LFEV-Y6-2018

Lafayette Formula Electric Vehicle

Year 6

ECE492 – Spring 2018



Statement of Work

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Lafayette College

Electrical and Computer Engineering Department

19 January 2018

Table of Contents

Scope	
ECE Deliverables	
Hardware Purchasing Deadline (HPD)	
Code Freeze	7
Final Delivery Date (FDD)	7
D000: PDR Report and Presentation	
D001: CDR Materials	9
D002: Users Manual	
D003: Final Report and Maintenance Manual	
D004: Acceptance Test Plan	
D005: Acceptance Test Report	
D007: Project Web Site	
D008: Final Presentation and Delivery	
D009: Conference Paper, Presentation, and Video	
D010: Project Posters	
D012: Software Maintainability Plan	
D013: Purchasing Report	
D014: Project Management and Status Letters	
Management Requirements	
Work Breakdown Structure	
Labor Resources, Management, and Organization	
Overhead Resources	
Budget for Direct Costs	
Non Budget Items	
Acceptance Testing	
System Integration	
Technical Requirements	
ECE General Project Requirements	
Special Waivers and Restrictions	
GPR001: Documentation	

GPR003: EMI/EMC	22
GPR004: Hazmats	22
GPR005: Safety and Good Practice	22
GPR006: Reliability	25
GPR007: Maintainability	25
GPR008: Manufacturability	27
GPR011: Project Video and Final Demonstration	27
GPR012: Final Disposal of Projects	27
Acronym Glossary	29
Appendix – Template Documents	31
Individual Progress Report	32
Project Status Letter	34
Work Breakdown Structure Example	38

Scope

Lafayette College Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) Department is pleased to propose the design, fabrication, and testing of an Electric Vehicle (EV) that in collaboration with the Lafayette College Mechanical Engineering (ME) department shall be suitable for entry into the Formula Hybrid competition beginning 30 April 2018 at New Hampshire Motor Speedway, Loudon, NH, USA.

LFEV-Y6-2018 shall take the final steps toward a competition ready LFEV and will deliver a car comprising an integrated set of subsystems that meet the following key requirements:

- **GPRXXX: ECE General Project Requirements** All ECE general project requirements described herein must be met by the ECE project team.
- **DXXX: ECE Deliverables** The ECE department requires projects produce certain paper deliverables described herein.
- **MEXXX: ME Project Requirements** The ME department has various project requirements and deliverables that must be supported.
- **EVXXX: Competition Requirements** A central goal of the LFEV-Y6-2018 project is to successfully enter a car in the 2018 Formula Hybrid competition. To that end, all the <u>rules specified by the competition website</u> must be met to the fullest extent possible.
- **CDXXX: Competition Deliverables** Along with the competition-ready car itself, entry in the Formula Hybrid competition rules require the production of various paper deliverables, including forms and other documents described on the competition website.

The LFEV systems shall be developed in Acopian Engineering Center and shall reliably, safely, and maintainably operate over a 5-year service life.

Should an ECE requirement not agree with another requirement given or referenced herein, as a general principle, both requirements shall be met, if reasonable to do so. If it is not possible or reasonable to meet both of the conflicting requirements, the team shall work with Lafayette engineering professors, possibly in conjunction with the Formula Hybrid organization authorities and Lafayette Security and Safety, to resolve the conflict.

ECE Deliverables

The description and due dates for ECE deliverables are shown below.

Final delivery of all LFEV-Y6-2018 hardware and operational software shall be per GPR012.

All data items, reports, and forms shall be in compliance with and delivered per GPR001. Specifically delivery is required both to the web site *and* to the course instructors by email.

Successful delivery of an item requires that the faculty reviewer accept the item. **Posting and emailing a data item does not imply it is accepted**. Faculty requires reasonable time to review items. If a data item is rejected it must be re-submitted. After allowing faculty reasonable review time, students are encouraged to use *closed loop communication* to verify that data items have been accepted and to seek written confirmation from faculty. Deliverable acceptance should be documented in the ATR. Review delays, rejection, and resubmission is no excuse for a late deliverable.

No partial credit is given for unacceptable deliverables. Status letters are not accepted late. Other deliverables that are late are penalized 10% per day late for the first 4 days, then 10% per week.

Rejected deliverables lower your grade and cost the project valuable time, therefore students are encouraged to solicit other students and faculty instructors for an opinion on the completeness and correctness of draft deliverable prior to the due date.

DLV	Team Grade Weight	Description	Due Date	
D000	5%	PDR Report, Presentation	ASAP	
D001	15%	CDR Report, Presentation, Demos	HPD	
D002*	5%	User Manuals	FDD	
D003*	5%	Final Report and Maintenance Manuals	FDD	
D004*	10%	Acceptance Test Plan	Outline at PDR. Must be approved prior to CDR	
D005*	5%	Acceptance Test Report	One day after FDD.	
D007	10%	Project Web Site	Must be updated weekly.	
D008*	15%	Complete System, Final Presentation Demo/Delivery	Final disposition per GPR012 no later than FDD	
D009*	5%	Conference Paper, Presentation, and Project Video	TBD (Typically 1 month prior to FDD)	
D010*	5%	Project Posters	FDD	
D012*	5%	Maintainability Plan	Outline at PDR. Final due 3 weeks after PDR.	
D013*	5%	Purchasing Report	Weekly Updates, complete at FDD	
D014	10%	Project Status Letters, Individual Progress Report, and Status Presentation.	Individual Progress Reports uploaded to Moodle by 5PM Friday every week beginning after PDR, including Spring Break and finals week. Project Status Letter due midnight Sunday. Status presentation during first class of every week.	

*Drafts of D002, D003, D004, D005, D008, D009, D010, D012 and D013 must be provided to the course instructors for review at least 1 week prior to the final due date of these deliverables.

Hardware Purchasing Deadline (HPD)

5 PM on the Thursday before 2018 Spring Break

All parts procurement, and part fabrication that relies on the Lafayette College machine shop or any outside vendor, including PC board and machined part fabrication, should be ordered by this deadline. Every subsystem BOM should be on order by this date. Purchases after this date, if allowed, will result in a team grade penalty.

Code Freeze

5 PM on the first Friday after 2018 Spring Break

No software or firmware changes are permitted after this date.

Final Delivery Date (FDD)

5PM on the final day of classes in the 2018 Spring Term.

Unless otherwise noted, all deliverables must be provided by this date.

D000: PDR Report and Presentation

PDR Materials include the Overall **PDR Report**, a live presentation that summarizes the PDR Report, **slideshow file** from the live presentation, and **meeting minutes** and action items from the live PDR. The PDR Report includes a **hierarchical work breakdown structure**.

Given the limited time available for this project, it's important that a team hit the ground running. The first task to be tackled is preparing a preliminary design. The main tasks for this are the following:

- 1. Analyze the hard and soft requirements of project.
- 2. Analyze the existing design (and errata) as documented in the web sites.

http://sites.lafayette.edu/ece492-sp13/ http://sites.lafayette.edu/ece492-sp14/ http://sites.lafayette.edu/ece492-sp15/ http://sites.lafayette.edu/ece492-sp16/ http://sites.lafayette.edu/ece492-sp17/

- 3. Analyze the resources available for this project, including the availability of time, money, and labor.
- 4. Decide what requirements teams will address and what team members will be personally responsible for each of these requirements.
- 5. Decide what requirements the teams will **NOT** address, and *have these omissions approved by faculty*.
- 6. Develop a preliminary system level design that meets the requirements. A systemdesign baseline includes a detailed and **complete hierarchical system block diagram** along with functional descriptions of these blocks and the interfaces between them.
- 7. Estimate the time, effort, and budgetary resources that will be required by the design and compare these estimates to the resources available.
- 8. Establish a hierarchical work breakdown (WBS) and schedule.
- 9. Allocate responsible individuals to determine individual responsibilities.
- 10. Do **cost analysis** and establish a detailed program budget that demonstrates compliance with financial constraints.
- 11. Develop a preliminary system **acceptance test strategy**. This should be a high level plan of how the team will prove that the final fabricated system meets all requirements.
- 12. Document all of this in a preliminary design report and slideshow, D000.
- 13. Submit the deliverable PDR Report and PDR Slideshow (both on the web site and by email).
- 14. Conduct a live Preliminary Design Review with faculty and reviewers, collecting comments and action items.

15. Deliver the meeting minutes.

All materials presented or referenced at PDR shall be on the project web site and delivered to course instructors 24 hours prior to the commencement of PDR. PDR meeting minutes are due with the next weekly status letter.

D001: CDR Materials

Deliverable CDR Materials include the CDR Report, a live presentation that summarizes the CDR Report, slideshow file from the live presentation, demonstration software from the required CDR demos, and meeting minutes and action items from the live CDR.

Deliverables due prior to CDR must be delivered and accepted prior to CDR in order for CDR to be undertaken. If any deliverables are missing, CDR must be cancelled and rescheduled (possibly with late penalties).

The CDR is a multi-disciplined technical and management review of the status of the project. All items that were presented at PDR (WBS, budget, ITCP, etc...) shall be updated, revised, or augmented as needed in CDR to communicate the current Plan of Record (PoR) for the project.

The printed WBS posted in room 400 shall be fully updated and re-printed for CDR.

Included in the CDR is a presentation of the system level Acceptance Test Plan (ATP), D004, that enumerates system level testing that will demonstrate compliance with all system level requirements.

The live CDR presentation must include a summary of all the topics in the CDR report. In addition the live CDR presentation must include

- A live system state demonstration. The team should conduct a system state demonstration using live hardware and software that shows all the system states and the events that cause transitions between states. Along with the demo, the CDR presentation must describe exactly where system state information will be maintained in hardware and/or software, what the state information consists of, and how the information required for state transitions is communicated among different locations.
- User interface demonstrations with live computer interactivity that implements as much as possible the final look, feel, and functionality of every user interface. It is desirable that the state demonstration be integrated with the UI demonstration.
- **Communication link demonstration** that proves operation of any wireless or wired communication links to every subsystem.

All materials presented or referenced at CDR shall be on the project web site and delivered to course instructors 24 hours prior to the commencement of CDR. CDR meeting minutes are due with the next weekly status letter.

D002: Users Manual

A users manual, per GPR001, shall be provided for each major subsystem and the system as a whole. This should be a high level document that contains an annotated drawing of the physical system, annotated screen shots of all user interface screens, annotated drawings of any physical control panels, indicator buttons, power switches, and other controls. The users manual must include a simplified block diagram, explains all operational procedures and techniques needed to operate the system is a safe and effective manner, including "getting started", "FAQ", detailed explanations of all functions and controls, and user level troubleshooting, calibration and maintenance.

D003: Final Report and Maintenance Manual

A professional quality soft-copy final report on DVD shall be provided. The Final Report shall be a single document of professional quality and suitable for printing that summarizes all high level aspects of the project and quotes or provides links and pointers to other documentation (e.g. sections in the Maintenance Manual, Users Manuals) giving full detail. The Maintenance Manual shall be a single document that unifies and indexes all low-level documentation (schematics, source code, test results, etc...) for the system. The DVD shall include a complete, static copy of the final project website indexed so as to be fully accessible on typical standalone PCs. The DVD must have an attractive cover and on-disk artwork. A 'Sharpie' written label is not acceptable.

The Maintenance Manual should be a low level document that explains the unique technical principles and details of system operation. The maintenance manual includes information on any advanced maintenance or calibration techniques that could be applied by an expert maintainer. A set of schematics, pinouts of all connectors, the signal assignments of all cables, the semantics of all interfaces (hardware and software), block diagrams, state diagrams, source code trees, and other low level information must be documented within this manual.

At least **Three Copies** of the DVD shall be produced and physically delivered individually to the chairman of the ECE department and to each of the course instructors. If necessary, the DVD can be supplemented by a thumb drives (also three copies) if more storage space is needed.

D004: Acceptance Test Plan

The Acceptance Test Plan (ATP) is a document that describes how the system as a whole will be tested and demonstrated so as to prove compliance with all requirements and specifications. The ATP should include forms that can be filled out by testers during execution. These filled out forms will be used to create the ATR.

Compliance must be **conclusively proved**.

Compliance can be proved in any of the following three ways:

• Analysis – detailed logical analysis can demonstrate compliance by reasoning from known facts (*a priori* or empirically) similar to the form of a mathematical proof. Analysis can be used cited research results in conjunction with the documented results of subsystem QA testing, along with generally accepted

technical principles to prove system level requirements are met. Analysis memos and relevant data are attached to the ATR.

- Test an explicit test, experiment, or demonstration can be used to prove compliance with a certain requirement by acquiring new empirical facts and combining these with analysis as described above. The comprehensive results of any measurements conducted as part of an ATP test is included in the ATR, along with date and time of the test, the pass/fail criteria, uncertainty, statistical confidence, pass/fail result, witness name, and witness signature..
- Inspection –compliance is made evident by directly examining the system. Photographs with detailed annotations or other evidence gathered in an inspection is included in the ATR.

The ATP should be arranged to minimize the work involved in testing. If possible, multiple requirements should be demonstrated by each test. The ATP should include a compliance matrix making it obvious that all requirements have been addressed by the plan.

Numerical specifications shall be considered "passed" if the measured value is demonstrated by empirical statistical trials to meet the specification at a 90% confidence interval. Quantitative tests must be accompanied by an error analysis.

D005: Acceptance Test Report

The Acceptance Test Report (ATR) is a document that documents the results of the execution of the Acceptance Test Plan (ATP). The ATR should include measured test data, annotated inspection photographs, and analysis reports that demonstrate compliance with all specifications, and a list of deliverables with their successful delivery dates.

Each test should have the following items noted

- Date/Time
- Person Performing Test
- ECE Professor witnessing test. (optinal)
- Test Results
- Relevant Specs and Requirements
- Pass Fail Criteria
- Pass Fail Determination
- Error Analysis (uncertainty, confidence, etc...)

ECE faculty must be invited to witness testing, but is not obliged to witness any test. The testers and witnesses must have the option to physically sign individual tests and the overall document. Since the test reports will likely include such handwritten content, these portions need to be scanned and preserved in electronic form. The paper document must be handled per GPR001 and GPR012.

Although handwritten signatures are required, the ATR should use automation as appropriate to streamline work and improve accuracy. For example, it is often convenient to create the ATR in the form of a computer spreadsheet automating statistical calculations, pass/fail determinations, plots, etc...

For any requirement passed by inspection, photographs are required. The photos shall be annotated and incorporated into an inspection report that explains for each photo exactly what requirements are shown as satisfied.

Individual test results shall be accumulated on an ongoing basis as tests are conducted. Test results shall be delivered to the website within 24 hours of test completion. The ATR report gathers together all test results. The report comprises the accumulated results of subsystem and system testing per the test plans and other related data. It shall adhere to the documentation standards of GPR001. If the test reports include some handwritten content, they shall be scanned and preserved in electronic form. The original paper must be disposed of per GPR012.

For each subsystem type, the report should include a record of the testing of each instance of the subsystem, including the date and time of the testing along with a handwritten signature of the test technician. The testing record shall include the test procedure (or reference to applicable procedure documents) actual test results explicitly recorded compared against specification limits and pass/fail criteria with each result clearly marked as pass or fail.

D007: Project Web Site

A project web site is required per GPR001 and GPR012.

The content of this site shall be professionally presented and organized. Weekly updates of the site are required. The site must serve the real time needs of the project, but also must be left as a useful resource for reference in the years to come. Content on the site must remain available for at least 10 years. Content on the site must be visible over the Internet by the general public using a standard browser. The main content should be largely static, with portable formats (e.g. PDF, TXT, XML) used exclusively for presenting information so as to guarantee compatibility with future viewing software. In addition, all source code, original documents in native format (e.g. docx, .xlsx, .c, .v, .m, etc...) shall be archived within the web site along with installation media for toolchains.

The use of supplemental "cloud storage" services (e.g. Google Drive, Dropbox, GitHub, etc...) are permitted only if the main website includes prominent, easy to find, index links to content on these services. Content not indexed by the web site effectively does not exist.

D008: Final Presentation and Delivery

LFEV-Y6-2018 must be fully integrated, tested, and actually working upon delivery. Demos, videos, lists, and spare procurement required by GPR006, GPR007, GPR008, and GPR011 must be completed. A final presentation shall be scheduled and conducted per GPR011. Engineering faculty and guests shall be invited to the final presentation.

Posters required by D010 shall be on display during the final presentation.

The Video required by D009 and GPR011 shall include clips from the development process that spans the duration of the project. For this reason, its necessary to work on capturing this video *throughout* the project. This video is shown as part of the final presentation.

The integrated hardware, software, and firmware constituting the LFEV-Y6-2018 system shall be installed in AEC rooms 400 and 401. Any additional parts, subsystems, paperwork, tooling, or other physical material associated with the system should be disposed of per GPR012. Soft copies of all deliverable data items shall be placed on the project web site per GPR012.

D009: Conference Paper, Presentation, and Video

The LFEV-Y6-2018 shall be documented in a suitable form and presented at an academic conference during the Spring 2016 term. One single student shall be elected by the teams to present a paper that highlights certain interesting aspects of the overall project. The conference paper shall be accompanied by a live conference presentation and an interesting, professionally produced video demo.

Since the conference paper is typically due a month before FDD, and may be limited to some small part of the overall project, the video presented at the conference generally cannot meet the requirements of GPR011 due at FDD. Nevertheless, the team is encouraged to produce the best video demo possible for the conference, and to further expand and improve this video to meet GPR011.

Most teams do not have a fully functioning system at the time of the conference. Nevertheless, a non-trivial live demo is preferred to a video. If such a live demo can be conducted, with permission of faculty it can replace the video in this deliverable requirement.

D010: Project Posters

Major subsystems of the LFEV-Y6-2018 shall be documented as attractive and interesting summary posters. These posters shall be delivered in electronic form per GPR001. In addition, the posters shall be physically printed in large, full color format and displayed in a poster session along with the final presentation (D008). The dimensions of the poster shall be compatible with available frames hung in the 4th floor AEC hallway, typically 47x35 inches. Images and text shall be clear and crisp when printed full size. The poster shall contain a web link to the project web site. Links shall be provided both as text and as QR code.

It's important that the poster quickly and effectively conveys the main aspects of the project. Review other ECE posters for formatting ideas. There are also some good online resources for poster design suggestions, such as

http://colinpurrington.com/tips/poster-design

D012: Software Maintainability Plan

Software maintainability is the most important software requirement. Unmaintainable software is completely and utterly worthless to a multi-year effort such as the LFEV

project, even if that software functions properly when demonstrated immediately after it was written.

The Software Maintainability Plan documents how the team plans to address the general maintainability requirements of the project, particularly those given in GPR007.

Any team that creates or substantially improves software for the project shall deliver a software-specific maintainability plan. Others must use the software written for this project over the 5-year life of the system. This deliverable documents how software maintainability will be achieved.

The software maintainability plan must be delivered in written form and accompanied by an oral presentation. The plan should describe the overall approach to software maintainability, and provide thorough answers to the following questions:

- 1. How will the software be installed on new hardware? What happens if the hardware goes obsolete?
- 2. How are errors and exceptions handled? How are logs viewed? How are exceptions configured and modified as requirements change?
- 3. How is backup performed? What is the restore procedure?
- 4. How is a fresh system deployed and validated on new hardware?
- 5. Are system logs and data files automatically trimmed? On do they grow and require manual trimming or offloading? If so, how is this accomplished?
- 6. What is the design of the system API and how will this design support ongoing reliable operation, maintenance and expansion?
- 7. How is system configuration maintained? Will the system auto detect hardware configuration changes or will configuration maintenance be required? If the latter, what is the consequence of misconfiguration? How will the software function when only some of the system hardware is available? Are demo or simulation stubs available for major hardware?
- 8. How is system configuration checked? Are tools provided for generating valid configurations?
- 9. What tool chain will be used? Is the tool suite up-to-date and actively supported? Is the tool suite mature enough to have stable functionality? How is the tool chain installed in a new development system.
- 10. What third party software will be incorporated into the system? How will this be maintained, upgraded, or patched during the life of the system.
- 11. How are requirements in GPR007 met?

Evidence must be provided to support assertions.

D013: Purchasing Report

This report shall document every purchase by the project. Tables shall be provided that showing each purchase request, what items were purchased in that request, when the items were received, and any returns/refunds.

Summary tables shall be provided that give purchasing totals broken down by budget categories, by week, and by task group. Statistics shall be calculated for delivery elapsed time, delivery cost, sales tax, and other items of interest.

D014: Project Management and Status Letters

A project wide management and system engineering effort must coordinate project wide tasks. It is required that some form of system engineering/management team be created. The system engineering team will have responsibility for project-wide delivererables such as the Project Status Letters and Acceptance Test Plan.

A single, weekly, project wide **Project Status Letter** (PSL) must be delivered per GPR001. An example is given in the appendix. This letter shall contain a summary of the individual progress reports. A single responsible individual shall be specified for each completed (or to-be completed) item.

The project status letter shall also include a cost summary that shows expenditures to date broken down by budget categories and compared with budgetary limits. Any over-budget items shall be identified, their consequences presented, and a mitigation plan given. A copy of every purchase request issued that week shall be attached to the status letter. A receiving report shall be included, identifying every item received, with delivery delay, and noting any ordered items not yet received.

Thirty minutes shall be allocated in the first scheduled class meeting of the week to an oral presentation of the status letter(s), if any.

In addition to the Project Status Letter, every student in the class is required to deliver their own **Individual Progress Report** (IPR). The IPR shall be delivered by upload to Moodle.

An example is given in the Appendix. This letter must identify schedule outcomes from the WBS that have been completed by that student in the previous week, and outcomes intended to be completed by them next week. Any overdue outcomes shall be identified, their consequences presented, and a mitigation plan given. Schedule items and action items must be specific and measurable outcomes. Task completion must be clearly defined and fixed. Only task outcome completion is to be considered. The ISL must not discuss "ongoing" or "in process" tasks. If nothing was completed in a given week, say clearly: "no work completed by me" and say why.

The final status letter, and the final individual progress report are to be expanded into a full project report that documents the full project experience over the entire term.

Status letters or progress reports are not accepted late.

Management Requirements

The LFEV-Y6-2018 shall be designed, developed, fabricated, tested, demonstrated, and documented by coordinated student teams during a challenging one-term (15 week) schedule. Each student team first conducts a Preliminary Design Review where that team presents a comprehensive system design and test plan to faculty reviewers and their peer teems. Based on feedback from the review and additional effort teams then refine this plan and conduct a Critical Design Review, followed by fabrication, development, and testing. Overall project management and inter-team coordination is also required.

Work Breakdown Structure

As part of PDR, a hierarchical task breakdown (Work Breakdown Structure, or WBS) shall be created in hierarchical tree form. An example WBS is shown in the appendix. This diagram focuses on the outcomes or milestones that must be accomplished to complete the overall project. The WBS should break down the overall project to identify specific, measurable outcomes that will be accomplished. The responsible individual ad due date shall be noted on the WBS for each outcome. The WBS shall follow the 100% rule and comprise the entire project, including deliverables and management.

There must be at least one individual outcome work goal scheduled for every team member and due for completion each and every week of the project, including spring break week. The responsible individual for each work goal must be identified and noted in the WBS.

In addition to being presented at PDR, the WBS shall be printed in large format paper and posted in room AEC400. The WBS is reviewed weekly, updated as outcomes are completed, and expanded as new goals are discovered.

Labor Resources, Management, and Organization

Teams of Lafayette College students shall comprise the main engineering labor pool. The students involved in this project must establish processes for organizing, planning, and allocating work to individuals and teams. A reliable process for *closed loop* intra-team communication and management must be developed.

Design project teams are student led. The full responsibility for project management and production of deliverables lies with the individual student team. Nevertheless, engineering division professors are specifically allocated to support this effort as consultants throughout the term. On a time-available basis, additional Lafayette professors may consult with the team as required.

Testing of deliverables is defined by students and executed by students. Engineering faculty has the right to review, participate in, and direct testing activities, but these professors have no obligation to do so. Professors do not explicitly correct and grade your work as they do in other courses. When the team creates a text document, computer program, physical part, assembly, or other deliverable, the *team itself* is responsible for inspecting and documenting that the deliverable meets requirements.

How well students work together as a team correlates strongly with project success. Team members must communicate with each other, and ensure that all members contribute meaningfully to each meeting and to the project as a whole. Face-to-face meetings of the whole team are essential. Past experience has shown that excessive reliance on open-loop electronic communication (e.g. email, texting, google apps, etc...) can be counter-productive. The team must communicate closed-loop, physically meet, and actively inspect first-hand the work of all team members. When team members fail to meet goals, the team structure must adapt and other people must step up to do the work if the team is to be successful.

Overhead Resources

The student teams should not attempt to build everything from scratch. Some items should be purchased outright. Experienced technicians should fabricate other items. Students shall not do production mechanical fabrication.

The Lafayette College Engineering Division shops and labs shall be the primary technical resource for production fabrication. External contract fabrication facilities may be utilized when necessary, subject to the budget for direct costs. All fabricators must be located in the USA.

The team should be aware of the lead-time required by the machine shop and other resources, factoring this time into the project schedule.

Students may not submit un-reviewed "sketches" to the machine shop for fabrication. All drawings must be prepared according to GPR001 standards, archived on the web site in PDF format, and bear review signatures along with the name, email, and cell phone number of the responsible individual BEFORE being submitted to the machine shop.

Budget for Direct Costs

Direct costs, including shipping costs for the entire LFEV-Y6-2018 shall be limited to a total of \$3,000 US.

No expenditures will be approved till the project has developed a detailed budget. All purchases must fit within pre-established budget constraints.

Any direct item to be purchased must be requested on a Lafayette ECE Department Purchase Request form. An ECE professor must approve all requests. The team shall keep a binder or spreadsheet with all approved purchase request forms. These should be tracked by the team against orders and received material. It is recommended that a single individual be assigned for managing material procurement.

The ECE Department Secretary will *not* accept unapproved requests nor will the Secretary accept requests that are not on the standard form. Basis for approval will be the degree to which the expense fits with the project plan of record. *Overnight shipping will not be approved*.

Running totals of costs incurred should be updated daily or even in real time if necessary, especially near the purchasing deadline. Updated cost reports and budgets shall accompany requests for major purchases.

Received material without special safety considerations may be stored in the empty cabinets and shelves in room 412 and/or 400. It is the responsibility of the team to receive, inventory, and preserve the stock of received material.

Non Budget Items

In exceptional situations certain "big ticket" items must be purchased for the project with funds that are outside the general project budget.

Non-budget funding for such items may be sought from the Engineering Division subject to the approval of Engineering faculty. All such requests much be accompanied by written justification and must be submitted to faculty no later than CDR.

Acceptance Testing

The ultimate goal of the project is on-time acceptance of all deliverables. To this end, deliverable acceptance comprises the Acceptance Test Plan (ATP) and the Acceptance Test Report (ATR). All specified requirements must either be waived by written agreement prior to CDR, or demonstrated in the ATP/ATR by analysis, test, or inspection.

Everyone in the team gets the same project success portion in his or her grade as measured by the quality and timeliness of the ATP/ATR and its supporting deliverables Thus, the importance of documenting ATP/ATR/QA/Analysis is paramount. All other activities in the project should serve the goals of on-time deliverables and successfully documenting acceptance testing.

At PDR and CDR a student team presents the plan for Acceptance Testing. For best chance of final success, **documented** QA, Analysis, and Acceptance Testing should be ongoing throughout the project. Test, demonstrate, and professionally document functions and deliverables early and often.

System Integration

Integrating independent subsystems into an overall working system is a critical and mandatory part of this project. It is easy to underestimate the amount of time and effort required for system engineering and system integration.

A team should conduct a vigorous **system engineering** effort from dayone and leave ample time at the end of the project for system integration, system debugging, and system acceptance testing.

Technical Requirements

The 2018 must establish a set of design technical requirements based on an analysis of all overall project requirements and rules. Compliance with established technical requirements must be proved by analysis, demonstration, or inspection. Compliance results must be documented with the system, either in the ATR or in a QA Data Report. Based on results from these reports, the technical compliance grade is calculated.

Requirements shall be demonstrated without requiring full integration and testing with the required wheeled vehicle chassis and mechanicals. The LFEV-Y6-2018 team shall design, test, and demonstrate electrical functions using the dynamometer test stand in such a way that the electrical functions can be easily integrated with the rest of the car at a later date.

Detailed analysis of the Formula Hybrid and EV rules was conducted during previous efforts. Detailed design requirements were developed. The 2018 team is encouraged to review and update these results.

Considerable progress was made in previous years, yet some software and hardware deliverables were never successfully integrated or failed to meet many LFEV requirements. Previous year web sites document shortfalls in errata documents. The 2018 team is encouraged to read all errata. After analysis of the design and implementation status, the 2018 team may choose to re-use all or part of the previous work, or completely discard it, as the team sees fit. This freedom to discard previous work notwithstanding, parts of the previous project that **do** adequately meet LFEV requirements may not be discarded and replaced with new parts that do not meet those requirements. The 2018 project should not "backslide".

ECE General Project Requirements

The following requirements fully apply to the LFEV-Y6-2018 unless waived or superseded herein by specific requirements of this project. Compliance with these requirements must be established by analysis, demonstration, or inspection. Compliance results must be documented with the system ATR.

Special Waivers and Restrictions

Analysis can be used to show the system is compliant to GPR003; no formal EMI/EMC certification testing or empirical data is required.

Surface temperatures, supply current drains per GPR005 must be analytically predicted at CDR and physically spot-checked to verify as compliant during ATP. If non-contact IR thermometers are used, the measurements must be corrected for emissivity and an error analysis provided.

The existing project safety plan from the 2015 must be reviewed in 2017 and updated if required. All student participants must read, understand, and agree to the updated plan.

The 50% power supply-overrating requirement does not apply to the accumulator subsystem as a whole.

GPR001: Documentation

Complete and accurate documentation must be provided with all projects. These documents shall include documents for mechanical and electrical fabrication, test results, software development kits, maintenance manual, user manual, and specification compliance matrices, and technical papers. All documentation shall be accumulated in electronic form, centralized in a project web site, and thoroughly indexed.

Data items shall be delivered both to the course instructors and to the project web site. In the case of moderate sized PDF documents, the document should be emailed to course instructors and posted on the course web site. For larger deliverables, email notice may be sent to course instructors along with a URL of the deliverable as placed on the web site.

Text documents shall be typewritten in a professional style commensurate with quality standards established by Lafayette College ECE writing courses (e.g. ES225 and ECE211).

All drawings shall be complete in accordance with the standards established in ME210 and ECE491. In addition drawings must

- Be legible and neat freehand sketches are unacceptable
- Exactly and unambiguously describe the most recent version of the part or assembly, including any bug fixes or improvements
- Give all critical dimensions with units
- Specify all materials

- Have a Lafayette or project specific border with completed title block that includes correct names, dates, part name, number, etc...
- Include the name of a specific individual requesting the part, with their full name, email, and phone number.

Parts must have a unique part number. Assembly drawings and BOMs should use these part numbers consistently.

A part drawing should show the part number somewhere in the title block, the part number should be included in the drawing file name, and the part number should be marked on the part itself at some inconspicuous location using an indelible marker, metal stamp, or other permanent marking system.

Any drawing submitted to the Lafayette Engineering Machine Shop for fabrication must be approved and signed by the designer, the team project engineer, and relevant faculty. "Rough" sketches without approval signatures may not be submitted to the shop.

Final drawings of fabricated parts must be indexed and archived on the project web site in PDF form. It should be possible to click on a drawing and open it directly without needing to download and unzip an archive.

All original paper documents should be scanned and stored electronically. The original should be disposed of per GPR012.

Test reports for hardware and software must show the date/time of testing, name and signature of the tester, and name/signature of any witnesses.

For all electronic PCB designs the following fabrication documents are required: dated, and numbered schematics or mechanical drawings on Lafayette College drawing format, circuit net-lists, bills of materials, artwork, assembly drawings, and all other files and instructions necessary for CAM or manual manufacturing. The source files for fabricating PCBs and editing linked schematics shall be clearly identified and preserved.

Documentation must be provided both for original designs and for any subcontracted designs. For purchased vendor components within the design, all vendor manuals and documentation shall be retained with the system. Proper mechanical drawings are required for fabricated mechanical parts. Manufacturers data sheets and interface drawings are required for all purchased components.

For software and firmware designs: Source code, and executable binaries for all applications; Verilog, constraints and configuration bitstreams for FPGAs; and ROM image files in commonly accepted JED or HEX formats for all PLDs.

Videos shall be produced in compression formats that play reliably on most PC, Mac, and Linux computers. Both a full resolution (640x480) and a compact (320x240) version shall be created.

All documentation must be provided and delivered in electronic form. Emailing a description of a document along with a URL into the project web site is an acceptable and desirable form of delivery. The use of standard and portable document formats (*e.g.* PDF, TXT), must be used so that the documentation can be viewed on any computer without the need for proprietary applications. Nevertheless, along with a viewable PDF version of every document, the original source format of the document (.docx, .vsd, etc...) must be

archived on the site. The documentation must be arranged in an organized and professional manner on the project web site.

To promote the College in general and the ECE Department in particular, documentation, hardware, and software shall be marked with the name of the college (using the official logo) along with the words "Electrical and Computer Engineering" in a similar sized font. All circuit boards, major assemblies, enclosures, racks, and any significant hardware subsystem, as well as all software modules, files, "About" screens, "splash screens" shall be so marked. In addition, the names of project team members may be added in a professional and tasteful way to titling on documentation, hardware, and software.

GPR003: EMI/EMC

Unintentional electromagnetic radiation radiated or conducted from designs must meet US CFR Title 47 Part 15 subpart B regulations for Class A digital equipment. Intentional radiators must meet subpart C regulations. Exemptions from 15.103 are not allowed.

GPR004: Hazmats

Hazardous materials should be avoided in designs. If use of a hazardous material is essential to the function of the design and there is no non-hazardous alternative, the use of the hazardous material must comply with the Lafayette College Chemical Hygiene Plan.

All materials used in electronic circuit fabrication must meet 2002/95/EC RoHS directives. NiCd or Lead-Acid batteries may not be used in new designs.

Any portion of the design or prototype that is discarded must be discarded according to the Lafayette College Chemical Hygiene plan. Also, projects should discard the collected electronic waste in an ecological-friendly manner as per the 2002/96/EC WEEE directive, either by ecological disposal or by reuse/refurbishment of the collected waste.

GPR005: Safety and Good Practice

All work shall comply with good industry practice that enhances reliability and maintainability. These practices include such items as

- Color coded wiring in accordance with applicable industry standard color codes (*e.g.* NFPA 79 or UL508 for power wiring, EIA/TIA 568 for network wiring, etc...)
- Wire and cable must be marked with gauge and temperature rating.
- Clear labeling of all controls and indicators.
- An obvious and clearly labeled system-wide power shutdown switch.
- Silkscreen on PCBs that includes reference designators, noted power supply voltages and other critical signals. Silkscreen must show a Lafayette College logo, leopard paw icon, the words "Made in USA", the words "Electrical and Computer Engineering", assembly number and revision, and designated locations for serial numbers to be attached or written. PCB bottom copper should have text indicating the board part number and rev.

- Fuses shall be mounted in UL listed sockets or holders and at least 5 spares must be included with system delivery; breakers shall be resettable. All are readily accessible per maintainability requirements.
- Service loops on all cable harnesses.
- Access panels on enclosures.

Software/firmware developed must adhere to the principles and practice established in Lafayette College course CS205. Source code must be maintained under configuration control.

FPGA Logic shall be defined in HDL according to the rules and guidelines established in Lafayette College course ECE491.

Embedded computer processors shall have reset buttons. These buttons must be readily acceptable for maintenance, but not so easy to hit that they degrade reliability.

Major, visible enclosures shall have pilot lights, indicators, meters, displays, and other features that allow observers to be able to tell what is "going on" within the box without need for extra equipment.

Power LEDs shall be green. Red LEDs shall be reserved for error or exception conditions.

Wiring connections shall be insulated with heat shrink tubing or other rugged material. Electrical tape may not be used for insulating wire connections.

Circuits must be enclosed either by fully grounded metal enclosures, or fully insulated non-metal enclosures. PCBs may not be mounted directly to the outer walls of enclosures. Every enclosure must be labeled both externally and internally. All cables and wiring harnesses must be labeled. Labeling must be consistent with the ICD.

Every cable between assemblies shall have at least one dedicated ground return within that cable.

Cable connectors must use strain reliefs to prevent mechanical stress on the pin-wire connection.

Crimped pins must be assembled using a proper crimping tool. The wire size and type must be compatible with the pin.

Current drain analysis must be provided for all power supplies. Each supply voltage must have a current rating with a 50% safety factor over the anticipated peak current.

All resistors or other parts dissipating more than 25 milliwatts shall be identified and analysis shall be provided that shows all such parts are properly rated for peak and average power dissipation and have a proper heat sink and fan, if necessary, that provides adequate cooling over the ambient temperature range.

Fans should be protected with grilles and filters. EMI analysis must consider the fan opening and specify EMI tight grillework if necessary.

Components must be cooled such that the surface temperature is no greater than 40 degrees C above nominal ambient.

Power dissipation rating of parts shall be 50% overrated over the required temperature range.

Working voltage of capacitors shall be 25% overrated above the peak voltage anticipated, including all expected glitches, spikes, and tolerance limits.

Project activities must adhere to the general Lafayette College safety policy, possibly augmented by any ECE Department or ECE Laboratory safety rules. Applicable rules are those in effect on the date of ATP.

Any project that develops AC RMS or DC potential differences greater than 30 Volts between any two points within the design (other than at the unmodified mains input side of a UL listed commercial power supply) must develop and implement an electrical safety plan before any circuits are powered. The safety plan must document the processes, design constraints, and equipment that will be used to ensure the safety of all participants.

The safety plan must include a "sealing" process for enclosures that contain voltages >30 Volts. Enclosures must be sealed with a label signed by a Qualified Individual (not a student) before being energized and tested by students.

The ECE Director of Laboratories must approve the electrical safety plan.

A project team member must be designated project safety officer. It shall be the project safety officer's responsibility to insure that all activities adhere to the project safety plan.

All equipment developed must comply with applicable national standards. Specifically, all electric supply, communications lines, and equipment must be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance to The National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) – ANSI C-2. Installations of electric conductors and equipment that connect to a building main supply of electricity must be designed, constructed, operated and maintained in accordance to The NASI/NFPA 70.

Any interconnection with the Lafayette College power grid is subject to the approval of Plant Operations. Any interconnection with the Lafayette College campus computer network is subject to the approval of the Information Technology Services department.

Use and design of lasers shall be in accordance with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Z136.1-2000, "American National Standard for Safe Use of Lasers". Only low power Class I, II and Class IIIa (<5 mW) lasers should be used. If project requirements necessitate higher power, the project must develop and implement a laser safety plan before any laser work begins. The safety plan must document the processes, design constraints, and equipment that will be used to ensure the safety of all participants.

All projects that involve RF power of any level must be designed to ensure that participants are not exposed to RF in excess of the recommended exposure limits adopted by the FCC (most recently in 1996, but note the proposed rule change in 2003). If project requirements necessitate radiated RF power in excess of 100 mW, the project must develop and implement an RF exposure safety plan before any high power RF work begins. The safety plan must document the processes, design constraints, and equipment that will be used to ensure the safety of all participants.

Projects that contain recognized hazards must develop a project safety plan. Such hazards include but are not limited to high altitude, operation at sea, on lakes, or in rivers or

mines, exposure to electrical, chemical, biological, radiological, or psychological hazards.

All projects that involve machinery that create hazards such as those created by point of operation, ingoing nip points, rotating parts, flying chips and sparks, etc..., must develop and implement a machinery safety plan before any machinery work begins. At a minimum the plan must address US Title 29 CFR Part 1910 Occupational Safety and Health Standards, Sub Part O, Machinery and Machine Guarding.

All applicable Lafayette College safety rules shall apply to this project, including posted rules in labs and shops used by team members.

GPR006: Reliability

The system wide Mean Time Between Failures (MTBF) must be greater than 1000 hours over the system lifetime.

Reliability requirements must be demonstrated in the ATP both by analysis and by Inspection. The use of MIL-HDBK-217, Bellcore TR-332, or other equivalent techniques are encouraged for the analysis. Every part and subsystem in the full BOM must be explicitly considered in the MTBF analysis.

Parts with power dissipation over 25 milliwatts shall be identified and the reliability analysis shall include reliability derating of these components based on the expected dissipation.

In addition to the analysis, a reliability inspection shall be conducted during ATP where the system is shown to operate for 24 hours without any obvious failure.

Failures are defined as anything that causes system requirements to be missed. Failures include, but are not limited to computer software lock-ups, shutdowns caused by overheating, automatic operations stalled by exceptions or requests for human intervention, as well as random component failure.

GPR007: Maintainability

Software Maintainability

Software must be developed according to an explicit Software Maintainability Plan.

All software source code must be maintained under configuration control. Release snapshots must be archived on the project website.

The system must start from cold power-up and boot to full operational status without requiring user interaction beyond enabling power and safety procedures.

Any PC software must be packaged for installation with a SETUP.EXE, RPM, "make install" or equivalent installer allowing it to be installed easily on any compatible computer.

Configuration parameters, calibration factors, preferences, and options shall not be hardcoded within the software source code. It shall be possible to alter these various factors without recompiling software or physically disassembling hardware. Altered configuration parameters must be persistent through power cycling and reboots. The system must have a function to initialize itself with sane (factory default) configuration content if requested.

All data and configuration files must be in a generally supported format (e.g. XML) or the format required by a mature and well supported application (e.g. MySQL database files, Berkeley db, etc...). The use of custom formatted ASCII or binary files for configuration or data storage is not permitted. Files shall be accessible either through removable media or network file transfer or both.

Log files, data files, and any other files that grow over time shall be automatically trimmed by system software.

A scheme for automatic system backup of data storage shall be provided.

To the largest extent possible, the use of passwords shall be avoided. If the use of a password is unavoidable for serious security reasons, the password must be archived in a clearly documented location, and the maintainability plan shall explicitly provide a scheme for password recovery.

The use of removable media (thumb drives, flash media cards) is permitted for configuration parameters, offline storage, access, and backup. If removable storage is used for configuration, the system must have the inherent capability to operate without media, and to initialize blank media with sane configuration content.

Enumerated devices, such as USB, must be automatically discovered by the system and assigned correct port designations such that the system operates correctly after reenumeration without any interaction or re-programming by the user. Port designations may not be "hard coded" in the software or firmware.

Any cell phone software must be packaged and available from an online "App store" for easy installation on any compatible phone without requiring special alterations of the phone such as SDK installation or jailbreaking.

Hardware Maintainability

Maintainability requirements for hardware must be demonstrated in the ATP both by analysis and by Inspection. The use of MIL-HDBK-472 (N1) and MIL-STD-470B, ISO/IEC 25000:2005, or other equivalent techniques are encouraged for the analysis.

In the hardware maintainability analysis you should assume a stock of recommended spare parts. The list of these spare parts should be included in the ATP. The Users Manual should include a section giving simple troubleshooting procedures. The Maintenance Manual should have more elaborate diagnosis and troubleshooting resources.

Should there be a failure, the system wide Mean Time To Repair (MTTR) must be less than 1 week over the system lifetime. MTTR applies to both hardware and software.

In addition, a maintainability inspection shall be conducted during ATP where a novice using procedures included in the User Manual demonstrates the diagnosis and repair of a likely failure, and an expert using resources included in the Maintenance Manual demonstrates the diagnosis and repair of an UN-likely failure.

GPR008: Manufacturability

All designs must be built from components and subassemblies that have a sustainable source of supply over the system lifetime. To demonstrate that this requirement is met in hardware, it must be shown that each item in the Bill of Materials (BOM) for the design is available from a minimum of two independent suppliers or justification must be given for sole source procurement. In addition, industry trends shall be considered when selecting implementation options. Designs should choose options most aligned with future industry trends.

The tolerances of components shall be considered in the design. Any component with a value that determines a critical voltage, time constant, frequency, or other parameter shall have a tolerance such that system requirements are met with 99% yield in manufacturing. An analysis shall be provided that identifies any tolerance critical components and proves that the tolerances are adequate to meet system requirements at that yield.

GPR011: Project Video and Final Demonstration

A video summary of the entire project must be produced.

The video should include a project introduction and summary, a collage of clips from the development process, a high level demonstration of the capabilities of the system, and a brief conclusion. It should be engaging, memorable, and professionally produced with titles, tasteful effects, and music. The video should be approximately 5 minutes in length.

In addition to the video, completed projects must be demonstrated live for review by ECE faculty. This live demonstration should include a brief oral presentation with slideshow describing the key technical achievements of the project. A screening of the project video shall follow, along with a live demo of the actual system in operation.

The entire design, or some major functional subsystem of the design, must be suitable for continuous, unattended display as a self-contained, active demonstration that would excite the interest of students, faculty, and other ECE Department visitors.

Such demonstrations must fit in a compact public area (possibly replacing an old, obsolete demo) and operate safely and without unreasonable disturbance of its neighbors.

In demo mode, computer screens must periodically display the Lafayette ECE logo, list of team members, and a team photo to the extent permitted by the graphics capabilities of the screen, and functional realizability.

If powered by building mains, the demonstration shall automatically restart after a power outage. User interaction with the demo is encouraged, but if activated by some passer-by, the demonstration must deactivate automatically after a short delay. The MTTR and MTBF of the demonstration must meet or exceed the project-level Maintainability and Reliability requirements given herein.

GPR012: Final Disposal of Projects

Projects may be stored for future work, placed on display, or discarded. Time must be included in project schedules for final disposal.

If a project is to be stored, all its materials must be collected together in a single location. If possible, these materials should be enclosed in a sealed container, locked cabinet, or secure room that contains only these materials from one project and no other. If certain parts are impractical to store with the bulk of the project materials, these separate parts must be clearly labeled so their association with the stored project is obvious.

Projects placed on display may have portions not on display. The undisplayed portions shall be either stored or discarded as described herein.

Portions of projects or complete projects that are discarded must be discarded in accordance with Hazmat procedures described herein.

Test equipment moved from labs shall be replaced in its original location.

Trash, loose wires, scattered components, and other detritus resulting from frenzied development and testing shall be cleaned up.

Paper documents that have been scanned per GPR001 shall be placed in a paper recycling bin.

The project web site must be updated constantly with the most recent versions of all documents. The documents on the final web site must match the delivered system. Obsolete documents on the web site shall be removed.

Acronym Glossary

ACAlternating CurrentAECAcopian Engineering CenterAIRAccumulator Isolation RelayAMSAccumulator Management SystemAPIApplications Programming InterfaceATPAcceptance Test PlanATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDHigh Voltage DisconnectICPIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTTRMean Time To Repair <td< th=""><th></th><th></th></td<>				
AIRAccumulator Isolation RelayAMSAccumulator Management SystemAPIApplications Programming InterfaceATPAcceptance Test PlanATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEElectric Magnetic InterferenceEMIElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EnginceringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	AC	Alternating Current		
AMSAccumulator Management SystemAPIApplications Programming InterfaceATPAcceptance Test PlanATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EnginceringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time Detaire	AEC			
APIApplications Programming InterfaceATPAcceptance Test PlanATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time To Repair	AIR	Accumulator Isolation Relay		
ATPAcceptance Test PlanATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGreneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between Failures	AMS			
ATRAcceptance Test ReportBOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	API	Applications Programming Interface		
BOBBreak out BoardBOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time To Repair	ATP	1		
BOMBill Of MaterialsBMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair				
BMSBattery Management SystemBRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	BOB	Break out Board		
BRBBig Red ButtonCAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	BOM	Bill Of Materials		
CAMComputer Aided ManufacturingCFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	BMS	Battery Management System		
CFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	BRB	Big Red Button		
CFECustomer Furnished EquipmentCFRCode of Federal RegulationsCDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	CAM	Computer Aided Manufacturing		
CDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time To Repair	CFE			
CDRCritical Design ReviewCOCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time To Repair	CFR	1		
COCCertificate Of ComplianceDCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTTRMean Time To Repair	CDR			
DCDirect CurrentECEuropean CommunityECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTTRMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	COC			
ECEElectrical and Computer EngineeringEMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	DC			
EMIElectro Magnetic InterferenceEMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTTRMean Time To Repair	EC	European Community		
EMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	ECE	Electrical and Computer Engineering		
EMCElectro Magnetic CompatibilityETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	EMI	Electro Magnetic Interference		
ETCEstimate To CompleteEVElectric VehicleFAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	EMC			
FAQFrequently Asked QuestionsFCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	ETC			
FCCFederal Communications CommissionFDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	EV	Electric Vehicle		
FDDFinal Delivery DateGLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	FAQ			
GLVGrounded Low VoltageGPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	FCC	Federal Communications Commission		
GPRGeneral Project RequirementHVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	FDD	Final Delivery Date		
HVHigh VoltageHVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	GLV	Grounded Low Voltage		
HVDHigh Voltage DisconnectICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	GPR	General Project Requirement		
ICDInterface Control DocumentIMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	HV	High Voltage		
IMDInsulation Monitoring DeviceIPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	HVD	High Voltage Disconnect		
IPRIndividual Progress ReportITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	ICD	Interface Control Document		
ITCPIndividual Technical Contribution ProposalJGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	IMD	Insulation Monitoring Device		
JGBJohn Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair		Individual Progress Report		
LFEVLafayette Formula Electric VehicleMCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	ITCP	Individual Technical Contribution Proposal		
MCSMotor Controller SystemMEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	JGB	John Gehrig Board (CAN bus DAQ board)		
MEMechanical EngineeringMTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	LFEV	Lafayette Formula Electric Vehicle		
MTBFMean Time Between FailuresMTTRMean Time To Repair	MCS	ž		
MTTR Mean Time To Repair	ME	Mechanical Engineering		
	MTBF	Mean Time Between Failures		
NEC National Electric Code		Mean Time To Repair		
	NEC	National Electric Code		

-		
NESC	National Electrical Safety Code	
OBPC	One Board Per Cell	
OBPP	One Board Per Pack	
PacMan	Pack Manager	
PDR	Preliminary Design Review	
PM	Program Management	
POR	Plan Of Record	
PSL	Project Status Letter	
QA	Quality Assurance	
RH	Relative Humidity	
RMS	Root Mean Square	
ROM	Read Only Memory	
RTDS	Ready To Drive Sound	
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition	
SDK	System Development Kit	
SOC	State of Charge	
SOW	Statement of Work	
TSAL	Tractive System Active Light	
TSI	Tractive System Interface	
TSMP	Tractive System Measuring Point	
TSMS	Tractive System Master Switch	
TSV	Tractive System Voltage	
UI	User Interface	
UL	Underwriters Laboratories	
VCI	Vehicle Computer Interface	
VSCADA	Vehicle Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition	
VSRD	Vehicle Systems Requirements Document	
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure	

Appendix – Template Documents

Individual Progress Report

IPR Number [serial number]
Covering period from [Start Date] to [End Date]
Prepared by: [Student Name (s)]

Tasks I completed in the previous week:

[Complete WBS items only. List specific, clear definition of completion that can be checked. Make special note of deliverables accepted or requirements demonstrated successfully.]

Task Completed 1: WBS Item Number, description

Task Completed 2: WBS Item Number, description

D00X Delivered: WBS Item Number, description

•••

Tasks I plan to complete next week.

[Complete WBS Items Only. List specific, measurable planned task outcomes along with the responsible individual for each goal.]

Due 1: WBS Item Number, description

Due 2: WBS Item Number, description

•••

Proposed Changes

[Propose new goals or sub-goals to be incorporated into the WBS. All changes are subject to management approval]

Overdue WBS Items

[Give consequences and a mitigation plan]

Project Status Letter

PSL Number [serial number]
Covering period from [Start Date] to [End Date]
Prepared by: [Student Name (s)]

Project Completion Graph:

[Plot overall percent project completion versus time. The time scale should extend from project start to final delivery date. The completion scale should be 0 - 100%. Include a line indicating ideal completion based on scheduling or estimation. As backup, additional graphs or tables should be given for major sub tasks.]



Tasks Summary from the previous week:

[Summarize the data from the Individual Status letters, giving special emphasis to overdue tasks that require mitigation, backup-behavior, or redesign]

Plan for next week:

[Summarize the plan for next week, giving special emphasis to tasks due that appear to be at risk]

Proposed Changes

[Propose new goals or sub-goals to be incorporated into the WBS.]

Budget Graph:

[Plot overall percentage budget expenditure versus time. The time scale should extend from project start to final delivery date. The budget scale should span from 0 - 100% of the budget allocation. Include a line indicating ideal expenditure based on scheduling or estimation. As backup, additional graphs or tables should be given for major budget categories using actual dollar amounts.]



Cost Summary

Team	Allocated Budget	Total Spent	Budget Remaining	Percentage Spent
TSI	\$1,000	\$1,041.67	-\$41.67	104.17%
GLV	\$1,000	\$620.90	\$379.10	62.09%
VSCADA	\$50	\$21.99	\$28.01	43.98%
Cell App	\$125	\$0.00	\$125.00	0.00%
Cooling	\$600	\$511.69	\$88.31	85.28%
Interconnect	\$1,000	\$2,241.52	-\$1,241.52	224.15%
Dyno	\$50	\$0.00	\$50.00	0.00%
TSV	\$500	\$890.43	-\$390.43	178.09%
Shipping/Tax	\$1,175	\$894.55	\$280.45	76.13%
Overall	\$5,500	\$6,222.75	-\$722.75	113.14%

[List over-budget items. Give consequences and a mitigation plan]

Receiving Report

[List every item received, with delivery delay]

[List any ordered items not yet received]

[List overdue items. Give consequences and a mitigation plan.]

Purchase Requests

[attach all new purchase requests as appendix]

Work Breakdown Structure Example



Work: 1.80% Budget: \$6,000.00

- 3.2.5 Hardware Work: 2.50% Budget: \$2,000.00