

Reflection Report on Pot-pulator

Aaron Billones, billonea
Gillian Ford, fordg
Juan Moncada, moncada.j
Steven Ramundi, ramundis

April 4, 2023

1 Changes in Response to Feedback

1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

Changes were made to SRS based on feedback from teammates, the instructor, and TAs. Requirements were adjusted as the design and scope of the project changed.

1.2 Design and Design Documentation

Design underwent many major changes throughout the process based on feedback. Between Proof of Concept and Rev0 Demo, feedback from teammates influenced a major change in the final design of the tray dropper subsystem. After Rev0, feedback from the instructor and TA influenced the revised design of the pot dropper subsystem, increasing the accuracy of the machine overall.

1.3 VnV Plan and Report

The VnV Plan and Report changed based on feedback from peers. Testing plans were updated to better ensure all components of the machine were being tested thoroughly, and all edge cases were considered when conducting testing.

2 Design Iteration (LO11)

[Explain how you arrived at your final design and implementation. How did the design evolve from the first version to the final version? —TPLT]

3 Design Decisions (LO12)

[Reflect and justify your design decisions. How did limitations, assumptions, and constraints influence your decisions? —TPLT]

4 Economic Considerations (LO23)

We believe there is a market for our product. All Sheridan Nurseries farms are ran in the same way as the farm which we used to influence our design. The cost of the manual labour does not justify the purchase of the machines that are currently available on the market, but our low cost solution is perfect for Sheridan Nurseries' current situation. It is also a great solution for any industrial potting farm which owns a soil and seed filling machine, but does not own a pot and tray sorting machine. Marketing the product would involve giving live demonstrations to decision makers at the farms or distributing videos showcasing the functionality of the machine and highlighting the value it will provide. We estimate it would cost approximately \$700 to manufacture if our current sourcing methods are used, but this price can be drastically reduced if it were to be manufactured in large quantities. We would charge a price which would translate to a 60% markup. At a cost of \$700, this would mean setting the price at approximately \$1150. We would be making about \$450 per machine, and our break even point would be dependent on the amount of capital we would be required to invest to establish a manufacturing process, and the amount of fixed costs that would incur on other activities such as advertising.

5 Reflection on Project Management (LO24)

[This question focuses on processes and tools used for project management. —TPLT]

5.1 How Does Your Project Management Compare to Your Development Plan

[Did you follow your Development plan, with respect to the team meeting plan, team communication plan, team member roles and workflow plan. Did you use the technology you planned on using? —TPLT]

5.2 What Went Well?

[What went well for your project management in terms of processes and technology? —TPLT]

5.3 What Went Wrong?

[What went wrong in terms of processes and technology? —TPLT]

5.4 What Would you Do Differently Next Time?

[What will you do differently for your next project? —TPLT]