****

Group Project

**First Demonstration & Presentation Assessment Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group Name/Student Names: Group B**  Robert Dunbar, Iolo Hughes, Christopher Lindsay, Helen Watson, Jing Wong, Kevin Sperin, Daniel Timms, Muhammad Usman  **Supervisor: DP** |

The following sections are intended to provide feedback about your performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Skills (25% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Presentation, visual aids, etc.* |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Progress to Date (50% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Demonstration of hardware built, software written, equations, etc.* |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Future (25% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Technical merit of proposals for completing the project. Adequacy and appropriateness of workplan.* |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |

Total grade allocated [in 1+,1-,2.i+,2.i-,2.ii+,2.ii-,F]: 2i+ .

# Comments And Advice

|  |
| --- |
| This was a reasonably well put together presentation that was delivered by a number of members of the team. The presentation focused heavily on the decomposition of the project and the early stage technical progress. The presentation made use of a number of different tools including system-level black boxes and decision trees. These allowed an extensive decomposition of the project, which then lent itself to separation into sub-teams which clear objectives. The interfaces between these sub-systems or teams, hinted at through the black box planning, were never fully disclosed despite a lot of references being made to "re-integration".  You need to divide tasks and focus on the practical work. The focus on strategic decisions was good but I would like to see you now focus on tangible deliverables. I feel that you need to implement a serious strategy for catching up. Put the control hardware on a board, programme it and mount it in a case then forget about it. It is good that you were aware of major issues.  The RC hacking was discussed in more depth, although the assessors (both supervisors) were generally confused by this until questioning. Again it appears that a number of solutions have been considered with a final version yet to be selected. The objective of hacking an existing RC was to simplify  this part of the project. Likewise, the comms discussion seemed to be quite in-depth to conclude a comparably obvious answer.  There are various processors available. The raspberry Pi is a distraction. Look at ODOO or Odroid.  The simulation graph needed a legend to be clear. It was also not made clear how the numbers on the vertical axis were generated. The simulation section was interesting, but given the status of the project it would appear that time could have been better apportioned to the algorithm itself.  It was not clear if you could run your images through the disparity software nor what the computation was. The discussion of disparity mapping was extremely high level and included very little technical content. This is the core of the proposed system so at this stage I think we were expecting more detail.  The plans for the future are presumably incorporated in the group Gantt chart which (again) was not shown. The discussion of work for next semester largely seemed to be in the nature of continuing with the proposed course with little explanation.  The demonstrations were ok, if somewhat limited for this stage of the project. It was good that the team had videos to fall back on when their demonstration of the hardware failed. Your image processing demo was not clear. Is Python the best choice. Ease of coding is not the major issue. A lot of work is required here to get something tangible working.  The group did well in the Q&A session, staying calm despite a substantial number of questions coming from the other team. Good answer to fail safe stop.  In summary, this group seems to have spent a substantial amount of time dissecting the problem and defining their solution, but still have a lot of work to do in order to implement it. This has led to difficulties in this technical presentation of progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| Project Team Assessors MS,ES,DP. Date: 9 December 2014 |