  |
| 138 |  | Superfluous space between 4.1.27 and 4.1.28. |  |
| 139 |  | Ordering page should be italics. |  |
| 140 |  | “a” user? Is “the” user appropriate? |  |
| 141 | 4.1.29 | Page in italics. |  |
| 142 |  | Shopping cart instead of cart. |  |
| 143 |  | “a” vs. “the”. |  |
| 144 |  | How do you actually remove the item from the cart? |  |
| 145 |  | How does the site handle removing items? Does the page reload or is it like Amazon where removing doesn’t affect the page beyond removing the item. |  |
| 146 | 4.1.30 | Italics |  |
| 147 |  | “should” enable—should be “enables” |  |
| 148 |  | Big gap between 4.1.30 and “Schedule page”. |  |
| 149 |  | “this should then direct the user to a page to schedule collection.” Ambiguous; it is uncertain what the writer intends. Is there a desire to reach the Schedule Page? That should be made clear. |  |
| 150 | 4.1.31 | Numbering error makes 3.1.29 unworkable. |  |
| 151 |  | It’s referring to “immediate collection” and “or later.” 4.1.29, what is intended, does not give any indication of time. |  |
| 152 |  | No full stop. |  |
| 153 |  | “20 minute collection” is impossible. Can’t be done. Moreover, it is not within the tester’s remit to ensure that. |  |
| 154 |  | “20 minutes from order receipt” is difficult language; “from order being placed” might be clearer. |  |
| 155 | 4.1.32 | Not feasible requirement when compared against other pizza ordering websites. Second sentence gives min and max value. Not clear when contrasted with previous point. |  |
| 156 | 4.1.32 | Time discrepancy. +45 minutes. Inconsistency? |  |
| 157 |  | Do we get a reminder for a long later order? Someone might forget if 7 days are specified. There should be a reminder. |  |
| 158 | 4.1.33 | 4.1.33 - complain about the wording. inferable but not clear.  Order receipt page is called “Order Receipt page” with a capital ‘R’ elsewhere. |  |
| 159 |  | The user vs. a user. |  |
| 160 |  | Double space between “order” and “Upon”. |  |
| 161 | 4.1.34 | Add “page” to Order Receipt. |  |
| 162 |  | Add italics to “Order Receipt page”. |  |
| 163 |  | What’s a unique order reference? Alphanumeric? How does it link to a database? Does it? What does it do and how does it behave? |  |
| 164 |  | “Confirmed date and time”. |  |
| 165 | 4.1.35 | should read “their” current email. |  |
| 166 |  | “appropriate message” should probably give specifics; what is appropriate? same applies after. |  |
| 167 |  | Too long. |  |
| 168 |  | Should be asking for old password as a security measure. |  |
| 169 |  | Last line is unclear. No telling of the validation for the new password. If the same as old password, there’s no existing rule that precludes that. |  |
| 170 |  | Untestable. |  |
| 171 |  | My Account – rest password. Does this imply there is a My Account and then a Rest Password bit? We noted that earlier, too. |  |
| 172 |  | Gap between 4.1.35 and 3.2. |  |
| 173 |  | “appropriate message” – untestable. |  |
| 174 |  | “appropriate validation” – untestable. |  |
| 175 | 3.2.1 | Numbering is problematic. 4.1.35 to 3.2 |  |
| 176 |  | Not feasible. 24/7 for the whole year. Validation needed; checks and balances needed. What does available mean in this context? It’s a universal convention but we want details. |  |
| 177 |  | Shall not crash is a separate point. |  |
| 178 |  | Shall not crash is untestable. |  |
| 179 |  | 24\*7 should be 24/7. |  |
| 180 | 3.2.2 | Needs rewritten. Grammar is problematic. Sentence structure is difficult. |  |
| 181 |  | For ease, refer back to the restricted sections. |  |
| 182 |  | More security needed; this seems scant—does security not pervade more parts of the site. |  |
| 183 |  | Whenever system is referred to at start, the jargon is in italics. Here, it isn’t. But is that correct? We need to consult a style guide. |  |
| 184 | 3.2.3 | “most common mobile devices” is untestable. |  |
| 185 |  | “on desktop” is too broad, ambiguous and untestable. |  |
| 186 |  | Browsers are too specific; should be all Chrome and IE. |  |
| 187 |  | … . should be colon. |  |
| 188 |  | IE 1 is too old. Too expensive to target for. |  |
| 189 |  | Browsers are in bold. |  |
| 190 |  | Version for Chrome. V for Firefox. Dispairty. |  |
| 191 |  | 7 inch Amazon Fire? Strangely specifc. Same for the rest. |  |
| 192 |  | Despite listing Apple devices, Safari is not mentioned on the target browsers. | Critical |
| 193 | 3.2.4 | Ambiguois and untestable for all three. “easy to use”; “fast transactions” |  |
| 194 |  | No space between the 3.2.4 etc. |  |
| 195 |  | 3.2.4 comes up twice. |  |
| 196 | 3.2.5 | “without notable transaction delay”—untestable. |  |
| 197 | 3.2.5 | No full stop. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |