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**1. Introduction**

* 1. **Document purpose**

This document has to be intended as a review about a previously developed Travlendar+ application. The content of this document follows and is based on the content of the RASD document, the DD document, the ITD document and the released application **of the developers’ group**. This document is addressed only to the developers.

* 1. **Reference Documents**
* Mandatory project assignments for the A.Y. 2017/2018 available on the beep’s page of the Software Engineering 2 course.
* ITD & ATD assignments for the A.Y. 2017/2018 available on the beep’s page of the Software Engineering 2 course.
* RASD Document available on the Delivery Folder on the repository <https://github.com/fila95/CalzavaraFilaferroNespoli> .
* DD Document available on the Delivery Folder on the repository <https://github.com/fila95/CalzavaraFilaferroNespoli> .
* ITD Document available on the Delivery Folder on the repository <https://github.com/fila95/CalzavaraFilaferroNespoli> .
* Application and Server releases available on the Delivery Folder on the repository <https://github.com/fila95/CalzavaraFilaferroNespoli> .
  1. **Document Structure**

This document is made up of 3 main sections. Beside the general introduction, you’ll find:

* **RASD & DD** section, where we’ll spend a few words about the RASD and DD documents delivered by the developers.
* **ITD** **& App** section, where we’ll discuss a few details about the ITD document delivered by the developers and show a few results obtained through the bet-testing process.
* **External References** section, where we’ll provide useful details and informations&data sources we used to build up this document.

**2. RASD & DD**

The RASD and DD documents seem to be coherent among each other.

The goals and requirements are well described and clear. Furthermore, all the goals are mapped with requirements and domain assumptions and, in spite of this, met.

In the design document all architectural choices are justified and the meaning of each module of the system is explained.

In the next section we will discuss how those goals are met in the released application.

**3. ITD & APP**

**3.1 Testing premise**

The client implementation of the project consists of an iOS (iPhone) application, buildable and runnable by means of XCode (Apple IDE), available only for Mac OS. We tested it both on the XCode emulator, on our computer, and on an iOS physical device, throughout the beta invitation code provided by the developers. (For this reason, we were not able to test some functionalities, such as the notification system and some map features because they are not available on the emulated system (as pointed out by the developers). )

**3.2 Documents coherency**

As we observed, the first release of Travlendar+ addresses the majority of the goals and requirements discussed in the RASD. The remaining goals and requirements will be fulfilled in the second release. Following a list of goals and requirements for each release (see RASD for details).

First release:

* [G0][R1]
* [G1][R2][R3][R4][R5]
* [G2][R6][R7][R8]
* [G3],[G3.1][R9][R11], [G3.1.1]
* [G4], [G4.1][R15], [G4.2][R16], [G4.3][R17], [G4.3.1], [G4.3.2], [G4.4], [G4.6][R19], [G4.7][R20]
* [G5][R22], [G5.1][R21], [G5.2]
* [G6][R25], [G6.2][R23], [G6.3][R23], [G6.4], [G6.5][R24]
* [G7][R27][R28], [G7.1], [G7.2]

Second release:

* [G3.2][R14]
* [G3.2.1][R10]
* [G3.2.2][R12]
* [G4.5][R18]
* [G6.1]
* [G6.6][R25]
* [G6.7][R26]
* [G8][R31]
* [G8][R29][R30][R31]

**3.3 Installation instructions**

Despite the fact that some installation instructions to make the application work properly on a local server and DB have been provided in the ITD, the released application has been developed to work natively with a remote server. For this reason, after following the provided instructions we were not able to check whether the operations performed through the mobile application were successfully handled by the server or not because the instructions don’t specify that the released client accesses a remote server. Our question was: why are there instructions to install a local server if the application doesn’t access it?

Our doubt was clarified only after we contacted the developers, that told us how to modify a couple of lines in the source code (basically the server address and local DB credentials) in order to make the client access the local server.

For the above mentioned reasons, we think that installation instructions could be clearer and more detailed.

**3.4 User experience**

Testing the app on the emulator we found a minor bug in the selection of the end date for a new event: if a begin date is selected, when clicking on the end date field, the date is initialized to the previously selected start date and this is coherent because the ending date should be after the starting date. However, if the choice is confirmed by the user (without modifying anything), the displayed date in the end date field remains unchanged (it remains the old one, that may be before the start date, and not the updated one). This happens because the user, seeing the right date already selected, doesn’t change anything and the system maintains the previous date. However, this bug is not critical (i.e. weak security, memory leak, crash) but it may lead to a selection of incorrect data for the scheduled activity if the user doesn’t notice the problem and re-selects the correct date.

Again, on the emulator, we experienced some crashes, for reasons that we were not able to understand because they didn’t appear to happen after any precise sequence of operations.

Despite this, the testing on the physical device was almost perfect: we didn’t experience any of the (few) issues enlisted above. This makes us think that they were due to the use of the emulator together with a possible bug fixing by the developers. Just random trivial glitches about duplicated past GPS location and routes between current GPS location and events was noticed, solved with an app re-spring.

Moreover, we really want to point out that the mobile application is really well-made: the layouts are nice and intuitive, almost all functions are easily reachable and exploitable.

**5. External References**

* Developers’ GitHub repository: [link](https://github.com/fila95/CalzavaraFilaferroNespoli)

**6. Effort Spent**

The amount of work hours that we needed to exploit the testing operations and to write down this document is showed below.

Matteo Biasielli : 4h

Capo Emilio: 4h

Mattia Di Fatta: 4h