

COSC 305 – P10 Audit Report

Campus Marketplace (Team L04_SFF)

Auditor – Aakash Singh – 63260442

A. Introduction

This audit evaluates the progress, accuracy, tracking discipline, and overall project management effectiveness of the Campus Marketplace (Team SFF) during Milestone 1. The audit focuses on the key questions specified by the executive:

1. How accurately the team followed its charter, timeline, and Gantt chart.
2. Whether the delivered features match the milestone video and milestone claims.
3. How effectively the team tracked risks, issues, changes, decisions, and quality metrics.
4. How responsive the team has been to stakeholder needs.
5. Whether the project is on a viable path toward successful completion.

Project Audited:

- Campus Marketplace – Team L04_SFF (Audited by: Aakash Singh)

Document Organization:

Each project audit follows a consistent structure:

- (1) Introduction of the project,
- (2) Audit process and methodology,
- (3) Findings responding to executive questions,
- (4) Recommendations to increase success probability,
- (5) Conclusion.

B. Project Audit – Campus Marketplace (Team SFF)

i. Project Introduction

Project Audited: Campus Marketplace

Team: L04_SFF

Auditor: Aakash Singh

Audit Meeting Date: Tuesday, December 2 (morning)

Campus Marketplace is a student-to-student buying, selling, and donation platform. The system supports item listings, messaging, authentication, UI flows, admin functionality, and special categories such as donations. The milestone deliverables included user homepage, item listing, search & filter, messaging, admin dashboard, campus map integration, rating system, and more.

The Milestone Review identifies several Pass deliverables (Homepage, Registration, Item Listing), several Conditional Passes, and multiple Fails (Admin Dashboard, Map Integration, Money Hold System).

ii. Audit Process and Methodology

The following documents were reviewed to perform the audit:

- Milestone Review (deliverable status, changes, risks, issues)
- Gantt Chart
- Risk & Issue Log
- Decision Backlog
- Scope Change Log
- Deliverable Status Report

Unavailable Documents:

- Project Charter – Not uploaded to the GitHub repository by the 2 PM Thursday deadline.
→ Limits ability to assess alignment with Charter objectives.
- Milestone Demo Video – Provided as a Google Drive link, not the required YouTube link.

Permissions were not granted, so the video could not be reviewed.

Audit Meeting Details:

Date: Tuesday, Dec 2 (morning)

Duration: Approx. 10–12 minutes

Participants: Entire SFF team + Auditor

Purpose: Validate milestone review accuracy, clarify inconsistencies, and understand blockers.

Key Audit Questions Asked (and answered by team):

1. Were video features implemented at recording time?
2. Why no open risks despite multiple “Fail” deliverables?
3. How often are risks/issues/decisions updated?
4. Blockers behind Admin, Map, and Money Hold delays?
5. Dependencies affecting multiple deliverables?
6. Any stakeholder requests that were not completed?

C. Findings

1a. Charter & Timeline Accuracy

Score: 5/10

Because the Project Charter was missing, alignment with mission, objectives, and quality expectations could not be evaluated directly.

Comparing the Gantt chart to the milestone status revealed:

- Major deliverables scheduled for October were still incomplete by late November.
- Admin Dashboard, Map Integration, and Money Hold System were marked “Fail” in the Milestone Review.

The team acknowledged delaying critical functionality due to planning issues, bugs, and complexity. This reduces alignment with the planned Gantt schedule.

1b. Video vs Current Implementation

Score: 4/10

The demo video could not be reviewed because:

- It was provided as a Google Drive link (not YouTube).
- No access permissions were granted.

From the team’s response during the audit meeting:

- Not all features shown in the video were fully implemented at recording time.
- Some lacked full functionality even though UI screens existed.

Thus, alignment between video and deliverables could not be verified and appears inconsistent.

1c. Milestone Review Accuracy

Score: 6/10

The milestone review captures Pass / Conditional Pass / Fail categories clearly.

However:

- The Deliverable Status Report shows 100% on Admin Dashboard and Map Integration, conflicting with Fail status in the Milestone Review.
- Risk log shows no open risks despite multiple failed deliverables.
- Issues log does not capture blockers that impacted milestone completion.

Thus, the milestone review is partially accurate but not fully aligned with project reality.

2a, 2b, 2c. Change, Risk, and Quality Tracking

Change Tracking – Score: 8/10

- Scope changes are clearly documented.

Risk Tracking – Score: 5/10

- Risk log contains only closed risks. No open risks were recorded despite major failures.

Quality Tracking – Score: 6/10

- Pass/Conditional Pass/Fail system used, but lacks deeper QA metrics.
- Monitoring occurred weekly but was not fully aligned with actual risk conditions.

3. Responsiveness to Stakeholder Requests

Score: 9/10

Team stated all sponsor requests were implemented.

UI improvements and clarity changes fulfilled expectations.

Main delays were due to internal complexity, not stakeholder responsiveness.

D. Suggestions & Recommendations

1. Improve Risk Tracking Discipline

- Log active risks when deliverables fall behind.

2. Reinforce Timeline Management

- Add weekly Gantt updates and track slippage.

3. Strengthen Quality Metrics

- Introduce acceptance criteria and testing practices.

4. Upload Required Artifacts on Time

Ensure Charter and Video meet requirements and are submitted by the deadline.

E. Conclusion

Campus Marketplace shows strong documentation discipline and responsiveness to stakeholders.

However, missing core functionality, mismatched tracking, and missing Charter/video reduce audit confidence.

The project is viable but requires tighter planning, transparency, and prioritization moving forward.

F. Appendix – Audit Meeting Q&A

1. Were all video features implemented?

→ No, some features were visually present but lacked full functionality.

2. Why no open risks despite fails?

→ Deliverables were classified as “Fail” due to bugs or non-implementation, but risks were not updated.

3. How often were risks/issues/decisions updated?

→ Mostly weekly; some updated immediately.

4. Blockers behind delays?

→ Admin Dashboard: planning uncertainty

Map Integration: recurring bug

Money Hold: complexity → removed from scope

5. Dependencies affecting multiple deliverables?

→ Yes. Homepage, authentication, and profile were prerequisites.

6. Any sponsor requests not completed?

→ All sponsor requests were completed.