Group 2 - MINUTES 25-11-2016

Date 18-11-2016

Time 13:00

Location Room A0-26

Present Harald Drillenburg

Adu Stephen, Andreicha Semida, Buaron Tal, Cholodov Andrej

Absent Nieuwenhuis Jens

Meeting started at 12:20 in room A0-26. The meeting began with discussing the basic structure of the agenda as well as the meeting minutes. We first began by checking the presence, then we went over the meeting minutes from last meeting.

At 12:25 we received feedback on the meeting minutes, which were short and not very clear. Harald gave guidelines on how a proper meeting minutes are supposed to be written. A proper meeting minutes is supposed to include the problem, argument and the decision or the list of actions. For instance, during meeting we discussed the sub-research questions they were not clear, we added new sub-questions and the order was changed. The main point of the meeting minutes is to be understandable to persons who were not in the meeting if they just read over it.

At 12:30 the topic of the meeting shifted towards the programme plan. The feedback was aimed towards the technical paragraph, a class diagram and a sequence diagram needs to be added. As well the standard approach for the 3rd application is in question, because the approach decided in the plan is not a finite one. This is also not the only way the applications can be connected, several other approaches can be applicable however more research needs to be done. Also a front/cover page needs to be added and the pages need to be numbered.

At 12:35 the project plan started to be discussed, the feedback given was in the following order: add page numbers at the bottom of the page, add the version of the project plan, add sub-questions discussed from last meeting, and write the methodology first , because the methodology will determine the work division.

At 12:40 the research report was brought up. The main discussion was about to remove the double in the iteration, and to change the word dint to another more understandable. The feature list that we had was wrong, being advised that if one can create a use case story then it is a feature. Receiving two examples which were “set all parameters” and “show prediction graph for next years”.

At 12:43 the diagrams were the center of discussion, which are supposed to be sent as a pdf file or added to the appendix. Also remove technical details form the diagrams such as constructors. We were advised to stick with the Larman diagram concepts and the domain models. As well the entities of the herbivores were mentioned , such as reproducing, feed, etc. The competition class brought a problem in refer to the understandability, it wasn’t clear what it was, what it does, the definition was missing. Harald as well mentioned that an association class needs to be created.

At 12:50 data collection was discussed, we asked about how to read/take specific numbers from a graph that is unreadable. We were advised to ask the other group members if they have the data, if they don’t we should send an e-mail to Harald asking for it.

At 12:52 the meeting closed.