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# Introduction

Below are the results from Eric Haslag’s technical inspection of the requirements, architecture, and test coverage. Eric Haslag is a fellow Software Engineering Team Lead at Garmin and can be contacted at [eric.haslag@garmin.com](mailto:eric.haslag@garmin.com).

# 2. Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Items to be Inspected** | **Pass / Fail / Partial** | **Comments** |
| Each symbol used in the class diagram / struct diagram are according to UML standards. | Pass | The symbols are accurate, but some of the terminology could be improved with respect to protocol conformance. For example, ObservableObject is a protocol that Project should conform to, not a class it inherits from. The same is true for Hashable, Error, CaseIterable, and View. This is a minor technicality as the purpose and relationship is still clear. |
| Each class / struct in the UML diagram have clear specifications as to their purpose in the System Architecture Document. | Pass |  |
| All requirements in the Software Requirements Specification (located in the Vision Document) have been covered in the Test Plan Document. | Pass |  |

Please see Cover Letter - Mike MSE Project – Signed.pdf for Eric’s written findings on the Planr project and technical inspection.