

# Problem Statement and Goals

## Software Engineering

Team #6, Six Sense  
Omar Alam  
Sathurshan Arulmohan  
Nirmal Chaudhari  
Kalp Shah  
Jay Sharma

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Developer(s)	Change
Date1	Name(s)	Description of changes
Date2	Name(s)	Description of changes
...	...	...

## 1 Problem Statement

### 1.1 Problem

Individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing tend to have difficulties with staying situationally aware, generally leading to increased risk of injury. Many safety cues such as "the sounds of a tea kettle, the warning beep as a fork lift backs up, and the engine of an oncoming car may be missed". [1] General sound cues such as someone calling their name, or a phone ringing, may also be missed, often leading to miscommunication and elevated frustration. With 1 in 10 Canadians being impacted by hearing loss [2], there are over 4 million individuals in Canada dealing with these struggles every day.

### 1.2 Inputs and Outputs

The high level input of the system is the audio from the surrounding environments, with the output being a visual indication of the direction of audio sources and their respective classifications.

### **1.3 Stakeholders**

The primary stakeholders are individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing.

### **1.4 Environment**

The software environment is a real-time operating system (RTOS, i.e. FreeRTOS) running C/C++ code. The hardware environment is a 4 dimensional microphone array, with each microphone connected to a STM32F767 microcontroller for processing, as well as a pair of smart glasses (Rokid Smart Glasses) for the visual display.

## **2 Goals**

## **3 Stretch Goals**

## **4 Extras**

1. Price + Hardware Selection Report
2. Usability Report

## Appendix — Reflection

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?

**Omar Alam:** I think all members of our team were proactive and genuinely interested in the project presented which made it easier to delegate and expect high quality work.

**Jay Sharma:** We aligned quickly on the problem and split responsibilities in a way that played to each person's strengths. Our LaTeX/Git workflow came together smoothly, which helped us iterate fast on the documents.

**Kalp Shah:** I think we all had a good understanding of the project after discussing it in detail during the write up for the development plan. Due to this, everyone was able to quickly contribute to the problem statement and goals without much difficulty.

**Sathurshan Arulmohan:** I focused on writing the Extras section of this deliverable. Since these items were pre-approved by the course instructor during the project approval stage, the writing process was straightforward and required minimal revisions.

2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?

**Omar Alam:** Since the project idea incorporates glasses with displays that are visible to the user, we had to do a significant amount of research to figure out if it was feasible in the time that we have. We resolved this by developing a contingency plan that would allow us to still allow us to develop the core algorithms without the display glasses.

**Jay Sharma:** Our main pain point was deciding on the hardware that we would use for the project. We had to spend a significant amount of time researching the different options and their feasibility.

**Kalp Shah:** I think we did end up spending a lot of time exploring the scope and feasibility of the project while writing the development plan which caused us to spend less time writing the problem statement and

goals. We ended up writing it all on the day before the deadline which was not a problem (as mentioned above - we already knew what to write), but cause a bit of stress.

**Sathurshan Arulmohan:** My main contribution to this deliverable was reviewing pull requests. The challenge was understanding the expected quality and depth since it is the team's first submission. To address this, we used Pull Requests to exchange feedback and propose improvements. This process helped the team establish documentation standards and align on expectations.

3. How did you and your team adjust the scope of your goals to ensure they are suitable for a Capstone project (not overly ambitious but also of appropriate complexity for a senior design project)?

**Omar Alam:** My team and I spent a significant amount of time researching the feasibility of the project. Since the team does not have much experience with signal processing, we decided to consult with Dr. Mohrenschildt to get his opinion on the project. He provided us with valuable feedback on how to constraint our project goals to ensure that we can complete the project in the time we have.

**Jay Sharma:** We started by mapping the problem space, did feasibility analyses, and set criteria around impact, difficulty, and time. We also checked in with Prof. Mohrenschildt to advise the direction of our project and keep the scope focused for the capstone timeline.

**Kalp Shah:** A lot of what we did for defining the scope of the goals was done through research and consulting with Dr. Mohrenschildt and Dr. Smith. Dr. Mohrenschildt helped us better understand the expected time and resource costs of the project since he has experience with similar work and confirmed with us that our scope is neither too simple nor too ambitious for a Capstone project.

**Sathurshan Arulmohan:** During the project proposal stage, the scope of the project was large. We had many features in mind, and we were not aware of the software and hardware complexities of achieving our vision. To refine this, each member shared their desired learning outcomes and technical interests. Through this discussion, we narrowed the scope of features and goals that balanced feasibility with sufficient challenge.

## References

- [1] E. Masterson, "Measuring the impact of hearing loss on quality of life," *NIOSH Science Blog*, 2016.
- [2] Healthing.ca, "Hearing loss in canada: Stats, impact and resources," *Healthing.ca*, 2025.