

Software Development Life cycle

End of project report

Author: Tom Reed, Matt Whitmore, Dave Clark, Silhab
Csoma, Mike Steel, Chris 'Tux' Lloyd, Aleksandra
Badyda, Samuel Jackson, Chris Marriott

Config. Ref.: SE.17.DS.01

Date: 2013-01-30

Version: 1

Status: draft

Department of Computer Science,
Aberystwyth University,
Aberystwyth,
Ceredigion, SY23 3DB,
U.K.

©Aberystwyth University 2013

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Management Summary | 2 |
| 2 | Historical account of project | 2 |
| 3 | Final State of project | 3 |
| 4 | Performance of each team member | 3 |
| 5 | Critical evaluation of the team and project | 3 |
| | REFERENCES | 4 |
| | DOCUMENT HISTORY | 5 |

1 Management Summary

This project has managed to achieve 25/27 of the functional requirements it was aiming to complete. See (cite requirements doc) for list of functional requirements. The only two that were not managed to be completed on time were, monster aging and server to server. The monsters ageing requirement, although not implemented, there was a formula that we had that worked. Given a bit longer on the project I believe we could have got the monster ageing working. The server to server side however was a bit further off. Silhab Csoma had a look at the server to server but due to the change in requirements and internet down time there was not time to implement server to server.

All the documents are in a good state—elabourate——.

A few difficulties got in our way during the development of the system. One of these issues was the change of requirements. Originally it was specified that the monster battle and breed would be offered up or requested but as the deadline approached the functional requirements were changed to specify that breed and battle requests had to be offered. This meant that part of the system had to be redesigned which took time off working on bugs and other functional requirements.

Another major issue that arose was that there was internet downtime in the week before the deadline. This caused several issues, the first of which was the inability to test the system properly. This led to work on the system being slowed down and thus resulted in a less complete system. It also meant more two of the coders(Sam Jackson and Chris 'Tux Lloyd) had to put in more hours to complete what was necessary to get a functional and bug free program. The second issue the internet downtime caused was a loss of work as when uploading the latest copy to git there was an error in doing so. We then tried to access the project which was stored on the M: drive however, this was unaccessable. We decided to leave the university grounds and head down into town to find somewhere with a working internet connection. Here the two coders managed to get access to the temporarily back up internet and M: drive and obtain a copy of the latest code. From here it was then uploaded to GitHub with an issue that meant the latest CSS code would be Lost. This meant Aleksandra Badya had to put more work into finishing of the design of the system.

The team performed outstandingly overall. However special credit has to go to Chris 'Tux' Lloyd and Samuel Jackson as they worked perfectly as a team. Between them they managed to sort out a large quantity of the bugs and get a large chunk of the system operational. The rest of the team fulfilled their roles and more, they managed to do what was asked of them and more.

This should sum up in one page what the project achieved (what parts of the program work and what parts do not; which documents are in a good state and which are not), what difficulties stood in the way of project completion and how

they were overcome, and how well the team performed.

2 Historical account of project

(look at gannt chart)

This should outline the main events over the lifetime of the project, and how the project team acted to produce a plan and to deliver a product within a constrained lifetime. This should take no more than two pages of A4.

3 Final State of project

This should give a summary of which parts of the project are perceived as correct and which are not. It is as well to be as accurate as possible here - more marks will be deducted for problems that are not declared but are detected by the markers than for problems that are declared in the final report. As well as missing or erroneous features in the software, known problems with documents should be included here.

4 Performance of each team member

4.1 Tom Reed

Tom's duties as Q.A. Manager were to manage other documentors and delegate documenting tasks where he felt appropriate. He performed brilliantly especially as the deadline approached, he assigned tasks well and made sure they were completed. He also kept Christopher Marriott (Project Manager) up to date on goings and asked for more work when finished all current work. He was an essential part of the team.

4.2 Chris 'Tux' Lloyd

Tux performed outstandingly. His time and effort put into the code was brilliant and he worked well with the rest of the team. He informed people of changes and explained things clearly. He worked especially well in tandem with Samuel Jackson. He put countless hours of work into the project and helped solve numerous bugs.

4.3 Samuel Jackson

Sam's performance was outstanding. Not only was he vital in the functionality of the overall system but on occasion performed as a brilliant project leader when Christopher Marriott was away.

4.4 Silhab Csoma

Silhab's work on data structures and work on algorithms was essential to the working of the system. Without these in place there would be no way of storing monster and user info. She worked well in a team and completed all tasks set for her.

4.5 Alexsandra Badya

Alex worked well in the team. She provided vital support to the team with git.

4.6 Dave Clark

4.7 Mike Steel

4.8 Matt Whitmore

The project leader should write a half page description of the duties and performance of each group member, including the group leaders themselves. This should be agreed with the group member if possible, and it should state whether agreement was reached, and if not, should give an explanation why not.

5 Critical evaluation of the team and project

This should be no more than a page in length and should address the following subjects:

- How did the team perform as a whole, and how could that have been improved?
- How could the project have been improved?
- What were the most important lessons learned about software projects and about working in teams?

End report/1(draft)

REFERENCES

[1] *N/A*

End report/1(draft)

DOCUMENT HISTORY

| Version | CCF No. | Date | Changes made to Document | Changed by |
|---------|---------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
| 1.0 | N/A | 2013-01-30 | Initial creation | dac26 |