

University College of Northern Denmark

IT-programme

AP Degree in Computer Science

Dmaj0919

SOLVR.ONLINE

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Repository:

Maros Cuninka, Sebastian Holesz, Samuel Horacek, Martin Hotka, Ioan-Sebastian Voinea

Aalborg, 20. 12. 2020



University College of Northern Denmark

IT-programme

AP Degree in Computer Science

**Class:** Dmaj0919

**Title:** SOLVR.ONLINE – SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

**Abstract:**

**Project participants:**

Maros Cuninka

Sebastian Holesz

Samuel Horacek

Martin Hotka

Ioan-Sebastian Voinea

**Supervisor**:

Nadeem Iftikhar

**Submission date:** 20. 12. 2020

Table of Contents

[**INTRODUCTION** 4](#_Toc58968267)

[**1.** **System Vision** 4](#_Toc58968268)

[**2.** **Business model canvas** 4](#_Toc58968269)

[**3.** **Prototyping (Personas)** 4](#_Toc58968270)

[**4.** **Mock-ups** 4](#_Toc58968271)

[**5.** **Methodology (Compare plan driven vs agile vs kanban)** 4](#_Toc58968272)

[**6.** **Choice of method** 4](#_Toc58968273)

[**7.** **Planning** 4](#_Toc58968274)

[**8.** **Quality assurance & Quality management** 4](#_Toc58968275)

[**8.1.** **Quality criteria and architecture** 4](#_Toc58968276)

[**9.** **Risk analysis** 5](#_Toc58968277)

[**10.** **Requirements definition** 6](#_Toc58968278)

[**10.1.** **Functional** 6](#_Toc58968279)

[**10.2.** **Non-functional** 6](#_Toc58968280)

[**11.** **Configuration management** 6](#_Toc58968281)

[**11.1.** **Version control** 6](#_Toc58968282)

[**12.** **Architecture?** 6](#_Toc58968283)

[**CONCLUSION** 6](#_Toc58968284)

[**REFERENCE LIST** 6](#_Toc58968285)

[**APPENDIX** 6](#_Toc58968286)

# **INTRODUCTION**

Text…

# **System Vision**

When we, as a group, were faced with a decision to come up with a unique idea that could change an industry and could be used for our project, we had a range of ideas. The technical requirements laid out by the curriculum had to be considered, as well as an applicability of the solution to the real word. Thus, we allowed ourselves some time to innovate and we narrowed the ideas just a top 3 from which we voted the winner. Most of the ideas were related to e-shops or customer-to-customer marketplaces with which we decided to go. None of has ever worked on a C2C project ever before, so we took it as a challenge.

Product vision is something that shapes the project itself – it describes the overall mission of the product. For us it means that each member has something to fall back on, something forms the end-goal of the entire process. This is our statement:

“The ultimate marketplace where your homework finds its solver”.

It has to be noted that before coming up with our vision, we focused on the products name. We felt that it needs to be striking and that its domain should be available for us to buy, which we did straight-away. After some changes we ended up with Solvr.online.

# **Business model canvas**

After we came up with an idea what product we want to develop we decided to find out if it is even possible and would make sense for us to even start with it. For this reason and for better understanding of the entire idea we created a business model canvas which helped us to visualize the core business concept.

As you can see in Appendix A – Business Model Canvas, on the right side we have our internal factors we considered as relevant for us – Key Partners, Activities and Resources. In the middle we have Value Proposition, which describes what values we want to deliver and on the right side there are external factors, such as Customers and Market in general.

The main goal of the business model is to plan how a business intends to make money and business model canvas makes it easier for stakeholders to understand it. As our project was not meant to be developed in a such way, we have not considered this to greater extent than what was described before.

# **Prototyping (Personas)**

# **Mock-ups**

# **Methodology (Compare plan driven vs agile vs kanban)**

# **Choice of method**

# **Planning**

# **Quality assurance & Quality management**

## **Quality criteria and architecture**

Reflections on methods and their uses in practice

# **Risk analysis**

Test Risk analysis can be best described as a process of assessing the likelihood of an unfavorable events that can happen during the project and can influence its success and lead to failure.

We started with risk analysis at the beginning of the project, even before sprint 0, by identifying the risks. You can see the result in the table XXX in first column. After we found out what risks can affect us, we analyze the likelihood and the consequence of each one of them and by multiplying these two values we got the overall score (risk priority).

The top three risks are very connected to each other, because we were using completely new methodology, which is different from plan-driven, and our planning was divided to sprints. From beginning it was very difficult to estimate, therefore the high probability and impact. Even though, there is a corona pandemic, we set the impact to very low, as we already worked in a situation like this in our previous project. We think that this is even a good experience to the future as well, because we could try how is it to work only online, instead to face it our jobs for the first time. Last two risks are brought from last project, where we also encountered burnout at the end of sprint and not all of us are using Windows.

Table 1 Risk analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Impact** | **Score** |
| Wrong total estimates | 8 | 7 | 56 |
| New system architecture | 6 | 9 | 54 |
| Wrong sprint estimates | 8 | 4 | 32 |
| Fluctuant sprint velocity | 8 | 3 | 24 |
| Illnesses | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Corona pandemic | 10 | 1 | 10 |
| New programming language | 1 | 9 | 9 |
| Problems with new SD framework (methodology) | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Burnout | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Different OS | 1 | 5 | 5 |

Next step was to plan how to minimize the effect of these risks as a part of qualitative risk analysis. We did not plan everything ahead, but we were monitoring it continuously during the entire project. We have only written down the strategy for the most crucial risks. For the new system architecture, the strategy was to find out what suits us the best and ask for a feedback. Nevertheless, we planned this, we end up with changing it three times, which had great impact. With the estimations, we decided that in the first sprint we will not overestimate ourselves, based on that we chose the starting sprint velocity and after that we knew if we could deal with higher or not. Monitoring crucial risks is shown in table XXX.

Table 2 Risk monitoring

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Indicators** |
| Estimation | Good estimation at first sprint without changing the velocity by much |
| Architecture | Changed architecture 3 times |
| Illnesses | very low impact other members substituted |
| Different OS | dealt by booting to Windows and by changing .net framework to .net core |
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