Nov. 14, 2013

Notes

Not having a moderator in a cabal is okay. For example, perhaps a group of people have a situation where their agenda has many conflicts but they may prefer to play it by ear. In that case, having a moderator decide on a final schedule for everyone is not ideal.

We do not bring Users to a decision, but we should probably have an evaluation of the schedule (ie point out timing conflicts)

Lenoid imagines a feature where at the end there is a print-me-a-plan button that asks you at each conflict which one you choose. Then the cabal is split into sub-cabals as people go to different events. (Not for MVP)

Cristina and Leonid think the agenda to not have an agenda model is fine, but could be risky later if we want to implement more things. An agenda is just a collection of pinpoints that we order by time

How to add a pinpoint if we don't have a map. Ideas: a form with latitude/longitude. Leonid points out that no one would want to input lat/long as opposed to addresses, but this is not easy to evolve into our final map which requires lat/long. Cristina says in our database we can convert ann address into lat/long which is easy to integrate into Google maps.

We just shouldn't implement anything for MVP that would take a ton of work and we have to scrap later on for the final product.

We need some encryption/decryption schemes. When we send a chat message, encrypt it on the client side. Then on the receiver end, decrypt it. But since we're not doing banking or storing passwords, non-encryption might not be a huge problem as long as we talk about the potential risks in the documentation and alternative solutions we could implement if we had time.

We should remove HTTPS as a mitigation in our design doc because we've apparently decided that we just don't care.

We already decided we are going under a model of trust (ie it's a group of friends that are not trying to be underhanded and trying to mess up someone's schedule) so perhaps it makes more sense for everyone to be able edit each other's pinpoints. Leonid says to

draw analogy to a structured Google docs vs a Facebook wall.

We need to add who gets to edit pinpoints as a design challenge to design doc.

Purposes and goal in design doc -- purpose is fine, but goals should be more accessible/modular -- something that we can say we achieved or didn't achieve at the end of the project.

Design challenges should include pros/cons, be more specific (ie do not just write "we chose the facebook way")
Context diagram looked good
We say a pinpoint has a place -- specify what place means
Talk about how agenda evaluation works a little bit more -- when that's given, is it dynamically generated?

Probably not worth it to try and integrate MIT certificates

Add to stakeholders some assessment of what type of people are intended audience are (ie college students)
Lenoid: Movie theatres are stakeholder because they want to be easily locatable through your app. They would be "super stakeholders" if they offered some sort of promotion through your website. Google is on the other end of the spectrum. They have stake but so indirectly...like the City of Boston would also be a stakeholder.

Make sure everyone does fair share of work and no one feels overburdened.