**User Stories (property owner)**

**Nearby Facilities**

As a property owner, I want a feature that showcases the nearby facilities so that my property becomes more attractive to tenants.

**Acceptance Criteria:**

* System must allow owners to input nearby landmarks, transport, and facilities.
* Tenants must be able to see facilities listed on the property details page.

**Failures:**

* Missing Facility Input: “Please provide at least one nearby facility before saving.”
* Display Error: “Facilities could not be displayed on property page. Please try again later.”
* System Failure: “Oops! We couldn’t save facility details. Please try again.”

**INVEST Justification:**

**Independent:** Facility listing can be implemented separately from tenant matching or chat modules.

**Negotiable:** Facility types (landmarks, transport, amenities) can be adjusted or extended.

**Valuable:** Makes properties more attractive, helping owners get tenants faster.

**Estimable:** Scope is clear—input, save, and display nearby facilities.

**Small:** Focused solely on facility listing and display.

**Testable:** Can be tested by entering facilities and verifying display for tenants.

**Property Visibility**

As a property owner, I want my property to be suggested more so that I quickly get a tenant.

**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Properties with complete profiles (photos, description, rent details) should be prioritized.
* Suggested properties must be shown on tenant’s search results based on relevance (location, budget, filters).

**Failures:**

* Incomplete Profile: “Property cannot be suggested because required details are missing.”
* Search Ranking Error: “Property could not be displayed in suggested results. Please check details.”
* System Failure: “Oops! Unable to prioritize property at this moment.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Works independently from chat, tenant verification, or legal support modules.
* **Negotiable:** Prioritization criteria can be adjusted (e.g., premium listing, boosting options).
* **Valuable:** Increases chances of renting out properties quickly.
* **Estimable:** Well-defined scope—profile completeness check + prioritization algorithm.
* **Small:** Only involves visibility logic, not notifications or recommendations.
* **Testable:** Testable by creating complete/incomplete property profiles and checking suggestions.

**Tenant Matching**

As a property owner, I want to have tenants who are according to my preferences so that my relationship with the tenant is cordial.

**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Owner can specify preferences (e.g., gender, occupation, lifestyle, diet).
* Matching algorithm must filter tenants based on these preferences.
* Owners should see a compatibility score for each tenant profile.

**Failures:**

* Missing Preferences: “Please select at least one preference to continue.”
* No Matching Tenants: “No tenants match your preferences at the moment. Try broadening filters.”
* Compatibility Calculation Error: “Could not calculate tenant compatibility. Please try again later.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Matching algorithm can work independently using tenant profiles.
* **Negotiable:** Preference categories and weights can be adjusted in future iterations.
* **Valuable:** Improves tenant-owner relationships, reducing conflicts.
* **Estimable:** Scope is clear—collect preferences, filter tenants, calculate scores.
* **Small:** Focused on preference-based filtering; advanced AI recommendations can come later.
* **Testable:** Enter preferences and verify matched tenant list and compatibility scores.

**Minimum Stay**

As a property owner, I want the tenant to stay for a minimum time so that I don’t need to search for tenants repeatedly.

**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Owner must be able to set a minimum stay duration (e.g., 3 months, 6 months).
* System must filter out tenants who do not agree to the minimum stay.
* Contracts must clearly display the minimum stay condition before confirmation.

**Failures:**

* Invalid Duration: “Please enter a valid minimum stay duration.”
* Tenant Rejection: “Selected tenant does not agree to the minimum stay requirement.”
* System Error: “Could not enforce minimum stay filter. Please try again.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Can be implemented separately from tenant verification or messaging.
* **Negotiable:** Minimum stay rules can be adjusted by the owner.
* **Valuable:** Reduces turnover and effort in searching for tenants repeatedly.
* **Estimable:** Clear scope—set, filter, and enforce minimum stay.
* **Small:** Only involves minimum stay logic.
* **Testable:** Test by setting different durations and verifying tenant eligibility.

**Tenant Ratings**

As a property owner, I want the tenant to have a rating according to previous rentals so that I can get good tenants.  
**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Tenants must have visible ratings/reviews from past landlords.
* Ratings must only be allowed from verified rental agreements.
* System should calculate average rating and show it on tenant profiles.

**Failures:**

* No Ratings: “This tenant has no prior ratings yet.”
* Invalid Review Submission: “Only verified landlords can submit ratings.”
* Calculation Error: “Average rating could not be computed. Please try later.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Rating module can work independently of property listing or chat.
* **Negotiable:** Display format (stars, score) can be adjusted.
* **Valuable:** Helps owners identify reliable tenants.
* **Estimable:** Scope is clear—submit, verify, and display ratings.
* **Small:** Focused on ratings only.
* **Testable:** Testable by submitting verified/unverified reviews and checking display.

**Tenant Verification**

As a property owner, I want the tenant to be verified so that I am secure and my house stays safe.  
**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Tenant must verify identity using government ID and institutional/work email.
* Verified tenants must display a “Verified” badge.
* Properties should allow filtering/search by verified tenants only.

**Failures:**

* Invalid ID/Email: “Tenant verification failed. Invalid ID or email.”
* Unverified Tenant Filtering: “Could not apply verified tenant filter.”
* System Failure: “Tenant verification service is currently unavailable.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Verification works independently of property listing or ratings.
* **Negotiable:** Verification steps (ID/email) can be updated later.
* **Valuable:** Ensures property safety and builds trust.
* **Estimable:** Scope—verify identity, show badge, filter by verification.
* **Small:** Limited to tenant verification logic.
* **Testable:** Test ID/email verification, badge display, and filtering.

**Legal Support**

As a property owner, I want a list of advocates so that my rent agreement is made easily.

**Acceptance Criteria:**

* Owners must be able to browse advocates/legal advisors within their city.
* Contact details of advocates must be available inside the app.

**Failures:**

* No Advocates Found: “No advocates available in your city. Try later or expand search.”
* Contact Details Missing: “Advocate contact information could not be loaded. Try again.”
* System Failure: “Unable to fetch advocate list at this time.”

**INVEST Justification:**

* **Independent:** Legal support can be implemented separately from property or tenant modules.
* **Negotiable:** Advocates list and details can be expanded or updated later.
* **Valuable:** Simplifies rent agreements and reduces legal hassles.
* **Estimable:** Scope—list advocates, display contact info.
* **Small:** Focused solely on legal support.
* **Testable:** Test by searching for advocates and verifying contact info.