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**Purpose of this document**

The purpose of this document is to provide Amristar and other relevant stakeholders with a summary of the project at frequent intervals. Amristar uses the progress report to assess progress and the contribution of team members. Amristar also uses it to identify any issues that occur during the project at an early stage.
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# HIGHLIGHT REPORT

| **Period From:** | **11/04/2022** |  | **To:** | **1/05/2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

## 

## Schedule Status



| **Forecast Duration** | 20/3/2022 to 23/10/2022 |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned End Date** | 23/10/2022 |
| **Actual / Forecast** | 23/10/2022 (forecast) |
| **Status** | In progress |

## Hours Spent

| **Item** | **Stage Baseline** | **Actual to Date** | **Forecast @ Completion** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Package 1** | 160 | 183.5 | 183.5 |
| **Package 2** | 150 | 121.5 | 121.5 |
| **Package 3** | 200 | - | 200 |
| **Package 4** | 200 | - | 200 |
| **Package 5** | 200 | - | 200 |
| **Package 6** | 200 | - | 200 |
| **Total** | 1110 | 183.5 | 1133.5 |

| Go to Green Strategy |
| --- |
| - |

| Issues and Notable Events |
| --- |
| All team members had multiple assessments from other units due during this reporting period. This created a delay in starting and submitting the initial drafts for the SRS document, as well as the completion of the Project Plan.  Furthermore, the group had to deal with multiple members, specifically Austin and Dillon who had to go into covid isolation, making meeting up in person extremely difficult. Dillon was tested positive and had symptoms which hindered him from contributing as much  As the package took place over a 3-week period instead of the standard 4-week period (for most other packages), the team decided to combine two sprints into a single 3-week sprint. As a result, less sprint-specific meetings were held. |

| Resource Activity Summary This Reporting Period |
| --- |
| **Austin Bevacqua**  Functional and non-functional requirement brainstorming. Formatted brainstorming into a list of requirements. Creating the requirements table and labelling the difficulty and business value for each requirement. Creating the project plan with Bradley. Organised and ran kickoff, retrospective and sprint meetings.  **Bradley Van Der Zwan**  Contributed to the key actors, product functions, and external interface requirements of the Software Requirements Specification document. Added tasks, duration, and dependencies on the project plan. Attended each team and supervisor meeting, and wrote meeting minutes for each of them. Brainstormed functional and non-functional requirements. Also submitted both drafts of the SRS, and the drafts for the project plan and progress report.  **Dillon Vincent**  Helped with brainstorming functional and non-functional requirements.Had a meeting with the supervisors and took the feedback to edit the SRS and proofread it. Looked deeper into section 2.2 Product Functions.  **Ryan Webster** Participated in the brainstorming for the functional and non-functional requirements. Researched existing social music streaming applications to further understand requirements. Estimated values for non-functional requirements.  **Tanaka Chitete**  Devised outline for the contents of the SRS–namely, “Introduction”, “Overall Description”, “External Interface Requirements”, “Functional Requirements”, and “Non-Functional Requirements”, along with the relevant subsections. Furthermore, actively took part in brainstorming functional and non-functional requirements, formally defining said requirements and making necessary refinements. |
|  |

| Weekly Effort Charts (hours per resource) |
| --- |
| **Austin Bevacqua:**Chart  **Bradley Van Der Zwan:**  Chart  **Dillon Vincent:**  Chart  **Ryan Webster:**  Chart  **Tanaka Chitete:**  Chart |

| Team Achievements This Reporting Period |
| --- |
| Completion of package 2. This includes the software requirements specification, first iteration of the project plan, and this document.  Two SRS drafts were submitted before version 1.0, and one progress report and project plan were submitted to gain feedback before the final submissions.  Functional and non-functional requirements are all defined, categorised, and labelled inside of the software requirements specification. |

| Risks and Issues Outlook |
| --- |
| Risks  Some of the values defined in the non-functional requirements could be deemed unrealistic in practice once the application is developed. For example, the NFR: “The system must be able to process up to 300 votes per second.” may be easily achievable, or may not be achievable at all, as the team is not entirely sure of the potential performance capacity. These are more of an estimate and may be changed throughout the duration of the project.  In the event that the Project Plan cannot be adhered to for specific tasks in the given time-frame, it will be revised to reflect these issues. Tasks may be shifted into further packages, for example: moving ‘Song Queue’ tasks currently in package 4 to package 5. On the contrary, if all tasks are met within a package with time to spare, additional tasks may be added, or tasks from future packages may be pushed forward. |

| Planned Activity for Next Reporting Period |
| --- |
| Completion of package 3 - Solution Specification. This deliverable will include use cases, walkthroughs, architectural diagrams, ER diagrams, test plans and component descriptions. This deliverable will also include an updated progress report, and an updated version of the progress plan if there are any changes.  The major sections to be considered for the solution specification include:   * Business Requirements and Goals * Business Model * Solution Architecture Model * Detailed Physical Architecture * Solution Impact * Quality Attributes * Success Criteria and Test Plan * Phasing, Roadmap, and Implementation Plan |

| Planned Resource Activity Next Reporting Period |
| --- |
| Every member will work together to participate in meetings and discussions about the formatting of the solution specification. Two sprint kickoff meetings will run, alongside two sprint retrospectives. A meeting with Amristar will take place each week on Monday to discuss progress and ask questions regarding package 3.  **Austin Bevacqua**   * Will organise, plan and run all standup, kickoff and retrospective meetings. (10%) * Will complete the business model portion of the solution specification   + Organisational Context (10%)   + Current Situation (10%)   + Solution Definition (15%)   + Actors (10%)   + Interactions of Actors (10%)   + Use Cases (30%) * Will update the project plan if there are any changes (5%)   **Bradley Van Der Zwan**   * Will write and submit meeting minutes, and submit drafts (10%) * Will update the project plan if there are any changes (5%) * Will complete the solution architecture portions of the solution specification:   + Solution Components (20%)   + Integration Specification (20%)   + Walk-throughs (30%)   + Information Model (25%)   **Dillon Vincent**   * Will complete test plans for the solution specification * Detailed Physical architecture   + Network Diagram (30%) * Solution Impact   + Impact on Processes (10%)   + Impact on People (10%)   + Technical Impact (10%) * Success Criteria and Test Plan   + Use Case Validation (10%)   + Validation of Solution (15%)   + Test Plan (15%)   **Ryan Webster**   * Will complete architectural diagrams and ER diagrams for the solution specification   + Business Drivers (10%)   + Solution Requirements (20%)   + High Level Metrics for Success (12%)   + Architecture Boundary (18%)   + System Specification Summary (20%)   + Configuration Requirements (20%)   **Tanaka Chitete**   * Will complete the quality attributes section for the solution specification   + Reliability (15%)   + Availability (15%)   + Serviceability (15%)   + Best Practice Commentary (25%)   + Architecture Commentary (25%) * Will contribute to the progress report (5%) |

**Product Status:**

| **Product** | **Planned Commencement Date** | **A*c*tual Commencement Date** | **Planned Completion Date** | **Estimated  Completion Date** | **Actual Completion Date** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scheduled Products** | | | | | | |
| **MP Managed Products** | | | | | | |
| **Technology Investigation Summary & Prototype** | 10/03 | 10/03 | 10/04 | 10/04 | 10/04 | Completed, with two draft submissions |
| **Software Requirement Specification (SRS)** | 11/04 | 15/04 | 1/05 | 1/05 | 1/05 | Completed, with two draft submissions |
| **Solution Specification** | 02/05 | - | 29/05 | 29/05 | - | - |
| **Application - 1st release** | 25/07 | - | 21/08 | 21/08 | - | - |
| **Application - 2nd release** | 22/08 | - | 25/09 | 25/09 | - | - |
| **Application - 3rd (final) release** | 26/09 | - | 23/10 | 23/10 | - | - |
| **Post-implementation Evaluation** | 12/10 | - | 23/10 | 23/10 | - | - |

| **Project Management Artefacts** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Progress Report 1** | 9/04 | 9/04 | 10/4 | 10/4 | 10/4 | Completed |
| **Progress Report 2** | 30/04 | 28/04 | 1/05 | 1/05 | 1/05 | Completed with one draft submission |
| **Project Plan** | 11/04 | 27/04 | 1/05 | 1/05 | 1/05 | Completed First Revision with one draft submission |
| **Progress Report 3** | 28/05 | - | 29/05 | 29/05 | - | - |
| **Progress Report 4** | 15/08 | - | 21/08 | 21/08 | - | - |
| **Progress Report 5** | 19/09 | - | 25/09 | 25/09 | - | - |
| **Progress Report 6** | 17/10 | - | 23/10 | 23/10 | - | Closure Report |

| **SCHEDULE EXCEEDED** | **LEGEND** |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT BOARD DECISIONS** |
| **APPROVED – COMPLETED** |
| **COMPLETION IN LATER STAGE** |

**END OF DOCUMENT**