

TiffinTrail — Smarter routes, Warmer meals.

Reflection on MVP Scope and Stakeholder Impact

How did we decide what not to do?

When designing the MVP, we deliberately stripped away advanced or “nice-to-have” features that would add complexity without being essential for the initial release. For example, we excluded advanced recommendation engines, AI-based personalization, subscription or loyalty programs, and multi-language support. Advanced compliance and health integrations, such as HACCP monitoring, IoT sensors, and FDA tracking, were set aside because they require specialized hardware, regulatory overhead, and complex integrations that are not essential for validating basic demand. These were attractive ideas from the old use cases, but they demanded significant engineering effort, larger datasets, and more testing resources than feasible for an MVP. We also chose not to focus on overly detailed restaurant profiles (e.g., photos, full reviews, extensive filters), since our goal was to get users from registration → restaurant → order as quickly as possible. The decision-making principle was clear: if a feature wasn’t directly tied to completing a basic food order, it was left out for later iterations. This allowed us to keep the scope lean, reduce technical risk, and prioritize speed to market.

What negative impacts or disappointments could this MVP have for stakeholders?

While this focused approach makes the MVP achievable, it introduces tradeoffs. Customers might be disappointed by the limited search and filtering options (only name and a few cuisine categories) compared to competitors, reducing discovery satisfaction. Restaurants may feel they lack visibility because reviews are simple and capped, which might make them less competitive. Regulators and compliance stakeholders represent another group that may not be fully satisfied, as the MVP does not integrate with HACCP or FDA-aligned monitoring systems, raising concerns in more strictly regulated markets. Drivers could be frustrated by the absence of earnings analytics or scheduling flexibility, which are standard in mature delivery apps. Investors and business stakeholders may also see the MVP as worrying that it doesn’t yet

differentiate itself in a crowded market. In short, while the MVP delivers the essentials, its simplicity may feel like a letdown to some stakeholders who expect richer functionality from modern food delivery platforms.

What changes did we make (and why) to the MVP to appease at least some stakeholders?

To balance stakeholder expectations with MVP constraints, we introduced a few thoughtful compromises. For customers, we added a streamlined but functional review system (ratings plus short text) to build trust and provide some transparency without overwhelming complexity. We also included basic re-order and favorites, giving users a sense of convenience and stickiness that goes beyond one-time orders. For restaurants, we ensured that average ratings update dynamically so they can see immediate feedback, even if detailed analytics aren't yet available. For drivers, we included masked calling and simple in-app navigation, which enhances safety and usability without over-engineering. Finally, for customer support, we implemented a hybrid system of common-issue auto-responses and a lightweight ticketing system, ensuring customers don't feel abandoned even if live support isn't fully fleshed out. These adjustments allowed us to stay within MVP scope while addressing at least part of the concerns from each stakeholder group.