# Elaboration Phase Status Assessment

## 1. Assessment against Objectives of the Elaboration Phase

### 1.1 Has ‘end-to-end production level support for the most critical, core (risky, difficult) use case, using the chosen software architecture, in the intended production environment’ been achieved?

*Yes*, we *have* achieved this objective. This is demonstrated in a short video walkthrough which may be accessed from here: [*Video*](https://interact2.csu.edu.au/webapps/blackboard/execute/groupFileExchange?course_id=_67345_1&action=LIST&group_id=_80585_1)

During the Inception Phase, we identified *create and add a task, storing a task, edit task and update database, delete task and update database, assign task as completed, and give and store points* as the critical core use case. This is because:

*the mentioned tasks are vital for the basic functioning of the application.*

We identified *the model-view-controller (MVC)* as a feasible approach to addressing the requirements of the projects as outlined in the updated and continuing Architectural Notebook, which may be accessed here:[*link*](https://github.com/commet003/ITC303-9-Team1-Project/blob/testing/LCAM%20Documents/LCAMFinalArchitecture.docx)

The main architectural elements which are demonstrated by the executable architecture are:

*the presentation layer, application layer, and the hardware abstraction layer*

Those aspects of the architecture not addressed include:

*the external database and physical android phone.*

Correct support for the CCRD use case by the executable architecture *was* achieved as demonstrated and documented in the following user acceptance tests.

* *create and add task*
* *set task title and description*
* *set due date and time (optional)*
* *save task in the database*
* *edit an existing task*
* *assign task a ‘complete’ status*
* *delete an existing task*

Actual test results can be accessed from here: [*test link*](https://github.com/commet003/ITC303-9-Team1-Project/tree/testing/Testing)

### 1.2 Have all critical and significant project risks been addressed and mitigated?

The following list identifies the most critical and significant product, technical and project management risks to the project. Mitigation strategies identified and applied and the current status of the risk are also listed.

*Risk: incomplete items in iterations.*

*Type: project management.*

*Priority: High. Impact: High. Probability: Medium*

*Description: Allocated iterations are either incomplete or partially complete.*

*Mitigation: Follow team charter*

*Current Status: Open and ongoing*

For others please see [link](https://github.com/commet003/ITC303-9-Team1-Project/blob/testing/LCAM%20Documents/RevisedLCAMRiskList.xlsx).

### 1.3 Have the initial Vision, Requirements (Scope), or Architecture changed?

During the Elaboration Phase, our understanding of the projects aims evolved as follows:

Vision

*<insert list of conceptual changes in the Vision here*

*Change: <identify change here>*

*Reason: <explain why the change was made here>*

*>*

*Change: limit customization options, such as font colour and size.*

*Reason: every customization adds another layer of complexity.*

Requirements (Functional)

*<insert list of added or removed use cases here*

*Change: <identify change here>*

*Reason: <explain why the change was made here>*

*>*

*Change: not counting or keeping track of number of tasks deleted.*

*Reason: It was deemed unnecessary because points are based on number of tasks completed.*

Requirements (Non-Functional)

*Change: Secure communication with external database will be achieved by using Cloud Firestore*

*Reason: for android application, it simplifies querying, syncing, and storing data.*

Architecture

*The architecture remains the same*

### 1.4 Have the initial Project Plan or Master Test Plan changed?

During the Elaboration Phase, our understanding of the best way to implement the project evolved as follows:

Project Plan

*<insert list of changes in the Project Plan here*

*Change: <identify change here>*

*Change: leader board logic*

*Reason: Users can compete and compare points with other users.*

Master Test Plan

*Change: System level testing will be done to see if application functions as expected.*

*Reason: Implementing testing such as unit testing yields no benefit, but adds unnecessary complexity and delays.*

## 2. Deliverables

*For each deliverable:*

### 2.x *<insert Document/Artefact name here>.*

*<identify any key points you wish to make about this particular deliverable>*

*<identify any issues encountered in producing the Document/Artefact, otherwise report as ‘No Issues’>*

### 2.1 *LCAM Iteration Plan 4*

* *merging branches proved challenging.*
* *work items completed satisfactorily.*

### 2.2 *Revised Project Vision*

* *the legal aspects such as patents and trademarks were removed as it was deemed unnecessary and beyond the scope of the assignment.*
* *Interactive leader board to enhance gamification.*
* *Minimise customisable options to reduce complexity.*

## 3. General Issues

*For each issue*

### 3.x *<insert Issue name here>*

*<identify any key points you wish to make about this particular non-deliverable-associated issue>*

*<say whether the issue is ongoing or resolved – if ongoing say what you are doing to monitor and manage it>*

### 3.1 Communication

*Communication remains an open and current risk.*

*This is an ongoing risk and team members need to adhere to the team charter to meet agreed objectives.*

## 4 Summary – Overall Project Progress

*Team 1 has met most of the set objectives. However, there were issues with merging branches which will require in the next iteration.*

*Another challenge was performing thorough testing, such as unit testing. However, testing will be done at system level to assess outputs based on selected inputs and determine if the application functions as expected.*

*The ongoing risks are communication, merging branches, and technical competency regarding addressing issues that emerges during the course of this assignment in a timely manner.*