

1. Review Information – Sprint 1

1. Your group members' names: Khalef Mechenane, Maral Hamedian, Íñigo Turrientes, Diego Peribáñez
2. Your reviewee group members' name: Sami Sipilä, Joonas Virolainen, Joel Vainikainen, Kalle Nurminen
3. Date 04/02/2020
4. Did your reviewee group correct their deliveries according to your comments (if no, what was not fixed)?

2. Project Plan Review

1. Does the project plan follow the instructions and the template?
 - No, it just does de minimum.
2. Is the text and language readable and understandable?
 - It's understandable (although they can give more details) but not readable, the format and the structure of the document is a bit unclear. The heading and subheading should be indicated and recognizable.
3. Is all necessary information there? If not, what is missing?
 - Yes, but this project plan lacks the details, it is really synthesized, it should be more elaborated.
4. What was done well?
 - Description of project is concise, risk analysis is well done they have tried to consider all possible risks, although they should not list the lack of skills as a risk.
5. What would you correct and how?
 - In the project limitation section: It seems that the team misunderstood the project limitations, they should list and explain clearly what is not going to be implemented in the project.
 - Outcome delivery: This section is too brief; they should be more specific on when and how are they checking product details with the customer
 - Documentation storage: in this part they only have the git repository address, they should indicate where they're going to store their backup files (In risk analysis it's written that they want to avoid the risk of redmine failure by having backups) .Furthermore, are they going to use a platform for task division and organization like trello?
 - Requirements specification: is well described but it doesn't say how it is going to be implemented (how the step is going to be counted, how can they avoid false steps...)
 - Test plan: they missed what and how they are going to test specifically and give approximately a timeline for each testing phase.

3. Assessment

1. What did you learn from your reviewee group's work?
 - They have the redmine risk, thing that we didn't consider.
2. Your grading of the assignments (0 – 4) : 1 because they have just made the minimum effort.
3. If you wrote your project plan now, what would you do differently
 - Considering the Redmine risk.

4. What did your group do better than your reviewee group and why?
 - Mostly everything, we structured the project plan in a better way and our explanations are deeper.
5. How would you grade your own assignments (0 – 4) and why?
 - 4 because we have specified each section of our project in much deeper detail and we are going to improve it in the future.