|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Name** | Billing And Premium Payment Portal | **Dept** |  |
| **PIF ID** |  | **Group** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No | **Review item** | **Finding**  **(Y/N/ N/A)** | **Remarks** |
|  | Applicable to HLD |  |  |
|  | Is the HLD template (corresponding to the design process) being used to make the Design Document? | Y | The HLD template being used is RBIN approved. |
|  | Has the design been reviewed by a person external to the project team? | Y | Design has been reviewed and approved by the project mentor and external auditors. |
|  | Is there Traceability from HLD to the requirements? Does this also address product quality characteristics? | Y | Complete traceability maintained from requirements to HLD addressing quality characteristics. |
|  | Have the naming convention used in the design defined and documented?  (Give reference to conventions for naming modules) | Y | The naming conventions have been documented in section 7 of the HLD document. |
|  | Is the design methodology documented?  (e.g.: OO , Structured ) | Y | The methodology used and the analysis behind this decision have been documented in section 12 of HLD document. |
|  | Is there a description available for the overall design strategy? E.g.:   * Text description containing the entire design strategy * ERD, FHD, Use Cases, etc. | NA | As per the synopsis given, we are not looking at any alternative methods. |
|  | Have alternative designs been explored?  (Documentation of alternative approaches with comparisons is sufficient. Complete alternative designs need not be made) | NA | Same as above.. |
|  | Have alternative design been evaluated using evaluation criteria (DAR guideline)? | NA | Same as above. |
|  | Is the record of evaluation of alternate design (DAR Template) available? | NA | Same as above. |
|  | Is the rationale of selecting the design, from alternatives available, documented in design document? | NA | Same as above. |
|  | Does the design refer to similar efforts in the past?  (Reference to earlier similar project by register number, if applicable) | Y | This is a mock project. The actual system is already up and running in the real world. |
|  | While breaking down the specification into functionally independent units, has a defined methodology been adopted?  (Reference to the design process being followed) | Y | We are following OOAD methodology. Therefore all the specifications have been broken down into classes and objects. |
|  | Are the scope, input(s), and output(s) of each module of the design specified clearly? | Y | Section 12 of HLD document gives the complete decomposition of each class. |
|  | Is the criteria to be considered while designing interfaces clearly documented? | Y | The association of each requirement with the classes have been clearly documented in REQ\_to\_HLD.xls |
|  | Have the interfaces descriptions been clearly identified? | Y | Interface description is shown in terms of class diagram under section 6 (design overview) of HLD document. |
|  | Has it been ensured that there is low coupling and high cohesion for the modules?  (Applicable to structured design only) | Y | Unless and until required , the kind of relationship between classes is association, this ensures low coupling and high cohesion |
|  | Have the communication protocols between the various subsystems been identified? (If applicable) | Y | Communication protocols identified for APIs between microservices. |
|  | Has an evaluation of make, buy or reuse been done as per DAR Process? | NA | ------------------ |
|  | Are software libraries being maintained and used? | Y | Software libraries maintained; dependencies managed through project build tools. |
|  | Are coding rules and conventions documented?  (reference to the concerned documents) | N | ------------------- |
|  | Has the user interface design been defined and documented?  (Applicable only if human interface is present) | Y | User interface design is fully defined and documented; usability tested as per section 2.3 and 8.1. |
|  | Has ease of installation been taken into consideration in the design?  (Applicable only to s/w products for which multiple installations are desired) | N | This is only a mock project and hence such advanced considerations have not been taken into account. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Applicable to LLD |  |  |
|  | Has the LLD template (corresponding to the design process) been used? | Y | The LLD template used is in accordance to the RBIN standards. |
|  | Is there Traceability from LLD to the HLD? Does this also address product quality characteristics? | Y | The HLD classes have been mapped to appropriate methods in LLD. |
|  | Have the naming convention and notation used in the design defined and documented? (Give reference to conventions for naming interfaces between modules) | Y | The functions have been appropriately named according to their functionality. The naming conventions have been documented in section 7 of the LLD document. |
|  | Does the definition of the interfaces match with what is specified in the HLD? | Y | The functions/modules of each class have been created according to its description. |
|  | Have timing and resource constraints been considered (if applicable) | Y | This has been documented in section 10 of the LLD document. |
|  | Have alternate solutions been explored, if applicable? | N | We have not considered any alternatives since this is a mock project. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Applicable to both HLD and LLD |  |  |
|  | Have the software product quality characteristics (as specified in Requirement specification, if requirements phase is applicable) applicable to the project team defined and quantified appropriately?  (e.g.: Functionality, Reliability, Usability, Efficiency, Maintainability, Portability etc.) | NA | As of now we have not considered the non functional requirements. This will be done during the implementation stage. |
|  | Has the design feasibility been ascertained? | NA | This is a mock project .Only simulation is to be achieved. The application is not to be deployed. |
|  | If diagrammatic representations (like DFD, ERD, UML etc.) have been used in the document, have the specified conventions been followed? | Y | The UML standards for class diagram and sequence diagram have been followed. |
|  | Have additional hardware and software requirements been taken into consideration? | Y | Documented in section 9 of the LLD document. |

**Note**: If your design involves GUI, also Refer Checklist for GUI Design

# Abbreviations

RBIN  **R**obert **B**osch **In**dia Limited

DFD  **D**ata **F**low **D**iagram

ERD  **E**ntity **R**elationship **D**iagram

FHD  **F**unction **H**ierarchy **D**iagram

HLD **H**igh **L**evel **D**esign

LLD  **L**ow **L**evel **D**esign

GUI  **G**raphical **U**ser **I**nterface

UML **U**nified **M**odelling **L**anguage

OO **O**bject **O**riented

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewed By:** | | | | |
| **Name** |  | **Department** |  | **Signature** |
| **Date** |  | **Group** |  |