

Challenges:

- We had very little idea of what was required for Section 4: Analysis Model. As this was our first time making a document like this, we did not know how specific or how generic should the use cases be. And because most of the subsections rely on the use cases, every time we added/removed use cases, we had to go through the rest of the subsections and commit similar changes.
- We felt that the document exclusively focused on the backend of the product. When the time came to implement the design in code, we were at a loss for the ideology for the GUI was not specific enough. We settled for a command-line, terminal based implementation because we thought it would be sufficient and efficient enough, but we had no guarantee because we never reviewed our options or knew what options were available to us at the time, since it was not part of the document.
- Some sections we had to completely reorganize because our initial impressions of what the section had to encompass were completely wrong.

Excellences:

- Most of the features we put as requirements (that were in addition to those expected by HtR) were implemented as written in the original version of the requirements section. This gave us a clearer picture of how the final product should function and what are its capabilities.
- We revised all document sections after learning new information on the final product and the software development process. Sections 1-3 had to be revised the most often as they were written when there was the least amount of information known about the project and were present for the longest amount of time.
- Section 5: System Architecture really helped us get the final understanding of the finished product and we heavily relied on our architecture diagram and description for the coding segment as well as subsections from Section 4: Analysis Model, like Use Cases and State Diagram.