# 1 Review Meetings

## 1.1 Review of Support plan document

**Date:** 21-04-2021
**Place:** mail correspondence
**Participants:** Company G, Company H
**Responsible:** Company H

### 1.1.1 Purpose of meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to review the document: Support Plan for the Updated Reconnaissance Pod, doc ID: 13, from Company G.

### 1.1.2 Comments from the review:

- sec 5: Phase out is not really described as you are stating here.

- sec 5.1 : How do you ensure that they keep the needed training qualities are there any tests or similar?

- sec 5.1: Maybe refer to the document where these training programs are defined or similar information about them.

- sec 5.2: Are the batches described? quantity, version number or similar. Also refer to them

- sec 6.2: Possibly add dates, im assuming u know the date of delivery

- sec 6.3: Better description, thought in the start that is was to stop taking pictures of the problem :) Maybe a more general statement such as stop the usage of the system or limit the usage as much as possible.

- sec 6.3: Should Company G be contacted every time or is there a protocol to follow?

### 1.1.3 Conclusion

In general a fine support plan!

## 1.2 Review of Test plan document

**Date:** 21-04-2021
**Place:** mail correspondence
**Participants:** Company G, Company H
**Responsible:** Company H

### 1.2.1 Purpose of meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to review the document: System Test Description, doc ID: 12, from Company G.

### 1.2.2 Comments from the review:

- sec 5: SRD? or SRS ?

- sec 6: Perhaps add the actual SRD requirement to the table just to be certain.

- sec 6: Is it true that you test the entire physical system by simulating it? You do not involve the actual system? Perhaps elaborate why this is enough to verify that the physical system works based on a software simulation?

- sec 6.1, id :std-c-01: We assume that all descriptions are valid...

- sec 6.1, id :std-c-01: It would perhaps make sense to elaborate what these simulation systems do and how they are enough to test the physical system?

- sec 6.1 - verif. method: What does this mean? Verification method?

- sec 7.2: ID: STD-EI-02, test steps: Not all tests have a verify/assert step - perhaps make it more clear about what is input, expected output and how to verify it.

### 1.2.3 Conclusion

A fine but not very detailed test plan. You could add some descriptions as commented.

## 1.3   Receipt of review of Support plan document

**Date:** 21-04-2021
**Place:** mail correspondence
**Participants:** Company A, Company H
**Responsible:** Company A

### 1.3.1   Purpose of meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to receive a review of the document: Support Plan, ID: SP-01-00-MJE_RC_MD_JB-v01-19042021

### 1.3.2   Comments from the review:

- sec 2.1 : Abbreviation? SOI

- sec 2.2 : Where specifically? casebook page?

- sec 3: Maybe put in a table, to make it look a bit cleaner

- sec 4: Not sure what the concrete meaning of this section is, but could still be relevant.

- sec 5: is this specified in the test plan? and if so, it should be added as a reference sec 5.1: Maybe a table of responsibilities

- sec 6.2: Maybe give a concrete predetermined number

## 1.4 Receipt of review of Test plan document

**Date:** 21-04-2021
**Place:** mail correspondence
**Participants:** Company A, Company H
**Responsible:** Company A

### 1.4.1 Purpose of meeting

The purpose of this meeting is to receive a review of the document: System Test Description, ID: STD-01-00-ALL-v01-20210420.

### 1.4.2 Comments from the review:

- sec4: Fint at i skriver at i har valgt at fokusere på system requirements og godt at i så også referer til hvert enkelt system requirement

- 4.3: good

- 5.1: Overall nice description

- 5.1 pre con: Could be nice with a table or listing to get an overview of what the prerequisites are

- sec 5.1 test proc 2: Why is a specific point the starting point? Unclear

- sec 5.1 post cond: Why is there a lower bound? Also discreppancy between the post condition and what is stated in the first part (no lees than 30 mins and no more than 1 hour)

- sec 5.1 SRS: Bør det ikke være et system requirement og ikke et test scenarie? Går ud fra at T står for test