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**Introduction**

With the request for a functioning website dedicated to allowing users to order pizza from the ‘Pizza IT’ Company, the following feedback report has been prepared in order to present the findings of defects and errors comprised within the requirements document provided by the Pizza IT Company.

The report has been prepared within the static testing period of the project between the Requirements and Analysis stages, with the feedback report carried out at the planning, kick-off and preparation steps of the formal review.

In accordance with the steps performed so far, a defects table has been provided to showcase the errors found by the inspectors reviewing the document thus far; while critical errors are highlighted to further engage the necessity for more information or corrective measures on the points in question.

**Planning process**

In order to critically review the requirements document, the following criteria was adhered to in the process:

* The document should not reveal a large number of major defects
* The document should include line numbering
* The document should be cleaned up by running automated checks that apply
* The author should feel confident about the quality of the document so as to be given the choice to join the review team

For this report, the team members highlighted earlier acted as the inspectors for this requirement document, and will have provided their comments under the Defects Table section of the feedback report.

The requirement document points are to be measured via a criteria based on points with least at risk of causing issues of confusion and error later in the project (minor), to points that cause the project to be faulted or break in the future (critical).

* Minor: Defects those are highly unlikely to cause damage later in the project (e.g. spelling mistakes).
* Major: Defects that could cause a potential for damage in the project at later stage (e.g. unclear details).
* Critical: The defects that will cause downstream damage (e.g. missing information).

**Defects Table**

\*\*\*\*insert table\*\*\*\*

**Main Highlights**

* Parts that were critical to the requirements doc

**Observations**

During the feedback report review of the requirements document, certain observations were made by inspectors that would need further clarification by the author, as to ensure any non-defect ambiguities are resolved. This included the following:

* It should be noted the company logo on the front page of the requirements document states “Pizza & Pasta” within its design; although within the document sections there is no mention of Pasta dishes or products to be made available for order by the user. Details on whether or not ‘Pasta’ products are to be offered by the website, and if pricing, product descriptions and images are required to be placed online for user selection.

**Conclusion**

* Closing points
* A ciritcal point or two that shows the defect of the req doc
* If document is ready for actual design and continuing the process?

**Appendix**

* Individual docs?
* Meeting minutes