

## Minutes

Location: Shed

Date: Wednesday 28th February

Not In Attendance: N/A

Attendance: Dharius Robinson, Daniel Knox, Daniel Carl Beauchamp, Natalie McLaren

### **What's Been Done since the Previous Meeting:**

<Natalie M>:

- Integration testing (testing sensor connected to processor and LoRaWan to ensure readings were being sent when expected to)

<Dharius>:

- Battery document

<Daniel B>:

- Integration testing (testing sensor connected to processor and LoRaWan to ensure readings were being sent when expected to)

### **Topics discussed:**

- **Poster:**

- Dan Knox explains that we should check coverage in Elliot (location of poster fair).
  - Having the device with us might be a downside if we don't get coverage.
  - Having it outside on the river, will be good but means not having the device with us
- Dan Knox suggests we talk who is going to say what - how we are going to talk about our project, what things we should mention
- We should also make sure that we can fire up any of our components (database etc) at a given time

- **Abstract:**

- We confirm that we have our abstract ready to submit

- **General:**

- continue completing tasks on list
- Dharius asks whether we should now focus more on getting the hardware together (once PCBs arrive) etc.
  - Dan Knox says we should focus on documentation now if we have free time as it would benefit us to start early
  - He says he will be responsible for setting up our hardware

- **Testing:**

- Integration testing:
  - We explain we got everything working together (sensor connected to processor and LoRaWan. Our system sent readings, errors and “still here” messages as and when expected.
- Dharius asks should we spend a lot of time doing a lot of tests
  - Dan Knox suggests we test properly - our tests should evaluate whether our device functions in normal situations
  - Things to think about:
    - What are the use cases?
      - If we say it takes x value and outputs y - then create a test that to ensure it does just that
  - Dharius asks whether it makes sense to make one for each function then
    - Dan Knox confirms that methodology would work - testing each thing individually - as that is the methodology we’ve gone for especially in the engineering menu
    - Start from lowest level then work outwards
      - E.g. can it handle being given a null?
      - E.g. if something is supposed to throw an error - does it if the condition is met?

**What’s Being Done:**

- Submit abstract and poster
- Continue on source code/with checklist

**Further Discussion:**