Checklist-based testing BF - Answer

Summary:

The requirements lack important details. Without this information, implementation could be inconsistent, and testing may be incomplete.

For certain requirements, the expected results need to be specified.

Below is a checklist-based review table, followed by a table of identified potential defects for **browsing facilities (BF)** requirements.

Checklist-Based Review					
#	Checklist Point	Evaluation			
1	Do all requirements give sufficient detail needed for determining the expected results for tests?	No. The requirements lack sufficient detail regarding the filter options, their interaction logic, and implementation aspects (e.g. UI behavior, calendar type, ability to clear selections, multi-selection, and search in dropdowns). There is also not enough information about how facility statuses are represented through colors or how these statuses are visually displayed. Similarly, the time slots are not clearly defined — their appearance, location, content, or implementation details are missing. Without this information, it is not possible to implement color coding and time slot selection accurately.			
2	Are all dependencies and restrictions specified?	No There is no clear definition of restrictions or dependencies — for example, how many facilities can be listed per page, whether there are limitations on filters, or how filters, time slots, and color-coded statuses interact with facilities.			
3	Are alternatives specified for all options?	No The requirements do not describe alternative flows or backup options — e.g. what happens if a user selects invalid filter combinations, wants to clear filters, wants to select a time range or clicks on unavailable facilities.			

Checklist-based testing BF - Answer

Potential Defects						
#	Defect	Description	Severity	Checklist Ref		
1	Missing UI Details	The requirements lack sufficient details about the user interface. Specifically: - There is no description of how filters and sorting options should be displayed (e.g. dropdown menus, checkboxes, layout). - The color codes used to indicate facility statuses are not defined, nor is it explained where and how this status should appear on the facility card. - Similarly, there is no information about the location, appearance, or content of time slots (e.g. how they should be visually represented, whether they are shown as buttons or calendar elements).	Medium	11, 15, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 36		
		This lack of UI guidance may result in inconsistent or incorrect implementation, as different developers or designers may interpret these aspects differently. This can cause delays, mistakes in how the page looks or works, and confusion for users.				
2	Partially specified Filtering	The specification lacks a clear definition of expected behavior filtering options. It does not explain what each filter should do or what features (e.g., multiple selection, search, clearing filters) should be supported.	High	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30		
3	Unclear Definition of Color-Coding for Facility Statuses	The specification does not describe how colors should be used to represent facility statuses or how these colors should appear on the facility card.	High	32, 33		
4	Unclear Definition of time slots for Facility Statuses	The specification does not clearly define how time slots should appear, how availability (e.g., available or booked) should be visually indicated, or what content they should display. This lack of detail may lead to inconsistent or unclear time slot implementation.	High	35, 37, 38, 39		