
Minutes 31st of February 2015

Tutor meeting

31st of March, 2015

2IO70

Brief overview of what was discussed and the decisions that were made

Group 16

Keet M. (Maarten)

Version 1

Contents

Attendance.....	3
Tutor.....	3
Group 16	3
Discussed points.....	4
Minutes	4
Deliverables	4
Final Report.....	4
Validation	4
System validation and testing.....	4
Software Specification.....	4
Software Implementation and Integration	4
Process part.....	4
Work Day	5
Remarks	5
Decisions	6

Attendance

Tutor

Woude J.C.S.P. van der (Jaap)

Group 16

Berg S.H.M. van den (Stefan)

Boelens W.W. (Wigger Boelens) (late)

Keet M. (Maarten)

Petrescu T. (Tudor)

Phung D.T. (Dat)

Verschuuren R.T. (Rolf)

Discussed points

Minutes

Mentioning the tutor can't see the future is trivial.

Peer assessment is now certainly going to be the same as before.

Deliverables

Tutor didn't see the separate parts on OASE. They are there though. He will look at the implementation today. The separate parts were in the Final Report though.

Final Report

Merely combination of the former reports. He couldn't see if there were changes.

Machine interface missed a picture of the machine and a table of the inputs and outputs. We should treat the Fischer Technik and the PP2 processor as black boxes.

The feedback is a first impression. He will look into it more.

Validation

Would like to have every element in bold. Explain what SLR stand for when using it the first time.

There were much more requirements in the Project Guide but they aren't in the report. Rolf mentions that the only real requirement is that the machine has to use at least 1 conveyer belt. Tutor is okay with that, but then we need to specify our high level specifications. We also need to define our SLRs.

System validation and testing

Our tutor expected that we would have performed tests on the machine but it's not mentioned in the document. We need to have the tests and see in what extent we meet the requirements and specifications.

This is a subdocument. Start with what you want to do with it. End with a conclusion consisting of what you think about the validation as a whole.

Software Specification

Tutor asked if something changed. 2 values changed, but that didn't influence too much, so it's okay.

Software Implementation and Integration

It says assembly to PHP compiler instead of PHP to assembly compiler.

Process part

Small. No link to the logbook from the Work Plan. Also, there are no numbers mentioned where conclusions could be derived from. Conclusions should be about how good the planning was, how good the execution was and if per person's time spent corresponds with the Work Plan.

The Work Plan is the blueprint for the process part.

A group reflection is missing. After the reflections we need to describe what the results were.

Process part was a little bit weak.

Work Day

Our tutor missed when we spent time instead of the assigned time.

Remarks

Wigger asked if the assembly code needs to be included into the document. Tutor confirms.

Our tutor mentions that the amount of Java code was a lot. We defend that we have a lot of states.

Our tutor would also like to see the transition from state machine to pseudo code. He would like to see an example from Java to **PHP** and an example of what the compiler does with a little piece of **PHP**. This is nice to see that things are straightforward and it would be nice to have it in the validation part.

Our tutor mentions that we didn't cover the scattered parts of the validation. This is not true, but references are needed to the different parts. The page where it is would suffice. He asks if we don't use **Latex**. We use **Word** and our tutor rests his case.

Decisions

- We will put the UPPAAL model in the appendix.
- We will put the assembly code in an appendix.
- Our tutor will give feedback on the Final Report today.
- We will have our next meeting Tuesday the 7th of April, 2015 at 10.30 hrs.
- In the next meeting we will make a new appointment for a meeting afterwards.