6 September

* Project should investigate specific application interfaces.
* Interface should be easy enough to learn for appropriate audience (elderly).
* An investigation should be done to determine what sorts of web browsing the elderly would like. Consider duplicating such sites.
* Achieve functionality early so that testing can be commenced early.
* Later versions may include some sort of audio feedback of pages.
* Meetings will generally be held on Mondays at 14:00 except for next week, which will be Tuesday.

20 September

* Rigours (broad) testing procedure vs. scientific (specific) testing procedure disused. Up to us as what approach to take.
* Use of Iterations mentioned.
* Possibility of conducting some tests on simple WebPages discussed and then extending to test if principle still holds on more complicated pages.
* Should find people who are computer literate for better testing
* The difference between proving and testing was discussed. This experiment is a test and not a proof. This means that an extensive sample space is not required.
* Possibly scout out old age homes
* A large of aim of the project is about understanding and working around the target audience and not about complex code implementation
* The finally report should make proposals with the results found

25th September

* Possibility of server side processing discussed
* The tradeoffs of creating pages dynamically (annotating) vs. hard coding the pages.
* Find re-occurring elements of popular WebPages (for instance, drop down boxes etc.\_
* Compare the different voice referencing techniques on simple and more complex WebPages
* Architecture of implementation is not vital as this is not the main aim of the project.
* Result biasing of informal experiments discussed
* Have a demonstration ready for next meeting
* Testing should have set manual questions if not everything can be incorporated into the site
* Start building in a few extra program features.

3 October

* Make the navigation more user friendly now
* Automatic mode for speech recognition is better.
* Try find ways of avoiding or rather detecting explicit problems with the PAI (e.g. If server is
* Think generally about how we can make the third iteration more user-friendly. That is. How do we give it a better interface?

10 October

* Content of the poster was discussed. Should include, title, name, school name. Not too much righting should be put on the poster.
* What aspect specifically of numerical referencing is better than spoken link names
* Might want to test one or two individuals to help results. This is fine, so long as actual implementation is done by open day.
* Make the last iteration more of a qualitative assessment
* Look at making burden on system user earlier by improving interface.
* Project should be able to derive suggestions for future work.
* Each use case should highlight individual features of the program one at a time (for the last iteration)
* Consider addressing problems of region problems on pages
* Possibly introduce a bookmarking feature
* Issue of HTML frames discussed
* Numerical could be adjusted to modify pages for more complicated pages (e.g. According to sections etc.)
* Some features do not have to be implemented. These can just be asked in the form of survey.
* Surveys should ask the questions of whether or not they consider the webpage a close enough resemblance to real pages
* Ask more experienced test subjects specifically about problems they might perceive with the current implantation
* Final report must demonstrate the decision judgement (thought).

16 October

* Paper size of poster discussed. Flexible.
* Airtime used for data bundles to conduct testing can be claimed form the budget
* Poster should not be too wordy
* Photos can be put up on a secondary poster
* Consider having a short section for technologies used
* Await email confirmation from Aveer regarding venues
* We can keep testing up until open day.
* Report should highlight future work