SRS Checklist

Spencer Smith

November 3, 2026

This checklist is intended to help with a high-quality SRS document. If you use the SRS template correctly, it will improve your project and make your life easier. You shouldn't view the documentation as an unpleasant milestone, but as an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of your project. This understanding will pay off throughout the project's duration.

- Follows writing checklist (full checklist provided in a separate document)
  - ☐ LaTeX points
  - ☐ Structure
  - ☐ Spelling, grammar, attention to detail
  - ☐ Avoid low information content phrases (like replacing "in order to" with "to")
  - ☐ Writing style is appropriate
  - ☐ Any points made by your TA on the previous documents that should also apply to this document, have been addressed
- Follows the template, all parts present
  - ☐ Have you selected the right template?
    - SRS, which is suited to scientific computing problems (rare choice (suited to physical phenomena and numerical libraries))
    - SRS-Volere, which is a complex, comprehensive, general, template (long, repetitive)

  - SRS-Meyer, which is a simpler, general purpose template (reasonable scope, good generic choice)

- ☐ Unused template folders are deleted from your repo
- ☐ File name for the SRS matches the name in the template repo
- ☐ Table of contents
- ☐ Pages are numbered
- ☐ Revision history included for major revisions
- ☐ Sections from template are all present
- ☐ Values of auxiliary constants are given (constants are used to improve maintainability and to increase understandability)
- ☐ Symbolic names are used for quantities, rather than literal values (You shouldn't say 3-second response time, you should use a symbolic constant. If you do say a 3-second response time, a rationale for this value should be provided, or possibly you should be focusing on the real requirement, rather than this derived requirement.)

• Overall qualities of documentation

- ☐ No statement is repeated at the same level of abstraction (for instance the scope should be more abstract than the assumptions, the goal statements should be more abstract than the requirements, etc.)
- ☐ Someone that meets the characteristics of the intended reader could learn what they need to know
- ☐ Someone that meets the characteristics of the intended reader could verify all of the statement made in the SRS. That is, they do not have to trust the SRS authors on any information.
- ☐ SRS is unambiguous. At least check a representative sample.
- ☐ SRS is consistent. At least check a representative sample.
- ☐ SRS is validatable. At least check a representative sample.
- ☐ SRS is abstract. At least check a representative sample.
- ☐ SRS is traceable. At least check a representative sample.

- ☐ Literal symbols (like numbers) do not appear, instead being represented by SYMBOLIC_CONSTANTS (constants are given in a table in the Appendix)

- Reference Material
  - ☐ All units introduced are listed (searching the document can help look for other units that may be present, but not listed)
  - ☐ All symbols used in the document are listed
  - ☐ All symbols listed are used in the document
  - ☐ All abbreviations/acronyms used in the document are listed
  - ☐ All abbreviations/acronyms listed are used in the document
  - ☐ Hyperlinks and/or bibliographic references to external resources
- Functional Requirements
  - ☐ All requirements are validatable
  - ☐ All requirements are abstract
  - ☐ Requirements are traceable to where the required details are found in the document
- Nonfunctional Requirements
  - ☐ NFRs are verifiable (use fit criteria as appropriate)
  - ☐ NFRs are unambiguous
  - ☐ Usability used for users and understandability used for programmers
  - ☐ Specify what you want, not how to achieve it (for instance, don't say how you will make the software maintainable via modularization, say how you will measure maintainability and your target)
  - ☐ NFRs point to the VnV plan for details as appropriate
- Requirements
  - ☐ Rationale is required for non-obvious requirements
  - ☐ Rationale is provided for assumptions, scope decisions and constraints

- Likely and Unlikely changes
  - ☐ Likely changes are feasible to hide in the design
- Avenue Rubric
  - ☐ You have checked your work against the grading rubric on Avenue
  - ☐ If the grading rubric requires something not in your template, have you modified the template, and included a description of the modification in the document's introduction? (For instance, you will have to add a traceability matrix to the Volere template.)
  - ☐ You need over 5 peer review issues for both the SRS and HA for full marks.
  - ☐ Specific timeline for phase in plan?
  - ☐ Likely/unlikely changes?
  - ☐ Traceability?
  - ☐ Part of the SRS document has been formalized

If you are using the Scientific Computing SRS template, a separate checklist is available.

Other checklists to consider can be found in the resources for the University of Toronto course CSC340F include:

- Checklist for Requirements Specification Reviews
- Software Requirements Checklist (JPL)