

ITERATE

Severity-Ranked Issue List

Severity vs. effort — so the fix list is a decision, not a wish list

Eleven findings ranked by what they cost and what they take to fix. Includes the three things that are working and must not be redesigned by accident.

PROJECT	PHASE	VERSION	PREPARED BY
Organic Life	Phase 2 — Evaluation	1.0	Tauseef Abbas

How this list is ranked

Eleven issues, ranked by severity against effort, so the fix list is a decision rather than a wish list. Severity is a function of how many users hit it and what it costs when they do. Effort is a build estimate, not a design estimate.

SEVERITY	DEFINITION	ACTION
CRITICAL	Blocks a core task or loses trust irrecoverably	Fix before build proceeds
HIGH	Significant friction; affects a subset severely	Fix before launch
MEDIUM	Noticeable friction, recoverable	Fix in first iteration after launch
LOW	Minor; may be intentional	Backlog — revisit with more data

The ranked list

#	ISSUE	SEVERITY	EFFORT	AFFECTED	VERDICT
1	WhatsApp handoff not understood as leaving the site	CRITICAL	Low	3 / 8	Fix now
2	No price shown; blocks the order decision	CRITICAL	High	5 / 8	Mitigate now
3	Practitioner credentials not findable from home	CRITICAL	Low	2 / 8	Fix now
4	Escalation read as refusal by one participant	HIGH	Low	1 / 8	Fix now
5	Chip auto-submit surprises users	MEDIUM	Low	2 / 8	Fix now
6	Product card does not update as conversation continues	MEDIUM	High	2 / 8	Next iteration
7	Chip row scroll affordance ambiguous	MEDIUM	Low	3 / 8	Fix now
8	"Learn more" competes with the primary CTA	LOW	Low	1 / 8	Fix now
9	Nobody scrolls past section 3 on mobile	LOW	—	8 / 8	Not a defect
10	Latency comfortable at 2.4s	POSITIVE	—	8 / 8	Protect
11	Spontaneous intent to share	POSITIVE	—	4 / 8	Protect

Severity vs. effort

The matrix that turns the list above into a sequence.

QUADRANT A — DO FIRST

High severity, low effort

Issues 1, 3, 4 — three of the four most damaging findings are cheap to fix. Copy and placement changes, not architecture.

QUADRANT B — PLAN PROPERLY

High severity, high effort

Issue 2 — price. Blocked by an operational constraint, not a design one. Needs a business decision before a design one.

QUADRANT C — SWEEP UP

Low severity, low effort

Issues 5, 7, 8 — cheap enough to fix in the same pass as quadrant A.

QUADRANT D — DEFER

Low severity, high effort

Issue 6 — dynamic card updating. Real, but the cost is not justified by two participants.

THE USEFUL SHAPE OF THIS DATA

Seven of the eight genuine defects are low-effort. Sequenced correctly, one revision pass clears everything except the price problem — which is not a design problem and should not be treated as one.

Issue detail — critical and high

Issue 1 · WhatsApp handoff not understood

FIELD	DETAIL
Evidence	3 / 8 stalled; mean hesitation 14s; two asked aloud whether they were leaving the site
Root cause	The WhatsApp glyph was read as decoration, not as a destination signal
Cost if unfixed	Direct revenue loss at the conversion moment — highest-cost issue in the set
Effort	Low — label and micro-copy change
Owner	Design

Issue 2 · No price shown

FIELD	DETAIL
Evidence	5 / 8 asked about price aloud; 2 named it as their reason for hesitating
Root cause	Operational — pricing varies by batch and quantity; no fixed figure exists to display
Cost if unfixed	Hesitation at the decision point for the majority of users
Effort	High — requires a pricing decision from the business, then design
Owner	Business, not design. Design can mitigate, not resolve.

ESCALATION

This was predicted in the journey map, confirmed by fulfilment in stakeholder interviews, and has now been observed in five of eight sessions. Three independent sources agree. It should be treated as a business decision with a deadline, not as an open design question.

Issue 3 • Credentials not findable

FIELD	DETAIL
Evidence	2 / 8 failed task 3 entirely; both scrolled rather than using navigation
Root cause	Credibility information lives on /about; users who never touch the header never reach it
Cost if unfixed	Loses evaluative users at the credibility check – the Asad journey's decisive stage
Effort	Low – surface credentials inline in the practitioner card and hero-adjacent trust line
Owner	Design

Issue 4 • Escalation read as refusal

FIELD	DETAIL
Evidence	1 / 8; participant asked whether she had "done something wrong"
Root cause	Escalation copy leads with the boundary before the reason
Cost if unfixed	Low frequency, high harm – directly contradicts Principle 04 for affected users
Effort	Low – copy reordering only
Owner	Design, with practitioner sign-off (clinical copy)

Non-defects — do not fix

#	OBSERVATION	WHY IT STAYS
9	Nobody scrolls past section 3 on mobile	Expected and intended. Sections 4–6 exist for the evaluative minority and for SEO. Not a failure of the scroll — a confirmation that the hero holds attention.
10	2.4s latency uncommented	Working. Protect the budget rather than optimising further; the effort is better spent elsewhere.
11	Spontaneous share intent	The growth loop functioning as designed. Any change to the response or card region must be re-tested against this.

WHY NON-DEFECTS ARE LISTED

A report that lists only problems invites the team to redesign the parts that are working. Four of eight participants spontaneously wanted to share this — that is the acquisition model of the entire product and it needs to be defended in the next revision, not accidentally optimised away.

Fix sequence

PASS	ISSUES	EFFORT	GATE
Revision 1	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8	Low — one design pass	Re-test task 2 and 3 before build proceeds
Business decision	2	Decision, then design	Required before launch
Post-launch	6	High	Revisit with real traffic data

DOCUMENT OWNER Tauseef Abbas · **PROJECT** Organic Life — AI-First Naturopathy Platform

PHASE Phase 2 — Evaluation · **STATUS** Complete — revision 1 scoped

NOTE Sample deliverable published as a portfolio artefact at tauseefabbas.com