

# STEatS

Team C

2024-10-27

## Table of Contents

<b>Team Members and Roles</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Functional scope</b>	<b>2</b>
Hypothesis . . . . .	2
Found limits . . . . .	2
Selected strategies and specific elements . . . . .	2
Extensions 1 : Discount . . . . .	2
Extensions 2 : Restaurant overload control . . . . .	2
<b>UML conception</b>	<b>3</b>
Glossary . . . . .	3
Use case diagram . . . . .	3
Class diagram . . . . .	3
Design patterns . . . . .	3
Design patterns we included . . . . .	3
Design patterns we almost included . . . . .	5
Sequence diagram . . . . .	6
Individual order inside a group order . . . . .	6
Discounts . . . . .	7
Mock-up . . . . .	8
<b>Code quality and project management</b>	<b>8</b>
Supported test types, quality and coverage . . . . .	8
Our vision of code quality . . . . .	8
Our project management . . . . .	8
<b>Retrospective and self-assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
What was done well, lessons learned, mistakes made . . . . .	9
PO (Lassaunière Théo) . . . . .	9
SA (Falcoz Alban) . . . . .	9
QA (Galli Evan) . . . . .	9
Ops (Gripari Alexandre) . . . . .	9
Self-assessment . . . . .	10

## Team Members and Roles

- LASSAUNIÈRE Théo (PO)
- FALCOZ Alban (SA)
- GALLI Evan (QA)
- GRIPARI Alexandre (Ops)

## Functional scope

### Hypothesis

- Orders within a group order can only be placed at the same restaurant
- The delivery time of a group order or a single order doesn't need to be specified in advance, in this case the system will propose a appropriate delivery time (one that satisfies the restaurant capacity).

### Found limits

- We try to prepare the menu item during the schedule (30 min for example) before the delivery time. If the item can't be prepared because the schedule is too tight, we try to prepare it during the previous schedule, up until 2 hours before. If it can't be prepared during any of the schedules 2 hours before then the item is not available.
- As we don't have a database for this project, we had to create managers to handle our data. We have managers to add, remove, retrieve restaurants, users, addresses, single orders and group orders that have already been created. These managers allow us to simulate our database.

## Selected strategies and specific elements

### Extensions 1 : Discount

The discount system consists of the `DiscountBuilder` and `Discount` classes. The `DiscountBuilder` class uses the builder pattern to construct `Discount` objects with various options, criteria, and discount details. We've chosen this pattern because it allows flexible and readable construction of discounts by chaining method calls. The `Discount` class encapsulates all the discount logic. We've chosen to have just one `Discount` class to enable the criteria/effects of the same discount to be combined (for example, we could imagine offering a free product and a 50c discount to every student ordering at least 10 items). But the `Discount` class may become cumbersome if too many criteria or discount effects are added, a potential evolution would be to implement a chain of responsibility pattern.

### Extensions 2 : Restaurant overload control

In order to not invalidate orders and to not take into account orders that may never be validated, we have decided to set a maximum number of (non-validated) orders possible at the same time. This maximum is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Remaining time}}{\text{Average order time}}$$

Note:

- The average order time is calculated from an arbitrary number of past orders (currently set at 50).
- The number of non-validated orders is strictly lower to the maximum to give a margin.


# UML conception

## Glossary

- **Guest** : A person browsing the platform without being authenticated
- **Registered User** : Any registered member of the campus (students, staff, ...)
- **Restaurant Staff** : A person employed by the restaurant to prepare meal
- **Restaurant Manager** : A restaurant staff that can update menus offering and opening hours

- 
- **Menu**: All the menu items propose by a restaurant
  - **MenuItem**: A item propose by a restaurant (ex : ice-cream, fries, burger, soda, ...)

## Use case diagram




## Class diagram

## Design patterns


### Design patterns we included

#### Singleton



For our project, we didn't have a database. However, for our code and our tests, we still needed to access, modify or check the existence of our data, for example to create an order. That's why we simulated our database using our managers. We have an `AbstractManager` abstract class, which has the `contains`, `add`, `get`, `remove` and `clear` methods. For all our classes that need to be represented in our database, we've created a manager class that inherits from `AbstractManager`. To ensure that we only have a single instance of these classes, as in a real database, while sharing the data between the different classes that will use our managers, we decided to transform these classes into singletons

## Builder



To implement the extension of discount strategies for restaurants, we decided to use the Builder design pattern. We created two classes: Discount and DiscountBuilder. Our DiscountBuilder has options (is the discount cumulative, does it apply to the current order or the next one, etc.), criteria (the number of items required to trigger the discount, what the user's role should be, etc.) and certain types of discount (free items, reduce the total price of the order by a certain percentage/amount, etc.). Once the options, criteria and types of discount have been chosen, all that remains is to build the discount using the discount builder. Restaurants have a list of discounts to apply to each order, and single orders have a list of applied discounts that is updated with each new item added to the cart.

## Facade



We choose to implement a Facade design pattern to serve as a primary entry point for our backend, particularly in managing user interactions and coordinating requests. It hides the complexity of the subsystem by providing a higher-level interface, making it easier to manage and coordinate the interactions between the different components of the subsystem.


## **Design patterns we almost included**

**Proxy** We wanted to implement a proxy, so that we could restrict orders to registered users, the taking of an order to restaurant staff, and changes to opening times to restaurant managers. However, we didn't do it due to lack of time and because it's possible that we'd implement it during the creation of the front-end.


**Chain of Responsibility** Initially, we wanted to manage the criteria for discounts using a chain of responsibility. We wanted each criterion to be checked by a class, and the discount to move from class to each class to validate/invalidate each criterion. However, this would result in a lot of fairly empty classes, since they would only be used to check a single pretty simple criterion.

# Sequence diagram


## Individual order inside a group order



## Discounts



## Mock-up



## Code quality and project management

### Supported test types, quality and coverage

We have unitary tests assuring that methods containing a complex algorithm works properly and also functional tests through the use of US (User Story), which translates into Gherkin scenarios.

We also have some integration testing through the facade, which is responsible for distributing responsibilities across the classes.

This results in a 90% coverage on methods, which gives us a certain confidence in the quality and reliability of the code.

### Our vision of code quality

Our vision of code quality revolves around building a structured, maintainable, and resilient codebase with careful attention to package organization and component responsibility. Each package is designed to encapsulate specific functionality, promoting cohesion and reducing dependencies. This approach allows us to assign clear responsibilities across the codebase, though we recognize that some areas, such as the facade class **STEats**, currently take on a bit too much. As a result, this component has become overly complex, handling tasks beyond its intended purpose and tends to become a “God” class. Moving forward, we aim to refactor this facade into more focused modules, distributing responsibilities more effectively and enhancing code readability.

In terms of error handling, our strategy has prioritized capturing and managing straightforward, anticipated errors, which has contributed to stable performance in standard scenarios. However, we acknowledge that testing for rare, edge-case errors such as the non validation of a group order or the validation of a group order just before the delivery time. Addressing these edge cases more rigorously will help strengthen our application’s reliability in diverse environments.

### Our project management

To bring business value to our project, we first create a US (User story) from this user story, we then create technical issues. Each user story is linked to one or more issue(s) that aim to respond to it. To be able to work in parallel, each member creates a branch from main, named feature/name, and indicates which issue(s) will be closed. On each pull request on main, thanks to GitHub Actions, it automatically executes the compilation and all tests.



## Retrospective and self-assessment

### What was done well, lessons learned, mistakes made

In this project, several key practices were implemented successfully, including effective package separation that ensured modularity, comprehensive test coverage, and well-organized GitHub repositories that streamlined collaboration and tracking. Through this experience, we also deepened our understanding of design patterns, recognizing their importance for sustainable and maintainable code architecture. Additionally, we learned the critical role of well-defined user stories in maximizing business value and gained insights into using scenario tests to simulate real-world functionality. However, there were areas for improvement: one significant oversight was creating a facade layer that took on excessive responsibilities, complicating its maintainability. Some tests also relied on time-dependent data, which introduced inconsistencies and made results harder to predict.

### PO (Lassaunière Théo)

As the product owner of STEats, my role was to link the users needs to the implemented feature in our projects. I had to ensure each feature implemented was linked to a certain user need. In order to fulfil my assignment, I had to put myself in the user's shoes. For this, I wrote user stories in order to guide the features development. Each user story had to be defined by a scenario, a level of priority, a business rule (how we implement the requested feature as devs) and acceptances criterias (scenario for tests). In total, we came up with 6 different user stories covering all the features to be implemented in our project. I tried to make sure we implemented the stories with the highest priority first, in case we didn't have time to do them all.

### SA (Falcoz Alban)

In my role as Software Architect, I ensured the quality of the project structure. To do this, I had a lot of discussions with the other members to find the best way of dividing the project into different classes. That's how I came up with the skeleton of each class, asking myself what its responsibilities should be, what methods and arguments it should have, and so on. However, although we tried to produce the best possible architecture, we unfortunately came up against problems that we hadn't seen coming. And to solve some of these problems, we needed to refactor some functionality in our architecture. However, I tried to avoid these refactors as much as possible, by thinking about how to solve the problem without completely changing certain classes.

### QA (Galli Evan)

As a Quality Assurance (QA) engineer, I was responsible for ensuring the overall quality and reliability of the application. I did all the code reviews before merging branches, to make sure everything was up to a certain standard and to find logical issues with the proposed code. I collaborated closely with the rest of the team to understand the implementation details and provided feedback on potential defects. I also designed and executed comprehensive test plans to cover all functional and non-functional requirements. I utilized JUnit and Cucumber for automated testing, ensuring that all features were thoroughly tested through unit tests, integration tests, and behavior-driven development (BDD) scenarios.

### Ops (Gripari Alexandre)

In this project, I fulfilled my operational mission by implementing a seamless workflow through strategic use of Git branch management and continuous integration. I set up a robust branching strategy to isolate features and the main code, which allowed our team to work concurrently while maintaining code integrity. Through automated CI pipelines (automated build and test run for every PR on main), I ensured that each code update was thoroughly tested, helping us catch issues early and maintain high-quality standards across development cycles. Finally, each pull request had to be reviewed by 2 members before being validated and then merged. By orchestrating these operational processes, I contributed to a smoother, faster development lifecycle and supported the team in delivering reliable results on time.

## Self-assessment

Everyone fulfilled the various tasks attributed to their roles and contributed to the development of the backend.

Name	Grade
Alban	100
Théo	100
Evan	100
Alexandre	100