Yuconz System Status Report

Written by Aum Desai (Project lead)   Date: 15/03/2020

The purpose of this system status report is to provide clear clarification of the progress that has been made on the Yuconz project, to all stakeholders that hold an interest in its completion. This report also details key aspects of the project that were either not developed or underdeveloped, by the project development team (and compared against what was specifically requested in the original client requirements).

PROJECT SUMMARY

The Yuconz project consisted of five distinct stages, each of which have been broken down individually below, in terms of expected progress against the actual progress that was made. These progress details relate to the development of the UML use case/class diagrams, the system code, the system testing and also the project documentation. For each stage, the feedback that was received (from the client) has been detailed, as well as the changes or adjustments that were made (or not made) in response to this feedback.

PROGRESS OF EACH PROJECT STAGE

Stage	Start date	End date	Status details
1.	25/11/2019	06/12/2019	Stage_1_Details
2.	19/01/2020	03/02/2020	Stage_2_Details
3.	03/02/2020	17/02/2020	Stage_3_Details
4.	17/02/2020	02/03/2020	Stage_4_Details
Stage 5/Overall Project	**25/11/2019**	**06/03/2020**	**Project_Status_Summary**

PROJECT STAGE 1 DETAILS

Below are specifics relating to the implementation and results from the first stage in the Yuconz project.

STAGE REQUIREMENTS

Deliverables	Delivered (Y/N)	Assessment requirements met? (Y/N)
User stories (as PDF)	Y	Y
Scenarios	Y	Y
Use case diagrams	Y	Y

CLIENT FEEDBACK

The client (Miles Roman, of Yuconz) was highly satisfied with our progress on the UML (in relating to personal details) and all of the stage requirements were met. The only negative criticism came in the form of an unnecessary user story (story 4), that failed to relate to personal details. Moreover, the scenario testing was encouraged to be wider, with the use of both positive and negative test cases.

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

Due to the aforementioned criticisms (for the stage deliverables) not capable of having much impact on future deliverables, these improvements were recorded but not implemented by the project development team.

STAGE SUMMARY

The stage was executed well, with all deliverables met and all of the assessment criteria (the client requirements) was also satisfied. The status of the stage 1 is therefore **completed fully**, with no needed revisions necessary to this stage's work.

PROJECT STAGE 2 DETAILS

Below are specifics relating to the implementation and results from the second stage in the Yuconz project.

STAGE REQUIREMENTS

Deliverables	Delivered (Y/N)	Assessment requirements met? (Y/N)
UML class model	Y	Y
Project management documentation	Y	Y
QA documentation	Y	Y
Review documentation	Y	N
Version control documentation	Y	N
Testing documentation	Y	N

CLIENT FEEDBACK

The client (Miles Roman, of Yuconz) was fairly satisfied with the work produced from this stage, though he provided large amounts of feedback in terms of improvement. Among the most notable feedback, the client was unhappy with the reviewing process that the project team had designed (only reviewing at the end of each stage). The client was also unsatisfied with the lack of formal version control processes within the Version Control documentation. Finally, the client was dissatisfied with the testing document, stating that the tests were limited and should be developed further.

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

The project team decided to completely change their reviewing process (from this stage onwards), with the addition of progress reviews (now held at most meetings) to compliment the end of stage reviews. Moreover, the documentation amendments were conducted to the Version Control document, though the testing document was left unchanged due to a QA and miscommunication issue.

STAGE SUMMARY

The stage could have been executed better, despite all of the deliverables being met on time. The status of the stage 2 is therefore **completed, with improvements needed** (at time of writing), with improvements needed to be made to the testing document.

PROJECT STAGE 3 DETAILS

Below are specifics relating to the implementation and results from the third stage in the Yuconz project.

STAGE REQUIREMENTS

Deliverables	Delivered (Y/N)	Assessment requirements met? (Y/N)
Evidence of document planning enactment	Y	Y
Class diagram (authentication)	Y	Y
Java source code (authentication)	Y	N
Junit tests	N	N
Criteria document	Y	Y

CLIENT FEEDBACK

The client (Miles Roman, of Yuconz) was satisfied with the overall deliverables provided in stage 3, though was highly critical of the Java source code provided. The client stated that there was a clear lack of correspondence between the code and the UML class model provided. Moreover, the lack of Junit test cases was also of high concern for the client.

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

The project team acknowledged the feedback provided by the client for this stage but were unable to enact the required changes within the stage 4 deliverables (due to receiving the client's feedback after the deadline had passed). In response, the project team hoped to rectify this problem for the stage 5 and final submission.

STAGE SUMMARY

The stage could have been managed more effectively by the project team, notably with the absence of the Junit test cases (a serious QA issue). Due to the lack of Java code amendments and the absence of the Junit test cases, the stage is therefore requiring **immediate completion/correction** (amendments in stage 5).

PROJECT STAGE 4 DETAILS

Below are specifics relating to the implementation and results from the fourth stage in the Yuconz project.

STAGE REQUIREMENTS

Deliverables	Delivered (Y/N)	Assessment requirements met? (Y/N)
Evidence of enactment of project documentation	Y	Y
UML Class diagram (personal details)	Y	Y
Java source code (personal details)	Y	N
Evidence of significant testing	N	N

CLIENT FEEDBACK

The client (Miles Roman, of Yuconz) was overall satisfied with the implementation of the deliverables (with the exception of the absence of a good testing document/evidence). However, the client was not satisfied with the lack of coherence between the UML class diagram and the Java code, and has urged immediate correction for this (before the final submission).

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

The project team has acknowledged this feedback from the client and is confident that the appropriate changes can be made (for the final submission/stage 5 of the Yuconz project). Testing is also of significant interest to the development team, and will ensure that the final product has been thoroughly checked for quality, functionality and usability.

STAGE SUMMARY

The stage was handled well (for providing the needed deliverables), but the lack of time (in response to feedback) meant changes weren't able to be implemented. Due to this, the stage requires **immediate correction/completion** to ensure the correctness of stage 5/final deliverables.

PROJECT FINAL STAGE/OVERALL STATUS

Whilst this report has so far covered a step-by-step stage status evaluation, below is a complete summary and evaluation of the current state of the Yuconz project (as a whole, in its entirety). It also details what needs further completion or improvement.

YUCONZ PROJECT DELIVERABLES

Deliverables	Delivered (Y/N)	Further improvements needed? (Y/N)	Crucial improvement? (Y/N)	Notes on improvements needed
Evidence of enactment of project documentation (all)	Y	N	N/A	N/A
UML Class diagrams (all)	Y	N	N/A	N/A
Java Source code (all)	Y	Y	N	All of the code has been provided but there needs to be a means of triggering system methods without calling them. There is also code that can be cleaned up at a later point (e.g. unclosed scanners objects).
Index page for project	Y	N	N/A	N/A
Additional documentation (Status, User guide)	Y	N	N/A	N/A
Evidence of significant testing	Y	N	N/A	N/A

YUCONZ PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The above table shows the deliverables (in their entirety, compiled from the stages, outlined in previous pages) that have been submitted in the final submission (and those that have not). Potential or needed improvements have also been recorded within the table, and each have been deemed as crucial or not crucial (whether they are of significant importance to the whole system).