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## Revision History

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version Number** | **Date** | **Author** | **Comment** |
| 1.0 | 24/11/2020 | Kai Tindall | Initial draft of the document |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Document References

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification Number** | **Description** | **Version** | **Reference Number** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Acronym** | **Definition** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Glossary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Word** | **Definition** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Actions from previous review

## Have the previous actions been made?

Not applicable, first review of its kind.

## Were they effective?

See above.

## What could be changed to increase effectiveness next time?

See above.

# Scope

## Has any work in the project been done that might be out of scope?

No. So far only documentation and research work has been done.

## Has the scope changed from the last review?

No.

## What effect will the change have and what needs to happen as a result?

None.

# Timescale

## How is the project doing against the plan?

The project is currently one week behind schedule. The plan shows the project should have been on the software testing description, however the project has just finished the requirements specification and has moved on to the design document.

## Could this be fixed with a proposed action to re-align?

Yes. Action proposed below.

## Does the plan need to be altered and how?

No. Project only behind by one week now.

# Actions for next review

Spend two more days than planned week commencing 30th November 2020. This should give enough time to catch up and should mean by the next minor review the project should be closer to having a zero-time difference from the plan.

# Additional Comments

As the project is using an agile approach, the design document can alter with time if it needs to be more specific. This means that the design document doesn’t need to be perfect the first time around, it just needs to be good enough to build the first prototype.

This also means designing the project to be adaptable and expandable to ensure the design can change and it won’t cause too much technical debt.