Design Specification Feedback

Group	02
Document Version	1.0
Indicative Grade	C

1 Document

Front and header/footer material meets the standard.

The requirements specification should be referenced fully.
The user interface design in a specific version of the Project Plan should be cited and referenced to relate screens and pages to code.

2 Design

Android application. The design lacks integration. Four UI and two other classes are specified in section 1. Figure 1 is labeled Component diagram but the boxes are classes specified under 2.2. The relationship between the classes of sections 1 and 2 is not given. Interactions between the components in Figure 1 will presumably be more than Login with User – other aspects of the model will be manipulated by other components. Storage and selection from multiple recordings (visits) are not handled. More detail in depth would also be useful, particularly in relation to obtaining latitude and longitude and gallery or new pictures from the OS. Management of delayed and failed transmission and marshaling into the the format of 4.2.2 are not covered.

Website. The significant components and through to the detailed design cover much more functionality than the stated FR8 and FR9. The relationship between the items under 3.1 and 3.2 is unclear. Some under 3.1 have a .php extension, most do not. Under 3.2 most sections are design for items listed under 3.2 but some (e.g. 3.2.18) lack context. Links between pages under 3.1 do not all correspond to pages specified (e.g. add_plant_record – is that add_plants_record) and parameters to calls are not provided (e.g. how is $individual record provided to edit_record. Most importantly, the management of reserves records is not covered at all.

Server. Retrieval of records through HTTP is not used by the Website, where direct SQL access seems to be specified. Modification of records is not required at all (that is only required within the Android application). The specification requires transmission of a recording by the Android as a single POST. Multiple transmissions (images followed by the "record") will achieve the overall aim but will require design to handle communication failure and marshaling of the record as noted above.

There is no design for the database to handle reserve information.

Overall the design covers middle level components, failing to show how components relate and interact and how some lower level functionalities are achieved. Parallel development is likely to have problems of integration.