



TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIS	SIONS	3
1	Overview	4
2	Recommendations	4



REVISIONS

VERSION	DATE	NAME	DESCRIPTION
1.0	22.09.2020	Mohamed Khalid	Initial draft version created.



1 Overview

This document contains a list of UI recommendations from the Adobe UI team on the M1 microsite implementation.

Few key points about the review and recommendations:

- This is a high-level quick review of UI implementation of M1 microsite
- Review is based on the workshop between Adobe and Infosys on 21-Sep-2020.
- Adobe UI team has not done a detailed code review of the M1 code base.
- Adobe team, both UI and AEM backend team, are not involved in day to day development process of M1 microsite.
- Review recommendations are based on the responses from Infosys team to the Adobe questionnaire.
- Adobe and Infosys also reviewed the product listing component during the workspace, code review is based on this review.

2 Recommendations

The following recommendations for improvement were identified during the review and are in high, medium, and low priority order.

RECOMMENDATION 1		PRIORITY: Medium
Category	Development Methodology	
Issue/risk if not addressed	Mobile first layout is not followed, high chances of UI issues and consumes more time in development for desktop and mobile.	
Always we should follow mobile that we can design and develop a desktop screen.		,
Recommendation(s)	Having a mobile first approach for development would have avoided rework for many components.	



RECOMMENDATION 2		PRIORITY: High
Category	Code Quality	
Issue/risk if not addressed	SCSS files created but its fundame functions, variables instead they hand hardcoded colors, font-size ar If in future theming (ex: colors, for changed across application then vand endup with more efforts	ave used it like normal CSS and viewport sizes in all css files. arts and font-sizes) to be
Recommendation(s)	Always use variables for colors, fonts, viewport sizes and also use SCSS mixins which helps to reuse repetative CSS code. One place change will reflect in all SCSS files.	

RECOMMENDATION 3		PRIORITY: High
Category Code Quality		
Some of the CSS properties are w files. In future while updating CSS HTML syntax or JS syntax then en break.		property if someone misses
Always write CSS code within not break entire application L component.		,

RECOMMENDATION 4		PRIORITY: Medium
Category	UI Architecture	



Issue/risk if not addressed	Atomic design approach is not followed. All HTML templates are made static and those HTMLs cannot be reused in other places instead need to rewrite HTML and CSS again which consumes more effort and also increases the size of CSS file.
Recommendation(s)	Always break each section into individual component which can be reused across different pages/sections. Examples Accordions, Tabs.

RECOMMENDATION 5		PRIORITY: Medium
Category Build Process		
Issue/risk if not addressed	There is no separate UI Environment maintained for the project, UI team is currently coding within AEM component. This makes development more time consuming as each time after we do any change in HTML/SCSS/JS we need to run Maven build. Also, it consumes time in UI-AEM integration.	
should have build proces		arate UI Environment and p, grunt or webpack. Once we orking fine then final UI code d productivity of UI team.

RECOMMENDATION 6		PRIORITY: Low
Category	UI Testing	
Issue/risk if not addressed	As per the discussion, unit testing simulators and simulators will not devices. There will be more risk of	give exact results as physical



Recommendation(s)	If we don't have physical devices, then try using Browserstack.com which gives better results than browser
	simulators.

RECOMMENDATION 7		PRIORITY: Low
Category	Security	
Cookie values are directly exposed. We are able to see to saved cookie objects on browser developer tool and reactly clearly		
Recommendation(s) Always Cookie/Session data to be encoded and be saved. We can use methods like encodeURIC decodeURIComponent()		