

**Meeting Details:**

**Date:** 05/04/2020

**Time:** 3:45pm-5:00pm (1 hour 15 minutes)

**Participants:** David Liang, Max Shi, Susmitha Shailesh, and Aparajita Rana

**Task:**

- Add all issues raised to Section 8: Issues.
- Resolve the issues so coding can go forward

**Issues:**

1. Lost labels from class diagram in the software component architecture diagram.
2. Lack of consistency between context diagram and component diagram.
3. No mention of testing interface in document.
4. Class-based UML is outdated for a call-return architecture.
5. Inconsistent mentions of configuration file.
6. Introduction needs to relate more to the overall document.
7. Requirements are not entirely consistent in wording.
8. Further detail the preconditions in the Use Case 1
9. Fix minor inconsistencies within the diagrams to keep everything the same
10. Reinterpret sequence diagrams created for the use cases for return-call architecture
11. Update executive summary to represent further additions
12. Context diagram missing technician

**Summary:**

During this review session, we focused mainly on the descriptions of the implementations of the software, in order to get ready to code. Therefore, the team as a whole reviewed the use cases, the software architecture diagrams, and the requirement modeling diagrams in the context of call-return architecture. While reviewing, we found many inconsistencies between what we used before (a sort of class-based modeling structure) and what we plan to do (a call-return architecture). In order to make sure coding can go as smoothly as possible, we will reevaluate our thinking and interpretation of some of these diagrams so that everything can be smoothly integrated into a call-return architecture.