

Project Plan Feedback

Group	02
Document Version	1.0, 0.4. 1.0 delivered on time and graded below. 0.4 (an earlier version No.) delivered late comments included.
Overall grade	D 0.4 would be a B

1 Document

1.1 Cover material (D)

Title, version No. and status provided. Missing are the authors (IDs do not help); configuration reference; date; name & address of Department, copyright notice; headers and proper footers, table of contents. 0.4 addresses many of these. Purpose presented, though it is not intended as a point of interaction with the client in this process. The scope is covered but the objectives do not say what will be achieved, only what will be delivered.

0.4 would be a B grade.

2 Overview of proposed system (B)

The platforms are clearly identified. Versions for LAMP could be provided. Citations for the platforms could be provided. Restatement of the functional requirements (without proper citation, q.v.) does not provide an architecture and the non-functional requirements in 2.2.4-7 in 0.4 do not add to the understanding. Three components are identified but their interactions are not. How and when will they interact? Their relationship to the platforms is not explicit. Offline storage by RPSRrec is mentioned (§2.3) and a mechanism for this would help. Only one class of user is identified: this conflicts with §3.1.

3 Use-cases (C)

0.4 improves on the overall structure (removing duplication). Addition of references to FR is a good idea, but serves to highlight the many discrepancies between the requirements and this design. Some examples: FR2 does not mention "Login"; FR1 and FR2 site and visit concepts are not covered under "AndroidOS" (which is not a subsystem identified in (§2.2); FR4 mentions two (optional) pictures; "species details" are not mentioned in FR4 (is this a change of terminology or lack of precision?). RPSR will need a "finished recording – you may transmit" interaction. The cases for "Website" represent huge feature creep (See §6.3) and do not cover the RPSRview FR8 and FR9.

4 User interface design (C)

The "Android Interface" (presumably RPSRrec and AndroidOS) does not relate to the use cases. Login (if required) is not represented; it does represent the

missing site and visit concepts. The major data collection elements are covered, but sequence is not represented: 4.1.1 presumably moves to 4.1.2 but where does “Confirm” then lead? How is 4.1.3 reached? Does “Edit species return to 4.1.2?

The images under “Web interface” are not legible. The relationship to the use cases is not clear from the text, but most would seem to be covered. The missing FR8 and FR9 are crucially missing.

5 Gantt chart (F)

This is missing from 1.0.

0.4 does not identify tasks (See SE.QA.08, §2.2). It should allocate people, or at least teams with associated people, to the tasks. It would be good to see review dates (with staff) for the test and design specs. The review of the prototype seems a good step, it takes 3 days – who is doing that and what is its outcome? Who will do the “update”. Communication (RPSRrec to database) seems absent, though what will the demo achieve? Perhaps communication comes later? The plan could be improved therefore by a finer breakdown of tasks, with their outcomes and more dependencies between them, allowing for progress monitoring and thus implementation of the slippage risk mitigation reported in §§6.2 and 6.3.

Version 0.4 would be a B grade.

6 Risk analysis (B)

Good list. Unknown and untried technologies could be represented, with consequent early design and testing of those components.

7 REFERENCES and DOCUMENT CHANGE HISTORY (D)

References are required. These were added in 0.4, but the entries are incomplete: full bibliographic references, with version numbers are necessary.

Document history should end with the current version (i.e. Version 1.0 should include what happened to take it to Version 1.0). 0.4 seems possibly to get this right.

0.4 would be a B grade.