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# Overall process

Working on the “Traffic Lights Simulation” software application has been a long and difficult process. The work on the project has been accomplished in two broad time periods - being the first and second block of the second study semester.

During the first period meetings with the client and teacher were present. Arrangements were made and all the requirements were set. Most of the time was spent on creating and delivering documentation about the project. There were four main documents:

1. Project Plan - describing the project as a whole, describing the developers, being students, and the product being the assignment.
2. User Requirements Document - describing the requirements set by the client.
3. Design Document - describing the structure of the software application to be built. Class diagram and Sequence diagrams were illustrated.
4. Test Plan - describing the testing way of the application to be created. All the situations were covered, with all the needed exceptions and “monkey” behaviors.

### Week 1

During week number 1, a meeting with the client and the teacher was held. Assigned roles at the team were discussed and first questions regarding the Project Plan were asked.

Roles were assigned as follows:

* Bilger Yahov - being the Project Leader
* Oleksandr Suprunenko - being the Chairmain
* Ilia Nikushev - being the Quality Manager
* Georgi Chishirkov - being the Agenda keeper
* Lyubomir Dimov - being the Minutes keeper/Secretary
* Mengchuan Liu - being a girl ☺

All Minutes can be found in Appendix A, all Agendas can be found in Appendix B.

Team members started working on the Project Plan. The work has been divided and everybody worked on a part from the document. As a result the document was created.

### Week 2

During week number 2, Project Plan draft remarks were discussed. The group also asked the teacher should they use the provided DLL by Fontys.

The group got feedback for the first version of the Project Plan.

The team worked on finishing the Project Plan. Apart from that creating the User Requirements Specification document had started.

### Week 3

During week number 3, final remarks about the Project Plan were gotten. Feedback for the initial version of the User Requirements Specification document was gotten.

# Understandings made with the group and the teacher

# Separation of work

# Choices and problems

# Personal Evaluations

### Bilger Yahov Evaluation

### Lyubomir Dimov Evaluation

The project was a big challenge for everyone from the group and our ambition to make it perfect was driving us forward. The cooperation in the group was perfect, we rarely had any disagreements, we rather discussed and the problem and made solutions.

In the beginning of the project I didn’t have any clue how are we going to do the project and how is the final product going to look like. The process of making use cases and after that UI, designing the class diagram and constructing sequence diagrams gave me almost clear vision of what we wanted in our application.

In the beginning we had to discuss and think about functional and nonfunctional requirements of the project. This was a very tricky part in which I had to think forward in the future about what might happen, how is the application supposed to behave. We came up with ideas which were accepted by our teacher, he also gave us feedback on how to express ourselves in the use cases.

After finishing the URS, we knew what are the functional and nonfunctional requirements. We also had an idea of what kind of User Interface we are developing. Now was time for Designing the class diagram and making sequence diagrams based on the previously specified use cases. I learned many things from them during the phase of designing the class diagram, Ilia and Georgi were the people who did most of the class diagram and I really liked their approach. We had meetings and a final version of the class diagram was finished, followed by sequence diagrams on which I worked hardly.

During the implementation phase, we worked in a very structured way, we tracked the tasks and tried to develop in Agile approach. It was very interesting to work in a group like this. I learned extremely much and I am very satisfied. My colleagues showed me many tricks and I learned some new skills. The project was very challenging but the final result is very satisfying.

I am glad I participated in this course and I was in a group with such a nice people.

### Ilia Nikushev Evaluation

I am disappointed at how this project had been given so many years in a row. We were tempted to use already done solutions, but we went for our own, so we would make good practice. This project would have been a lot better to be made in Agile, from start to finish. The documentation is pointless if the product is not working, you cannot plan every single step in advance.

For future projects it would be better to not use Sequence Diagrams; Use Cases. In the Development phase, Use cases are pointless. Instead of wasting time on Use cases, it would be better to use something similar to Flow charts, as they depict the IDEA of how an activity should work, and its outcome, not word by word. A programmer does not need documentation when they can read the code for themselves; they just need to plan out how things are made. Most programmers stick to Pseudo code.

The team had its flaws and not everybody had the same amount of time to spend on the project. In the end we made it through and got to a good solution.

I personally did not learn anything new.

I tried to lower my standards for quality of the project, due to not all participants having the same level of knowledge, but it difficult to make a good project with rotten design.

Overall the project was ok, nothing special. Would have been a lot better if it was a real life project, or aimed to ‘Innovate’.

### Georgi Chishirkov Evaluation

Overall the project left me with a positive impression. The task had been given for a few years before us but we managed to make it our own. As always we had to do a lot of unnecessary documentation which only proved to waste time and had no real effect once we started writing the code.

For future projects I think Fontys should come up with a newer idea and maybe throw away having to do another waterfall project like ProP. Focus on something that could be ideal for an agile way of programming.

The team was definitely the best I have worked with during my time at Fontys. I wish more projects would let us take 6 people since this lets us divide the work far better. As always there were one or two things that were left out that I would have liked to see in the project, but we decided to focus on the core of what we promised instead.

I did learn a few things from working with the synchronization of traffic lights and cars. Overall I was happy with the work during the implementation phase not so much with the starting documentation phase.

### Mengchuan Liu Evaluation

Even though the project is old, it is still a good practice for me.

This last several months, I really worked on improving my teamwork skills. I had a much better understanding of team dynamics and how to contribute more effectively in the various roles and stages of team development.

I struggled a bit in dealing with my tasks. My colleagues, especially Bilger, tried a lot to help me. He explains me how to start my tasks and helps me to fix my errors. I did learn not only from my tasks, but also from my colleagues’ part. And in the end, we manage to make a good project.

Overall we have a great team and finish our own beautiful project. But it is better to come up some new projects. As a student, we always have more willing to work on a new project.

### Oleksandr Suprunenko Evaluation

# Appendix A: Minutes

Date of Meeting: 24 – Feb– 2016

Time: 13:00 - 13:20

Minutes

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* The development method will be discussed next block.
* For grading the process of work is also important
* Work has to be separated evenly
* At the end of each black there is a peer review
* The client talked with one of the teachers about the project
* The client has more information what he really wants and he has no professional background.
* The city is small about 3000 villagers, but in rush hours the cars are much more than usual
* The program should be able to simulate types of crossroads and the actions going on this crossroads.
* The program has to be able to simulate crossroad action with pedestrians, cars, ambulance.
* The final outcome that the client wants is that there should be no accidents
* It should be possible to simulate different types of situations
* In the program there should be a matrix of 3x3 – 9 crossings
* Pausing the simulation should be possible.
* The client should be able to give an input to the application – number of cars, number of pedestrians.
* There should be possible to block one of the roads – road maintenance
* No parked cars will be illustrated on the simulations
* Saving the simulation should be possible
* Undo action should be possible
* Unlimited number of cars and pedestrians
* Preparation for next meeting is important.
* Good agenda should be prepared.

Date of Meeting: 29 – Feb– 2016

Time: 13:00 - 13:20

Minutes

With teacher:

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* Feedback on the project plan was given
* Project plan is almost complete
* Project plan should be written more formal
* We should be more flexible with the roles in the project, we should change regularly
* Net 3.0 was chosen because of compatibility
* Project risks are nicely specified
* Concrete dates for the milestones has to be specified
* We should be working with concrete schedule
* Test plan for the specification, not a unit testing
* Second page of the PP has to be placed on the Organization

With Mr. George

* Undo/Redo - if possible the client would like it
* Start application UC
* Install application UC
* Copy a crossing UC
* Statics about how the stimulation is done with a specific layout
* Moscow has to be made about the requirements

Date of Meeting: 7 – March– 2016

Time: 13:00 – 13:45

Minutes

With teacher:

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* Milestones written in the project plan were mistaken and changed during the meeting
* Project plan was graded with a grade 6,5
* Final Version of URS has to be delivered by Friday night
* In the use cases, all kind of exceptions should be handled
* Use case Loading Grid has a mistake
* We should be more concrete about pedestrians, not so vague
* Sensor has to be specified
* UC #23 has to be substituted
* User interface in the URS document has to be specified as an initial version
* MoSCoW changes – more things should go on Must, and some has to be in coulds
* How are the accidents going to be simulated?
* Sequence diagrams for all musts

With Mr. George

* Graphical user interface was explained to the client
* The format of the results of simulation was settled.

Date of Meeting: 14 – March– 2016

Time: 10:30- 11:00

Minutes

With teacher:

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* URS review was given
* New use case has to be specified “Set Green Time”
* Variation in the green time should be possible
* The group has to think of implementing rotating a crossing
* Mark 7 for URS
* Test Plan review
* With test plan we should be as specific as possible
* To be able to test monkey behavior
* Column with preconditions for tests in Testplan
* Class diagram has to be specific

Date of Meeting: 21 – March– 2016

Time: 13:00 – 13:20

Minutes

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* The preconditions were not very clear in each Test case - for example: Starting simulation
* The testplan has to be made in a way that person who is outside the project can make the tests only by looking at the testplan.
* Undo/Redo precondition in the testplan should give more information about the situation
* Class diagram has to be displayed in a UML notation
* In sequence diagrams – when specifying objects and classes they has to be present in the class diagram of the project.
* Sequence diagrams has to be based on use cases from URS
* GUI is satisfying
* There is no need of crossing rotation

Date of Meeting: 24 – March– 2016

Time: 13:00 - 13:20

Minutes

With teacher:

* Everyone attended the meeting.
* Vague feedback on testplan
* By “#” we denote a protected data field
* Sequence Diagrams and use cases have to be connected
* Mr.Kuah accepted the reason we use ‘X’ in sequence diagrams
* Update interface in the MainForm will be updating the graphical user interface and repaint
* Teacher keeps the feedback vague because he wants us to learn by ourselves

Date of Meeting: 01 – June– 2016

Time: 13:30 – 13:50

Minutes

* Do synchronization between components this week
* Next week, have stable prototype
* Process report - have individual contribution
* Presentation - free, talk what you have created, if proud talk about it
* After week 6 - have working prototype and send it
* Polish bugs afterward
* During assessment, if they worked on it they should be able to answer questions
* Turn off resize
* "is good" - Kuah 2016

# Appendix B: Agendas

## February 22, 2016

13:00

Type of Meeting: Questions and introduction

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee: Chung Kuah

1. Greeting,
2. Assigned roles within the team,
3. Project plan draft questions.

## February 29, 2016

13:00 pm

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Mr. George being the client
3. Greetings
4. Assigned roles within the team
5. Open issues
6. Project Plan draft remarks
7. Additional questions

* Use of the provided DLL from Fontys

1. Adjustments ( if any )

## March 7, 2016

13:00 pm

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Mr. George being the client
3. Greetings
4. Open issues
5. Project Plan final remarks
6. URS document remarks
7. Adjustments ( if any )
8. Agree on time for next meeting

## March 14, 2016

10:30 am

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Mr. George being the clien
3. Greetings
4. Open issues
5. Test plan - remarks
6. Improved URS – remarks
7. Additional questions
8. Adjustments ( if any )

## March 21, 2016

13:00 pm

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Mr. George being the client
3. Greetings
4. Open issues
5. Test plan final version – remarks
6. Design document – first version
7. Additional questions

* Agree on the use of rotate functionality with the client.

1. Adjustments ( if any )

## March 24, 2016

12:30 pm

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Mr. George being the client
3. Greetings
4. Open issues
5. Test plan– remarks
6. Design document – remarks
7. Adjustments ( if any )

## April 25, 2016

09:00

Type of Meeting: Feedback and review

Meeting Chairman: Oleksandr Suprunenko

Invitee:

1. Chung Kuah being the teacher
2. Greetings
3. Assigned roles within the team
4. Open issues
5. Documentation overall feedback
6. Peer reviews feedback
7. Adjustments ( if any )