

P1C1: Reflection Document

Authors: Robert Kemp, Matthew Nguyen, Tiehang Zheng, Rishi Jeswani

What negative impacts or disappointments this MVP could have for your stakeholders?

By excluding several key features from the MVP for the food delivery service, stakeholders may experience a range of disappointments and concerns. Customers might feel frustrated by the lack of push notifications and address management, which can lead to confusion and a less seamless experience. The absence of refund handling could erode trust, especially if something goes wrong with their order. Without customer reviews and ratings, users lose a sense of transparency and community validation. Drivers may also face challenges, particularly without navigation assistance or support for multi-order deliveries, which can reduce efficiency and earnings. Internally, business teams may struggle without promotional campaign tools, loyalty programs, or performance reporting, which can limit growth, retention, and strategic decision-making. The lack of fraud detection and security monitoring could raise red flags for both internal stakeholders and external partners, potentially exposing the platform to risk. Investors and partners might view the MVP as too basic or lacking differentiation, especially without data insights to demonstrate traction or scalability.

To make our MVP more acceptable to stakeholders, we added a few important changes that balanced simplicity with usability. For example, we decided to include basic push notifications so customers would at least know when their order was confirmed or delivered, which helps reduce confusion. We also added a simple address management feature so users wouldn't have to retype their details every time they ordered. On the driver side, we introduced basic navigation support so they could complete deliveries more efficiently, even without advanced routing. For the business team, we added a lightweight reporting tool that tracks completed orders, which gives them some insight into performance without needing a full analytics system. These adjustments were made because they directly addressed the biggest pain points for customers, drivers, and business managers, while still keeping the MVP lean enough to launch quickly.

Changes per Use Case

For UC-14: Customer Support Interaction, we decided not to do it by customer support interaction because customer support is unnecessary for the final product. Customer Support is not a core value when making a product or placing and receiving orders.

For UC-16: Driver Navigation Assistance, we chose not to do this because the driver could use Google Maps or Apple Maps for driving assistance.

For UC-18: Manage Customer Addresses, we chose not to do this because the user can type their address each time when ordering their food. The product doesn't have to remember this.

For UC-17: Push Notification and Alerts, we chose not to add this to the MVP because the user can manually check when his/her order is ready. It is unnecessary to have push notifications for the product to work.

For UC-19: Promotional Campaign Management, we chose not to do this since the core value of this product is ordering and receiving orders. A promotional campaign management, while helpful for sales, is unnecessary to achieve the final goal of the product.

For UC-20: Generate Sales and Performance Reports, we chose not to do this because our MVP already has a rate and review system. It is unnecessary for our MVP to just make PDF reports. Users can go to the app to see the ratings and the reviews.

For UC-21: Handle Payment Refunds, refunds can be handled elsewhere and with our product. While we will certainly assist with any issues regarding refunds, our app does not need to handle them directly. We will work with the customers, restaurants, and banks to work out if there are any issues.

For UC 22 - While reviews build trust long-term, they are not required for the viability of the core transaction. The MVP can function and provide value (connecting a customer with a restaurant and a driver) without a public rating system.

For UC 25 - We think that Group orders add complexity—managing multiple participants, split payments, and shared carts requires advanced synchronization logic. Since MVP should target the most common flow (a single customer placing a single order), it would be best if deferred.

For UC 27 - This use case is NOT excluded. A simplified version is included as UC-03: Track Order in Real Time in the MVP list. The MVP version will focus on status updates (e.g., "Preparing," "Driver Assigned," "Out for Delivery") and a simple ETA rather than a live GPS map.

For UC 26, we think that Loyalty systems are growth/retention features, not core validation features. Implementing rewards points, expiration rules, and fraud monitoring introduces overhead. For MVP, it's more valuable to validate demand and repeat use without incentives.

For UC 30 Fraud/security features are critical in a mature system, but they require advanced monitoring. For MVP, it's more efficient to assume trusted early users (small test groups) and handle fraud risks later.