

Respondent: **Markku Leppälä** Submitted on: Monday, 31 August 2020, 3:34 PM

## Project evaluation form

1 \* Name of the group being evaluated

Network-Simulator-2

2 \* Names of the persons authoring this evaluation

Markku Leppälä, Jonatan Prinsén

3 Proposed grade for Design category (15%)

5

4 \* Verbal evaluation for Design category, to justify grade.

- + The design is well documented and justified.
- + Inheritance and abstract classes are used.
- + The design allows future additions which were planned to be included in the original plan/beginning of project.
- + Code is well commented and dirty/ugly code is pointed out to be refactored.
- + External libraries are used whenever suitable. However, there are no comments which function are used from which library. E.g. limits.h in link.cpp.

Minor note: Includes for libraries are doubled in .cpp and .hpp which is a bit extensive.

5 Proposed grade for Working practices category (15%)

5

6 \* Verbal evaluation for Working practices category, to justify grade.

- + The team had a extensive plan for the project with features/tasks distributed including timeline.
- + Clear .gitignore and project folder
- + Branches used clearly. However, using prefixes such as hotfix or feature would make it easier to organize.
- + Pull requests are used with description, peer reviewed and discussed if unclear.
- + Issues are used at some level. (Only 4 issues tracked).
- + Team had weekly meetings where they discussed current progress and the next steps. There was no mention about how issues/tasks were divided but we assume it was via the meetings held.
- + Progress is tracked in personal logs and project level with changelog.
- + Reflections of the project and learnings and are added to the documentation.
- + Tests are extensively implemented and well documented.
- + Excellent documentation and tracking of the progress.

7 Proposed grade for Implementation category (20%)

4

8 \* Verbal evaluation for Implementation category, to justify grade

- CMake did not compile straight away with the Mac i.e. it did not adapt to different environments.
- + However, they had it covered in documentation.
- + User input is validated and faulty inputs are dropped/filtered not crashing the software.

9 Proposed grade for Features category (40%)

5

10 \* Verbal evaluation for Features category, to justify grade.

- + Extensive amount of features, and we did not find any bugs while testing ourselves, i.e. it works robustly.
- + GUI was explored and tentatively implemented.