



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



SOFTWARE DESIGN REVIEW

eVET (ONLINE VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION AND TRAINING
PLATFORM)

Project Number | 2017-1-TR01-KA202-046541



Project Coordinator

The Governorship of Istanbul

GOI



T.C. İSTANBUL VALİLİĞİ

Partners

Bogazici University

BOUN

Euregio-
Berufsbildung e.V.

EBEV

Universita Degli
Studi Guglielmo
Marconi –
Telematica

MARCONI

Ortakoy Zubeyde
Hanim Mesleki ve
Teknik Anadolu
Lisesi

OZHMTAL



Revision History

Name	Date	Reason For Changes	Version
Birgül Kutlu Bayraktar	30.4.2018	Created	1.0
Birgül Kutlu Bayraktar, Meltem Ozturan, Mustafa Gulsoy, Aysun Bozanta, Baris Cimen	7/27/2018	Updated during WP3-Design	2.0

Reference

Adapted from Karl E. Wieggers, 2001. Permission is granted to use, modify, and distribute.

Retrieved from:

http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~sme/CSC340F/2005/assignments/inspections/reqts_checklist.pdf

Checklist for Software Design Review

Structure	Y/N/NA	Comment
Does the architecture allow for implementation of all of the requirements?	Y	
Has the architecture been adequately decomposed?	Y	
Have the system functions been appropriately allocated to components?	Y	
Does the architecture provide an adequate base for subsequent design work?	N	Suggestion is to insert a detailed guide on system and platform for non registered user
Is the architecture feasible for implementation?	Y	
Have maintainability issues been adequately addressed?	Y	
Can the program set be integrated and tested in an incremental fashion?	Y	
Is the pseudocode or other representation format consistent in its level of detail?	Y	
Correctness	Y/N/NA	Comment
Does the architecture avoid unnecessary redundancy?	Y	
Have all reliability and performance requirements been addressed?	N	Before resetting password a password-suggestion sentence could be implemented to permit user to remeber password
Have all security considerations been addressed?	Y	
Does the architecture consider all existing constraints?	NA	No constraints has been defined in SRS.
Are all necessary, and only the necessary, data structures defined?	Y	
Will the proposed architecture satisfy all specified quality attributes and performance goals?	NA	All quality attributes and performance goals are related to implementation not design.
Standards and Traceability	Y/N/NA	Comment
Have all architecture standards been followed?	Y	

Can all parts of the architecture be traced back to requirements?	Y	
Are standard, not proprietary, components being used wherever possible?	Y	

Logic	Y/N/NA	Comment
Is there any missing or incomplete logic?	N	
Are all possible states or cases considered?	N	Same consideration on password suggestion
Interfaces	Y/N/NA	Comment
Are all interfaces clear and well-defined?	Y	
Is the minimum data passed at each interface?	Y	
Is minimum global system data added or impacted?	Y	
Clarity	Y/N/NA	Comment
Is the architecture, including the data flow, control flow, and interfaces, clearly represented?	Y	
Are multiple representations of the design consistent with each other?	Y	
Are all of the decisions, dependencies, and assumptions for this design documented?	Y	
Data	Y/N/NA	Comment
Are global constants and passed data parameterized?	Y	
Has all the data been properly defined and initialized?	Y	
Are data structures and element names meaningful and compliant with naming conventions?	Y	
Is all defined data used?	Y	
Do the data element names and types conform to the project data dictionary?	Y	
Are defaults used, and are they correct?	Y	
Standards and Traceability	Y/N/NA	Comment
Have all design standards been followed?	Y	
Does the human interface follow project standards?	Y	
Can all parts of the high-level design be traced back to requirements?	Y	



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Review Checklists

Check Date : _____

Checked By : Marconi University

Signature :