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| Meeting Purpose: | Weekly status report to the Client |
| Meeting Date: | *03/02/18* |
| Meeting Time: | 11:00 |
| Meeting Location: | Trottier 4100 |
| Meeting Facilitator: | Prof. Lowther |
| Attendees: | Prof. Lowther, Bryan Jay, Luka Jurisic, Patrick Ghazal, Tianyi Zou, Enan, Volen |
| Minutes Issued By: | Luka Jurisic |

| **Next Steps:** (Task, Assigned to, Checkpoint Date) | **Owner** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Improve the Gantt Chart to better reflect the teams progress; Bryan Jay | Prof. Lowther | 14/03/18 |
| Implement one of the 3 presented hardware Designs; Enan | Prof. Lowther | 13/03/18 |
| Create extensive version histories for all related documents; Luka Jurisic | Prof. Lowther | 13/03/18 |
| Create the Software Architecture; Volen | Volen | 13/03/18 |

| **Decisions Made:** (What, Why, Impacts) |
| --- |
| 1. Gantt Chart needs to improved    * Updating Gantt chart every week based on actual budget. As Progress is made, or if there are problems that delay the expected completion of a task, this must be accordingly reflecting in the Gantt chart. 2. Version control system for Documentation to be improved.    * *Currently, a version history exists for each document. However, the client needs to be able to go back to a point in time and read exactly a system document as it was in that current state. Thus, extensive version documentation must be created.* 3. System Document needs to be slightly improved.    * A flowchart of the whole design needs to implemented. This is not urgent, as we are still in preliminary stages. |
|  |

| **Discussion:** (Items/Knowledge Shared) |
| --- |
| 1. PowerPoint Presentation   * + *Presentation was well executed and Presented. However, it was far too long. Prof. Lowther explained that in the future, it must be under 10 minutes long.*   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   * + The Gantt chart was the overriding topic of discussion during this meeting. Prof. Lowther provided many critiques regarding how our Gantt chart currently poorly reflects the actual progress made, and progress left towards our end goal. He advised on adding competition bars, and updating the chart daily/weekly/task based to reflect the actual current budget of the team.   4. Version Control   * + Gantt. Prof. Lowther commented that any other team must be able to pick up this project at any point in time and be able to understand what has been done and how to continue. If our team fails in providing the end requirements of the client, another team could pick this project and continue from a point before failure occurred. Therefore, extensive version control histories must be created and well organized.   5. Project Specifications   * + Our team discussed a few points of doubt regarding the exact specifications of the final project. For example, when crossing the bridge, the specifications do not say that we have to have both wheels on it. As such, we thought we could loop around this and have 1 wheel in the water while crossing the bridge as it would make it easier. However, Prof. Lowther clarified that this is not allowed and that both wheels must be on the bridge. He continued by stating that the specifications document has other similar ambiguities that encourage students to be creative in their design choses; i.e. some scenarios can be exploited by the team.   **PARKING LOT**: |
|  |

| **Miscellaneous Items:** |
| --- |
| * The following week’s meeting time has been moved from Friday to Wednesday (14th March) * The beta demo is on march 25th |