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| Meeting Purpose: | Weekly status report to the Client |
| Meeting Date: | *03/14/18* |
| Meeting Time: | 11:00 |
| Meeting Location: | Trottier 4100 |
| Meeting Facilitator: | Prof. Lowther |
| Attendees: | Prof. Lowther, Bryan Jay, Patrick Ghazal, Tianyi Zou, Enan, Volen. |
| Minutes Issued By: | Luka Jurisic ( after receiving notes of the meeting) |

| **Next Steps:** (Task, Assigned to, Checkpoint Date) | **Owner** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Improve the Gantt Chart by implementing use of ID’s; Bryan Jay | Prof. Lowther | 03/22/18 |
| Hardware design needs to be built and tested built; Enan | Prof. Lowther | 03/22/18 |
| Improve the documentation for Hardware | Prof. Lowther | 03/22/18 |
| Create the Software Architecture; Volen, Patrick | Prof. Lowther | 03/22/18 |

| **Decisions Made:** (What, Why, Impacts) |
| --- |
| 1. Gantt Chart needs to improved    * Implement ID’s on the Gantt Chart 2. Hardware documentation to be improved    * The document needs to be updated to reflect the necessary developments in the design. 3. Software to improve their pace.    * The software team is slowing the team down, they need to start implementing the requirements for the beta demo. |
|  |

| **Discussion:** (Items/Knowledge Shared) |
| --- |
| 1. Hardware Documentation/ Design   * + During the meeting, the hardware design was detailed and physically exhibited. However, the progress seen through this has not been properly reflected in the hardware document. It was also discussed that the back wheel needs to be fixed because it is causing issues when crossing the bridge. It is too unstable to deal with the speed bumps.   2. Hardware Designs Presented   * + The presented 3 designs were each briefly discussed with the Professor. Each design was liked, and Prof.Lowther simply commented that now it was up to us to test and evaluate which of the 3 designs is superior.   3. Gantt Chart   * + Following the criticisms from the first meeting, necessary improvements to the Gantt Chart were made, however, ID’s explicitly correlating an action to the team time sheet must be implemented.   4. Software   * + Ideas regarding the software implementation were discussed. It was noted that Navigation accuracy depends on the size and leeway granted when entering the bridge. Secondly, due to multiple instances of having to localize, there should be a method implemented to allow the ongoing localization to adjust to error.   5. Project Specifications   * + The beta demo specification were discussed.   + 1) The Robot will localize. 2) Navigate tunnel and localize. 3) Navigate bridge and localize. Initial localization must take no longer than 30 seconds.   **PARKING LOT**: |
|  |

| **Miscellaneous Items:** |
| --- |
|  |