Acceptance Testing for Planetarium Application:

* Is the intended use of the service intuitive?
  + The use of the service is intuitive as the simplicity of the mechanics of each feature can be self explanatory. Some of the buttons were clearly labeled aside from a couple buttons like the submit button or the moon/planet drop down option.
* Is the service easy to use?
  + The service is slightly easy to use. Some features are self explanatory with labels inside text boxes such as name and id to be submitted or type and name labels on the tables. Some features can be confusing as to what the button will do. The options to delete a moon or planet can be confusing as it asks for a celestial body while someone may try to delete a planet when the drop down options would be in the option of moon.
* Does the service inspire confidence?
  + The service does not inspire confidence. With a few defects such as requiring an image to submit a planet or moon, to having planets and moons that can share names, it shows a lack of attention to the software requirements. Without the ability to add objects without requiring images it would mean that the service was not built correctly.
* Is the service pleasing to look at?
  + The service is not pleasing to look at. The service could be modified to support better graphics that can mesh well better such as the background. The Tables can be better detailed with ID numbers and owners. The options to add and be deleted could be better implemented to not be hidden at the beginning before choosing to deal with planets or moons.