# **REVIEW OF Fried Phish**

### **Section number: 02**

### **REVIEWER group number:** Team 8

### **REVIEWER group members:**

* + 1. Liam Madiam
  + 2. Campbell Parks
  + 3. QiuYu Zhao

### **Who is your scribe:** Liam Madiam

### **REVIEWEE group number:** Team 4

### **REVIEWEE product name:** Fried Phish

### **⚠️ GROUP WORK AGREEMENT**

### **By typing WE AGREE below, we confirm:**

### We will discuss EVERY question as a group

### We will NOT divide questions individually

### Our scribe will type only what we agree on together

### We understand that breaking these rules = a grade of zero

**Does your team agree to the terms above?:** Yes

**\*REVIEWERS will answer the following questions about the REVIEWEE project proposal\***

## 0 - Mechanics

**→ Indicate YES or NO for each of the following:**

|  | **Yes or No** |
| --- | --- |
| Title of document has team number and app/product name? | **No** |
| Title text at top of doc includes team number and product name? | **No** |
| All template instructions and boilerplate text removed? | **Yes** |
| Proper formatting? - ex. headings, subheadings, reasonable length paragraphs(no “walls of text”), lists | **Yes** |

**→ If any NO's above, specify what needs fixing:**

Missing product name and team number in document title. Missing team number in doc title.

## 1 - Executive Summary

*You will evaluate the Executive Summary based on Clarity, Conciseness, and Engagement. Does the app solve a key problem? Does it have unique features and benefits?*

* **The Shark Tank First Impression:** As a group, imagine you're a Shark Tank panel with 30 seconds to decide whether to back the project. Discuss and come to consensus.  
  We’re in on this one. It’s a basic premise with technology that we’ve had for a little while but hopefully at the next level. It seems like it’s easy to use and convenient.
* **The Grandma Test:** Pick someone's grandma or a less tech-savvy relative - could they understand this app/product/service if they were told about it? Discuss as a group.

Since this one seems pretty simple I think the biggest problem would just be getting it to the more vulnerable audience that would need it.

* **The "So What?" Factor:** Quick group vote: How many think 'Wow!' vs 'Meh'? Discuss why you differ and try to reach agreement.

We’re all 2’s and 3’s on this, something this basic sounds like it should’ve been done a while ago and would be very handy for a lot of people. I think they could take this one step further and send data about fishy links back somewhere for examination.

* **One-Line Wonder:** Each person writes a one-sentence description that captures what this product is and why it matters. Then combine the best elements into one you all support.

A simple and easy to make product that will help people stay safe on the internet, that we are surprised hasn’t already been made.

## 2 - Market Research and Need Analysis.

*You will evaluate the market research and need analysis based on the data used to support claims, the relevance to the proposal, and the depth of the research done.*

* **The Competition Crusher:** As a group, pretend you're their biggest competitor. What weakness in their market research would you exploit to steal their customers?   
  We’d get one step ahead by making a mobile version because they’re suggesting a browser extension where most of their research indicates scams happen over mobile devices.
* **The Missing Piece:** Is there *specific evidence* cited for all of the claims made in this section? Discuss what evidence would make their case bulletproof. Come to agreement on the most significant gap.

I would want to see data about how much people are saved from being scammed and how exactly their product could improve on those numbers

* **Reality Check:** Go around the group - does anyone actually know someone with this problem? How real does this need *feel*? Is it a solution in search of a problem?

We think this problem would scale around an 8 because most say we’ve personally experienced the problem or had someone close to us experience a problem like this.

* **The Investor's Question:** If you were skeptical investors, come to a consensus on the first hard question you'd ask? Check if they answered it. (If you can’t come up with a question, *“How does it make money?”* is often a good one to start with)

Is the data that the AI scans and uses going to be safe? If the user allows for collection of information how would they make sure it stays in the right hands.

* **The Visual Aesthetics Question:** Are the charts and graphs relevant and do they improve the proposal? Are they visually appealing? Could any of them be moved to the appendix?

The provided chart gave satisfactory data in regards to how necessary a product like this could be.

## 3 - Product Description

*You will evaluate the product description based on the clarity of the description, the feasibility of production, and the uniqueness or innovativeness of the product.*

* **The Feature Graveyard:**Discuss as a group: which feature seems unnecessary or overcomplicated? What obvious feature(s) are they missing?

One feature we don’t really get behind is the minor and major risk warnings. If something could potentially pose a threat they should be given equal treatment so users don’t deprioritize ones that are “minor risks” and fall into something. An additional feature that would make this a homerun is having the option of making a separate email folder for potential scams and getting potential threats completely away from a user's eye.

* **The Confusion Award:** Together, identify the most confusing part of how their product works. Collaborate on a clearer explanation.

There’s nothing we found that was too confusing about their product in the read.

* **Would You Use It?** Go around the group - who would actually download/buy/use this? For those who said no, agree on the ONE change that would convert the most skeptics.

We all agree that we would use a tool like this in our daily lives. If there was an \*optional\* subscription I would be willing to go 5 bucks a month. If there was a required subscription maybe not because this feels like a free tool.

* **The "Wait, This Exists!" Check:** Does this remind you of any existing product or service they didn't mention as a competitor?   
  It’s similar to ad-blockers in the fact that it’s a background extension for your browser but not really any direct competitors.

## 4 - Problems and Counterarguments

*You will evaluate the problems and counterarguments based on how well problems are identified, the proposed counterarguments to the problems, and the balance of how everything is presented.*

* **The Elephant Hunter:** Discuss what obvious major issue they're avoiding or not addressing. Come to consensus on the biggest one.   
  A major flaw we see with their design is keeping up to date data. If the data collection setting is off by default and very few users allow it to learn how is the algorithm going to be fed enough to stay up to date with new scams.
* **Devil's Devil's Advocate:**Review their counterarguments section as a group. Which concern did they handle weakly or completely miss?   
  They gave us arguments that would potentially come up but not many solutions and how they would solve them like the security issues and how they would actually secure the data.
* **The Achilles' Heel:** If this product crashes and burns, what will be the cause? Discuss and agree on the most likely failure point.   
  One thing that they pointed out is how many people would avoid their product simply because it is AI. In the modern age AI has become a very big point of contention and many people uneducated about AI would not know how this differentiates from more malicious and resource intensive AI that are actually bad.
* **The Ethics Check:**Brainstorm potential ethical issues as a group (privacy, addiction, discrimination, manipulation, etc.).   
  False information feeding from scammers. They did say they have a setting to whitelist and mark things as safe. There could be potential to manipulate the data to skew towards making things that are a scam and reporting them as not scam. This could cause flaws in their algorithms and potentially cause a lot of losses that they claim to protect from.

## 5 - Conclusion and Recommendations

*You will evaluate the conclusion and recommendations based on overall effectiveness and clarity.*

* **The Money Test:** Each person decides: would you invest $100, $1,000, or $10,000 of your own money? Discuss where you each draw the line.   
  We agree on dropping $1,000 maybe somewhere a bit higher. We like the idea but are scared of all the security risks of the project.
* **The Memorable Moment:** What's the ONE thing from their conclusion you'll all remember tomorrow? Agree on what stuck with you most.   
  Making a product that’s “lightweight and easy to use” because you don’t see many simpler tools nowadays, everything has to be big and in your face.
* **The Call to Action:** If their proposal convinced you, what would you actually DO next? Is this clear from their recommendations?   
  They don’t offer any directions besides going forward with it but we would like to see more importance placed on security of data.
* **The Passion Check:** Does their conclusion show genuine excitement or does it feel flat? Discuss and rate as a group.   
  We would rate this at a 7 because it seems very well thought out and a great tool that would do a lot of good and they’re acutely aware of the issues they still have

## 6 - Appendix

*You will evaluate the appendix based on organization and value of the additional materials.*

* **The Evidence Test***:* Review their sources as a group. Identify the strongest and weakest pieces of evidence.   
  Their third source is great for their proposal on why their product needs a modern solution. The second source is a bit outdated and retreads on ground the first one already covered.
* **The Visual Vote:** Look at all their images, charts, and mockups together. Which visual element helps or hurts their case?   
  The first chart is good. The Norton Genie one feels unnecessary to their proposal, just discussing it would’ve been fine.
* **What's Missing?** Discuss what additional evidence or visuals would strengthen their proposal.   
  Additional information on modern scam protection more in the direction of what they want to do. The third source talks about how outdated scam protection is but I wonder if there’s more about modern protection they could improve on.

## 7 - Overall feedback

*Provide additional feedback to support your responses to the previous question, as well as suggestions for improvement:*

* **The One Thing:** If they could change just ONE thing about this proposal to dramatically improve it, what should it be? Must reach consensus.   
  If they could discuss a way that this project would be funded and could be kept free for everyone on the internet because we would hate to see this put behind a paywall or go down because it would be genuinely a really good thing.
* **The Surprise Factor:** Share what surprised each of you, then agree on which surprise was biggest for the group overall.

The most surprising thing about this proposal is that we haven’t heard of anything like this before.