"You Might Dig"
Elaboration Phase Status Assessment

1. Have you eliminated all critical and significant risks?

a) What were the most significant risks you faced?

Architecture is not flexible enough or capable of supporting changes required during development

The risk is mitigated through careful design choices and the fact that the architecture is well supported.

The application is designed with future expansion in mind by keeping the different components of the system mostly self contained and modular.

The architecture has worked well for us and is easily expandable when an issue or limitation might be found. It remains to be seen if the architecture will continue to serve us well during the next phase when we aim to implement the recommendation engine.

The team might not have the skills required

The architecture is reliant on many skills taught by the computer science course itself and other elements which are very well publically documented and

The CCRD was completed without too much issue with lack of skills

Requirements are unclear, confusing and open to interpretation

A concise idea of the requirements of the project must be expressed and understood by all team members

An accurate and concise use case model and requirement model, demonstrating the system requirements was composed

The team understands the requirements of the system

b) What issues have come up during the Elaboration phase?

Deciding on a development architecture and environment has been an issue due to not all team members being able to run the development environment as intended (so far due Docker differences between win 10 and win 8) This issue should have been resolved by the adjustment of the scripts and tools used to deploy and run the architecture (and has been confirmed to work within a VM running Windows 8) however some issues seem to still occur and so the issue is ongoing.

A team member being unreachable and a major change to our CCRD occurred near the middle of the elaboration phase which resulted in the project being delayed heavily and rushed for the executable architecture to be prepared in time for LCAM. The architecture is running and completed for LCAM however so the issue was resolved and not ongoing.

2. Do you have an executable architecture?

Our CCRD use case was "Rate a game" (after changing mid elaboration phase from "View recommendations") this use case was chosen because every other major system revolves around the ability to rate a game and the next most substantial element of generating recommendations was too large to develop supporting use cases as well as the use case itself during the elaboration phase.

No elements of the architecture were left out besides the recommendation engine which is intended to be developed during the second semester.

The entire normal and alternate flow of all use cases intended to be developed for the CCRD use case were implemented with the caveat that any use case that will ultimately rely on recommendations is currently using a sorted list of games, sorting by release date. (Rate Games, Browse Games, Sign In, Sign Up)

No architectural elements besides the recommendation engine were left out of fully supporting the use case. Which was left out due to being too large to develop during this phase and is slated for development during the following phase.

The application is fully deployed in the intended production environment. (http://violet.blacklotus.cc/)

One issue was encountered during deployment in that the VPS on which the application is hosted would take a long time to start Tomcat (an integral part of our architecture) the issue was resolved with a quick google as it was revealed the VPS' entropy pool was being emptied during startup and would halt for long periods and could be fixed by installing the package 'haveged'.

3. Have you got a final project plan?

The order of addressing different use cases and architectural elements has been adjusted from the initial project plan in that our CCRD was changed from "View Recommendations" to "Rate Game" with recommendations being slated for the next phase. This was due to realising recommendations will take a substantial amount of time and relies on the "Rate Game" use case

The elements specified within the final project plan do add up to the completed project set out in the project vision.

4. How did your testing go?

A master test plan does exist and identifies the major features and capabilities we want to test and make sure operate correctly.

They are the elements supporting our implemented use cases, and the use cases themselves

Formal alpha level use acceptance testing for the CCRD was completed by Somer and the results were a pass (can be found here)

5. How is the team going?

Everyone is pulling their weight and completing tasks assigned to them.

No major foreseeable issues with involvement and commitment are coming up besides the usual work commitments.

6. Miscellaneous concerns

The architecture document has been updated to reflect the currently developed and deployed architecture

The vision and supporting documents have been revised to reflect the current project concept

7. What lessons have you learned so far about implementing a team based project?

One of the most substantial issues is organising amongst ourselves the tasks we're completing for the iteration and what the best course of action may be.

This is especially noticeable in the development of the executable architecture itself with some issues relating to the codebase and the final architecture being decided.

All in all the project has come along surprisingly well and all elements we aimed to deliver have been delivered without *too* major a delay.