After study

Editor:

Version 1.0

Status

Reviewed	Pontus Erlesand	2016-12-20
Approved		

PROJECT IDENTITY

2016/HT, TSKS05-POZYX
Linköping University, (ISY)

Group members

Name	**Responsibility**	**Phone**	**Email**
Rasmus Vilhelmsson(RV)	Project Leader (PL)	0700 423 400	rasvi146@student.liu.se
Pontus Erlesand(PE)	Head of documentation (DOC)	0707 964 955	poner538@student.liu.se
Markus Petersson(MP)	Head of sensor fusion	0703 823 630	marpe163@student.liu.se
Ching-Hsiang Yang(CY)	Head of hardware	0737 227 489	chiya469@student.liu.se
Susmita Saha(SS)	Head of testing	0720 451 029	sussa301@student.liu.se

Group e-mail: pozyx.cdio@gmail.com
Customer: ISY, Linköping University, 581 83 Linköping
Customer contact: Danyo Danev, 013-281335, danyo.danev@liu.se
Course leader: Danyo Danev, 013-281335, danyo.danev@liu.se
Supervisor: Trinh Van Chien, 013-282643, trinh.van.chien@liu.se

Contents

1 Timescales

This section describes the workload and time put in the project.

1.1 Workload

The workload was mainly focused to the second study period of the autumn semester. This was mainly due to the fact that the group members had many other courses in parallel to the project during the first study period. This resulted in the group putting in a lot of time during the last weeks. We think that the execution of the project would have been better if the customer and supervisor had been more strict, in order to ensure that more work was done earlier in the project.

1.2 Amount of time put compared to planned

The hours planned for the project was set to a total of 200 hours each. In the table below we present the hours each student put in project. Note that some work is done after this documentation, small things such as completing the website and commenting code etc.

Name	Total time
Rasmus Vilhelmsson	228 Hours
Pontus Erlesand	227 Hours
Markus Petersson	227 Hours
Ching-Hsiang Yang	216 Hours
Susmita Saha	215 Hours

2 Analysis of work and problem

This section describes the relations between the project group and the customer and supervisor. The project phase and the project model are also discussed.

2.1 The project phases

The before phase consisted of writing the documents, i.e. the Design Sketch, the Project Plan and the Requirement Specification.
From our point of view, the Design Sketch is important and handy to have. This gives a general understanding of how the final product/system will look like. The Requirement Specification feels very important as well, it also gives a general understanding of what has to be done in the project. The project plan feels more of a document that *has to be made*, that maybe doesn't provide much. It's very repetitive to the other two documents. Maybe the Project Plan could be excluded.

2.2 The project model

The project model felt quite clumsy. An agile model of working might be preferable, if possible.

2.3 Relation to the customer

Danyo Danev was the customer for this project. We got constant feedback, and praise, which was really nice. However, we would really have liked some more feedback on the documents. The customers for the different projects should have agreed on the how much revision should be expected, and so forth..

2.4 Relation with the supervisor

Trinh Van Chien was the supervisor for this project. We did not have very much contact with him throughout the project. We think that the relation would have worked well if we would have needed help.

3 Target fulfillment

In this chapter, we discuss the goals we achieved in this project and study situation in the project.

3.1 What is achieved?

All requirements in the requirement specification was fulfilled in the project, [1]. The requirement for 240 hours each was negotiated down to 200, however the group almost got 240 hours anyway. The project was passed in time and most mile stones was completed in time.

3.2 How was the delivery?

The delivery of this project was done in the form of presentation, demonstration and documentation.

The presentation was satisfactory and worked out quite well in our opinion.

The demonstration in the Communication System corridor worked as intended, if a little underwhelming to the audiences. We also got feedback from the supervisor during the demonstration, which we could have used to improve the results, had we gotten those earlier.

The several documentations received different levels of attention. As stated previously, the project results could have been improved if the requirements are more clearly defined.

3.3 How did the study situation affect the project?

As previously stated, the study situation during the first study period stated was a lot different from the work load that we had in the second study period. This is hard to get away from, but it would have been nicer for the group to work more during the first study period.

4 Summary

In this section the most important parts of this after study is brought up. Also some good advice is given to students upcoming years that will do this project.

4.1 The three most important experiences

- Working in Sharelatex's online editor have lots of advantages, especially the ability to edit in one document with multiple users ate the same time. The biggest disadvantage with Sharelatex is that it has no fully working version control system. Instead of using an online editor, the project documentation could be done by writing the documents separately in a offline editor and use a working version control system were all users uploads the documents.
- The project was divided in modules that can be modified separately. It was a big advantage to work in modules since we could divide the task between the project members and work separately. The hard part is to integrate the modules in the end but with a good design sketch and specified interface between, the integration should not take to much time.
- We have learned that good communication with the customer is needed in order to have a requirement specification thet can support the work throughout the project. We think that having more dialogue would have made this project easier for us.

4.2 Good advice to students upcoming years

Make sure that you have a well specified task so that you don't have to make up the project yourselves.

References

[1] Pozyx CDIO-group. *Requirement Specification*. `https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1yPHU_z3ez8UXBTNW1JTDQ1VGs/view?usp=sharing`. 2016.