BRD Analysis - 2025-08-12

Okay, thank you for providing this extensive BRD. It's a very detailed document! As a Senior BRD Analyst, I see a lot of potential here. Let's start with a high-level analysis and then delve into some specific areas. **Overall Assessment:** This BRD is impressively thorough. It covers a wide range of functionality and provides detailed specifications for the Gen-AI App Store API. However, there are areas where greater clarity and precision are needed to reduce ambiguity and facilitate smoother development. Specifically, the documentation leans heavily on "details" and "processes" that could benefit from more concrete, prescriptive guidance. **Key Areas for Improvement & Questions:** 1. **RAG Implementation – Chunking and Relevance:** The description of RAG (Page 9) mentions chunking and relevant chunk identification, but it lacks specifics. What are the default chunking parameters? What algorithm is used to determine relevance? Are there adjustable parameters for chunk size and overlap? This is a critical area, as the performance and accuracy of RAG heavily rely on effective chunking. *I'd like to see a documented strategy here.* 2. **AI Model Selection – ‘simplyfillm’ – Deeper Dive:** The description of ‘simplyfillm’ (Page 3) states it “runs all models and selects the best response.” While this is a powerful concept, it needs further clarification. How does ‘simplyfillm’ determine the “best” response? What is the scoring mechanism? What are the performance trade-offs between running all models vs. a single, optimized model? *We need a clearer definition of its effectiveness and potential resource overhead.* 3. **Guardrail Implementation - Depth of Analysis**: The guardrail system (Page 9) describes profanity detection and scam/fraud detection. It’s reassuring to know this exists, but it needs more detail. What specific keywords or patterns are flagged? Are there thresholds for triggering the guardrail? *We need the metrics surrounding this guardrail implementation to assess potential false positives and negatives.* 4. **Error Handling – Specificity**: While the error handling section (Page 8) outlines common errors, it's somewhat generic. It needs more detailed guidance on *how* to troubleshoot each error. For instance, for the “No input provided” error, what specific diagnostic steps should the user take? *Provide a troubleshooting flow chart.* 5. **Performance Metrics - 96.7% Success Rate - Validation**: The BRD states a target success rate of 96.7%. How was this success rate determined? What constitutes a “successful” response? What are the key metrics tracked to monitor performance and identify potential issues? *Need to understand the underlying methodology.* 6. **File Guidelines - DPI Recommendation:** The file guidelines (Page 10) state a recommended 300 DPI for images. Why is this important? What impact does a lower DPI have on analysis quality? *Clarify the rationale.* **Next Steps:** I'd like to focus on the RAG implementation, error handling, and AI model selection. Specifically, I'd like to schedule a follow-up discussion to: * Establish the RAG chunking strategy. * Define the ‘simplyfillm’ scoring mechanism. * Develop a detailed error troubleshooting guide. * Quantify the success rate and the associated metrics. To help me with this, could you provide the following information (if available): * The specific algorithms used for RAG chunking. * The weights/parameters used by ‘simplyfillm’ to determine the "best" response. * Sample error logs for the "No input provided" and "Input flagged by guardrail" errors. Do you agree with my initial assessment and priorities? Would you like me to prioritize any other areas for further investigation?