

## CHOCOLICIOUS MIDTERM PRESENTATION

---

**Date:** 07 Oct 2014  
**Time:** 1.30 pm  
**Venue:** SIS Seminar Room 2.1

**Attendees:** Trecia, Zhen Jie, Terence, Ming Min & Jinq-Yi

**Apologies:**

**Agenda:**

1. Midterm Presentation
2. Any other business

---

### Midterm Presentation Feedbacks

1	<p><b>User Hierarchical System</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• User Management involves 12 roles; we should have a slide for explaining the different responsibilities each role has.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Terminologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss with Client on the adding of Events for Budget as some items may not necessarily be an event.</li> </ul>
3	<p>While SMUSA can enforce that no user has more than one Finance Secretary Role, our system should be able to validate that as well.</p>
4	<p><b>X-Factor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e-Receipt cannot be an x-factor as the complexity is too low.</li> <li>• “Recipient” is spelt wrongly in e-Receipts</li> <li>• Token distribution can be a hassle as users have to make sure all 10 tokens are used.</li> <li>• If there is no strong justification to why there are 10 tokens, we should not use that.</li> <li>• Vendor Recommendation is not very complex</li> <li>• If x-factors are too stand-alone, they do not value-add that much to the system, perhaps, we can look into integration, e.g. claims with adding vendor reviews.</li> <li>• Check that e-Payment tallies with amount paid.</li> </ul> <p>We currently do not have any function complex enough to be called a X-factor</p>
5	<p>Auto Approval implies a level of integration with the SAP System that OFIN uses. Change the name to Batch Reconciliation if the integration is non-existent so that the name describes the function more accurately</p>
6	<p><b>UAT Learning Curve needs to be addressed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps for the next UAT, have two sets of testers, one would be the old testers, and the other would be the new testers. This way, if we have made a self-documenting system, the two should have similar results.</li> <li>• Charts are easier to visualize data</li> <li>• Data presented should be evaluated to show some learning, or they would be rendered a waste of time</li> <li>• Test cases should have a description attached to them or audience will not know what that test case is</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decide on User Manual again after UAT 3</li> </ul> <p><b>User Interface</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We should not have trialed two different UI in one system as that is wrong planning.</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Scope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on scope is more in favor of client, can be removed in Midterm presentation</li> </ul>
8	<p><b>Architecture Diagram</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources can be separated to those used in Project Management and those used in the project for better description of project</li> <li>Load Testing data could have been plotted out to see how much the system will degrade before it ultimately crashes to better assess the system and server.</li> </ul>
9	<p>Having data that can display the amount of help we have introduced in the current system will help us address the main problem since the system is supposed to do cure than harm.</p>

The presentation ended at 1510.

Prepared by,

Ng Zhen Jie

Vetted and edited by,