business analysis

think differently

Stakeholder Requirements Checklist
<<Project Name>>

<Delete and Replace with Company Logo>

Status Draft / Issued
Monday 2 March 2020
Business Analysis (BAPL)

Improve | Innovate | Digitise

Document details

Project Information

Organisation	<< Organisation Name >>
Project Sponsor	<< Sponsor Name >>
Project Name	<< Project Name >>
Project Number	<< Project ID >>

Contact for enquiries and proposed changes

If you have any questions regarding the information in this document or suggestions for improving the document, please forward details to following contact point:

Email: info@business-analysis.com.au

Website: www.business-analysis.com.au

Phone: 1300 33 11 64

Version History

Version	Date	Changed By	Nature of Amendment
1.00	24 May 2012	Business Analysts Pty Ltd	Initial document creation
1.01	30 May 2012	Business Analysts Pty Ltd	Standardise document style
1.02	5 June 2012	Business Analysts Pty Ltd	Minor updates to style
1.03	15 July 2020	Business Analysts Pty Ltd	Minor updates for CoE inclusion

Contributors, Reviewers and Signatories

The following people were involved in finalising the document:

- Contribute – had input into the creation of the document

- Distribute – receives the document as a courtesy/for information only

- Review – receives the document in order to review and provide feedback

- Endorse – responsible for endorsing/approving the document

Name & Role	Contribute	Distribute	Review	Endorse

Stakeholder Review

The content of this document has been reviewed by:

Name & Role	Title/Designation	Approval Signature	Date

Sign-off/Acceptance

The following people are responsible for signing off on the content of the document. Signatures may be physical, via an email attached to the document or saved in an electronic format and referenced in the table below.

Signatures constitute an acceptance and agreement of the document's content.

Name & Role	Title/Designation	Approval Signature	Date

Copyright © Business Analysts Pty Ltd 2012

Disclaimer

Business Analysis (BAPL) does not guarantee or warrants the results obtained while using this document and conducting business analysis activities. Usage of this document is strictly under the proviso that the user takes all responsibility for the document outcomes.

Template Usage Guidelines

The text mentioned below is to be used as a reference guide while completing this document. Remove this section/page after completing/before-publishing this document.

a) The dark blue text represents help/instructional text in the template – please remove it from the final version and/or before publishing the document.

b) This template is designed for the author of the Business Requirements Specification (BRS) should use this checklist to make sure the BRS is ready for review.

c) Additional sections can be added if required.

d) Please do not remove any section(s) from this document unless otherwise specified.

e) Please do not leave any section blank.

f) Please ensure not to describe any System Design element(s) in this document.

g) Do not forget to update the table of contents figures and caption tables (Reference tab in MSWord) once the document is complete.

h) Introduce naming conventions as required for traceability purposes.

Checklist Instructions

<<The Business Requirements Specification (BRS) author should use this checklist to make sure the BRS is ready for review. The reviewer is to use this checklist to provide consistent feedback to the author. The comments area should be used to provide examples of any inconsistencies found. This checklist can also be use as the basis of a structured walkthrough with the author and the reviewer >>

Note: **Stakeholder requirements** describe the needs of stakeholders that must be met in order to achieve the business requirements (in the business case). They may serve as a bridge between business and solution requirements.

Stakeholder requirements can be expressed as simple statements, spreadsheets, user views, models, epics/user stories, business use cases, or workflows with or without models or diagrams.

A commonly used structure for a simple textual stakeholder requirement has evolved into a format known as **user story**.

Format: As a stakeholder/group, perform an action, to achieve/to ensure/enabling my goal or objective.

Standalone Statements	User Story
The ability for **[standard phrasing]** a **[stakeholder]** To browse the current product catalogue **[action]** to view items for purchase **[goal]**	As a website visitor **[stakeholder]** I want to view the cost of coverage for each insurance provider **[action]** so I can select the cheapest option **[goal]**

	Yes	No	N/A
Template			
Has the correct template for the document been used?	☐	☐	
Version number (Note that draft versions of the document will have version numbers that are less than 1.00, v0.01, v0.02, v0.03. The first formally issued version will be numbered v1.00. Minor document version changes will have the decimal component of the number incremented. Major document version changes will have the integer component of the number incremented).	☐	☐	
Has the version control information been completed correctly?	☐	☐	
Has the introduction information been completed correctly?	☐	☐	
Have all the stakeholders been identified clearly?	☐	☐	
Document Format Requirements			
All pages must be numbered.	☐	☐	
If figures, tables, diagrams and pictures are used these must be numbered.	☐	☐	
Document language must be set to English (Australia) to ensure correct spell checking in MS Word. The document must be checked for spelling mistakes.	☐	☐	
If a section is not populated or *Not Applicable*, has an adequate explanation as to why been provided?	☐	☐	
Has all unnecessary white space been removed? eg. only single spaces after a period and single carriage returns between paragraphs	☐	☐	
Business Processes			
Has each process been traced back to the business process framework?	☐	☐	☐

Can each process related requirement be traced to a process task, and does every process task have traceability to a requirement?	☐	☐	☐
Are all diagrams clear and understandable?	☐	☐	☐
Stakeholder Requirements			
Have requirements been identified in accordance with a requirement identifier?	☐	☐	
Are the requirements verifiable? (ie. They do not include words that have relative meaning, and as a result are not verifiable (eg. easy, maximum, minimum, more efficient, adequate)	☐	☐	
Are requirements clear and unambiguous? (ie. Do you understand all of the requirements?)	☐	☐	
Are all requirements mutually exclusive and not contradict each other?	☐	☐	
Are the specifications logically structured and organised with suitable sub-headings?	☐	☐	
Are requirements consistent with each other and with other requirements in related documents? (ie. no conflict between requirements.)	☐	☐	
Appendices			
Has any information not directly required within the Stakeholder Requirements Specification been included as an appendix rather than embedded within the specification?	☐	☐	☐
Has each appendix been uniquely identified using an alphabetic character?	☐	☐	☐
Language and Style			
Do the business requirements explain the (WHY) rather than the solution?	☐	☐	
Have the words *should*, *may* and *could* been avoided to inadvertently denote priority?	☐	☐	
Have the words *good*, *better*, *more*, *fast*, *efficient*, *usually*, *never*, *sometimes, relevant* and *appropriate* been avoided to inadvertently prevent explicit verification?	☐	☐	
Is the document understandable on first reading without the need for clarification from the document author/editor?	☐	☐	
Is all information clearly written (the language is direct and economical and every word counts)?	☐	☐	
Comments			
Reviewer Name:			