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# Project Details

## Project ID: RT001

## Project Name: Red Turf

## Customer: Tanvi IT Solutions Inc

## Project type: Software Development

## Project Manager: Nagoor Inaganti

## Project Team Members: Eswara Prasad Gatamaneni, Pavan Kumar Pentela, Vijaya Somarepetta, Sravanthi Yerramsetti, Monalisha Mishra, Gaurav Sachetee

## Project Start Date: 10/01/18

## Project End Date: 04/03/19

## Closure Type (Successful completion/ Termination): Successful completion

## Project Description: Red Turf project is an Enterprise Business Intelligence product. The project is targeted to be used as a part of Campaign and Constituent Management services.

## Project Write-up:

Red Turf is a cloud based integrated online system which can be used as a part of Campaign and Constituent Management services and is accessible using any device. Red Turf is a dynamic political campaign management software made specifically for canvassing. With this software, campaign team will be able to map out canvassing routes and assign them to volunteer groups. Red Turf also combines both field operations management and robust data analytics to help your campaign succeed. Using the mobile app, volunteers and team members will have access to key talking points and canvassing routes.

# Project Size, Effort and Schedule Details:

## Size:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial Estimate | Revised Estimate | Actual | UOM | Reasons for significant deviations if any |
| 15 | 15 | 15 | People | There is no significant deviation. |

## Effort in Person Months/ Person Days:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal | Planning/ approved in PIN | Revised | Actual | Reasons for significant deviations if any |
| Red Turf | 103 Days | 115 days | 115 days | Change in engineering support environment |

## Effort Distribution in Person Months/ Person Days:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phases | Planned Effort (A) | % of total planned effort | Actual Effort  (B) | % of total actual effort | Phase wise effort variance  ((B-A)/A)\*100 |
| Requirements | 103 | 57 | 115 | 60 | 11 |
| Design | 103 | 78 | 115 | 80 | 11 |
| Coding & Unit Testing | 103 | 100 | 115 | 100 | 11 |
| Testing | 103 | 90 | 115 | 90 | 11 |
| **Total Effort** | **103** | **81** | **115** | **83** | **11** |

## Schedule:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Milestones | Deliverable | Original  date | Revised  Date | Actual  date | Slippage in calendar days\* | Reasons for slippage |
| Concept approval | PIN | 10/01/18 | 10/10/18 | 10/10/18 | 9 | Delay in meeting with stakeholders |
| Requirements review | REQM, RD | 10/10/18 | 10/10/18 | 10/10/18 | 0 | NA |
| Preliminary design review | TS, PI, DAR | 11/05/18 | 11/05/18 | 11/05/18 | 0 | NA |
| Test plan review | VER, VAL | 12/17/18 | 12/17/18 | 12/24/18 | 7 | Delay in input to the development of test cases and test procedures. |
| Document outline complete | PP | 10/1/18 | 10/1/18 | 10/1/18 | 0 | NA |
| Software product build complete | Project Closure Report | 03/04/19 | 03/04/19 | 03/04/19 | 0 | NA |

# Automated tools Used (if any):

| Activity | Tools |
| --- | --- |
| Analysis | Delphi Analysis |
| Design | .NET |
| Testing / Debugging | Selenium |
| Configuration Management | Microsoft Azure |
| Project Estimation | Wideband Delphi Analysis |
| Planning & Tracking | Excel |
| Risk Management | Risk Log |
| Defect Tracking | Defect Tracking Log |
| Change Management | Change Request Tracker |

# Defects:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phase | Type of Defects | No of Defects (Severity wise Breakup) | Causes | Defect Prevention action |
| Phase I | Unit Testing | Defect in the vote propensity | Requirements Development | Adapting to the change requests. |

# Other Metrics:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Other Metrics Planned (As per Project Plan) / Not Planned, but collected | Set Goal | Actual achieved | Reasons for significant deviation, if any from the estimates |
| Cycle time | 32 Days | 25.6 Day | Average completion rate is higher |
| Team Velocity | 50 story point | 45 story point | The level of effort and output of work based on each team's unique interpretation of story points. |
| Mean time to repair | 20 minutes | 15 minutes | Incident acknowledgement time is high |

# Causal analysis of Defects & Feedback

During phase I of unit testing of the Red Turf project, the code coverage was tracked. It is one of the common metrics that software teams track, i.e. what percentage of the code written for the product is tested by a unit test. Software development managers believe that 100% code coverage is necessary to ensure that the code is tested adequately. Code that is very highly tested is very tough to change. If unit tests are used excessively, software teams will find themselves considering the costs of changing the existing unit tests when changing the code, and these costs can spiral out of control.

# Project Feedback

By the end of phase I of the Red Turf project, the project has been successfully implemented and the Project Manager received a feedback that the project can be extended. The Red Turf phase II can be used to benefit the Non-profit organizations.

# Best Practices Followed

The following are the best practices followed:

* Test-first programming (or perhaps Test-Driven Development),
* Rigorous, regular refactoring,
* Continuous integration,
* Simple design,
* Pair programming,
* Sharing the codebase between all or most programmers,
* A single coding standard to which all programmers adhere,
* A common "war-room" style work area.

# Backup and Archive

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S. No. | Source Code/Files/  Reference Material | Version and Date | Media of Storage |
| 1 | PP, PPQA, IPM, MA, RSKM | 1.1  11/05/18 | Azure Cloud |