Reflection and Traceability Report on TPG

Team 3, Tangle
Calvyn Siong
Cyruss Allen Amante
Edward Gao
Richard Li
Mark Angelo Cruz

1 Changes in Response to Feedback

This section summarizes the changes made over the course of the capstone project in response to feedback from sources such as TAs, the supervisor and other teams. The associated commits can be found by clicking on the associated issue created.

1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

Here is the feedback we received on the SRS and Hazard Analysis documents, and the changes we made in response to that feedback.

Table 1: Feedback and Changes for SRS Documentation

Feedback Source	**Feedback Item**	**Response**	**Issue**
TA Feedback	Formalization	Attempted to improve formalization of documentation where possible.	#311
TA Feedback	Extension of Knowledge	Mentioned and cited sources where terms are taken from.	#310
TA Feedback	Verifiable Requirements	Updated requirements to ensure they were testable and measurable.	#309
TA Feedback	Traceable Requirements	Added traceability matrix to enhance traceability.	#308
TA Feedback	What not How (Abstract)	Revised some requirements to focus on "what" the system should do rather than "how" it should do it.	#307
TA Feedback	Content of SRS (Functionality and Specificity)	Revised functional requirements and clarified ambiguous sections.	#305

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA Feedback	Formatting and Style	Modified formatting according to feedback.	#306
Peer Review	Project Goals	Modified project goals associated with peer review.	#106
Peer Review	Verifiability	Adjusted specified requirements for verifiability.	#105
Peer Review	User Business	Clarified problem context.	#104
Peer Review	Dev Planning	Updated development planning section with metrics.	#102
Peer Review	Data Dictionary and Scope	Revised data dictionary.	#101
Peer Review	Maintainability, Supportability, Adaptability Requirements	Adjusted requirements for maintainability, supportability, and adaptability.	#107
Peer Review	Fix Functional Requirements	Revised concerned FR-6 for specificity.	#103

Table 2: Feedback and Changes for Hazard Analysis

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA Feedback	Recommended Actions	Modified actions to be more actionable.	#314
TA Feedback	Hazard Identification	Adjusted concerned sections with feedback.	#313
TA Feedback	Spelling and Grammar	Corrected spelling and grammar errors and implemented other feedback specified.	#312
Peer Review	Inconsistent Hazard Reference	Fixed inconsistency between hazard references.	#136
Peer Review	Potential Missing Hazard for FMEA	Added missing hazards to the FMEA analysis.	#135
Peer Review	Priority Assignment	Revised priority assignments based on updated risk assessments.	#133
Peer Review	No Mitigation Strategy	Modify mitigation strategies for hazards.	#132
Peer Review	Prioritization Justification	Provided detailed justification for hazard prioritization.	#130
Peer Review	SRS Linking Roadmap	Linked SRS in roadmap to hazard analysis.	#128
Peer Review	Ambiguous Terms	Clarified ambiguous terms in the hazard analysis.	#134

1.2 Design and Design Documentation

Here is the feedback we received on the design documents (MG and MIS), and the changes we made in response to that feedback.

Table 3: Feedback and Changes for Module Guide

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA Feedback	Quality Information	Fixed all addressed concerns with issue.	#346
Peer Review	Lack of Links to Other Documents	Added links and references to related documents/sections for better traceability.	#242
Peer Review	Module Decomposition	**Did Not Fix**: Decomposition was deemed unnecessary for the current scope.	#240

Table 4: Feedback and Changes for Module Specification Interface

Feedback Source	Feedback Item	Response	Issue
TA Feedback	Enough to Build	**Did Not Fix**: Did not include additional sketchecs or examples, as current level of detail seemed sufficient for our project scope.	#347
Peer Review	Confusion	Clarified confusing sections in the module specification interface.	#245
Peer Review	Lack of Info for Independent Developer	Added additional details to support independent developers.	#243
Peer Review	Incorrect "Uses"	Corrected "Uses" subsections in the module specification interface for modules.	#244

1.3 VnV Plan and Report

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]