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# **SCRUM ROLES**

SCRUM Master:

Product Owner:

# **Sprint Planning**

1st Sprint:

8th of October – 12th of October

2nd Sprint:

22nd of October – 16th of October

3rd Sprint:

29th of October – 2nd of November

4th Sprint:

5th of November – 9th of November

5th Sprint:

12th of November – 16th of November

6th Sprint:

19th of November – 23rd of November

7th Sprint:

26th of November – 30th of November

8th Sprint:

3rd of December – 7th of December

9th Sprint:

10th of December – 14th of December

# **Group Meetings**

Group meetings will be on Fridays. They will consist of SCRUM Review and Retrospective.

They will all be held at the university. There will be approximately 150 hours of work each sprint.

# **Sprint Backlogs**

1st Sprint

Sprint Review:

Work was split in multiple days as immediate priorities took held of our schedules. The meetings got heated because of arguments, but it didn’t impend the work pace. Due to planning, everything was achieved even before the term. The results of designing the system were satisfactory.

Sprint Retrospective:

WHAT WENT WELL:  
- TEAMWORK

- WORK PACE

- FOCUS

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED:

- COMMUNICATION

The way we planned our schedules worked properly to satisfy both personal and professional. Work pace and focus were centered on the work, but communication got heated because of arguments. They were solved but could’ve been avoided by a bit more tact. In future meetings situations like these will be dealt with a better approach.

Finished Work:

Architecture Diagrams

System Sequence Diagram

2nd Sprint

Sprint Review:

The design is still the focus. Meetings took place to prepare for future sprints in which we will implement the system. The schedule for meetings was unaltered by external issues. In this sprint, the process evolved further in designing the system.

Sprint Retrospective:

WHAT WENT WELL:  
- TEAMWORK

- WORK PACE

- COMMUNICATION

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED:

- FOCUS

In comparison with the previous sprint, communication was on point. Arguments were dealt with a better attitude, especially openness. Focus started to fall off towards the end, but it didn’t affect the result as most of the work was already done. The working medium was a better environment for working and discussing.

Finished Work:

Requirements

Use Cases

3rd Sprint

Sprint Review:

The focus was designing the proof of concept. The common agreement was to work on the first component and have it working as intended, in order to demonstrate the feasibility of our system. The construction of the system also started with this sprint

Sprint Retrospective:

WHAT WENT WELL:

* TEAMWORK
* COMMUNICATION
* FOCUS

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED:

* UNDERSTANDING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SYSTEM

As the designing and implementation began, doubts started to appear. This was mainly the only issue with this sprint. There is a need for a meeting with the supervisors to understand in a clearer manner what is expected. The working environment was satisfying in this sprint.

Finished Work:

Design of the first component

4th Sprint

(Add supervisor meeting with Jan during this sprint. He explained what designing our own protocols means and we remade our code using sockets)

Sprint Review:

After discussing with one of the supervisors and meeting to reflect on the evolution of the code, the design was improved as there was a lack in understanding of the requirements. This was one of the biggest steps until now for meeting the requirements.

Sprint Retrospective:

WHAT WENT WELL:

* ADDAPTIVENESS OF THE TEAM

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED:

* COMMUNICATION
* TEAMWORK
* FOCUS
* WORK PACE

In comparison with previous sprints, the results of planning and splitting the tasks was not fruitful. It was not such a big issue as most of the code was scrapped. Looking forward to future sprints, plans should be made in such a way that the direction is clear and easy to follow.

5th Sprint

(Add supervisor meetings with Jakob and Jan. They both explained how we didn’t really respect the 3-tier model and would be a good idea to have the database server separate. We decided after this to code it in C# and communicate over sockets.)

Sprint Review:

The proof of concept created was reviewed by the supervisors. After the meeting, design was adjusted and tasks on how to improve it were done. Requirements were made clearer and the vision for the system is becoming clearer.

Sprint Retrospective:

WHAT WENT WELL:

-COMMUNICATION

-TEAMWORK

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED:

-FOCUS

-WORK PACE

Comparing it to previous sprints, the vision for the final product became more defined. The pace should be improved as the number of sprints until the hand in are decreasing. The problem of members not communicating when in doubt started to become less of an issue. Use of tools like Github and Trello has improved.