

PROCESS REPORT

LARP EVENT SOFTWARE SOLUTION



Version 2.0

GROUP 34

Dholon Akter | Nr. 3047040

Chanelle Hart | Nr. 3323781

Talia Santos | Nr. 3294579

Thanh Hoàng | Nr. 3353362

# Version History

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version #** | **Implemented By** | **Revision Date** | **Approved By** | **Approval Date** | **Reason** |
| 1.0 | T. Hoàng | 12th Feb | - | - | Layout of document  First meeting information |
| 1.1 | C. Hart | 9th Mar | - | - | Modifications  Update |
| 2.0 | T. Hoàng | 16th Mar | - | - | Update |

Table of Contents

[Version History 2](#_Toc508979763)

[Week 1.5 5](#_Toc508979764)

[Meeting #0.5 5](#_Toc508979765)

[Task Delegation 5](#_Toc508979766)

[Week 2 6](#_Toc508979767)

[Meeting #2.0 6](#_Toc508979768)

[Week 3 8](#_Toc508979769)

[Meeting #3.0 8](#_Toc508979770)

[Meeting #3.5 9](#_Toc508979771)

[Week 4 11](#_Toc508979772)

[Meeting #3.5 11](#_Toc508979773)

[Task Delegation 11](#_Toc508979774)

[Mark justification 12](#_Toc508979775)

[Individual Reflection 13](file:///C:\Program%20Files\Git\ProPGroup34\ProcessReportV1.1.docx#_Toc508979776)

[Dholon Akter 14](#_Toc508979777)

[SWOT Analysis 14](#_Toc508979778)

[Learning moments 14](#_Toc508979779)

[Self-evaluation of spent effort 14](#_Toc508979780)

[Improvements for next project 14](#_Toc508979781)

[Chanelle Hart 15](#_Toc508979782)

[SWOT Analysis 15](#_Toc508979783)

[Learning moments 15](#_Toc508979784)

[Evaluation of spent effort 15](#_Toc508979785)

[Improvements for next project 15](#_Toc508979786)

[Talia Santos 16](#_Toc508979787)

[SWOT Analysis 16](#_Toc508979788)

[Learning moments 16](#_Toc508979789)

[Self-evaluation of spent effort 16](#_Toc508979790)

[Improvements for next project 16](#_Toc508979791)

[Thanh Hoàng 17](#_Toc508979792)

[SWOT Analysis 17](#_Toc508979793)

[Learning moments 17](#_Toc508979794)

[Self-evaluation of spent effort 17](#_Toc508979795)

[Improvements for next project 17](#_Toc508979796)

[Appendices 18](#_Toc508979797)

[Appendix A: Report of the interview with the client 18](#_Toc508979798)

[Appendix B: Process Report Setup 18](#_Toc508979799)

# Week 1.5

## Meeting #0.5

Date: Monday 12th February 2018  
Time: 10:00 AM  
Location: Fontys R1 2nd floor, Common Area  
Attendees: Talia, Thanh, Chanelle

#### Agenda

1. Company’s name and logo
2. Project plan v1.0
3. Questions for client

#### Company’s name and logo

Discusion: The name for the company should relate to our names. EL from Chanelle, ON from Dholon, IA from Talia and AH from Thanh, forming ELONIAH

Final decision: ELONIAH (see logo at top)

#### Project plan V1.0

Discussion: The cover and set up

#### Questions for client

Discussion: What the questions will be for the client

## Task Delegation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Start Date** | **Assigned to** | **End Date** | **Completed by** |
| Company’s name | 12 Feb ‘18 | Everyone | 12 Feb ‘18 | Everyone |
| Company’s logo | 12 Feb ‘18 | C. Hart | 20 Feb ‘18 | T. Hoàng |
| Project plan v1.0 | 12 Feb ‘18 | Everyone | 20 Feb ‘18 | T. Santos |
| Questions for client | 12 Feb ‘18 | Everyone | 20 Feb ‘18 | Everyone |

# Week 2

## Meeting #2.0

Date: Tuesday 20th February 2018  
Time: 3:00 PM  
Location: Fontys R1 2nd floor, Common Area  
Attendees: Project Team, Mentor, Client

**Roles:**

* Chair: Talia
* Secretary: Thanh
* Minute taker: Chanelle

#### Agenda

1. Presenting the revised project plan.
2. Presenting what the team have researched for identification methods and ask for the mentor’s advice.

**Advice on revised project plan**

Discussion and advice over:

* The following parts of the document were not up to par: problem description, project statement’s introduction.
* Phrasing of document was leading to misunderstanding.
* Source code vs. Licensing the software
* Advised to add the following: detailed process of application, architecture, workflow diagram
* Advised to prepare our presentation of prototype to the client soon.

**Advice on ID methods**

Discussion and advice over:

* RFID:
  + Cost-efficient: cheap, reprogrammable and better than plastified paper
  + Obtainable to use as a demo at the end of this block.
  + Can be used in parallel with barcode for extra security.
* Final decision for QR Code: should be used as tickets

**Extra points discussed during the meeting**

*System risks*

The mentor brings up risks for us to consider. Namely, he suggests a few cases where the applications crash (database issues), or the ID method fails (smudged barcode).

*Conduct of meeting*

The mentor suggests we do the rotation on positions for next meetings, so everyone can learn each role

# Week 3

## Meeting #3.0

Date: Tuesday 6th March 2018  
Time: 3:00 PM – 3:30PM  
Location: Fontys R1 2nd floor, Common Area  
Attendees: Project Team, Mentor

**Roles:**

* Chair: Chanelle
* Secretary: Thanh
* Minute taker: Thanh

#### Agenda

1. Ask for mentor’s advice on what we have researched for RFID cards
2. Ask for mentor’s advice before meeting with the client.
3. Ask for mentor’s advice on the architecture we made according to previous feedback.
4. Present our bare layout for the setup document to see if we may be missing something

**ID Methods**

*Barcode*

We discuss the risk of losing the barcode and the respective solutions: re-verify ID, get another card at a price or relocate data.

*Bracelet*

The mentor proposes categorizing participants by their bracelet colors as a visual aid for visitors and staff. We should also note the price of the bracelet.

**Architecture**

The mentor gives us an example draft of a blueprint: how all applications are connected to each other and to the database.

He also proposes a decentralized system for databases so that when one fails, the whole system stays functional. A backup database was also mentioned.

The mentor stresses on the risk of a database crashing and reminds us about the robustness of our software solution

The mentor suggests things we can include in our architecture: back-up mechanisms, availability of database. He also mentions that we should opt for a more networked design.

**Setup document**

The mentor suggests changes to layout of the document: the MoSCoW section should be an appendix.

The mentor suggests a detailed description of all processes involved in the architecture.

The mentor suggests adding a ‘Dependencies’ section to the document, stating in details the dependencies and risks of our software.

**Project plan**

The mentor remarks that the Table of Contents looks good.

Meeting #3.5

Date: Tuesday 6th March 2018  
Time: 3:30 PM – 4:00PM  
Location: Fontys R1 2nd floor, Common Area  
Attendees: Project Team, Mentor, Client

**Roles:**

* Chair: Chanelle
* Secretary: Thanh
* Minute taker: Thanh

**Agenda**

1. Propose our budget
2. Discuss how to handle source code after the project is over
3. Present our research and proposal for identification in events
4. Discuss further into the website: the must-have's, should-have's and would-be-nice-to-have's

**Budget**

The client thinks the budget requires further justifications: hours spent and the licenses necessary.

The client agrees with a proposed amount of 5000 euros; however, our mentor thinks it can be improved.

**Handling of source code**

If we want to sell the software as a license with an expiration date – thereby keeping our work copyrighted – we will need a maintenance contract to the client.

**Identification: cards or bracelets**

The client prefers bracelets despite its higher price (negligible to him). He thinks it is more personal and harder to lose than a card. He thinks categorizing people by their bracelet is a good idea and he also suggests having different member access for different bracelets.

The client emphasizes security of method: if the price is higher but the device is more personal and cannot be swapped from person to person, we should opt for that device.

**Website**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Must-have | Nice-to-have |
| The client mentions:   1. Visual appeal 2. Should be informative to visitors 3. Commercial functions: tickets, reservations and cancellations 4. Personal information of visitors *must* be carefully stored. | 1. About page for the client’s company. (Proposed and approved) 2. About page for the event itself (Proposed) 3. Room for feedback and reviews (Client) 4. Links to social media (Client) 5. Picture gallery (Mentor) |

**Extra points discussed during the meeting**

*Event*

We proposed to the client bundled prices and he thinks it would be an interesting option to consider.

*Application*

The application will run on Windows, only the website will run on mobile devices. However, the client thinks it will be fancy if we have a mobile app for the event.

# Week 4

## Meeting #3.5

Date: Tuesday 13th March 2018  
Time: 3:50 PM – 4:25PM  
Location: Fontys R1 2nd floor, Common Area  
Attendees: Project Team, Mentor   
Absentee: Dholon, due to unforeseen circumstances

**Roles:**

* Chair: Thanh
* Secretary: Thanh
* Minute taker: Chanelle and Talia

**Agenda**

1. We will ask for the mentor’s feedback on the Project Plan v2.0
2. We will ask for the mentor’s feedback on the Setup Document v1.0
3. We will briefly update the mentor on our progress as a whole

Meeting had to be cut short due to the mentor having previous engagements. The next ProP Meeting will be on Tuesday, and will be extended due to this meeting’s time  
being cut short.

**Feedback**

We have assisted the mentor in setting up his local git repository. He will inform us when he will be ready to give us feedback. In the meantime, he will let us know after he has pushed the comments on git.

**Security**

We have to consider the security of the website when it comes to transactions: we’re  
currently limited to the knowledge from WEB1. We may have to learn more.

## Task Delegation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Start Date** | **Assigned to** | **End Date** | **Completed by** |
| The architecture | 13th Mar ‘18 | T.Hoàng | - | - |

Next meeting will address points on this week’s agenda and potentially future issues after we have received the mentor’s feedback.

# Mark justification

(details)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Mark** | **Reason** |
| Dholon Akter | 10 |  |
| Chanelle Hart | 10 |  |
| Talia Santos | 10 |  |
| Thanh Hoàng | 10 |  |

# Individual Reflection

# Dholon Akter

## SWOT Analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
|  |  |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
|  |  |

## Learning moments

## Self-evaluation of spent effort

## Improvements for next project

# Chanelle Hart

## SWOT Analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| Documenting skills  Organizational skills Presentation skills | Lack proactivity  Lack punctuality |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
| Get ahead in deadlines  Start healthy habits – sleep early | Loads of third-party assignments |

## Learning moments

* Everyone has their own view and style for the project, and our ideas tend to clash. I learned that with patience and cooperation, we can create something better than our individual ideas.
* During the 3rd meeting, I learned that we cannot accept the price our client offers us, and we have to fight for a better offer.
* I learned that an organized meeting retrieves better results than a prolonged one.

## Evaluation of spent effort

* Loads of documentations – I enjoy it.

## Improvements for next project

* (N/A - at a later date)

# Talia Santos

## SWOT Analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
|  |  |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
|  |  |

## Learning moments

## Self-evaluation of spent effort

## Improvements for next project

# Thanh Hoàng

## SWOT Analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| Grasp concepts fairly easily  Sufficiently dedicated | Troubles conveying ideas  Impatience  Taking over work too much |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
|  | Working too individually  Miscommunication |

## Learning moments

* I learned that a disorganized meeting is taxing on the team’s performance
* People are good at different things; being patient with myself when I am not good and others when they are not good will be beneficial for all parties involved.

## Self-evaluation of spent effort

The spent effort is sufficient.

## Improvements for next project

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Report of the interview with the client

## Appendix B: Process Report Setup

A sufficient structure of the process report might include the following:

* Title page
* Table of contents
* Global work division
* Week 1:
  + Minutes
  + Who did what
* Week 2:
  + Minutes
  + Who did what
* …
* Week 20:
  + Minutes
  + Who did what
* Mark justification
  + What mark do you feel you deserve
  + Justify by mentioning the strong and weak points of your system and process
* Individuals reflections
  + Strong/Weak traits that affected the project
  + Learning moments from the project
  + Evaluation of spent effort
  + Improvements for next project (what could you do better next time?)
* Appendix A: Report of the interview with the client