

Review report Group 1

Group 3

24 september 2015

1 General

Generally we found the document to be logical and well written. However, we made some comments in the document. We also noticed that some things in the document were different from the presentations. We made the most comments on your document before the presentations, so maybe these issues are already addressed by now. In this document we will give a short summary of things that we noticed in your report. For more details we refer to the document itself, with more extended comments.

The most important thing we noticed is that there is no consistency in the SMS service to residents. You never mention how this is done, but you do assume it is possible. We don't have a different section for chapter 4 since there are just some typo's and rephrasing things.

2 Chapter 1

When talking about a flood monitoring system, the first thing that came to our mind was, dikes. If dikes are not in your scope, thats oke, but maybe you can mention it in your context. In the system context you could also mention which authorities you like to warn. You say appropriate, but which authorities are appropriate?

3 Chapter 2

You could make your vision more specific. You want to be the next generation of flood monitoring software instead of hoping to be it. And why is it next generation. In section 2.9 you mention there are no known competitors. If there is no current system that does this, how can yours be the next generation?

In section 2.4 it is not really clear if and how you send warnings to residents, this was also not really clear from your presentation. Besides this, this section suggests that officials issue warnings to the authorities, when we read further we know this isn't true, but it is not clear from this section.

We don't fully agree with your business model. We don't think UAV's should be in there, since they are part of you actual system. This model should contain the third parties you need to complete your product, for example hardware suppliers.

4 Chapter 3

According to your definition of a high priority stakeholder, we still think citizens should be a high priority stakeholder. We already had a discussion about during the presentation, but we think citizens fall under ‘or it is critical to them that the system is operational’. In your presentation you mentioned that UAV’s will have different kind of sensors to monitor dikes. In the report you only mention photographs.