# Semester Project Deliverables

**Course:** Fundamentals of Software Project Management
**Deadline: November 30, 2025, 11:59 PM.**
**Total Marks: 15**

This project consists of **three graded deliverables**. All teams must submit and present the final integrated work.

## Overview of the Project

Each group will design, develop, and demonstrate a **working AI Agent System** that interacts using a **Supervisor–Worker (Registry) architecture**. The project focuses on both **project management documentation** and **technical implementation**, reflecting real-world software project practices.

# Project Deliverables (3 Components)

## 1. Project Report (30%)

Submit a professionally compiled report including the following sections:

| Section | Required Content |
|---|---|
| **Project Overview & Objectives** | Clear description of problem and goals. |
| **Project Management Artifacts** | Updated WBS, schedule (Gantt), cost estimate, risk plan, quality plan. |
| **System Design & Architecture** | Architecture diagram, module/class design, data flow, agent communication model. |
| **Memory Strategy** | Short-Term and Long-Term Memory plan for the agent. |
| **API Contract** | JSON request–response format with sample inputs and outputs. |
| **Integration Plan** | How your agent interacts with the Supervisor system. |
| **Progress & Lessons Learned** | Challenges faced and how they were addressed. |

**Format:** PDF (10–20 pages max, concise and clear).

## 2. Code and Working Prototype (50%)

Submit a functioning implementation of your agent.

| Requirements | Description |
|---|---|
| **Working AI Agent** | Fully functional and responds per JSON contract. |
| **Deployment** | HTTP API preferred, or a runnable script with instructions. |
| **Communication** | Agent must communicate with Supervisor/Registry structure. |
| **Logging & Health Check** | The system should return a status response when requested. |
| **Integration Test** | Show that your agent can be called externally and return correct outputs. |

## 3. Presentation & Live Demonstration (20%)

Each group will present in the final sessions.

| Component | Description |
|---|---|
| **Slides** | Project overview, architecture, and workflow summary. |
| **Live Demo** | Show the agent responding to real-time requests. |
| **Team Participation** | Every member must contribute during Q&A. |

# Mark Distribution Rubric (100%)

| Deliverable | Component / Criteria | Marks (%) | Excellent (A) | Good (B) | Satisfactory (C) | Poor (D/F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Project Report (30%)** | **Project Overview & Objectives** | 3 | Clear, concise, and compelling description of problem and goals. | Mostly clear with minor ambiguity. | Some clarity but lacks depth or precision. | Unclear or missing overview. |
| | **Project Management Artifacts (WBS, Gantt, Cost, Risk, Quality)** | 7 | Comprehensive, realistic, and consistent PM artifacts. | Mostly complete; minor inconsistencies. | Partial or outdated information. | Major sections missing or incorrect. |
| | **System Design & Architecture** | 6 | Detailed, well-structured diagrams and communication model. | Functional but missing one or two details. | Minimal or unclear diagrams. | Absent or irrelevant design. |
| | **Memory Strategy** | 4 | Sound and technically appropriate memory strategy (short/long-term). | Mostly clear; minor technical gaps. | Vague or partially correct. | Missing or incorrect approach. |
| | **API Contract** | 3 | Complete JSON schema with accurate examples. | Small omissions or unclear notation. | Incomplete or unclear contract. | Missing or incorrect. |
| | **Integration Plan** | 3 | Clearly explains Supervisor–Agent interaction and protocols. | Mostly clear, lacks full detail. | General plan only, lacks specifics. | Absent or infeasible. |
| | **Progress & Lessons Learned** | 3 | Deep reflection on challenges, solutions, and learning. | Some reflection with minor gaps. | Basic description, limited insight. | None provided. |
| | **Report Format & Professionalism** | 1 | Polished layout, consistent formatting, concise writing. | Minor format or grammar issues. | Disorganized or unclear. | Poorly formatted or incomplete. |
| **2. Code & Working Prototype (50%)** | **Functionality** | 15 | Fully functional system; meets all requirements. | Mostly functional; minor bugs. | Partially working; some missing features. | Non-functional or incomplete. |
| | **Integration with Supervisor/Registry** | 10 | Seamless and correct communication between components. | Works with minor issues. | Inconsistent or limited integration. | Fails to integrate. |
| | **Code Quality & Documentation** | 8 | Well-structured, modular, and clearly documented. | Generally good; some redundancy or unclear naming. | Poor organization or limited comments. | Disorganized or undocumented. |
| | **Deployment & Execution** | 7 | Easy to deploy/run with clear setup instructions. | Some issues but mostly functional. | Requires manual fixes or unclear instructions. | Cannot be executed. |
| | **Logging & Health Check** | 5 | Detailed, consistent status responses and logs. | Basic logs, minor inconsistencies. | Minimal or unclear logging. | Missing or incorrect checks. |
| | **Integration Testing & Validation** | 5 | Comprehensive test cases with valid outputs. | Limited testing but functional. | Few tests; limited validation. | No testing or failed results. |
| **3. Presentation & Live** | **Presentation Slides** | 5 | Professional, visually clear, and logically structured. | Minor formatting or content gaps. | Basic or unappealing visuals. | Disorganized or incomplete slides. |

| Demonstration (20%) | Live Demonstration | 8 | Smooth, successful live demo showing all core features. | Works with small issues. | Partial demo or minor errors. | Demo fails or not presented. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Team Participation | 4 | All members contribute effectively during Q&A. | Most members contribute; minor imbalance. | Unequal participation. | One or few members dominate or absent. |
| | Delivery & Communication | 3 | Clear, confident, well-timed delivery (8–10 min). | Slightly over/under time; minor delivery issues. | Unclear explanation or time mismanaged. | Unprepared or poor communication. |

## Submission Format

| Deliverable | Format | Platform |
|---|---|---|
| Project Report | PDF | Google Classroom |
| Source Code & Instructions | ZIP or GitHub repo link | Google Classroom |
| Presentation Slides | PPT/PDF | Google Classroom + On presentation day |

## Late Submissions

Late submissions will lead to a deduction from the mark obtained. The following rules will apply:

| Criteria | Penalty |
|---|---|
| Late submission (0–10 mins) | 10% deduction |
| 11–30 mins late | 20% deduction |
| 31–60 mins late | 30% deduction |
| Beyond 1st hour (same day) | 40% deduction |
| Up to 2 days late | 50% deduction |
| After 2 days | Zero marks |
| *Missing cover page, member details, and section details* | *Up to 2 marks deduction* |