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| Meeting Purpose: | Weekly status report to the Client |
| Meeting Date: | *04/06/18* |
| Meeting Time: | 11:00 |
| Meeting Location: | Trottier 4100 |
| Meeting Facilitator: | Prof. Lowther |
| Attendees: | Prof. Lowther, Luka Jurisic, Bryan Jay, Patrick Ghazal, Tianyi Zou, Enan, Volen. |
| Minutes Issued By: | Luka Jurisic |

| **Next Steps:** (Task, Assigned to, Checkpoint Date) | **Owner** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Implement as many required robot behaviors as possible; **Software team** | **Prof. Lowther** | 03/29/18 |
| Testing of searching, capture, and situational behaviors must be done; Testing Team | **Team 11** | 03/28/18 |
| Documentation to be continually improved and perfected for submission; **Luka Jurisic** | **Luka Jurisic** | 04/13/18 |
| Presentation outline to be created. Practice run throughs must be done.; **Bryan Jay** | **Team 11** | 04/11/18 |
| Final Report to be written; **Luka Jurisic** | **Luka Jurisic** | 04/13/18 |
| Clear and simple file directory to be created to ensure client has ease of access when viewing documents; **Luka Jurisic** | **Luka Jurisic** | 04/13/18 |
| Poster to be finalized and printed; **Luka Jurisic** | **Luka Jurisic** | 04/10/18 |
| Version 1.0 of the Hardware design to be created on the LDD; **Enan Ashaduzzaman** | **Luka Jurisic** | 04/10/18 |

| **Decisions Made:** (What, Why, Impacts) |
| --- |
| 1. Do not necessarily strive to have a perfectly working robot. The goal is to implement as many required behaviors as possible to achieve marks during the competition day. 2. Version 1.0 of the Hardware Design must be created on the LDD. This is to ensure that the full evolution of the robot from preliminary design to final version 2.1 is documented visually. 3. Testing to form main part of these last 5 days.    * Tests still need to be performed and documented. Out of all the documents, this one takes priority. |
|  |

| **Discussion:** (Items/Knowledge Shared) |
| --- |
| 1.  **Maximizing Efficiency of time spent on Software**   * + During the meeting Prof. Lowther outlined the rubric on which robot performance will be graded. The team will have 4 runs, and there are 9 behaviors that, if achieved, will earn the team a point. Behaviors can be achieved across the 4 runs independent of each other. For example, if the robot successfully localizes in run 1 but fails to traverse the bridge, then in the next run it could fail localization but complete the traversal, and the team will be awarded the points for both behaviors at the end of the day. The following are the list of behavioral requirements:   + *1) Receive parameters from game controller correctly*   + *2) Localize under 30 seconds*   + *3) Navigate to tunnel/bridge*   + *4) Traverse river to other side*   + *5) Search for opposition flag*   + *6) Clearly indicate capture*   + *7) Navigate back to the start*   + *8) Stop*   + *9) Completing the entire procedure under 7 minutes.*   2. **Testing Document**   * + Following the complaints regarding the testing document in the previous meeting, there has been a significant improvement in this weeks submission. However, the obstacle traversal test, although procedurally correct, did not clearly present the results. This is because the tester thought that qualitative data did not have to be tabulated and presented clearly. Thus, this test has be formatted slightly to meet the correct client requirements.   .  3. **Budget and Timeline Discussion**   * + The Gantt chart clearly reflects that we are behind schedule, especially on software and testing. The team has put in significant hours these past 2 weeks to ensure that an attempt to come back on schedule is made. However, Prof. Lowther is quite worried, and rightly so, that a working robot for demo day is simply not feasible currently. The team concurred with his opinion, but we have ensured him that these next 5 days are solely dedicated to maximizing the success of this project. We believe that we will actually be over budget if this goal is achieved.   4. **Competition Day Discussion**   * + Prof Lowther outlined the structure of demo day. The team must be well prepared to present for 10-15 minutes to judges, and then be able to answer any questions for another 15 minutes.   + The team will be assigned 3 judges, each of varying background. For example, one judge might be a design engineer with decades of experience, while another might be a professor from outside the engineering department. Thus, it is pertinent for the presentation to be tailored to each type of judge.   + The team’s competition day checklist will ensure that we are fully prepared for the demo.   5. **Final Submission of Documentation**   * + All the documents ever produced during this project must be submitted to the client. Thus, due to a large number of documents being presented, a clear directory system must be created so that the clients.   **PARKING LOT**: |
|  |

| **Miscellaneous Items:** |
| --- |
| * One team member is below the 10% average team hour threshold. Prof Lowther once again reminded the team about the penalties for this. * Prof Lowther once again emphasized that the documentation of the project is far more important than a working robot. |