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**1. Introduction**

Welcome to the XENO Code Inspection Report. As of the first spiral, there is very little code to be inspected, but in later spirals, this document will become more comprehensive and more useful.

**1.1 Purpose of this Document**

The purpose of this document is to explain and verify that the XENO team has followed and agreed upon a set of coding conventions as well as explain and verify the XENO team’s code review process. Any defects or abnormalities will be reported in this document.

**1.2 References**

* PEP 8 - Style Guide for Python Code
  + URL: https://www.python.org/dev/peps/pep-0008/
* W3Schools JavaScript Style Guide and Coding Conventions
  + URL: http://www.w3schools.com/js/js\_conventions.asp
* W3Schools HTML5 Style Guide and Coding Conventions
  + URL: http://www.w3schools.com/html/html5\_syntax.asp

**1.3 Coding and Commenting Conventions**

The style and coding conventions described in the referenced documents (See 1.2 References) will be followed without alteration. These are being used because they are clear, concise, and accepted by the public coding community. If the code is ever made public, these conventions will be easily readable by others. They were also chosen in part because they are already defined and the XENO team has used them in previous projects.

**1.4 Defect Checklist**

* Coding Convention Defects
* Commenting Defects
* Display Defects
* Conflicting CSS styles
* Wrong or Invalid HTML5 Tag Names
* Syntax Errors

**2. Code Inspection Process**

**2.1 Description**

**2.2 Impression of the Process**

**2.3 Inspection Meetings**

**3. Modules Inspected**

**4. Defects**

**Appendix B – Team Review Sign-off**

As of 3/2/2015, all group members of XENO have reviewed the System Requirements Specifications (SRS) document and all have agreed the content and format of this document is correct. This document has been tailored to meet the client’s necessities for an online web application which will offer an online exotic car rental service to VIP customers.
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**Appendix C – Document Contributions**

Vesh Bhatt: Contributed checks for thoroughness and consistency with other documents. Estimated percent of work is about 5%.

Michael Bishoff: Verified the details of use cases and reviewed any other written text. Estimated percent of work is about 10%

Edward LaFemina: As the requirements leader, was responsible for the formatting and appearance, as well as writing section 1 and documenting the functional and nonfunctional requirements. He reviewed and edited all other sections before submission. Estimated percent of work is about 70%.

Michael Lee: Michael worked on Appendix A & B, Open Issues, and References. Estimated percent of work is about 10%.

John Swank: Also contributed checks for thoroughness as well as completeness. Estimated percent of work is about 5%.