|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Requirement | Defect | Effect | Severity |
| Cover Page | “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 | Not using correct grammar. | Minor |
| Cover Page | 2/12/2015 – In the future; doesn’t exist yet. That’s the American date. | Adds confusion to the start of the document. | Major |
| Revision History / Document Approval | Page 1 should come after the contents. | Affects the page sequence for the entire document. | Minor |
| Revision History / Document Approval | Despite the document being listed as V1.1, there is no record of a V1.0—or even V1.1—in the “Revision History” table, nor do there accompany these any entries for “Description”, “Author”, “Comments”. | How is it possible for a developer to confirm that the present document is the most up to date if there is no evidence of version history. | Critical |
| Contents Page | Not clearly numbered. 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 or anywhere in the document, and it may be the case that they do 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. | Document is not consistent. The referencing for the document is incorrect. This is critical as it will cause defects when creating the system. | Critical |
| Contents Page | The contents page numbering does not prove similar for all members of the committee. | This led to confusion as different documents within the group had very different layouts, providing page references for talking points to become challenging to find. | Critical |
| Contents Page | The Table of Contents specifies “1.3 Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations” for page 3. Page 3 specifies “Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations” after 1.4 instead of 1.3, inconsistently. | This makes the document inconsistent and makes it unclear for a developer if something has been left out. | Critical |
| Contents Page | After acronyms, there is a comma. Style guide disagrees with this practice. Consistently wrong. | Poor grammar lets the document down. | Minor |
| Contents Page | Numbering off. | This makes the document inconsistent and makes it unclear for a developer if something has been left out. | Critical |
| Contents Page | Add “page” to after Navigation, Home, Registration. | This makes it clearer for the developer as it provides a good reference to the page of description. | Major |
| Contents Page | The “Non-Functional Requirements” has subsections in the document proper—3.2.1 to 3.25—that are not listed on the contents. | This makes the document inconsistent and makes it unclear for a developer if something has been left out. | Critical |
| Contents Page | “Fireband” Web development company:  spelling error here. “Firebrand” listed on cover in company image. Should be proper company name: “Firebrand Web development company” should instead read “FIREBRAND WEB DESIGN.” | This is the company name and should not be spelt wrong. Inconsistency with company name looks extremely poor. | Major |
| Contents Page | “This Software Requirement Specification”. The title and the harmonized title for the document is “Software Requirements Specification.” With an ’S’. | Inconsistent and lets the document down. | Minor |
| Contents Page | “For the Pizza IT.” Likely should 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, simply Pizza IT. In which case, the title page has an error. | This is not clear and needs to be looked at again and corrected. | Minor |
| Contents Page | “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. | This is not clear and needs to be looked at again and corrected. | Minor |
| Contents Page | Ambiguity; intended; doesn’t exclude others. Who are “representatives” of Pizza IT and the Firebrand Company? Perhaps this should be clarified. | This is not clear and needs to be looked at again and corrected with greater clarification. | Minor |
| Contents Page | Firebrand Company does not align with information given elsewhere in the document. If it does, outside sources suggest that company should be capitalized. | Inconsistency with the rest of the document. | Minor |
| Contents Page | “The company targets Computing students at QUB.” This contravenes the “necessary” requirement if it is a wish list; or, alternatively, it is not feasible if it is a testing requirement—we cannot assess concretely the success of how the website targets those students. | This can’t be tested. Needs to be made clearer as to what is desired. | Minor |
| 1.2 | Scope should probably not be broken down into (1) and (2). It is thematically inconsistent with the rest of the document. Take, for example, Product Perspective, where points of a joined theme flow one after another under the appropriate rubric. Point 2 elucidates point 1 and defines it—it is not a disparate objective, as the numbering may imply. | Lacks consistency to the rest of the document. | Minor |
| 1.2 | There is a return space entered on point (2) between “for and “later.” This is a formatting error which connotes the same problem as a spelling mistake. | Lacks consistency to the rest of the document. | Minor |
| 1.2 | “The company targets Computing students at QUB.” Myriad issues here: QUB is an acronym that has not been expanded hitherto, contravening the review checklist. Secondly, it is not feasible to test the line. | Can’t test this. Acronym is not listed and therefore equates to lacking of specific description of knowledge. | Major |
| 1.4 | Acronyms in the doc are missing. | Could be talking in acronyms and the readers not have any idea what they mean. | Major |
| 1.4 | Secondly, it is not feasible to test the line 1.3 misnumbered as 1.4. |  |  |
| 1.2 + 1.4 | Oxford English Dictionary lists “website” as one word, not two. | Does not look professional with errors. Should not be problematic. | Minor |
| 1.4 | 1.3 misnumbered as 1.4. | This makes the document inconsistent and makes it unclear for a developer if something has been left out. | Major |
| 1.2 | “Pizzas” once again spelled with a capital when it should be lowercase. | Inconsistent and lets the document down. | Minor |
| 2.1 | What other fast food websites? What do we assume? Pizza fast food websites are very different from general sites because of customization options. Ambiguous. Needs more detail and clarification; there’s too many. There’s no paradigm. | Ambiguous here and needs more description in terms of examples of websites to refer to. Different people have different examples which could ultimately lead to very different developements for the system. | Critical |