

# Reflection and Traceability Report on Plutos

Team #10, Plutos

Payton Chan

Eric Chen

Fondson Lu

Jason Tan

Angela Wang

[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. Therefore, traceability between Revision 0 and Revision 1 is an important part of the reflection exercise. 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]

[Version control can make the summary relatively easy, if you used issues and meaningful commits. If your feedback is in an issue, and you responded in the issue tracker, you can point to the issue as part of explaining your changes. If addressing the issue required changes to code or documentation, you can point to the specific commit that made the changes. Although the links are helpful for the details, you should include a label for each item of feedback so that the reader has an idea of what each item is about without the need to click on everything to find out. —TPLT]

[If you were not organized with your commits, traceability between feedback and commits will not be feasible to capture after the fact. You will instead need to spend time writing down a summary of the changes made in response to each item of feedback. —TPLT]

[You should address EVERY item of feedback. A table or itemized list is recommended. You should record every item of feedback, along with the source

of that feedback and the change you made in response to that feedback. The response can be a change to your documentation, code, or development process. The response can also be the reason why no changes were made in response to the feedback. To make this information manageable, you will record the feedback and response separately for each deliverable in the sections that follow. —TPLT]

[If the feedback is general or incomplete, the TA (or instructor) will not be able to grade your response to feedback. In that case your grade on this document, and likely the Revision 1 versions of the other documents will be low. —TPLT]



## 1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

Table 1: SRS Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">106</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add section for "normal operation"		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">107</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add section for undesired event handling		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">108</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add fit criteria to requirements		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">109</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Link requirements to rationale section		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">110</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Link likely and unlikely changes to requirements		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">38</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: OCR system accuracy	✓	—	This was a question, which was answered as a comment in the issue.
<a href="#">39</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: OCR pipeline privacy	✓	—	This was a question, which was answered as a comment in the issue.
<a href="#">40</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: release platform		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">41</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team23]: Non-Functional Requirements Verifiability	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Changes made
<a href="#">42</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Ambiguous Response Time Specifications	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Changes made
<a href="#">43</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Item Recognition and Categorization Requirements	✓	<a href="#">299</a>	Slightly reworded requirements to make them more clear, but the issue was more of a clarification question than feedback
<a href="#">44</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Data retention and Deletion Policies	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Changes made
<a href="#">105</a>	TA Feedback	docs(SRS): Include formal/math specs	✓	<a href="#">300</a>	Added formal math specifications in SRS for OCR model, data constraints, budget calculation and receipt/receipt item data definitions

Table 2: Hazard Analysis Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">111</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Add list of tables	✓	<a href="#">288</a>	Added table
<a href="#">112</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Put constants in constants section	✓	<a href="#">288</a>	Referred to symbolic constants
<a href="#">113</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Fix hazard recommended action	✓	<a href="#">299</a>	Changed recommended action
<a href="#">51</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Expand Analysis on External System Interactions		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">52</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Enhance Network Failure Handling and Data Integrity Measures		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">53</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Improve Hazard Mitigation User Feedback		<a href="#">x</a>	
<a href="#">54</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - some assumptions needed for user end equipment	✓	<a href="#">187</a>	Added suggested assumptions
<a href="#">55</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - concern about problem resolution	✓	<a href="#">187</a>	Added suggested changes

## 1.2 Design and Design Documentation

Table 3: Design Doc Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">158</a>	Peer Review	Module hierarchy diagram Link Issue	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Adjusted DAG diagram
<a href="#">239</a>	TA Review	DetDesDoc semantics - add 'main' UI module	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Adjusted DAG diagram and added Main UI module to module hierarchy and DAG
<a href="#">238</a>	TA Review	DetDesDoc semantics - add state diagram	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added state diagram to Figma
<a href="#">240</a>	TA Review	DetDesDoc semantics - exception handling specs	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added exception handling section for item misclassification
<a href="#">159</a>	Peer Review	OCR Processing Module Issue	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added exception handling section for OCR module

### 1.3 VnV Plan and Report

Table 4: VnV Plan Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">74</a>	Peer Review	Automated Testing and Verification Tools	×		Daily sanity checks aren't necessary as we are running the tests and linter pipelines on every PR. This will ensure that the app/features work seamlessly after every change.
<a href="#">75</a>	Peer Review	Load Testing for Concurrent Users	×	<a href="#">298</a>	Already addressed in initial version of VnVPlan 'Performance tests can be conducted to measure the app's speed and reliability, especially when processing large receipts or handling multiple users'.
<a href="#">120</a>	TA	docs(vnv): system tests for FRs	✓	<a href="#">290</a>	Adjust control of system tests.
<a href="#">119</a>	TA	docs(vnv): add to testing plan	✓	<a href="#">290</a>	Adjust functional testing criteria.
<a href="#">52</a>	Peer Review	Enhance Network Failure Handling and Data Integrity Measures	✓	<a href="#">185</a>	

Table 5: VnV Report Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">266</a>	Peer Review	Missing Functionality	×		A couple of the FRs weren't implemented yet during the initial draft of VnVReport - they have now been implemented. As for account update and notifications, we felt that for the scope of the project, these functionalities would be able to be implemented later.
<a href="#">267</a>	Peer Review	Reduced accuracy	✓	<a href="#">306</a>	Added more reasoning as to why we decreased accuracy threshold.
<a href="#">268</a>	Peer Review	Reduced accuracy	×		Multiple NFRs are tested (NFR-ACC-1, NFR-ACC-3, NFR-MTB-1)

## 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]