Team, good day.

"I have reviewed the document Sizwe attached, and sections 2.2 and 2.3 of our guidelines have been addressed accordingly."

While the document outlines economic benefits and justifications for a preliminary feasibility study, it lacks comprehensive details on both technical and operational feasibility per the guidelines. I propose that we integrate this with the feasibility study section from the planning phase of the draft I provided, assuming it has been reviewed. This integration would enable us to address the missing feasibility aspects.

This discussion has been prompted by the need to evaluate the development of native mobile applications for both Android and iOS, as well as desktop platforms. Given the potential complexity of managing three separate projects.

If I may share my perspective, I recommend utilizing JavaFX for server-side development alongside Spring Boot, while implementing a web-based solution for the client side, contingent upon team consensus. This approach would facilitate cross-platform development, accommodating all operating devices.

In the initial phase, we removed Swift from the front-end technology stack to minimize implementation complexity and address the steep learning curve. However, our project must support all operating devices—not just desktop and Android, but also iOS.

While adopting a web application approach may necessitate investment in unfamiliar frameworks (such as Angular), it would streamline development by enabling API communication with backend servers. Given that the theme park system is expected to function as an enterprise application, a backend native application (JavaFX) is preferable to a solely web-based solution.

For section 2.4 of Phase 2's guidelines, Sizwe, your document outlines informative objectives and implementation strategies.

Additionally, if we decide to adopt web development for the client side, I recommend that we clearly specify this in the 'Out of Scope Features' section of the project planning for Phase 2. This will help prevent scope creep, especially regarding features that may necessitate significant additional resources or technologies not initially planned.

For Example:

Rationale for Change:

- The initial plan to utilize Android SDK and Swift for mobile applications was ambitious given our limited timeframe. This change is a strategic decision aimed at ensuring timely project delivery.

- Developing separate native applications for both Android and iOS would necessitate additional resources and expertise that are not feasible within our current timeline.

Out of Scope Features:

- If we decide to exclude the development of native applications using Android SDK and Swift, this will encompass both Android and iOS applications for ticketing and payments.

New Approach:

- Should the team opt to focus on web development for the client-side interface, this would provide cross-platform compatibility and a faster development cycle. A web application can be accessed across various devices and operating systems without the need for separate native apps.

Server-Side Development:

- We will continue utilizing Spring Boot for backend services, alongside JavaFX for necessary desktop applications. This choice will maintain a robust architecture while simplifying the overall project structure.

Impact on Project Scope:

- Excluding mobile app development allows the team to concentrate on delivering essential features, such as QR code integration, payment processing, and user management. While mobile applications are out of scope for this phase, we may consider them for future updates if resources and time allow.

@Sizwe, in terms of design the document you provided looks appealing if you don't mind maybe after we have finalised the whole of phase 2, you won't mind rendering your skills again for the final draft? although it is not must. I'm only trying to be transparent

I plan to finalize sections 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7, along with the overall second phase, by Monday at least if not during the week.