CSCI222

Assignment 1

Report

Overview

This project involves the design and implementation of a file management system, it is made for the purpose of providing practice to student doing CSCI222 at the University of Wollongong, the project itself is broken into design and implementation elements, with students required to provide reports and documentation to demonstrate proper use of a rational unified process (RUP) design as well as provide a demonstration of the working finished product.

The programs main functionalities are, storing and managing files in persistent storage, as well as compressing and decompression of those files, keeping track of additions and removals and implementing a functional graphical user interface, the project uses a MySQL database as its backbone for data storage.

# Program Presentation

*A brief presentation that illustrates the actual implemented product. This presentation should combine text commentary with information captured from actual execution of programs (as screen shots or as captured text inputs and outputs). This presentation should clarify which of the functional requirements have been successfully implemented.*

## Functional Requirements

**TODO:** Probably add screenshot of final working instance of these. The text can probably be written beforehand.

Create Initial Archive (completed)

Detect Changes (completed)

Save Modified Version (completed)

Display a summary of versions in storage (completed)

Retrieve chosen version (completed)

Show comment associated with version (completed)

Use compression (completed)

Incremental changes (completed)

Discard old (completed)

# Group

*A tabular summary of the group structure identifying group members, the roles that they filled, the artifacts that they successfully delivered.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Assignee** |
| Manager (1) | Nicholas Morgan |
| Lead Designer (1) | Josh Coleman |
| Lead Implementer (1) | Phil Edwards |
| Designer (\*) | many |
| Data Persistence Specialist (1) | Thomas Nixon |
| Systems integration and systems test (\*) | Ivana Ozakovic, Phil Edwards |
| Documentation (\*) | many |
| Implementer (\*) | Phil Edwards, Thomas Nixon, Ivana Ozakovic, Josh Coleman |
| Document Backup Maintainer (1) | Thomas Nixon |

## Deliverables of Members

### Thomas Nixon

* Researched the benefits of using MySQL
* Designed new database layout
* Created database diagrams
* Wrote SQL code for database
* Created the SQL statements and C++ code required for the program
* Created initial document in Google Docs for outlining responsibilities and requirements
* Defined layout of classes and member functions and their interaction (With Phil Edwards)
* Implemented VersionRecord member function code
* Moved documents from Google Docs to Git
* Wrote code to handle compression of files and implemented it in required functions

### Phil Edwards

* Created GitHub suppository for project
* Created initial class files
* Created the Netbeans project
* Wrote coding standard document
* Fixed indentation issues across Netbeans project
* Moved database connection to a static function in a class
* Add dependency for MySQL to Netbeans project
* Fixed header guard bug
* Added murmur hash to implementation
* Implemented FileRecord
* Implemented FileArchiver
* Implemented RetrieveVersionRecord in VersionRecord
* Fixed Bugs VersionRecord
* Created Wiki for Git
* Created TODO document
* Wrote Git Primer for other members to refer to
* Defined layout of classes and member functions and their interaction (With Thomas Nixon)
* Created a modified version of murmur hash function to read from file.
* Wrote test code for functions in FileArchiver & FileRecord
* Added logging to program
* Made some modifications to database
* Created MySQL database server setup for other group members to use

### Ivana Ozakovic

* Created GUI main window and dialogs in QtBuilder.
* Created all the GUI functionality in collaboration with Josh.
* Took GUI screenshots for the report.
* Created Program Presentation section for the report.
* Created GUI Implementation and Planning section for the report.
* Declared data members and functions in the VersionRecord.h.
* Created VersionRecord.cpp file and set up stubs for declared functions.

### Josh Coleman

* Created all functionality for FileLib.
* Created all CppUnit tests for FileLib.
* Took images of FileLib code (both header/stubs and source/definitions).
* Took images of FileLib CppUnit tests.
* Created the table model for the table view in the GUI.
* Worked on all GUI table/button functionality (in collaboration with Ivana).

### Nicholas Morgan

* Meeting Reports
* Documentation
  + Elements and unit testing procedure
  + Supporting code samples and listings
  + Version Management – initial
  + Detailed meeting report – revision
* Project collation

### Phil M

# Design & Implementation

*A summary of your group’s work on design and the implementation plan. This should cover: any reworking of the proposed implementation classes and give details of decisions relating to data persistence and user interface issues. UML modeling diagrams should be used to illustrate*

*design decisions. If your group decides on a different implementation plan, with different iterations, you should give details and justification.*

* *Details of the construction phase. This part of the report should clarify the work done in each iteration.*
* *Summarize the new elements added and the extensions to existing implementation elements. Include brief details of unit testing procedures used to verify new elements prior to their commitment to the project (this does not mean list unit test code and test outputs, simply identify the additional tests created by individual implementers).*
* *Summarize data from defect and integration reports created by the systems integrator.*
* *Provide evidence for the appropriate use of version control software; this would typically take the form of excerpts from subversion’s logs of commit operations.*
* *Subversion statistical reports, showing overall contributions by different members, could be included in the report on the final iteration. N.B. some practice use of the subversion code management system is a requirement of this exercise. Of course it’s overkill here. The intention is that you practice the use of such technology on something fairly trivial before you need to use it for real as in CSCI321.The important thing is that you gain some practice in the use of a version management system.*

## Design Choices


### Database

Diagrams go here

Explanation of why we changed it

### FileArchiver

Diagrams go here



Explanation of why we changed it

## Implementations

### Iteration 1

New elements added

Tests used

Functional Requirements met

### Iteration 2

New elements added

Tests used

Functional Requirements met

### Iteration 3

New elements added

Tests used

Functional Requirements met

## Version Control

How we used it

Setup

Details

Access

Usage Information

# Group Records

*Group meeting records and individual diaries:*

* *There should be a summary detailing the work done at each formal group meeting.*
* *There should be an example agenda, and report from at least one of these meetings.*
* *There should be samples taken from the work diaries of at least two members of the group.*
* *There should be samples from bug logs and testing logs*

Group Meeting Summary

# Meeting One

Meeting called by: Nicholas

Note taker: Nicholas

Timekeeper: Nicholas

Attendees: All

Report Presenter: Nicholas

Target Meeting Time: 30 minutes

**Manager Perception of project state:**

Being the first group meeting, my impressions mostly revolved around how I thought we would work as a group, some members had already worked together on projects so group cohesion was already in a good place, the main adjustments needed was introduction of the new people to the group.

**Agenda Topic:** Role Selection  
**Time Allotted:** 10  
**Discussion:**

We took some time to discuss as a group which kind of role within RUP each member would like to take.

**Action Items:**

1. Advise of desired role within the group, by next week lab
2. Revise and familiarise yourself with the assignment details

**Agenda Review**

1. Currently no items for review

**Agenda Topic:** Week in plan- design discussions   
**Time Allotted:** 20

**Discussion:**  
We took some time here to quickly review the assignment and began to brainstorm so idea’s for the design.

**Action Items:**

1. Discuss initial design thoughts for the project

2. Create a sort of coding style guide – Phillip Edwards

**Agenda discussion**

Some concerns were raised about the structure of the current design, a decision was made that we would revise the design in order to streamline it, no date was targeted, merely we acknowledge that we felt there was a need for redesign and agreed to go about it, at some undefined later date.

Philip E. also posted a coding style document for all members to follow, this was to ensure consistency in the code throughout the project.

# Meeting Two

Meeting called by: Nicholas

Note taker: Nicholas

Timekeeper: Nicholas

Attendees: All

Report Presenter: Nicholas

Target Meeting Time: 30 minutes

**Manager Perception of project state:**

At this stage my perceptions were largely the same as the previous meeting, with no hard work being done there is no data to base a review on, the cohesion of the group appeared to be strong and members seemed flexible and willing to assist of all parts of the project.

**Agenda Topic:** Week in review

**Time Allotted:** 15 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

Reviewed assignment specifications

Preferences for Role within the team

**Agenda Review**

1. All members reported familiarising themselves with the assignment specs, questions were raised which lead to the group reading through the assignment spec’s to get everyone on same page before beginning planning and implementation

1. Roles
   1. Manager- Nicholas Ross Morgan
   2. Lead Designer – Josh Coleman
   3. Lead Implementer- Phil Edwards
   4. Designers – Assigned to all
   5. Systems Integration – Ivana Ozakovic, Phil Edwards

\*Roles were expanded- check detailed report for final roles

**Agenda Topic:** Week in plan

**Time Allotted:** 15 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Assign regular meeting times
2. Establish Secondary communication methods
3. Investigate Technologies for use( MySQL/Mongo, GiTHub/provided repo)

**Agenda discussion**

1. Regular Meeting times were scheduled for 6pm every Sunday, with regular informal check in’s during the week
2. Group chose skype as external communication platform
3. A brief discussion was had about the familiarities of each member with the systems, members reported being more familiar with MySQL and GiTHub came out as the preferred version management

# Meeting 3

Meeting called by: Thomas Nixon

Note taker: <fill this in > Phil and Thomas

Timekeeper: <fill this in > Thomas

Attendees: Phillip Edwards, Thomas Nixon, <anyone else?>

Report Presenter: Nicholas Morgan

Target Meeting Time: 5 Hours <edit this>

**Manager Perception of project state:**

I was not present for this meeting, but after receiving the notes and seeing the outcome I was happy with the direction the project was taking, a complete redesign on the structure had been completed

**Agenda Topic:** Week in review

**Time Allotted:** 10 Minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Supporting system selection
2. <any other items you think should be added here>

**Agenda Review**

1. Decisions were made, based on the preferences of the group at the previous meeting to go ahead with usage of MySQL and GitHub
2. <discussion for other items if any>

**Agenda Topic:** Week in plan

**Time Allotted:** 4 hours 30 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Project structure redesign
2. Database setup

**Agenda discussion**

1. A lengthy discussion was had about the redesign with a complete redesign of the structure complete by the end of the meeting \*refer to detailed report section
2. A database was setup to allow testing of interactions with code and a live database

# Meeting 4

Meeting called by: Nicholas

Note taker: Nicholas

Timekeeper: Nicholas

Attendees: All

Report Presenter: Nicholas

Target Meeting Time: 1 Hour

**Manager Perception of project state:**

At this stage prototyping for functions within multiple sections of the program had been completed, the design phase was completed and members had a clear view of the new direction of the assignment, The project as a whole seemed to be on track to be completed. Group cohesion was slightly lower, with the redesign happening in the previous meeting, however by the end of the week’s meeting, people were back on the same page.

**Agenda Topic:** Week in review

**Time Allotted:** 35 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Discussion on the changes made to design
2. GitHub member familiarization

**Agenda Review**

1. Phil and Thomas ran the members not present at the previous meeting through the specifics of the redesign
2. Time was spent showing members the proper use of GiT to avoid issues and insure all could successfully commit their work without issue

**Agenda Topic:** Week in plan

**Time Allotted:** 20 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Initial Code Assignment and discussion

**Agenda discussion:**

1. Code Assignments
   1. VersionRec – Thomas
   2. Gui/Reporting – Nicholas
   3. FileRec – Phillip E.
   4. CPPUnit – Ivana/Josh
   5. Gui - Phillip M.

# Meeting 5

Meeting called by: Nicholas

Note taker: Nicholas

Timekeeper: Nicholas

Attendees: All

Report Presenter: Nicholas

Target Meeting Time: 1 Hour

**Manager Perception of project state:**

Project is currently in crunch mode, some deliverables of members hadn’t been committed on time, other group members had been working hard and a large portion of coding was completed, at the beginning of this meeting CPPUnit testing, Gui and some touch ups on the versionrec and filerec functionality needed to be completed, reports also needed to be completed and the design document fleshed out.

**Agenda Topic:** Week in review

**Time Allotted:** 20 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Update internal TODO list
2. Discuss issues in functionality

**Agenda Review:**

1. As a group we sat down and updated the TODO list, this updated all members perspective of the current state and gave us a clear idea of what was remaining to finish
2. We took some time as a group to discuss any functionality issues we had in an effort to see if any group member could provide insight or a new look on the problem

**Agenda Topic:** Week in plan

**Time Allotted:** 25 Minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Gui design and implementation finalized
2. CPPUnit testing code finalization
3. Makefile fixes
4. FileRec and VerRec implementation finalized
5. Reports
6. Presentation

**Agenda discussion:**

1. Gui design was passed onto Ivana and Josh
2. CPPUnit testing was assigned to all members
3. Makefile fixes for Unit testing
4. Report writing assigned to Nicholas
5. FileRec and VerRec finalized assigned to Thomas and Phil. E.
6. Presentation for inclusion in report assign to IvanaFinal Meeting

**Meeting called by:** Nicholas

**Note taker:** Nicholas

**Timekeeper:** Nicholas

**Attendees:** All

**Report Presenter:** Nicholas

**Manager Perception of project state:**

Project is currently in crunch mode, some deliverables of members hadn’t been committed on time, other group members had been working hard and a large portion of coding was completed, at the beginning of this meeting CPPUnit testing, Gui and some touch ups on the versionrec and filerec functionality needed to be completed, reports also needed to be completed and the design document fleshed out.

**Agenda Topic:** Week in review

**Time Allotted:** 20 minutes

**Discussion:**

**Action Items:**

1. Final check of TODO list
2. Report update with finalized info

**Agenda Review:**

1. As a group we went through the TODO, ensure all items checked off were completed and assigned final tasks
2. Tasks
   * + - 1. Gui – Jason and Ivana
         2. Report – Phil M. and Nicholas
         3. Version Rec – Phil E.
         4. File Rec – Thomas
         5. CppUnit testing – Phil E. and Thomas

## Detailed Meeting agenda and Report

# Detailed Meeting Report

[Date] – Date where this happened

Agenda Items:

1. Visualize the current design and structure of the program
2. Redesign area’s we feel can be improve.
3. Design and setup the database for use with testing throughout the remainder of the project

Time allocation:


10am-10pm

Discussions:


Discussion continued throughout the day, but started with a layout of the planned stages and ultimate goals for the meeting


# Program Design

## FileArchiver

To understand the program better we wrote the main functions on a white board

This gave a good starting point. From here we began to flesh it out and understand what functions were needed and how to communicate between the different components.

Expansion from the starting point, designed to provide, at a glance an overview of the structure of the entire program, to provide insight into program flow and to highlight any area’s where improvements could be made.

The further we got the better we understand what we were working towards. We were able to trim excess functions and remove anything that was doubled up.

All the class files were designed from this initial layout. From here we decided to get some of the core functionality going.

Database connection.


Creating a FileRecord.

Creating a VersionRec.


Storing a file in the database.

Retrieving a file from the database.

Storing multiple versions.





The whiteboard was also used to help us come up with logic in some of the functions. That  
way two people could look at it and make sure it made sense before implementing.





## Database

When looking at how to store the data of the file we decided to break the file down into blocks. These blocks would be linked to a version with the intermediate table VtoB which would keep track of the blocks required for a version file and the appropriate index. This allowed for a many to many relationships between Version and Block so that we could store blocks that were the same under different versions without needing to duplicate data.

 After deciding on how to store the files we redesigned the database to better reflect what we wanted to achieve. Redundant tables and fields were removed. Names of tables were modified to better reflect the data within them and reduce confusion.



An ERD was created to show how the database worked. This was useful if anyone needed to refer to the database or see under which table data was stored. The relationship between the tables is also shown. You can see that there are two hashes in the Block table. This was done reduce the number of collisions possible. This is very important in the Block table as a collision would destroy the integrity of our version files. When a hash1 is the same as a block that is stored it generates a second hash (hash2) which has a different seed. We found this a suitable solution.

This is the database code at our first implementation. The insertion and retrieval of a File, Version, Block, and VtoB worked perfectly.


# Discussion – Final

At the end of the meeting, we were happy with the current state of the project, we identified some redundancies in the program and trimmed them, the database was setup and ready to be utilized and the current version of the version record and file record functionalities were implemented.


# Group member work journal Samples

Group members maintained a work journal to track work times, the primary goal of these journals was to identify and shortcoming pertaining to time management and to ensure an organized approach to the design and implementation of the project.

## Sample of work diary from Thomas Nixon




## Sample of work diary from Ivana Ozakovic





# Supporting Code Samples

## Support code for connecting to the database




## Support for utilities for logging debug info






# Unit Testing Samples

## Testing for correctly appended path to file



## Testing for retrieving filename functionality



## Bug/Testing Log Samples

# Appendices

## Code Elements

* FileArchiver.cpp / FileArchiver.h
* FileLib.cpp / FileLib.h
* FileRecord.cpp / FileRecord.h
* CompressUtils.cpp / CompressUtils.h
* DBConfigurationFileUtility.cpp
* DBConnector.cpp / DBConnector.h
* GetCommentForm.cpp / GetCommentForm.h
* MurmurHash.cpp / MurmurHash.h
* MyWindows.cpp / MyWindow.h / MyWindow.ui
* ProjectConstants.h
* RetrieveForm.cpp / RetrieveForm.h
* TestUtilities.cpp / TestUtilities.h
* Utilities.cpp
* VersionRecord.cpp / VersionRecord.h
* FileLibTester.cpp / FileLibTester.h
* BackendTests.cpp / BackendTests.h