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## Acronyms
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## Glossary

|  |  |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
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# Actions from previous review

## Have the previous actions been made?

Not applicable. First review.

## Were they effective?

Not applicable. First review.

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

Not applicable. First review.

# Timescale

## Plan Position

Software Test Description.

## Actual Position

Software Design Document

## Reason for Difference

Languages and compilers coursework was due in last week so progress on the project was postponed until this week.

# Testing

## Have new unit tests been put into place?

No tests have been created yet due to code not being written yet.

## Are they relevant to the code being tested?

See above.

## Do they test only the unit they are supposed to test?

See above.

## Is code coverage above the mandated percentage?

See above.

# Actions for next review

Spend an extra two days on the project next week to compensate for the postponement.

# Additional Comments

Allocating extra time has been effective so far.

Being on a discord call with someone has enforced accountability which has helped to progress the call more. However, this isn’t bulletproof and can sometimes lead to getting drawn in helping other people. This, while is good morally, can lead to time previously allocated to project being used up.