# Evaluation

## Introduction

Once the system is complete, it is important to analyse how the finished product compares to the original brief agreed by the customer and producer. To this end I have made my own judgements on the performance of the system against the original “SMART” objectives, as well as collecting feedback from the customer (proof of which is included in the appendix) and discussed what the implementation has succeeded in doing and what it has failed to do. I have also discussed what possible changes and additions could be made to the system and how easy it would be to expand the project.

## Comparison of Implementation with “SMART” objectives

In the analysis section a number of “SMART” objectives were laid out for the system. These objectives are compared to the finished system here, explaining to what extent they were met, to what extent they were not met, and why.

#### The Laplacian method must be implemented

The laplacian method was included in the system. It was decided that the 3x3 pixel kernel method was to be used as opposed to the 5 pixel ‘+’ kernel method as this allows for edge detection in 4 directions as opposed to two.

#### A Sobel method could be implemented

The laplacian method was not included in the system. It was decided not to include this as it was not part of the AS physics course, so time and resources would be better spent on algorithms that were in the course.