



Australian Universities Rocket Competition 2018/2019

Progress Report 2 - Task Sheet

1 Introduction

The purpose of the second progress report is for your team to demonstrate that you are still on track to meeting the AURC launch event deadline. The second progress report also serves as a platform for teams to present any major design changes that have occurred since the first progress report to the AURC committee for review prior to the submission of the Project Technical Report.

As per the latest *AURC Scoring* document, the maximum length of the second progress report is 20 pages. This page limit is from the title page to the conclusion; appendices are excluded from the page limit but are not to be used for storing run-over from the report body.

The report should contain the information presented in the Required Information section as a minimum. Teams are free to format the report as they wish, however, all formatting must comply with the MEA Report Writing Guide

(https://www.eait.uq.edu.au/filething/files/get/teaching_learning_docs/MEA_Rep_Write_Guide_2011.pdf).

Finally, note that teams will have a period of 1 week after the release of marks and feedback for the second progress report to request clarification on their mark. After this 1 week period has lapsed the AURC will not be providing any additional feedback on the marking of the second progress report.

2 Required Information

The following information shall be included in the second progress report:

- Executive summary
- Overview of design changes/updates
 - Major rocket design changes
 - Payload changes/updates
 - Avionics changes/updates
- Production Overview
 - Brief overview of manufacturing processes/techniques used for critical components including your nose cone, airframe and fins.
 - Brief overview of your assembly processes/techniques.
 - Brief overview of materials and adhesives used (justification provided where necessary)
- Timeline Update
 - Details on current certification status
 - Details on schedule for test flights
 - Details on manufacturing milestones
 - Any other major updates since the first progress report
- Project SWOT Analysis

- Brief SWOT analysis of the project in the context of your team's current and past performance
- Conclusion
- Appendices [As Required]

In addition to the details listed above your team will need to submit your latest OpenRocket file at the time of report submission. This file will not be explicitly marked, but will be used to verify any design changes and ensure your team is still on track and is making good progress towards the AURC launch event. Feedback on your OpenRocket model will only be provided if it is believed that your design poses a serious safety risk.

3 Criteria Sheet

Your final grade for the progress report will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a mark.

Criteria	Poor (1)	Average (2.5)	Good (5)	Score
Executive Summary (10%)	Limited or no executive summary present.	Outlines the majority of relevant findings within the report. May not be clear or concise or may be missing critical information.	Clearly and concisely outlines all relevant findings within the report in a manner suitable for presentation to an executive.	
Overview of Design Changes (20%)	<p>Major design changes not documented or do not meet AURC or AMRS requirements.</p> <p>Payload is still at an immature state with critical areas lacking in detailed design. Payload may not meet all proposed requirements/functions.</p> <p>Avionics design and integration still at an immature state. Major design changes have not been accurately captured or well justified. Avionics package may not meet all AURC, AMRS or team specified requirements.</p>	<p>Majority of major design changes documented and are safe. Small changes required in order to meet all AURC or AMRS requirements.</p> <p>Payload design and integration is predominantly matured to a preliminary design level. Some additional work is required to reach the desired progress level. Evidence suggests that the payload should be able to meet all proposed requirements/functions.</p> <p>Avionics design and integration are predominantly matured to a preliminary design level. Majority of major system changes captured and justified. Justification may be inadequate. Evidence suggests that the avionics package should be able to meet all AURC, AMRS and team specified requirements, although additional work may be required.</p>	<p>All major rocket design changes presented are safe, meet all AURC and AMRS requirements and are appropriately justified.</p> <p>Payload design and integration well thought out and matured to a preliminary design level. Some detailed design present for critical payload elements. Sufficient evidence presented to show that the payload will be able to meet all proposed requirements/functions.</p> <p>Avionics design and integration matured to a preliminary design level. Any major changes to the systems proposed within the first progress report captured and justified. Sufficient evidence presented to show that the avionics package will be able to meet all AURC, AMRS and team specified requirements.</p>	

<p>Production Overview (20%)</p>	<p>Limited or no overview of the manufacturing techniques your team will be utilising.</p> <p>Limited or no overview of the materials utilised for your vehicle. Insufficient or inappropriate justification of the materials selection.</p> <p>Unclear or missing overview of key assembly processes/techniques.</p> <p>No or limited attempt at the use of images, bullet points or diagrams to convey information. Excessive amounts of text present.</p>	<p>Functional, but not clear or concise overview of manufacturing techniques. Some critical components manufacturing techniques missing or inappropriate.</p> <p>Materials utilised for your vehicle presented but poorly justified.</p> <p>Adequate overview of key assembly processes/techniques that will be utilised. May not be brief or may require additional clarification.</p> <p>Adequate use of images, bullet points or diagrams to convey information.</p>	<p>Clear but concise overview of the manufacturing techniques your team will be utilising for the manufacturing of critical components (nose cone, airframe, fins, etc.)</p> <p>Outline of the materials utilised for your vehicle and a brief justification of the reasons behind their selection.</p> <p>Brief but clear overview of key assembly processes/techniques that will be utilised for your launch vehicle.</p> <p>Excellent use of images, bullet points or diagrams to convey information.</p>	
<p>Timeline Updates (15%)</p>	<p>Little or no attempt to update timeline relative to progress report 1.</p> <p>Limited or no details provided on certification status. Inadequate progress made towards certification.</p> <p>Missing evidence of AMRS L3 certification requirements progression or inadequate progress made. [If applicable]</p> <p>No or little details provided on key manufacturing milestones. Unrealistic manufacturing schedule.</p>	<p>Adequate attempt at presenting an updated timeline. Some minor changes missed.</p> <p>Details provided on certification status. Adequate progress made towards certification, however, additional work is required to be able to fly at TDU 2019.</p> <p>Adequate evidence of progression with AMRS L3 certification requirements. Additional work is required to ensure requirements will be fully met in time for TDU 2019. [If applicable]</p> <p>Adequate details provided on key manufacturing milestones. Some clashes between manufacturing milestones and the test flight schedule or inadequate float provided.</p>	<p>Timeline updated relative to progress report 1 to reflect any changes experienced by the team.</p> <p>Details provided on certification status. Evidence to suggest that team is on track to be able to fly at TDU 2019.</p> <p>Evidence of progression with AMRS L3 certification requirements. Team is on track to achieving L3 certification as required. [If applicable]</p> <p>Key manufacturing milestones outlined. Manufacturing milestones align with test</p>	

	No or little details provided on the proposed test flight schedule. Unrealistic test flight schedule proposed.	Test flight schedule provided is mostly realistic but may require minor changes to account for unforeseen risks.	flight schedule and allow for sufficient float in case of slippage. Realistic and achievable test flight schedule outlined with suitable float included in the timeline.	
SWOT Analysis (20%)	Limited or no SWOT analysis of the project provided. Top three risks are inappropriate or not provided. Limited or no mitigation strategies presented for the top three risks. Mitigation strategies are inappropriate. Limited or no discussion identifying any links between internal and external factors of the SWOT analysis.	SWOT analysis of the project provided but may not be brief or may be missing critical information. Top three risk are provided but may not all be the most critical for your team. Mitigation strategies presented for the top three risks. Mitigation strategies may not be concise or completely realistic. Links between internal and external factors of the SWOT analysis identified but may not be clear or concise. Some links may be inappropriate or irrelevant.	Brief but informative SWOT analysis of the project based on the context of your team. SWOT analysis must highlight the top 3 risks and opportunities for your team. Concise and realistic mitigation strategies must be presented for the top three risks. Clearly and concisely identifies any links between internal and external factors of the SWOT analysis.	
Conclusion (5%)	No attempt to present a suitable summary of the relevant information within the report.	Presents a adequate summary of most relevant information within the report.	Presents a clear and concise summary of the relevant information within the report.	
Presentation (10%)	Multiple spelling and grammar errors. Poor formatting.	Minimal spelling and grammar errors. Satisfactory formatting.	No spelling or grammar errors. Excellent formatting.	
Total				