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# List of Questions

* Why are the modes not defined?
* Is it possible to have an error somewhere other than the motors and sensors? What if it’s a software malfunction rather than a hardware malfunction?
* Are you sure the event table covers all possible errors? Can there be motor errors other than speed?
* Should //ERROR// display what the error is rather than just which component is in error? How does the user know what the actual error is?
* Are you sure the only input and output items are the desired and actual motor speeds? What about sensor data?
* No mode transition table?

# List of Good Points

* Good job giving examples of errors and what the output reads for each
* Good job giving values to the errors to be displayed
* Symbolic Constants and Text Macros look comprehensive
* Good intro / description of the document

# Additional

* Input Data Items definitions all say motor 1
* Seems to focus a little much on speed, not enough on other potential errors
* Software errors not mentioned