



# Secure Software Development

## Team Meetings for Team 4

Notes:

<b>Date</b>	17 Sep 2021	<b>Meeting ID</b>	7
<b>Attendees</b>	Andrey Smirnov; Taylor Edgell; Michael Justus;		

### Agenda

- Review Technical Report

### Minutes of Meeting

#### Final Review of Technical Report

- Word count is within acceptable limits.
- References added to the overview based on risk assessments for the ISS since the tutor's are keen on references within the opening sentences.
- It is difficult to add references that actually matter.
- Reviewed GDPR, the team is happy that we don't extensively cover all GDPR issues and mitigations. Mainly because it seems far-fetched to provide in-depth GDPR analysis.
  - We're ensuring the DB is secure by leveraging a well-designed solution using the latest tools; therefore, what else can we do regarding GDPR given there is very little *personal* (Personally Identifiable Information) data.
  - The solution does not, in theory, require many GDPR controls.

## **Section: Assumptions**

All is well and acceptable.

## **Section: Security Considerations**

Slight change in wording. Most important aspect is that we're showing that we considered these topics. References were added.

## **Section: High level System design**

Added a textual paragraph for reference UML style.

## **Section: Class Diagram**

Changes to the diagram and speclling changes

Description paragraph updated to reduce wordiness.

## **Section: Technical Overview**

Section rewritten and restructured to include layout of the APIs. The idea of two diagrams was set aside because nothing meaningful could be shown on the second diagram especially if the second diagram has basically the same underlying logic as the first diagram.

We will add another diagram detailing additional details in the appendix.

Code generation will be provided to the team.

The team proposes to distribute the role based on chunks of responsibility:

- Authentication
- Document management

## **Questions:**

Q. Shall we rotate the roles?

A. No, we can continue as we are.

Q. Shall we continue to have weekly meetings?

A. Yes, most likely we may have to meet more than once a week, especially prior to the demonstration of the code.

Q. What are we going to write in the final solution document?

A. It is not necessarily the Architect's responsibility because the document is more about implementation versus architecture.

### **Document submission**

Deadline listed for Sunday 19 Sep, 8pm.

### **Part 2 Preparation**

First week will deal with allocations and setup of the Codio environment. Concern is that not all functionality works in Codio as expected. Let's make Cathryn aware of this issue, possibly next week.

Part 2 Kickoff meeting scheduled for 20 Sep 2021. Discussion points will be

- how to allocate the work.
- Monolithic design.