Meeting 2 Summary:
- Brad's sketched a schedule for the project-plan, based on 6 week cycles each composed of three 2 week sprints drawing from Main course reading. Michael and Brad drew on academic and professional observations to validate it as suitable. We believe that 6 weeks between full progress reviews is frequent enough to be adaptive but not too frequent to be detrimental to progress. Localised progress reviews will happen every 2 weeks.
- We discussed scrum team compositions, and how many teams would be needed, arriving at the conclusion that it depends upon budget. Brad will create and analyse a systems workers model, to identify associated risks, and help gauge good budget options.
- Michael's created a list of Gherkin statements for the requirements. We noted the difficulty of identifying behaviour-driven specifications to describe hardware specifications. We need to add a table of requirements to the plan. We noted that the plan will look less well tailored if the table is too big, but large tables help to get around word limits, so some care is needed.
- A blank document will be created to add the unit 6 submission material too, guided by Tarek's template. Brad will do that.
- We discussed the importance of drawing from references where possible for justification. We note many academic disagreements, but it's better to have some model, than none, in order to gauge effectiveness of decisions.
- Michael will look at hardware/software configurations that would meet the requirements, to identify associated risks, and help gauge good budget options. We discussed the possibility of creating a lite version of the system that costs £250, and other better versions. Hardware takes some priority as software can be rolled out later (by floppy disc). The inhouse memory solution might be worth prioritising to cheapen costs.
- It would be helpful to identify all the specific tasks that will make up the project lifecycle, so we can identify task dependencies and task parallelism opportunities
- We discussed risk mitigations such as phased deployments and saw them as advantageous. It would be helpful to identify requirements that have multiple solutions differing by ease, for a versioning plan
- We discussed TOGAF as an enterprise architecture that could be compared to our plans structure
- We discussed the possibility of creating more than 2000 machines, so the project makes profit for building more machines

Meeting 3 Summary:

Meeting Summary for Haaris Mian's Personal Meeting Room

Hi Haaris Mian,

Here's your meeting summary for Haaris Mian's Personal Meeting Room on 10/16/2023. This summary has been auto-generated. AI-generated content may be inaccurate or misleading. Always check for accuracy.

Summary

Project Planning and Deadline Strategy

Haaris, Michael, tarel, and Brad discussed their ongoing project, planning for the next steps. tarel suggested they should review the methodology and ensure the word count meets the assignment requirements before the submission deadline. They agreed to allocate time before the submission, with tarel proposing they could meet on the weekend or at least a day before the submission. Haaris suggested meeting times for Saturday and Sunday, with tarel and Brad agreeing to these plans.

Progress Update and Document Review

tarel summarized the progress of the team's work, detailing that Michael, Brad, and she herself had completed sections 1, 3, and 4. Brad was focused on the limitations and deviations section, while Mike was working on the good consideration segment. tarel also mentioned that she was working on the cost breakdown, selling plan, and deliverables for section 4. Haaris inquired about the ongoing addition of links, to which tarel confirmed they would be added individually to the references section. The team agreed to edit, add, or remove content as needed from the document, with the intention of submitting it to the portal.

Hardware Risks and Limitations

Haaris asked the team members to send any specific risks related to their parts. tarel pointed out that risks can be identified from each part of the project, including hardware, software, and resources. Michael noted that the availability of required hardware could be a potential risk. Brad also asked for any notes on limitations related to hardware and workforce.

Planning Monday Meeting and Availability Discussion

Michael and tarel confirmed their plans to meet next Monday. tarel expressed her availability for additional meetings during non-work hours. They discussed the possibility of working on the post-planning sheet together during their next meeting. Brad had a follow-up question regarding Anna, but it was not specified in the transcript.

Assigning Tasks and Budgeting With New Team Member

Brad and tarel discussed assigning tasks to a new team member. tarel suggested that the new team member could assist Brad with the presentation and perhaps with tasks related to limitations and deviations. They also talked about the possibility of the new team member helping with the budgeting and logistics. Michael agreed with the suggestions and added that the new team member could also work on the introduction and the costs and quantities for the resources. tarel suggested that the new team member could create an excel sheet with all the costs and quantities to ensure the total is within the budget.

Software Requirements and Operating System Selection

The team discussed the software requirements for their project, focusing on selecting operating systems and programming languages. Michael suggested creating a public and an Edc version of the software, with the Edc version having more comprehensive features. There was a debate about whether to develop an in-house operating system to reduce software costs, with Brad arguing in favor. tarel expressed confusion about the existing software options, which include the hyper basic operating system and the Mcc and Mc ROM systems. The team agreed to provide the hyper basic system to Edc and the basic system to the public, along with the Mcc and Mc ROM options. There was uncertainty about the need for additional storage units that support these operating systems for the public system. tarel and Michael discussed the need for additional storage for different operating systems, agreeing that if a desktop is purchased with the hyper basic operating system, additional storage would be needed for other operating systems. They planned to add another storage unit for the Mcc kernel and the Fcc. ROM, and a floppy disk for the hyper basic.

Design Costs and Appendix Discussion

Michael and tarel discussed the design costs per component in the software appendix. They agreed that the cost would be a one-time expense, used in the initial design and then repeated in production. They also discussed the confusing nature of the appendix, noting that it lacked important information and used many abbreviations. tarel confirmed that everyone had access to the Google documents and could modify, remove, or add items as needed. She also mentioned that she would try to be more active in the slack group, despite her previous lack of involvement due to its confusing nature.

Next Steps

• Meet on Saturday or Sunday to review the document before submission.

• Tarel will assign Anna a task if needed.

• Tarel will create a Google document with the hardware and software requirements, including costs and quantities.

• Brad will work on developing the operating system.

• Tarel will add another storage unit for the additional operating system.