Reflection and Traceability Report on SFWRENG 4G06A

Team #25, RapidCare
Pranav Kalsi
Gurleen Rahi
Inreet Kaur
Moamen Ahmed

1 Changes in Response to Feedback

This section summarizes the changes we have made in regards to the feedback we got from TAs, supervisor, peer review, supervisor, and during usability testing. The changes made can be found in the below able by clicking on associated issues. In order to ease the traceability we have categorized the issue into milestones such as 'TA Feedback Issues', 'Peer Review', and 'Final Doc Updates' which can be found in Team-25's Capstone Deliverables Project. Associated PRs for issues can be viewed under specific views created for TA feedback, Peer review, and Final documentation updates issues.

1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

Changes to SRS and Hazard Analysis along with the feedback, response and associated issues and PRs can be found in the tables below:

Table 1: Changes for SRS Documentation

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA	Document Content: missing revision history; Document Organisation: Incorrect template; LO Ext. Knowledge: No mention of feedback from supervisor; LO Formalisation: Missing formalisation and other sections related to data types etc.	Template updated to include all relevant sections including formalization. External knowledge from supervisor added. Revision history updated.	#166

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA	Formatting and Style: Grammar, capitilization errors; Focus on Users: Issues with stakeholder and user section; Phase In Plan: missing phase in plan; LO Impact: impact on society is not clear	Fixed grammar, random capitilization. Updated stakeholders and users section. Society is listed as a stakeholder along with impact on health safety, cultural diversity etc. Phase in plan added.	#167
TA	Notations and Conventions: use case diagram missing labels	Use case diagram updated	#168
TA	What not How(Abstract): Constraints listed as requirements; Basis for Design: Vague constriants, HIPAA included which is not applicable; LO Standards: vague requirements	Constriants and NFRs updated to address issues. Compliance is changed to PIPEDA.	#169
TA	Complete, Correct and Unambiguous: Unclear requirements; Traceable Requirements: Incorrect traceability matrix; Verifiable Requirements: Unclear fit criterion	Outlined requirements and fit criterion reworded. Traceability matrix fixed.	#170

Table 2: Changes for Hazard Analysis

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA	Spelling and grammar and style: FMEA Table formatting	Formatting fixed.	#171
TA	Recommended Actions: mention user involvement in assumptions	Assumptions updated.	#172

1.2 Design and Design Documentation

Changes to Desgin and Design Documentation along with the feedback, response and associated issues and PRs can be found in the tables below:

Table 3: Changes for Design

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA			
TA			

Table 4: Changes for MG and MIS

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA	SoftArchitec: Quality Information: Some secrets are not secrets		
TA	DetDesDoc: EnoughToBuild: Vague and ambious wording		
TA	CI/CD Infrastruture: not working, actions failing	CI/CD fully setup.	
TA	LO SpecMath: no specific feedback	Already formalised best to our ability.	
TA	LO ProbSolutions: no specific feedback	Already completed best to our ability.	
TA	LO Explores: no specific feedback	Already completed best to our ability.	

1.3 VnV Plan and Report

Changes to VnV Plan and Report along with the feedback, response and associated issues and PRs can be found in the table below:

Table 5: Changes for VnV Plan

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA	Content: Broken entry in references	Reference issue fixed.	#190
TA	Spelling and grammar and style: Break into paragraphs such that one paragraph talks about one topic.	Formatting fixed.	#191
TA	Plan: VnV Reviews issues.	Updated to remove mutation testing and include a checklist.	#194
TA	System Tests for Functional Requirements are specific: Issues in input and error messages.	Provide concrete inputs and error messages.	#197
TA	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements are specific: vague tests	Updated tests to include details and concrete details	#198
TA	Nondynamic testing used as necessary: details missing for static testing	Added details for static testing and fixed errors.	#200

Table 6: Changes for VnV Report

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA			
TA			

2 Challenge Level and Extras

2.1 Challenge Level

[State the challenge level (advanced, general, basic) for your project. Your challenge level should exactly match what is included in your problem statement. This should be the challenge level agreed on between you and the course instructor. —TPLT]

2.2 Extras

[Summarize the extras (if any) that were tackled by this project. Extras can include usability testing, code walkthroughs, user documentation, formal proof, GenderMag personas, Design Thinking, etc. Extras should have already been approved by the course instructor as included in your problem statement. —TPLT]

3 Design Iteration (LO11 (PrototypeIterate))

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

[Don't just say what you changed, say why you changed it. The needs of the client should be part of the explanation. For example, if you made changes in response to usability testing, explain what the testing found and what changes it led to. —TPLT]

4 Design Decisions (LO12)

[Reflect and justify your design decisions. How did limitations, assumptions, and constraints influence your decisions? Discuss each of these separately. —TPLT]

5 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]

6 Reflection on Project Management (LO24)

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

6.1 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]

6.2 What Went Well?

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

6.3 What Went Wrong?

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

6.4 What Would you Do Differently Next Time?

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

7 Reflection on Capstone

[This question focuses on what you learned during the course of the capstone project. —TPLT]

7.1 Which Courses Were Relevant

[Which of the courses you have taken were relevant for the capstone project? —TPLT]

7.2 Knowledge/Skills Outside of Courses

[What skills/knowledge did you need to acquire for your capstone project that was outside of the courses you took? —TPLT]