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# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 System Description

The project chosen for the class is a Soccer Team Management System, developed by TeamLeader in CMPT 370 in 2011. The software is a web-based system which relies on a database to store and access all types of information. A variety of programming languages are utilized in the project including Java, JavaScript, MySQL, CSS, and HTML. The project was developed in NetBeans IDE and will be done so for this class as well.

## 1.2 Current System Status

The system has only changed minimally since the last milestone and changes will be outlined later in the document.

# 2. Design Artifacts

This section describes the changes made to the project compared to the previous milestone.

## 2.2 Implementation of Best Practices

### Binary Mini Milestones

Like the previous milestone we have implemented binary mini milestones for this milestone. Binary Mini Milestones are used to keep group on task and on time. It allows for monitoring task completion and helps with time estimation.

To help better manage the team, new Binary Mini Milestones have been defined for Milestone 4. These Binary Mini Milestones will help better define each group members tasks and specific work and will also provide an easy and accurate way in which to monitor our progress for this milestone. The Mini Milestones are as follows:

* *Drake –* simClipse usage for our project

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Adam**–* investigate Checkstyle

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Simon**–*Continue with risk driven incremental development as well as focused prototypes

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Luke*– Continue to implement Binary Mini Milestones to set goals and tasks for each team member and continue with estimation practices

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Patrick*– Perform rigorous risk driven testing

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Steven*– investigate AspectJ and its application to our project

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Tom*– Evaluate the best practice of seeing the big picture

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

The following is the completion status of the previous Binary Mini Milestones:

* *Drake* – Download and install Maven to become familiar with its project object model file format and get the project working in netbeans.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Adam*– Learn and implement JMock and Log4J which both help for the best practice of rigorous risk driven testing.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Simon*– Investigate daily build, continuous integration, and smoke tests to be implemented into the project.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Luke*– Implement Binary Mini Milestones to set goals and tasks for each team member and look at the estimation practices to help focus on team management.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Patrick*– Learn and Implement EMMA, a free java code coverage testing tool, for our project.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Steven*– Learn and implement VisCad and NiCad, both of which are excellent tools for clone detection.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

* *Tom*– Peer Review each team members work to be compile mini reports with helpful insight into how to improve individual work.

Evaluation: **Complete** Incomplete

### Estimation

For Milestone 4, Range Estimates were chosen for the numerous benefits they will provide. They explicitly differentiate best vs most likely vs worst case scenarios for each task. They will make it less likely that individual group members mistake worst case as a most likely case. Range estimates provide clients with important information regarding the uncertainty of estimates and will decrease the risk that an estimate is considered to be a commitment.

For this milestone, all estimation practices will focus specifically on this milestone and each of the previous Binary Mini Milestones that are outlined above. There are four key rules of thumb to consider for large software projects. These rules of thumb are as follows:

1. *Rule of Thirds –* requirements/design, testing and developing all require roughly the same time.
2. *Rule of Three –* if you can’t think of three circumstances in which the design might fail, you haven’t thought about it enough.
3. *Paradox Rule –* if there is no paradox that the design must resolve, you don’t understand the problem.
4. *Law of Insatiable Appetite –* the last ten percent of performance generates one-third of the cost and two-thirds of the problems.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hours to Complete | | | | |
| Name | Item | Best Case (25%) | Most Likely Case | Worst Case  (25%) | Expected Case (50%) |
| Drake | simClipse | 2 | 2.5 | 4 | 2.83 |
| Adam | CheckStyle | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| Simon | RDD/FP | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Luke | MS/Est | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Patrick | RRDT | 4 | 4.5 | 6 | 4.83 |
| Steven | AspectJ | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5.5 |
| Tom | Big Picture | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |

### Rigorous Risk-Driven Testing

Testing is the process of making sure the product does what it is supposed, and does it correctly. Software testing is absolutely crucial, especially on large systems, as software is very prone to defects and problems. It is also very difficult to know what kind of problems and how many a system a software system has without doing some actually testing. The purpose of testing, however, is not just to find major defects with the system, but also to find issues like usability annoyances and generally just ensure the overall quality of the product.

There are two major implications to this:

1. Systems should be designed with tests in mind, that is no feature should be built before there is a method of testing that feature prepared.
2. Testing should focus on such features of the system that are most critical to the products success.

In order to accomplish this testing must focus on all parts of a project, not just the code. Useability and other non-code related parts of the system are very important when considering that an unusable system is a system that no one will buy. This does not just mean that the interface should be tested, but that parts of the system should be tested based on their relative importance to system operation. Another critical part of testing is documentation. Poorly documented bugs are difficult to find, reproduce, or fix and will end up costing an organization plenty of time and money to re-find, or ignore and fix later which of course is more expensive. This means that careful bug reports for every defect or quality issue should be carefully documented by the person finding the problem, and reports should be carefully analyze by the appropriate personnel and sorted by importance. It is important to note that not just the problem itself, but the method by which it was found is very important to document so that problems can be reproduced if needed, and also so that duplicate bugs do not get recorded into the system.

*Relevant Tools*

* Bugzilla (Bug Tracking)
* EMMA (Testing)
* TeamCity (Test Tracking)
* JMock (Assists Testing)
* Log4J (Tracking, Risk Assessment, etc.)
* Maven (Test Automation)
* JUnit (Testing)
* Wiki (Tracking)

Team Effort has implemented this best practice from early on. Desired features were chosen and worked on based on their importance to the system. Testing was emphasized, and unit tests were written for all Java classes. Careful bug reports were created and tracked using the wiki, so that these bugs could be found, reproduced, analyzed for importance, and eventually--fixed. In order to ensure good documentation a bug report template was created and strictly adhered to. The greatest deficiency of this best practice is that so far new things have been added without much thought towards testing. In future milestones this will be remedied and every new feature added will have a testing procedure created prior to any actual coding.

*Example*

This will be a simple example of using this best practice in regards to a known bug in this project in a manner in which it should be used on the remaining milestone:

1. Identify a known bug: Password Case Bug
2. Identify system feature: security
3. Identify critical nature of feature: severe due to the nature of security, and the ability of administrators to alter the database
4. Decide whether this bug should be fixed or triaged: due to severity and likely relative simplicity the bug should be fixed immediately
5. Design tests to run once the bug is fixed:\* Test via user interface

* Login as a known user, use the correct password with incorrect case
* Try varying the number of incorrect case characters with at least one case of all of them wrong, one of them wrong, and more than one wrong
* If at any point up to this the user is allowed in the problem is not fixed
* If the user can then log in with the correct password (correct case), then the problem shall be deemed fixed.

### Focused Prototypes

*From Wikipedia:* "The original purpose of a prototype is to allow users of the software to evaluate developers' proposals for the design of the eventual product by actually trying them out, rather than having to interpret and evaluate the design based on descriptions. Prototyping can also be used by end users to describe and prove requirements that developers have not considered, and that can be a key factor in the commercial relationship between developers and their clients.  Prototype software is often referred to as alpha grade, meaning it is the first version to run. Often only a few functions are implemented, the primary focus of the alpha is to have a functional base code on to which features may be added. Once alpha grade software has most of the required features integrated into it, it becomes beta software for testing of the entire software and to adjust the program to respond correctly during situations unforeseen during development."

* Minimal mockups to test (grouped) ideas
  + Examine key issues w/o assumption that using this approach
* Risk analysis e.g.
  + Prototype most challenging or highest priority questions
  + Pick best idea from each affinity group for prototyping
  + Prototype each affinity group
* Should be for throw-away use - do not use code
* Later use should be driven by open issues & decision making needs

*UI Prototypes*

* May be done by non-technical individuals
* Rapid UI prototypes can use e.g. CSS, HTML, Flash
* Can help accelerate discussion
* Help make sure everyone agreeing to same concrete look & feel

*Why Prototype?*

User may not be always be able to provide a full design requirements at the initial stage of a project. Users require multiple re-evaluations of prototypes to finalize design requirements. Prototypes are developed and evaluated by users. After the user evaluation, another prototype will be built based on feedback from users, and again the cycle returns to customer evaluation.

* Engineering mockups critical in other domains (e.g. construction)
* Identify relationships between components
* Identify risks
* Identify potential engineering savings from design changes
* Understanding interfaces between components
* Understanding testing principles

*Prototyping Process*

1. Basic requirement identification

* Any and all requirements that can be determined at earlier stages should be a part of this identification process.

1. Initial Prototype

* Initial prototype is developed based on the basic requirements

1. Review

* Customers/users should examine the prototype and provide feedback

1. Develop new prototype based on review

* The feedback is the driver now. If the feedback isn’t extensive enough development of new prototypes will be difficult.

*Prototypes*

The original development group from CMPT 370 created a series of prototypes using incremental delivery in which more features were added each time, and those included as well as the GUI were refined during each release. A series of slighty revised and modified prototypes have been released over the course of this project. Due to the requirements of the class, not a lot in terms of added functionality has been done.

*Current Prototype*

The current prototype can be viewed at <http://rtvt.usask.ca:8080/cmpt371group02/> (best viewed on Firefox).

### Peer Review

Peer review is the process in which peers review coding, documenting, and other work that is being performed by individuals. The reviewers provide feedback to the individual. Peer review is not only important for overall group performance, but also an important feedback mechanism for individuals. Milestone 3 saw an intensive and thorough peer review of every member’s participation in the project.

*Grading Scale used:*

Communication effort: /2

Thoroughness and quality of documentation: /10

Communication ability: /8

*Communication Effort:*

Members will be given 0 if nothing is provided to me in time to include it in the presentation, 1 if a group member must take effort specifically to ask them for documentation, and 2/2 if they made their documentation easy to access (e-mailed it to me or put it on the wiki) as requested.

*Thoroughness and Quality of Documentation:*

This will be an estimation of how much of the expected material the given member wrote about, and how in-depth of an explanation was given (note that giving the peer reviewer *too* in-depth of an explanation is seen as redundant, and may lose marks)

*Communication ability:*

Communication is an important skill in *any* field of work, and this is most evident when dealing with technical details and projects with lots of finicky bits and interconnected pieces. Thus, every member's ability to clearly and concisely communicate will be examined. Spelling and grammar issues may result in losing "marks" in this area (if they're bad enough).

**Appendix M** has a list of one review performed on each group member.

## 2.3 Implementation of Management Tools

### AspectJ

Aspect-oriented programming is a paradigm which allows increased modularization of code by cross-cutting of concerns. AspectJ is an extension built for IDEs such as Eclipse or Netbeans that allows users to use Java like programming to form code as aspect oriented programming (AOP). All Java programs are AspectJ programs, however, AspectJ allows for programmers to define constructs called aspects. These aspects can contain several entities that are unavailable to standard classes.

**Concerns** - Are what need to be added to the code, most often in multiple places.

**Aspects** - Encapsulates the new concepts that are being added.

**Join Point** - A *join point* is a well-defined point in the program flow. A *pointcut* picks out certain join points and values at those points. Before method calls or after a method is return would be typical join points. A piece of *advice* is code that is executed when a join point is reached. These are the dynamic parts of AspectJ.

**Advice** - The code that is to be executed at a certain point.

There are mulitple AspectJ plugins that have been developed for Netbeans. However they are no longer being actively developed. One plugin was developed for Netbeans 3.5.x, one developed for Netbeans 6.0 and another 6.7. As a result of the lack of support for Netbeans Team Effort set up a project in Eclipse to demonstrate the usefulness of the tool.

Aspect Oriented Programming has a lot of uses:

* Untangle complex concepts that are divided across multiple methods into one aspect
  + Makes code readability easier reducing maintenance costs.
  + Easier to pinpoint location for software change
  + Developers can focus on one concern
  + More reuse of code
  + Easy modifications, one aspect across multiple methods
* Simple uses
  + Easily implement logging to multiple methods.
  + Clean input data before all database writes.

Basically anytime a feature needs to be implemented across numerous methods it would be easier to use AOP compared to going to each method and adding code, which could introduce new bugs and is there for more risky.

See **Appendix** J for more information on AspectJ.

### CheckStyle

CheckStyle is a development tool to help programmers write Java code that adheres to a coding standard. It automates the process of checking Java code to spare humans of this tedious task. This makes it ideal for projects that want to enforce a coding standard.

The netbeans plugin would not work for Team Effort in Netbeans 7. The CheckStyle option was always greyed out despite configuring the pattern xml in Netbeans -> Preferences -> Quality. As an alternative to using Checkstyle in the IDE, Team Effort downloaded the jar file and manually, from the command line, used CheckStyle on the Soccer System source code. We obtained the Sun Standards XML for Java CheckStyle and executing it recursively on all java source files.

Although it would take far too long to bring the code to these standards as we do not adhere to the Sun Standards only important changes were made. **Appendix K** has the complete report.

CheckStyle works great and was relatively painless to use. It enforces a coding standard to such an intense degree that it makes it hard for anyone to deviate from this standard. It helps greatly in the general process improvement best practice because if there are consistent standards then there is less room for error and bugs become easier to spot.

# 3. Milestone (Revised)

There will be five major Milestone deliverables and five presentations over the course of the term. Each Milestone will include some new functionality as well as its related testing. Below is a Mini-Milestone list of the proposed objectives. Future milestones objectives have been altered to better reflect the need for management and tool implementation as opposed to design implementation. Previous milestones objectives have not been altered, however conclusions have been added, all other milestones are being refined in this document and in future milestones, removed object are in red, added objectives are in green.

## 3.1 Previous Milestones

**Milestone 1**

*Objectives*

* Resolve technical issues with database and versioning system
* Begin detecting existing bugs, defects, and limitations of program
* Develop plan for subsequent milestones

*Conclusions*

* Had previous database restored and migrated to Team Effort's database.
  + Made backup copies, and will continue making backup copies to ensure problem doesn't arise again.
* An SVN repository was set up, but accessibility was difficult. For Milestone 1 we used drop box until our SVN accessibility issues were fixed.
  + SVN as a version control system has been dropped in the current Milestone (Milestone 2) in favor of GitHub.
* Bug detections and determining application limitations is ongoing.
* Revising plans for upcoming milestones is ongoing.

*Time Sheet*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Date | Time Spent | I worked on… |
| Luke Brisebois | Jan 24 | 1 Hr | Reviewing Soccer Project  -running the system  -looking at code  -familiarizing myself |
| Feb 2 | 2 Hr | Adding to report |
| Simon Fanner | Jan 31 | 1 Hr | Report/Presentation Outline |
| Feb 1 | 2 Hr | Report documentation/Tech issues |
| Feb 2 | 2 Hr | Database dump/Report completion  - handed in Milestone 1 to moodle  - may need/have time to revise it |
| Steven Hancock | Feb 1 | 1.5 Hr | TXL Pretty Printing |
| Feb 1 | 1.5 Hr | Risk Analysis |
| Feb 3/4 | 0.5 Hr | Just a little bit more on TXL, and a small write-up |
| Adam Mravnik | Feb 1/2 | 2 Hr | Tried to resolved ssl and access issues with svn  by communicating with CS Trac and modifying my own SSL settings. |
| Feb 2 | 0.75 Hr | - Restructured the project files in Dropbox.  - Removed all old svn references from when it was a 370 project.  - Renamed the project and various files to make their purpose updated  and more clear.  - Imported the project into the SVN repo using Tortoise SVN  - Current SVN Status: Works in windows, and on tuxworld (possibly all linux distros?),  does not seem to work in OSX |
| Amin Shaker | Jan 18 | 0.5 Hr | Presentation and reviewing the database |
| Feb 1 | 1.5 Hr | Working on presentation and milestone goals |
| Patrick Weckworth | Feb 1 | 3.5 Hr | Hours writing report |
| Tom Wetzel | Jan 18 | 0.25 Hr | Setting up wiki pages |
| Feb 1 | 2 Hr | Working on presentation and milestone goals |
| Feb 2 | 0.5 Hr | Helping connect to SVN and the database, presentation meeting |
| Drake Zarowny | Feb 1 | 2 Hr | Working on presentation and milestone goals |

**Milestone 2**

*Objectives*

* Tool Bar/Menu for navigation
* Implementation of unit testing using Junit
* Develop a more extensive bug tracking tool
* Use TXL to format code Java code into single style
* Use of refactoring in Netbeans in order to better structure code
* Restructure and refine database (in code and in database)
  + Revise password authentication (more secure, terminate sessions)

*Conclusion*

* Team Effort was able to complete all of the objectives for Milestone 2.
* Team communication difficulties made the Milestone more difficult than it should have been. The lack of communication, and when there was communication, miscommunication created a situation where Team Effort had difficulty completing the Milestone on time and efficiently.
* Following milestones should put more focus on the management tools and following best practises.

*Time Sheet*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Date | Time Spent | I worked on… |
| Luke Brisebois | Feb 18 | 2 Hr | Reviewing Milestone Document |
| Feb 25 | 2 Hr | Preparing for presentation |
| Simon Fanner | Feb 15 | 1 Hr | Setting up Git, re-factoring project name |
| Feb 17 | 0.5 Hr | Bug Documenting on Wiki |
| Steven Hancock | Feb 9-13 | 1 Hr | Getting Git setup and importing the project |
| Feb 13 | 0.5 Hr | Putting together a Doc for M2 |
| Feb 13 | 0.5 Hr | MySQL dump for backing up database |
| Feb 13/14 | 4 Hr | Writing milestone document |
| Feb 15 | 1.5 Hr | Creating menu navigation |
| Feb 15-18 | 5 Hr | Finishing milestone document and prepping for handin |
| Feb 25 | 2 Hr | Creating Presentation |
| Adam Mravnik | Feb 14 | 1 Hr | Writing test cases and setting up Git |
| Feb 17 | 2.5 Hr | Wrote Junit tests for schedule and stats |
| Feb 18 | 1 Hr | Wrote userBean tests and did some git research |
| Amin Shaker | N/A | N/A | Nothing Reported |
| Patrick Weckworth | Feb 16 | 2 Hr | Struggled with and finally set up git |
| Feb 16 | 2 Hr | Wrote a test class with some test |
| Feb 16 | 0.5 Hr | Wrote a bug report |
| Tom Wetzel | N/A | N/A | Nothing Reported |
| Drake Zarowny | Feb 20 | 0.5 Hr | Getting Github version of project setup in netbeans |

**Milestone 3**

*Objectives*

* Implement NiCad to determine software clone's in the project and use VisCad to visualize clones
* Implement logging feature
* Implementation of management tools like TeamCity, jMock, Emma, Log4J, Apache Maven, and Jira
* Implementing best practices, peer review, risk driven incremental delivery, and binary mini milestones and estimation practices.

*Conclusion*

* Team Effort was able to complete all of the objectives for Milestone 3.
* Team communication has improved.
* Binary milestones has allowed Team Effort to work more independently but still accomplish goals.

*Time Sheet*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Date | Time Spent | I worked on… |
| Luke Brisebois | Mar 3 | 2 Hr | Implementation of JUnit |
| Mar 7 | 2 Hr | Preparing for presentation |
| Mar 10 | 2 Hr | Binary MiniMilestones and Estimation practices |
| Mar 11 | 2 Hr | Individual Report for Binary Mini Milestones and Estimation practices |
| Mar 12 | 1 Hr | Preparing Best Practices slides for M3 |
| Simon Fanner | Feb 22 | 1 Hr | Fighting with GIt and Netbeans |
| Mar 11 | 2 Hr | Reading up on TeamCity  Researching Risk-driven incremental delivery best practice |
| Mar 12 | 3 Hr | Installing Team City and writing wiki page |
| Mar 12 | 1.5 Hr | Reasearching and writing up Wiki page for “Risk-Diven Incremental Delivery” |
| Mar 12/13 | 2.5 Hr | Assembling master powerpoint |
| Steven Hancock | Mar 4 | 4 Hr | Installing BugZilla and importing Bugs |
| Mar 6 | 4 Hr | Getting NiCad and VisCad to work and writing a short how-to |
| Mar 7&8 | 0.5 Hr | Putting together group mini-milestone |
| Mar 11 | 1.5 Hr | Finishing NiCad and VisCad report |
| Mar 12 | 0.5 Hr | Creating NiCad and VisCad Slides |
| Mar 13 | 2 Hr | Putting together M3 Document |
| Adam Mravnik | Feb 25 | 1 Hr | Dove into Log4J |
| Mar 6 | 2 Hr | Looked more into log4j and into jmock |
| Mar 10 | 3 Hr | Research Jmock and tried to implement with servlets |
| Mar 11 | 6 Hr | Implemented JMock testing for more complicated servlets |
| Mar 11 | 1 Hr | Wrote JMock and Log4J Wiki write-p for the handin doc |
| Mar 12 | 0.5 Hr | Wrote up presentation slides |
| Amin Shaker | N/A | N/A | Nothing Reported |
| Patrick Weckworth | Mar 7 | 0.5 Hr | Selected Tool and wrote up paragraph |
| Mar 10 | 2 Hr | Learned about EMMA |
| Mar 10 | 2 Hr | Got EMMA working in Netbeans |
| Mar 10 | 1 Hr | More or less got Emma working and wrote up wiki page |
| Mar 10 | 0.5 Hr | Did up slides |
| Tom Wetzel | Mar 12 | 2.5 Hr | Peer Review and reports |
| Mar 13 | 2 Hr | Peer Review |
| Mar 13 | 1.5 Hr | Creating Presentation |
| Drake Zarowny | Mar 5 | 3 Hr | Learning about Maven and getting basic project setup in Netbeans |
| Mar 10 | 3 Hr | Getting out project working as a Maven project |
| Mar 11 | 1.5 Hr | Writing report on Maven |
| Mar 12 | 1 Hr | Making presentation slides for Maven |

## 3.2 Current Milestone

**Milestone 4**

*Objectives*

* Make system more user-friendly
* Use VisCad to help visualize, manage, and order clones detected by NiCad
* Implementation of additional tools like Checkstyle, AspectJ, simClipse, etc
* Focus on some best practices.

## 3.3 Future Milestones

**Milestone 5**

*Objectives*

* Different view styles on profiles or stats (sort by teams etc)
* Player email notification
* More robust messaging system
* Implementation of additional tools like Checkstyle, GCad, etc
* Tie everything together
  + Bring all of the milestones together; link them into one defined flow.
* Finish any loose ends. Comment on all required tools and best practices.
* Evaluate team performance.
* Summarize and conclude project.

# 4. Risk Evaluation

**Appendix A** contains the risk report. No changes have been made to the risk report from the previous milestone.

# 5. Team Personnel

For the fourth milestone the team’s roles have been redefined. Team Effort’s group members have split up tasks on what to focus on each taking a different topic. Two volunteers have been chosen to write the milestone document and put together the milestone presentation.

# 6. Milestone Activity Report

This activity report outlines what has been accomplished by the design team over the duration of the milestone.

## 6.1 Work Completed

As mention previously, new tools and new best practises have been implemented in this milestone. However no code development has occurred.

## 6.2 Git Log

Please see **Appendix B**.

## 6.3 Wiki Log

Please see **Appendix C**.

# 7. Conclusion

Team Effort has put the major efforts into implementing new tools and new best practises. The new tools allow for better management of the project, in building, deployment, testing, and source code management. The new best practises that are being implemented and follow will allow for more reviewing, better time management, and lower risk.

# Appendix A

## Risk Report

*Software Requirement Risks*

* Change of requirements
  + The requirements of the software have drastically changed. Team Effort has removed many of the planned additions that we had laid out in the first milestone and shifted focus towards implementing new tools to help manage the software.
* Poor definition of requirements
  + The requirements from the previous milestone were some-what vague and had to be further revised for this milestone such as “What is a navigation bar? What should it include?” and “What is restructuring the database?”
* Impossible requirements
  + All requirements were possible

*Software Risks*

* Project & Milestone completion dates being unrealistic
  + Realistic given an isolated class, however with many assignments due and Mid-terms around the same time as Milestone 2 is due makes allocating time to this assignment difficult.
* Hardware (server issues)
  + Not a problem
* Lack of Testing
  + Not a problem
* Personal differences in design/coding techniques
  + Since there is less focus on design and more focus on management this risk is easily avoidable, especially with the help from TXL to format the code in one singular way.
* Lack of knowledge could make some features unobtainable
  + Not a problem
* Human Errors
  + None have occurred

*Software Scheduling Risks*

* Over-estimate time requirements
  + Not a problem
* Under-estimate time requirements
  + The group has severely under-estimated the time it requires to coordinate activities and to split up the work. Weekly meetings have not been enough, especially when its not always possible for everyone to make the meetings.
* Not managing time affectively
  + Because there is an under-estimation of time requirements the group needs to work better at maximizing the time that they do have together. Things like being better prepared for every meeting and participating on the project’s Wiki will help.
* Requirements changing and not being able to adequately allocate time
  + Not a problem
* Lack of skill could require additional learning to implement goals
  + Not a problem
* Tool failure, like SVN, or difficulties with NetBeans or Java Server
  + This has been the team’s single biggest hurdle. SVN has given Team Effort headache’s and the issue took weeks to resolve, and the resolution is still a little ‘iffy’. In the migration to GitHub there have also been difficulties as learning on the fly how to use a new version control system is not ideal.
* Lack of knowledge of tools
  + The project management tools that Team Effort would like to are all to new to the group. So time will have to be allocated for individual members (and the group as a whole) to learn the new tools in order to implement them into the project.

*Software Quality Risks*

* Improper or lack of design documentation
  + Not a problem
* Unrealistic scheduling leading to lack of testing and deploying bug filled application
  + Not a problem
* Lack of knowledge leading to unforeseen bugs, errors, or unexpected results
  + The group has limited knowledge of new tools. The new tools that are being introduced to the project bring the possibility of introducing new errors, bugs, and unexpected results.
* Application’s user interface not easy to use
  + This is a minor issue, however a navigation bar, would help to make the interface easier to use. For this reason, a navigation bar will be implemented in this milestone.

*Team Risks*

* Lack of communication
  + Communication is becoming a problem. Participation in the Wiki is not as active as it could be, classes and meetings are not being attended by all, and outside of class, group meetings, and the Wiki sees little to no communication.
* Scheduling conflicts
  + It has been very difficult for Team Effort to arrange any meeting times outside of the already scheduled weekly meeting.
* Lack of responsibility (ownership)
  + Those participating are taking ownership.

*Software Business Risks*

* No one wants the application
  + This is not applicable as we are not trying to sell/distribute the application.
* Budget failure (time or financial)
  + It remains unclear if the budgeted time we have given will create a project failure.
* Distribution failure
  + Distribution will most likely not occur in the form of Developer to User.

## Risk Re-evaluation

In light of our possible risks, the team will take a number of actions to ensure maximum risk avoidance. The requirements will be outlined as complete as possible in the first Milestone, however, Team Effort will remain flexible in case new requirements, or requirement definitions are changed. Any requirements that are deemed to be too expensive or impossible to meet will be abandoned immediately and no more time will be allocated to those requirements. Team effort will always conservatively budget time to ensure time-cost over-runs are minimal. The team will also ensure sufficient time is allocated for testing. Through code reviews and TXL ‘pretty printing’ the software’s code, although written by multiple programmers, will all be uniform.

# Appendix B

commit 507e43e85ec8c023a4036b97173a169e0019cc13

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Mar 22 06:26:10 2012 -0600

A start on Milestone 4

commit db1ab0bb6f104fc775784bbdd9840085a395cd0e

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Mar 19 09:29:31 2012 -0600

Added the jmock jars to the project.properties file

commit b1f5be52913e58cc8e3a4ec41761f88cf4d17328

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Mar 19 09:24:29 2012 -0600

Removing \_function-clones...log

commit 18842df29bf9f944ed1ce79acd07fe1f8d32d975

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Tue Mar 13 20:58:11 2012 -0600

Report for milestone 3

commit eb167fe6dbdcd01c3098c1934252bb1a8b04a13d

Author: Adam Mravnik <a.mravnik@usask.ca>

Date: Sun Mar 11 20:12:03 2012 -0600

Wrote jmock tests for the more important servlet functions

commit ff9260956481c1c018fb7ecd22c3719339f23c19

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Tue Mar 6 12:35:04 2012 -0600

Added Clone files

commit 73d536f0b5509ac50b28fd4c6cb1db8024b64782

Author: Simon Fanner <saf725@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Wed Feb 22 15:24:06 2012 -0600

Testing Github yet again 1

commit 6cd1b08f08706240a119a39ebf346588b7bd006d

Author: Simon Fanner <saf725@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Wed Feb 22 14:58:57 2012 -0600

Testing Github yet again

commit 71bd967cf9409b3e876f937ddc87ca666774526a

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Sat Feb 18 20:12:51 2012 -0600

Finished report

commit ae28b42630266daa71c6f171b0ddfb7b2e64854c

Author: Adam Mravnik <a.mravnik@usask.ca>

Date: Sat Feb 18 11:42:24 2012 -0600

Wrote the userBean tests

commit 587d4b85d84a91937e0afd899fd75b91f015e50b

Author: Adam Mravnik <a.mravnik@usask.ca>

Date: Fri Feb 17 21:59:02 2012 -0600

Added stats tests and moved it in with the edit schedule tests because it is necessary to know what game I am working on

commit df1ff82e6dfe8b558306d561246c396c90acb35a

Author: Adam Mravnik <a.mravnik@usask.ca>

Date: Fri Feb 17 21:39:22 2012 -0600

Wrote editSchedule Tests

commit 8c537180301e90d4d3096d557f8750573f6f29d9

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Fri Feb 17 09:34:22 2012 -0600

Added menu

commit a0449dc2a4a432bd762342326094d4bf0b20f07e

Author: paw818 <paw818@peon32.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 16 19:59:47 2012 -0600

Created a test class for editRoster.java and wrote some tests for it.

commit 04472a9d2d45e28a2a192d103204a462ca8636f2

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 16 18:58:01 2012 -0600

Report almost finished

commit 33851d2be9849567fc578b065fc8761a3ed80d69

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Wed Feb 15 19:00:11 2012 -0600

Filled out the Risks part

commit 407314afd397d2ca98e58da08a16f2f16f22f7f1

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Wed Feb 15 17:16:03 2012 -0600

Removing old cmpt370 directory

commit b553f9e13a9601dbd7f7fd208ec999112f23b8b5

Author: simonfanner <simonfanner@10.226.160.136>

Date: Wed Feb 15 16:28:47 2012 -0600

Updated the Project Name to reflect CMPT 371.

(Also testing to make sure I have git set up properly. Hopefully this doesn't blow up)

commit 3a5eb742762e9c8ea7e5d76251e2c4ae7d4898ba

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Tue Feb 14 19:36:10 2012 -0600

Added to Milestone2's report

commit 885b16956b6368e015a36fa891289e095f0b5d87

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Feb 13 22:48:29 2012 -0600

Added Milestone2-Report and filled out some sections and have the skeleton for others

commit edeb2cca86a58a7ed4fc30203f1db43adc5f8b8c

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Feb 13 15:48:31 2012 -0600

Added a mysql dump

commit 6a24f77266506da465521da0940dfd24719ee8b5

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Feb 13 15:29:41 2012 -0600

Cleaning up working directory and adding breif outline for milestone2

commit a238e12e9d02de54d9cf56e1a38f1f4d42409cd9

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Mon Feb 13 12:20:20 2012 -0600

Renamed M1 Final Report

commit b967aed46a5a93453fea7d936ac46199f512accf

Author: smh875smh <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 14:48:23 2012 -0600

Update README

commit 1a132ea0ca00e12d02e5d4c6acae2bcfe0eef629

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 14:39:14 2012 -0600

Updated README

commit 25a86e06d319d293939e8d55775a90c3e96c5071

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 12:35:51 2012 -0600

Re-organized image and css files.

commit 7a4ff7bc89bcfd6a86d32d0e70600680749d0bd1

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 12:17:25 2012 -0600

Re-organized image and css files.

commit bd848d021367087d2c16fef6b833f999f61ef22a

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 12:16:33 2012 -0600

Re-organized image and css files.

commit bfe447e78b5cd246d6894cbbd23c6c9f339bd113

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 11:58:10 2012 -0600

Re-organized image and css files.

commit 6ca5833510dc7d237c7c26fe02161c5261d84759

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Thu Feb 9 08:30:43 2012 -0600

Initial import of project

commit 3c849c9156f165b466c2c92e25a55b525cbbcba3

Author: Steven Hancock <smh875@mail.usask.ca>

Date: Wed Jan 25 15:00:33 2012 -0600

First Commit

# Appendix C

Hours sheet - Drake Zarowny - about 2 hours ago

SimClipse - Drake Zarowny - about 2 hours ago

Hours sheet - Simon Fanner - about 8 hours ago

Hours sheet - Thomas Wetzel - about 9 hours ago

Hours sheet - Amin Shaker - about 13 hours ago

Hours sheet - Steven Hancock - about 14 hours ago

AspectJ - Steven Hancock - about 14 hours ago

Hours sheet - Patrick Weckworth - yesterday at 11:45 PM

Roles - Thomas Wetzel - yesterday at 11:43 PM

Rigorous Risk-Driven Testing - Patrick Weckworth - yesterday at 11:34 PM

Roles - Patrick Weckworth - yesterday at 10:51 PM

CheckStyle Report - Adam Mravnik - yesterday at 10:02 PM

Home - Simon Fanner - yesterday at 04:49 PM

Focused Prototypes - Simon Fanner - yesterday at 04:47 PM

PlayerHome.png - Simon Fanner - yesterday at 04:38 PM

Login.png - Simon Fanner - yesterday at 04:38 PM

Roles - Drake Zarowny - yesterday at 03:44 PM

Roles - Simon Fanner - yesterday at 03:43 PM

Roles - Luke Brisebois - yesterday at 03:33 PM

AJ.png - Steven Hancock - Mar 20

Roles - Adam Mravnik - Mar 20

Roles - Steven Hancock - Mar 18

Meeting Minutes - Simon Fanner - Mar 14

Hours sheet - Luke Brisebois - Mar 13

VisCad - Steven Hancock - Mar 13

Mini Milestone for Milestone 3 - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

Risk-driven Incremental Delivery - Mar 13

Best Practices - Mar 13

JetBRAINS - TeamCity 7 - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

5.png - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

4.png - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

3.png - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

2.png - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

1.png - Simon Fanner - Mar 13

Hours sheet - Adam Mravnik - Mar 12

EMMA Code Coverage - Patrick Weckworth - Mar 12

Maven - Drake Zarowny - Mar 12

Mini Milestone for Milestone 3 - Thomas Wetzel - Mar 12

Log4J Report - by Adam Mravnik - Mar 11

JMock Report - by Adam Mravnik - Mar 11

NiCad - by Steven Hancock - Mar 11

Hours sheet - by Patrick Weckworth - Mar 10

viewCoverage.jpg - by Patrick Weckworth - Mar 10

runTest.jpg - by Patrick Weckworth - Mar 10

activate.jpg - by Patrick Weckworth - Mar 10

Roles - by Amin Shaker - Mar 08

Mini Milestone for Milestone 3 - by Steven Hancock - Mar 08

Roles - by Patrick Weckworth - Mar 07

Meeting Minutes - by Adam Mravnik - Mar 07

Roles - by Luke Brisebois - Mar 07

Roles - by Adam Mravnik - Mar 06

Roles - by Drake Zarowny - Mar 06

HierarchicalDependencyGraph.png - by Steven Hancock - Mar 06

codeClones.png - by Steven Hancock - Mar 06

fileCloneSnippets.png - by Steven Hancock - Mar 06

TreeMap.png - by Steven Hancock - Mar 06

cloneDistribution.png - by Steven Hancock - Mar 06

Tools - by Steven Hancock - Mar 04

Bugzilla How To - by Steven Hancock - Mar 04

Bugs - by Steven Hancock - Mar 03

Roles - by Steven Hancock - Mar 01

Meeting Minutes - by Simon Fanner - Feb 29

Roles - by Thomas Wetzel - Feb 29

Presentations - by Steven Hancock - Feb 25

GitHub and Database Access Info - by Simon Fanner - Feb 22

Password Case Bug - by Adam Mravnik - Feb 18

Table Display Formatting - by Simon Fanner - Feb 17

Password Case Bug - by Simon Fanner - Feb 17

Meeting Minutes - by Steven Hancock - Feb 17

Hours sheet - by Patrick Weckworth - Feb 16

editRoster addUser( false team) - active - created by Patrick Weckworth - Feb 16

tests errors - created by Amin Shaker - Feb 16

GitHub and Database Access Info - commented by Patrick Weckworth - Feb 16

Hours sheet - by Amin Shaker - Feb 16

GitHub and Database Access Info - commented by Steven Hancock - Feb 15

GitHub and Database Access Info - commented by Thomas Wetzel - Feb 15

Roles - by Thomas Wetzel - Feb 15

Bugs - by Steven Hancock - Feb 14

GitHub and Database Access Info - by Steven Hancock - Feb 13

Roles - by Simon Fanner - Feb 09

Roles - by Steven Hancock - Feb 09

Roles - by Amin Shaker - Feb 08

Roles - by Adam Mravnik - Feb 08

Hours sheet - by Luke Brisebois - Feb 08

TXL Pretty Printing - by Steven Hancock - Feb 03

PP-KeepStruct.tar.gz - attached by Steven Hancock - Feb 03

Objectives - by Thomas Wetzel - Feb 02

Bugs - by Adam Mravnik - Feb 02

Hours sheet - by Thomas Wetzel - Feb 02

PrettyPrinting.tgz - attached by Steven Hancock - Feb 01

SVN and Database Access Info - commented by Steven Hancock - Jan 31

Group Admin - created by Adam Mravnik - Jan 31

GitHub and Database Access Info - created by Adam Mravnik - Jan 31

Tentative Meeting Attendance - created by Adam Mravnik - Jan 26

Home - by Luke Brisebois - Jan 25

Home - by Michael Fulton - Jan 25

Bugs - created by Michael Fulton - Jan 25

Roles - by Michael Fulton - Jan 24

Roles - by Luke Brisebois - Jan 24

Home - commented by Steven Hancock - Jan 19

Roles - by Drake Zarowny - Jan 19

Objectives - by Steven Hancock - Jan 18

TeamEffort - attached by Adam Mravnik - Jan 17

CMPT 371 - Team Effort - created by Adam Mravnik - Jan 17

Home - created by Adam Mravnik - Jan 17

# Appendix D

**Executive Summary**

The best practice being implemented for my portion of Milestone 3 is the use of Binary Mini Milestones and estimation practices. These two best practices will mainly focus on the administration and management sides of our project and our group. Both of these tools are extremely helpful in keeping projects on track. They allow for ways to monitor and estimate time requirements for tasks and the completion of these tasks. I will look at how changing to Binary Mini Milestones have changed our group dynamic and how they will help us improve production, time management and risk analysis. Using the key best practice of estimation will help estimate time and risk requirements for the rest of the project this term.

**Binary Mini Milestones**

To help better manage our team, we have implemented Binary Mini Milestones for this Milestone 3. These Binary Mini Milestones will help better define each group members tasks and specific work and will also provide an easy and accurate way in which to monitor our progress for this milestone. The Mini Milestones are as follows:

* *Drake* – Download and install Maven to become familiar with its project object model file format and get the project working in netbeans.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Adam*– Learn and implement JMock and Log4J which both help for the best practice of rigorous risk driven testing.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Simon*– Investigate daily build, continuous integration, and smoke tests to be implemented into the project.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Luke*– Implement Binary Mini Milestones to set goals and tasks for each team member and look at the estimation practices to help focus on team management.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Patrick*– Learn and Implement EMMA, a free java code coverage testing tool, for our project.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Steven*– Learn and implement VisCad and NiCad, both of which are excellent tools for clone detection.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

* *Tom*– Peer Review each team members work to be compile mini reports with helpful insight into how to improve individual work.

Evaluation: Complete Incomplete

**Estimation**

For Milestone 3, Range Estimates were chosen for the numerous benefits they will provide. They explicitly differentiate best vs most likely vs worst case scenarios for each task. They will make it less likely that individual group members mistake worst case as a most likely case. Range estimates provide our client with important information regarding the uncertainty of estimates and will decrease the risk that an estimate is considered to be a commitment.

For this milestone, all estimation practices will focus specifically on this milestone and each of the previous Binary Mini Milestones that are outlined above. There are four key rules of thumb to consider for large software projects. These rules of thumb are as follows:

1. *Rule of Thirds –* requirements/design, testing and developing all require roughly the same time.
2. *Rule of Three –* if you can’t think of three circumstances in which the design might fail, you haven’t thought about it enough.
3. *Paradox Rule –* if there is no paradox that the design must resolve, you don’t understand the problem.
4. *Law of Insatiable Appetite –* the last ten percent of performance generates one-third of the cost and two-thirds of the problems.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hours to Complete | | | | |
| Name | Item | Best Case (25%) | Most Likely Case | Worst Case  (25%) | Expected Case (50%) |
| Drake | Maven | 2 | 2.5 | 5 | 3.16 |
| Adam | JMock/Log4J | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.67 |
| Simon | DB/CI/ST | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Luke | Mini MS/Est | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Patrick | EMMA | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | 4.5 |
| Steven | VisCad/Nicad | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5.33 |
| Tom | Peer Review | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.33 |

Figure 1. Range Estimate for Milestone 3

**Because of the amount of images in the following appendixes, the appendixes have been migrated to separate PDF documents.**

# Appendix E

For information about Team City please see AppendixE.pdf

# Appendix F

For information about NiCad please see AppendixF.pdf

# Appendix G

For information about VisCad please see AppendixG.pdf

# Appendix H

For information about VisCad please see AppendixH.pdf

# Appendix I

For information about Maven please see AppendixI.pdf

# Appendix J

For information about AspectJ please see AppendixI.pdf

# Appendix K

For information about CheckStyle please see AppendixK.pdf

# Appendix L

For information about Focused Prototypes please see AppendixILpdf

# Appendix M

**Peer Reviews**

*Tom Wetzel:*

Effort: 2/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 6/8

Overall total: 18/20 (90%)

Tom is reasonably good at communicating in general. On the other hand, he hasn't been keeping up with my Hours Sheet, so he must improve and remember to fill that out in future. In retrospect, Tom should have tried to make a concise "marking scheme" for this milestone early and provide it to all group members before evaluation.

*Adam Mravnik:*

Effort: 2/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 7/8

Overall total: 19/20 (95%)

Documents were placed on the wiki, and made easily accessible in good time. Documents were nicely-formatted, easy and quick to read, and still contained all the necessary information. Adam's work is great. He got through two different tools, put in plenty of effort, updated his hours sheet diligently, and wrote good documentation.

Advice: Work on organizing your thoughts before finalizing them in documents; the Experiences and Report section of your Log4J document was slightly ramble-y.

*Steven Hancock:*

Effort: 2/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 7/8

Overall total: 19/20 (95%)

* Report included graphs, with explanations
* E-mailed me report, and put the short version on the wiki in good time
* Steven works diligently, makes good documentation, and also keeps his Hours Sheet on the wiki up to date.

Advice: Whitespace is nice when reporting data figures, for instance when you were reporting the figures from Nicad's HTML report.

Advice: Lastly, this is likely more Nicad's fault than yours, but charts and graphs are more useful when labelled for quick reference, so that you don't have to read the whole explanation and then look at the graph again to actually understand it.

*Drake Zarowny:*

Effort: 2/2

Thoroughness: 9/10

Communication: 7/8

Overall total: 18/20 (90%)

Drake’s report was e-mailed to me in good time. Drake keeps up with his Hours Sheet, and worked diligently to get Maven working despite setbacks and compatibility issues.

Advice: Some of the topics in your report weren't things that were needed (for instance, the XML Maven uses for the Project Object Model).

Advice: When writing a report adjudicating software for your company, be more decisive about whether or not you think it should used. It's hard to tell whether you think the team should use Maven despite that it is designed for larger projects, or if the team should avoid using it because it is designed for larger projects and isn't of much use to us.

*Simon Fanner:*

Effort: 1/2

Thoroughness: 9/10

Communication: 8/8

Overall total: 18/20 (90%)

* Report received after the agreed-upon time, but still in good enough time that I could include it in the presentation
* Very detailed installation guide for JetBrains, complete with pictures
* Simon gave reasons ahead of time for why his stuff would be late coming in, so I'm willing to cut him some slack; we are all busy, and he works diligently regardless.

Advice: Some of the pictures in the JetBrains documentation were redundant; the most egregious instance was having a picture of the loading screen as part of the install guide.

*Luke Brisebois*

Effort: 1/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 7/8

Overall total: 19/20 (90%)

* Report was nicely formatted and detailed, included charts
* Time estimates seem reasonable
* Luke's work is great in general; it's very easy to extract the desired information from his report quickly.

Advice: Keep up with your hours sheet, start work on your reports earlier, and add separating lines to your tables so that it's easier to distinguish between columns.

*Patrick Weckworth:*

Effort: 2/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 7/8

Overall total: 19/20 (95%)

* Documentation was put up on the wiki in good time; also e-mailed me to ensure that would be sufficient
* Tutorial to use EMMA was brief but very effective, good use of pictures
* Numbers and data were reported briefly, complete with datestamps
* Patrick put a bunch of effort into trying to make this tool work, and concluded decisively that EMMA is not for us, since it does not work with servlets.

Advice: Don't try to use tools that measure JUnit testing with a project that runs mainly on Java servlets. It's doomed to fail.

*Amin Shaker:*

Effort: 0/2

Thoroughness: 10/10

Communication: 6/8

Overall total: 16/20 (80%)

Amin’s documentation was not delivered on time. However, when it was delivered, the document held all necessary information and used pictures.

Advice: Since English is probably not your first language, continue working on your grammatical skills; it's understandable but could use "polishing".