

Reflection and Traceability Report on CVT Simulator

Team #17, Baja Dynamics
Grace McKenna
Travis Wing
Cameron Dunn
Kai Arseneau

[Reflection is an important component of getting the full benefits from a learning experience. Besides the intrinsic benefits of reflection, this document will be used to help the TAs grade how well your team responded to feedback. Therefore, traceability between Revision 0 and Revision 1 is an important part of the reflection exercise. In addition, several CEAB (Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board) Learning Outcomes (LOs) will be assessed based on your reflections. —TPLT]

1 Changes in Response to Feedback

[Summarize the changes made over the course of the project in response to feedback from TAs, the instructor, teammates, other teams, the project supervisor (if present), and from user testers. —TPLT]

[For those teams with an external supervisor, please highlight how the feedback from the supervisor shaped your project. In particular, you should highlight the supervisor's response to your Rev 0 demonstration to them. —TPLT]

[Version control can make the summary relatively easy, if you used issues and meaningful commits. If your feedback is in an issue, and you responded in the issue tracker, you can point to the issue as part of explaining your changes. If addressing the issue required changes to code or documentation, you can point to the specific commit that made the changes. Although the links are helpful for the details, you should include a label for each item of feedback so that the reader has an idea of what each item is about without the need to click on everything to find out. —TPLT]

[If you were not organized with your commits, traceability between feedback and commits will not be feasible to capture after the fact. You will instead need to spend time writing down a summary of the changes made in response to each item of feedback. —TPLT]

[You should address EVERY item of feedback. A table or itemized list is

recommended. You should record every item of feedback, along with the source of that feedback and the change you made in response to that feedback. The response can be a change to your documentation, code, or development process. The response can also be the reason why no changes were made in response to the feedback. To make this information manageable, you will record the feedback and response separately for each deliverable in the sections that follow. —TPLT]

[If the feedback is general or incomplete, the TA (or instructor) will not be able to grade your response to feedback. In that case your grade on this document, and likely the Revision 1 versions of the other documents will be low. —TPLT]

1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

The following table corresponds to SRS changes in response to feedback.

Feedback Item	Source of Feedback	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
Functional Requirements do not seem to have measurable/fit criteria associated with them Issue #38	Peer review	No change made, Functional requirements were deemed measurable	N/A
Acknowledging possible floating point errors and specifying a tolerance range for error would be beneficial Issue #39	Peer review	Added floating point accuracy consideration to NFR1 .	b737c9d
Adding why specific section were NA Issue #40	Peer review	No change made, deemed not relevant	N/A
Traceability matrix not clear Issue #41 and Issue #64	Peer review and TA feedback	Traceability Matrices fixed to be more clear and complete	f8dc185d5080ccb7db68a
Reusability metric not practical Issue #42	Peer feedback	No change made as was deemed practical as previous CVT information was available to us.	N/A
Remove unused SRS folders Issue #55 .	Supervisor feedback	Removed used SRS folders from the repository	b6e45c2
Add References Issue #61 .	TA feedback	Added references to SRS where needed.	1632c65
Discuss standards Issue #62 .	TA feedback	Added standards section.	91148c8

Missing numerical rational as why certain numbers were chosen in requirements Issue #65 .	TA feedback	Added rationale for the numbers selected.	b5b0137
Missing phase in plane of requirements Issue #66 .	TA feedback	Added phase in plan for requirements.	43c023e
Add description of sheaves Issue #158	Supervisor feedback	Added sheave description to improve user understanding.	e3953cc

The following table corresponds to Hazard Analysis changes in response to feedback.

Feedback Item	Source of Feedback	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
The failure mode of "insufficient frictional forces" has no requirement associated with it according to the FMEA table Issue #48 .	Peer review	Addressed why one failure mode did not have requirement due to assumptions made.	430fb6d
Assumptions listed outside Assumptions section Issue #49 .	Peer review	No change made as discussing some assumptions in the scope section was relevant.	N/A
Security requirements missing fit criteria Issue #50 .	Peer review	No change made as security requirements were deemed practical and attainable.	N/A
Table is missing references for one failure mode Issue #52 .	Peer review	No change made as this was addressed with Issue #48 .	See 430fb6d
Table is missing failure modes and associated safety requirements for User Interface Component Issue #53 .	Peer review	Added a section to address why there were no UI security requirements.	bce0b02
Should consider cancellation errors under numerical stability Issue #54 .	Peer review	No change as not planned for this revision of our product.	N/A
Add traceability to security requirements in FMEA Issue #212 .	TA feedback	Added traceability to FMEA table for Security Requirements.	430fb6d

1.2 Design and Design Documentation

The following table corresponds to the changes to the Module Guide(MG) and MIS documents.

Feedback Item	Source of Feed-back	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
MG - Section 6 not valueable to the reader Issue #100 .	Peer review	No change made as section 6 was deemed valueable.	N/A
MG - Link back to SRS to reduce duplicate information and add traceability Issue #101 .	Peer review	Link to SRS was provided.	c947278
MG - Anticipated changes could be more clear Issue #103 .	Peer review	No change made as the anticipated change's section was deemed strait forward.	N/A
MG - Should the GUI module not make use of initialize module Issue #104 .	Peer review	No change made as not applicable.	N/A
MG - Missing Add timeline and detail about priority of modules being implemented Issue #222 .	TA feed-back	Added details of priority of modules and breakdown of timeline.	a3867bb
MIS - Some exceptions were left blank. Issue #102 .	Peer review	Blank exceptions were removed.	5c48147

The following table corresponds to the changes made in the design of the CVT Simulator's design.

Feedback Item	Source of Feed-back	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
Add units to the user inputs to improve user understanding. Issue #153 .	Supervisor feedback	Units were added beside inputs.	54bafd2
Add ability to upload dxf files for ramp geometry. Issue #153 .	Supervisor feedback	No changes as did not have time to implement.	N/A

Check for users entering negative inputs Issue #154 .	Supervisor feedback	Users are not allowed to enter negative numbers.	54bafd2
Provide default values in the input fields Issue #156 .	Supervisor feedback	Users are given default values allowing them to quickly tune CVT.	54bafd2
Provide user with loading information to improve user feedback Issue #204	Supervisor feedback	Added a loading bar to provide the user loading progress.	f9c304

1.3 VnV Plan and Report

The following table corresponds to changes regarding the VnV Plan.

Feedback Item	Source of Feedback	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
Confusion with Validation report extra Issue #76 .	Peer review	No change made, as one of our extras is a Validation report.	N/A
Repetitive information that can be listed in your development plan Issue #77 .	Peer review	No change as was deemed not repetitive.	N/A
Opportunity for more automated tests Issue #78 .	Peer review	No change as not planed for this revision of the product.	N/A
More granular items in the SRS verification plan checklist Issue #85 .	Peer review	No change as not planed for this revision of the product.	N/A
The checklist format was not consistent. Issue #86 .	Peer review	Checklist format was fixed so that the format of each checklist was consistent.	13e3596
Traceability labels could be shorter Issue #88 .	Peer review	No change made, as test labels were deemed appropriate.	N/A
Add traceability to tests in the tables Issue #214 .	TA feedback	Traceability added to the table.	c50551f
Link usability/understandability in the tests and add checklist where applicable Issue #215 .	TA feedback	Added link to usability/understandability survey and added verifiability checklist.	ff2bb8c and b26ab16 .

The following table corresponds to changes regarding the VnV Report.

Feedback Item	Source of Feedback	Change Made in Response	Commit Reference
Consolidating all your symbols, abbreviations and acronyms into one document Issue #201 .	Peer review	No change made, as symbols are referenced in SRS already	N/A
Adding expected result clarity explaining the results of your testing, Issue #202 .	Peer review	No change made, as not enough time to implement.	N/A

2 Challenge Level and Extras

2.1 Challenge Level

[State the challenge level (advanced, general, basic) for your project. Your challenge level should exactly match what is included in your problem statement. This should be the challenge level agreed on between you and the course instructor. —TPLT]

2.2 Extras

[Summarize the extras (if any) that were tackled by this project. Extras can include usability testing, code walkthroughs, user documentation, formal proof, GenderMag personas, Design Thinking, etc. Extras should have already been approved by the course instructor as included in your problem statement. —TPLT]

3 Design Iteration (LO11 (PrototypeIterate))

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

[Don't just say what you changed, say why you changed it. The needs of the client should be part of the explanation. For example, if you made changes in response to usability testing, explain what the testing found and what changes it led to. —TPLT]

4 Design Decisions (LO12)

[Reflect and justify your design decisions. How did limitations, assumptions, and constraints influence your decisions? Discuss each of these separately. —TPLT]

5 Economic Considerations (LO23)

[Is there a market for your product? What would be involved in marketing your product? What is your estimate of the cost to produce a version that you could sell? What would you charge for your product? How many units would you have to sell to make money? If your product isn't something that would be sold, like an open source project, how would you go about attracting users? How many potential users currently exist? —TPLT]

6 Reflection on Project Management (LO24)

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

6.1 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]

6.2 What Went Well?

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

6.3 What Went Wrong?

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

6.4 What Would you Do Differently Next Time?

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

7 Reflection on Capstone

[This question focuses on what you learned during the course of the capstone project. —TPLT]

7.1 Which Courses Were Relevant

[Which of the courses you have taken were relevant for the capstone project? —TPLT]

7.2 Knowledge/Skills Outside of Courses

[What skills/knowledge did you need to acquire for your capstone project that was outside of the courses you took? —TPLT]