Technical Review Assessment

For an Intrusion Detection System using a Neural Network

Version 1.0

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of MSE

Blake Knedler

CIS 895 – MSE Project

Kansas State University

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

This document will assess the technical reviews for the Intrusion Detection System (IDS). This document will analyze any failing points within the Technical Inspection Checklist given to both Tracy Marsahll and Keith Moyer. Any failing points will also be given an action plan to fix the issue that is found.

2 Assessment

The technical inspections had no failing cases so no further action is needed. However, some comments mentioned suggestions to improve which will try to be implemented in the final product of the IDS.

3   Inspection Checklists

3.1 Checklist by Tracy Marshall

Inspection Item	Pass/Fail	Comments
Does the code work and perform the intended task?	Pass	Code seemed to work as intended
Is the code easily readable?	Pass	Very easy to read and great use of comments
Is there duplicated code?	Pass	I didn't observe any duplicated code
Is the code modular?	Pass	Code was broken down nicely
Are there unused variables or functions?	Pass	I didn't observe any unused variables or functions
Is there commented out code?	Pass	There was no commented out code that i could spot
Are all debugging statements removed?	Pass	I didn't see any left over debug code
Are variable and function names meaningful?	Pass	Some names were not completely clear to me, but i believe they would be clear to a user that understood the functionality a little better than myself

Signed By: Tracy Marshall   *Tracy Marshall*

3.2 Checklist by Keith Moyer

Inspection Item	Pass/Fail	Comments
Does the code work and perform the intended task?	Pass	Many errors output on the console, and some elements non-functional. However, within expectations for prototype.
Is the code easily readable?	Pass	More narrative comments would be helpful. However, coding style and structure is very understandable.
Is there duplicated code?	Pass	Some places repeat the same calculation a few times when a temporary variable would have helped. But, no major code duplicated.
Is the code modular?	Pass	The code appears to be sufficiently modular for the project size.
Are there unused variables or functions?	Pass	The "vulture" utility detects several unused functions and variables. However, it is not excessive and further development could correct.
Is there commented out code?	Pass	There is a small amount of commented out code.
Are all debugging statements removed?	Pass	No debugging statements were found that are not appropriate.
Are variable and function names meaningful?	Pass	Consistency in naming, specifically class naming style, would be beneficial. The names themselves, however, are appropriate.

Inspected by Keith Moyer