Evaluation Document

Team: 9

Members:
Bohan Xu
Dziga Czaia
Jakob Gundersen
Szymon Masternak
Madelen Hellervik Lothe

Instructions to the Team:

- For each of the rows in the rubrics, select which level corresponds best to the current state of the delivery. Comment on each row.
- Propose changes to the rubric where you see need or possibilities for it.
- Ask up to three questions (at the end of the document) that you want to have especially feedback on.

Instructions to the Evaluator:

- For each of the rows in the rubrics, select which level corresponds best. Comment on possible improvements.
- Provide an overall comment for each section (that means, for each rubric.) These should help to improve the overall delivery.
- Answer the team's questions.

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Not rateable
Alignment	Noticable and consistent alignment between all parts.	Overall good alignment between all parts.	Minor inconsisentcies in alignment. Evaluator	Missing alignment.
Descriptions	Concise descriptions with focused formulations. Evaluator	Overall good language.	Minor flaws in formulations and language.	Major language errors and typos.

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Not rateable
Problem Description	Clearly identified, motivated and explained. Evaluator	Good	Problem is addressed and somewhat aligned with objectives and vision.	
Vision	Vision serves as overall, consistent goal for the entire system.	Vision is well aligned with the problem and objectives.	Vision is provided, but somewhat lacking in overall value. Evaluator	
Objectives	Objectives are focused, compact, specific and relevant.	Objectives are specific. Evaluator	A few good objectives are given.	
Stakeholders	Reveal valuable requirements and motivation. Evaluator	Are complete.		

Evaluator judgments:

The main problem I see (justification for the lower levels marked in the rubric) is that the objectives do not seem to align with the description of the problem. In the description, it is implied that the only problem is the cluttering sidewalks and obstacles, and though the solution given (rewards) is very good for it, the rest of the functionality added to the system does not seem to have a justification. Adding the social component can be fun and engaging for many systems, but it does not seem to adapt to what the purpose of the application is.

E-scooters, as you explained perfectly, are made for "commuters who want transport solutions that minimize travel time and allow them to start and end their journeys as close to their destinations as possible". How would adding the social component help this? Sharing how long and far you have travelled does not seem to be an achievement. I believe the idea has potential, but it would be better if you adapt it more to the problem or explain more thoroughly the reasons of what you have in mind!

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Not rateable
Layout	Layout follows a strategy that helps to understand the diagram.	Layout is structured.	Layout is structured.	Layout is unstructured and random.

	Evaluator			
Syntax	Correct syntax. Evaluator	Correct Syntax.	Overall good syntax, with a few minor errors.	Major syntactical flaws.
Level of Detail	Consistent and intentional level of detail.	Adequate detailing. Evaluator	Some inconsistencies, too much focus on some details on the expense of others.	

Evaluator judgements:

The deployment diagram is really good and detailed. It is very easily understood and concrete. Everything seems to be okay except for the Bluetooth connection. Maybe this was overlooked or I have not fully understood the connections, but it seems to me that the scooter should be connected to the mobile phone through bluetooth, not to the server directly.

	Excellent	**Good**	**Sufficient**	**Not rateable**
Hierarchy	Clear connection between use cases at different levels. Evaluator	Good	Connections between use cases of different levels.	No connection between use cases at different levels.
Levels	All use cases at proper levels. Evaluator	All use cases at the sea level are relevant and correctly placed.	Most use cases are at a relevant level.	Use cases are not at the correct level.
Relevance	Clear relevance of the selected use cases for the requirements.		It seems to lack some use cases Evaluator	Selection of use cases appears random.

Evaluator judgements:

In the Use-Case Sea level Hierarchy, I believe use cases could be better defined and complete. For example, there seems to be a lot of focus in the Social Media System, but the functioning of the Rental System is less explained. Is there a payment process? Where is the mentioned reward system? Can you park and lock a scooter?

Questions

Team: Ask up to three questions about aspects of the delivery you especially want to have feedback for.

Nothing to ask.

Pleasure giving you feedback! I hope you understand some of the issues that I found! Overall it is a nice System Specification!