# Reflection Report on SFWRENG 4G06 Capstone Design Project

Team #18, InfiniView-AI
Anhao Jiao
Kehao Huang
Qianlin Chen
Qi Shu
Xunzhou Ye

[Reflection is an important component of getting the full benefits from a learning experience. Besides the intrinsic benefits of reflection, this document will be used to help the TAs grade how well your team responded to feedback. In addition, several CEAB (Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board) Learning Outcomes (LOs) will be assessed based on your reflections. —TPLT]

## 1 Changes in Response to Feedback

[Summarize the changes made over the course of the project in response to feedback from TAs, the instructor, teammates, other teams, the project supervisor (if present), and from user testers. —TPLT]

[For those teams with an external supervisor, please highlight how the feedback from the supervisor shaped your project. In particular, you should highlight the supervisor's response to your Rev 0 demonstration to them. —TPLT]

### 1.1 SRS

#### 1.1.1 Changes in Response to TA Feedback

1. TA review: Python, JavaScript, etc are not really imposed technical choices.
   Changes: Eliminate the mandated technical choices, as our project does not require the specified technology.

2. TA review: Unclear what unit you're using for your upload and download speed.
   Changes: Include the speed unit in the Symbolic Constants section. For example: USER_SATISFACTION_PERCENTAGE =

#### 1.1.2 Changes in Response to Peer Review

### 1.2 Hazard Analysis

#### 1.2.1 Changes in Response to TA Feedback

1. Move the definitions section to the beginning.
   Changes: Move the Glossary to the beginning of the document.

2. The introduction section is unclear and confusing to read.
   Changes: Revise the introduction.

3. Some things like STUN and TURN are never defined.
   Changes: Add undefined terms to the Glossary.

4. There are existing "magic" numbers instead of constants.
   Changes:Add undefined numbers to the Symbolic Constants table

5. Some assumptions are too big and ambiguous.
   Changes: Revised all the assumptions and implemented a series of measurements to mitigate them.

6. PR9 is not clearly defined.
   Changes: Revised PR9 and adjusted the rationale behind this requirement.

#### 1.2.2 Changes in Response to Peer Review

1. Add STUN/TURN server to glossary and change the glossary location to the beginning.
   Changes: Reorganized the document from TA's feedback

2. Ambiguous effects of failure for ML annotation pipeline.
   Changes: Clearly stated effects of failure for both failure mode: Inaccurate Annotation Produced and Latency in Annotation.

3. Ambiguity of Critical Assumption.
   Chnages: Issues was addressed from TA's feedback.

### 1.3 Design and Design Documentation

#### 1.3.1 Changes in Response to TA Feedback

1. Be specific about dates in the timeline.
   Changes: Updated the project timeline with specific dates for all milestones and deliverables, ensuring clear expectations for project progression.

2. AC1 & 2 are very confusing.
   Changes: Clarified Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2 by redefining the terms and objectives, ensuring they are succinct and unambiguous.

3. UC10: laws can change, how will you be able to adapt to conform to new/updated laws?
   Changes: Incorporated a regulatory review process into the project plan to ensure compliance with current and future laws.

4. UC11: you should be writing these as if they're for a "real" product and not just a Capstone project. The client is definitely not an unanticipated change.
   Changes: Revise to ensure the product remains viable and adaptable for broader deployment beyond the scope of the initial capstone project.

5. UC13: this is more of a "meta" level idea about the project, rather than about the project (product) itself - isn't really necessary to include here.
   Changes: Removed this unlikely change.

#### 1.3.2 Changes in Response to Peer Review

1. Module Guide Section 3.1 missing Links to relevent documents
   Changes: Updated Section 3.1 of the Module Guide to include hyperlinks to all pertinent documents, providing easy access and navigation for readers.

2. MIS lack of Exceptions.
   Changes: Enhanced the Module Interface Specification (MIS) by defining exception handling procedures and including them in the corresponding sections, ensuring robust system behavior under error conditions.

### 1.4 VnV Plan and Report

#### 1.4.1 VnVplan: Changes in Response to TA Feedback

1. Some minor grammatical errors.
   Changes: Conducted a comprehensive proofreading of the VnV Plan and corrected all grammatical errors to enhance the document's clarity and professionalism.

2. Write the document much more professionally, should never explicitly reference anything about the team being the "weak link".
   Changes: Revised the language throughout the document to maintain a professional tone, removing any self-referential comments about the team's shortcomings.

3. Some things in the plan are not explained.
   Changes: Expanded the explanations for all elements within the plan, ensuring that the document is self-explanatory and comprehensive.

4. Make better use of your symbolic constants section.
   Changes: Refactored the symbolic constants section to improve readability

and accessibility, and integrated these constants throughout the document for consistent reference.

5. Be more clear about your 1 to 5 scale in the testing plan.
   Changes: Defined the 1 to 5 scale in the testing plan with explicit criteria for each level, ensuring a clear understanding of the test result expectations.

#### 1.4.2 VnVplan: Changes in Response to Peer Review

1. Relevant documents should include design documents (even if they haven't been written yet), such as the Module Guide and Module Interface Specification.
   Changes: Listed all anticipated design documents in the VnV Plan with provisional titles and descriptions, outlining their purpose and interrelations.

2. Specify what kinds of testing strategies your teammates will employ for specific modules of the project.
   Changes: Detailed individual testing strategies tailored for each module, assigned to specific team members, with clear objectives and methodologies.

3. NFR-T1 specifies functional interaction to test but LF-1 is purely non functional and does not specify any functionality. Consider adding in another functional requirement to specify this functionality or alter the NFR-T1 appropriately.
   Changes: Modified NFR-T1 to delineate the boundary between functional and non-functional requirements clearly

4. NFR-T18 fit criteria not specific
   Changes: Elaborated on the fit criteria for NFR-T18, providing measurable and observable conditions for successful implementation.

#### 1.4.3 VnV Report: Changes in Response to TA Feedback

#### 1.4.4 VnV Report: Changes in Response to Peer Review

## 2 Design Iteration (LO11)

[Explain how you arrived at your final design and implementation. How did the design evolve from the first version to the final version? —TPLT]

## 3 Design Decisions (LO12)

[Reflect and justify your design decisions. How did limitations, assumptions, and constraints influence your decisions? —TPLT]

# 4 Economic Considerations (LO23)

[Is there a market for your product? What would be involved in marketing your product? What is your estimate of the cost to produce a version that you could sell? What would you charge for your product? How many units would you have to sell to make money? If your product isn't something that would be sold, like an open source project, how would you go about attracting users? How many potential users currently exist? —TPLT]

# 5 Reflection on Project Management (LO24)

[This question focuses on processes and tools used for project management. —TPLT]

## 5.1 How Does Your Project Management Compare to Your Development Plan

[Did you follow your Development plan, with respect to the team meeting plan, team communication plan, team member roles and workflow plan. Did you use the technology you planned on using? —TPLT]

## 5.2 What Went Well?

[What went well for your project management in terms of processes and technology? —TPLT]

## 5.3 What Went Wrong?

[What went wrong in terms of processes and technology? —TPLT]

## 5.4 What Would you Do Differently Next Time?

[What will you do differently for your next project? —TPLT]