

Project Meeting 3 Evaluation

| Changes in Requirement | Is there any refinement/change in the requirement since the last project meeting? | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Points | 0 | 0.5 |
| Description | No discussion on the changes and refinement in the requirement. | Changes in the requirement are clearly identified and discussed in the project report. If there has been no change in the requirement, then it has been also mentioned. For Remote KYC project, groups need to include a summary of discussion with IBM (until project meeting 3) and for Game projects, groups need to include a summary of discussion with Yoga in project meeting 2 or additional discussions until Project Meeting 3. |

Project Meeting 3 Evaluation

| (Mostly) Complete Design | Design of different subsystems via UML diagrams | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Points | 0 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Description | No class diagram. | Class diagram is present. However, it is incomplete, does not show all the associations or multiplicities, does not show (comprehensively) what are the different operations in the class or it is inconsistent with the use case diagram. | Class diagram is complete and consistent with use case diagram, but does not comprehensively model sequence diagrams to reflect product workflow. | Complete, comprehensive and consistent class diagram with respect to its use case diagram. Sequence diagrams are as comprehensive as possible to reflect the detailed usage scenarios of the product. |

Project Meeting 3 Evaluation

| Implementation | Demonstration of features (clear indication is required on what is accomplished after project meeting 2). Snapshots and pictures are not considered as demos. In general, if there is no coding, then there is no demo. | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points | 0 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |
| Description | No demo or no progress after project meeting 2. | There is demo, but no coding was involved to prepare this demo (e.g. snapshots, pictures are not considered demos) after project meeting 2. | Demo of additional features crash or does not work. | Demo is well prepared and it is demonstrated without error. However, the progress over meeting 2 is minimal or the demo is not clearly aligned with the project objectives. | Demo is well done, significant progress over project meeting 1 and aligned clearly with the project objectives. |

Project Meeting 3 Evaluation

| Test Demo | Demonstration of basic (e.g. unit test) test execution. Walking through the software is not considered a test. In general, if there is no coding involved for the tests, then there is no test. | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|--|
| Points | 0 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Description | No test is written and the basic set of tests is reflected via using the software by its developers. | There is test, but no coding was involved to prepare these tests. Demonstration of test execution crashes or the tests are not aligned with the project objectives/use cases. | Demo of unit tests is prepared, but they do not comprehensively test the implemented software features. | Demo of basic test execution is well prepared and comprehensively test the currently implemented software features. If some implemented features are not tested yet, then the reason is clearly mentioned. |

Project Meeting 3 Evaluation

| Workload Distribution | Evidences of commit record / other evidences to show each group member is contributing | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Points | 0 | 0.5 |
| Description | No evidence | Evidence of commit record or evidence in some other form to show that each group member is contributing to the project. |