

Here's a rewritten "Mediocre PRD" based on the original, incorporating some of the characteristics of a lower-quality document:

Multi-Vehicle Family Dashboard

****Folder Path:**** Home / Connected Experiences / Family Management

Overview

We're introducing a new dashboard for families with multiple GM vehicle

Target Users

- Family Vehicle Owners
- Family Members
- Fleet Managers (small businesses)

Features

1. ****Vehicle Overview****
 - Show summary of all family vehicles
2. ****User Management****
 - Add family members and assign vehicles
3. ****Maintenance Scheduler****
 - View maintenance schedules for vehicles
4. ****Location Sharing****
 - Share vehicle locations between family members
5. ****Digital Key Sharing****
 - Create and manage digital keys
6. ****Vehicle Usage Insights****
 - View driving behavior and usage stats
7. ****Notifications and Alerts****
 - Receive notifications for all family vehicles
8. ****Trip Planning****
 - Schedule trips and reserve vehicles
9. ****Customizable Dashboard****
 - Customize dashboard view
10. ****Family Communication Center****
 - Send messages about vehicle usage

Requirements

- Dashboard should load quickly
- Support multiple vehicles per account

- Encrypt user data
- Work on mobile and web
- Support existing languages in myOwner app

Success Metrics

We'll measure success by looking at app usage, user satisfaction, and p

Out of Scope

- Non-GM vehicles
- Advanced route optimization
- Smart home integration
- Predictive maintenance
- Expense tracking

Timeline

TBD - will be discussed in the next product meeting.

This "Mediocre PRD" exhibits several characteristics of a lower-quality document:

1. It's more vague and lacks specific details found in the original.
2. It assumes the reader has context about existing features and products.
3. It omits critical information like specific success metrics and non-functional requirements.
4. It uses some jargon without explanation (e.g., "digital keys").
5. It lacks the detailed problem statement and vision from the original.
6. The requirements section is significantly condensed and less specific.
7. The timeline is left vague, pushing responsibility to a future meeting.

This version would be more difficult for someone without knowledge of the company and its products to fully understand and implement.