# **Project Plan Feedback**

Group	03
Document Version	8.0
Overall grade	В

### 1 Document (A)

Authors, configuration reference (SE\_xx\_PM\_01), document and copyright notice are missing from the front page. Pages should be numbered n of m. Comprehensive and clear introduction.

# 2 Overview of proposed system (C)

The requirements spec names RPSRview and RPSRrec, these could usefully be used in this description to identify components and clarify the architecture description. The platforms are not all considered: a web server will be needed; ndroid facilities (GPS, Camera) will be needed; persistent storage for the Android application will be needed. Id be a good addition.

### 3 Use-cases (B)

Good set of cases. A number of cases will have sequential dependencies, for example, a species can only be recorded as part of a site recording; editing can only take place after recording. Some indication of dependencies would be an improvement. Useful additions would be recognition of the DB and of the Android platform and the cases they handle (storage, imageg capture, GPS).

## 4 User interface design (A)

Selecting the reserve by GPS is an additional feature, as are Explore and Explore search". "Recorder view" on the web site is beyond the specification.

### 5 Gantt chart (C)

The individuals or teams responsible for each task are not identified and the tasks do not have identifiers (as per SE.QA.08, section 2.2). Work must be shared out and dependencies identified so that all staff can be occupied and so that later tasks can be started when earlier tasks have delivered. This will also allow for progress monitoring and corrective planning as necessary. Review meetings could usefully be included. The components available in the demo system for early December could be identified.

## 6 Risk analysis (B)

Specific technical risks – where how to implement a feature or how to use external technology - could have been included and fed into the scheduling of design and implementation for those features.

Monitoring slippage and re-scheduling actions are not helped by the limited granulatity of the task list.

# 7 REFERENCES and DOCUMENT CHANGE HISTORY(C)

There should be references, with versions: at least the Requirements Specification on which this is based should be identified. Good document history.

NwH 21/11/14