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**1. Sprint 4 Postmortem Results**

**1.1 Things That Went Well**

As a group we became more unified. Before midterm we were not as organized as we would have liked. We have managed to accomplish a lot after midterm. A lot of the work we did also involved teamwork and working through it together.

**1.2 Things That Did Not Go Well**

Our rough start on the project translated into our final sprint as we were not able to reach our stretch goals. Our focus also switched from working with the National Map itself to just working on the data that needs to be applied to the map.

**1.3 Lessons Learned While Doing The Project**

During this project, we learned many lessons that we can apply to our future. In terms of work distribution, we know that pairs or solo groups work best for working on the same task, and if you add too many people to the same task, you can sometimes get some diminishing returns. We learned many things about databases, geographic data, and how to store and display this type of data. In the end, we will be able to apply these lessons to our careers in a meaningful way.

**1.4 What We Would Have Done Differently**

The biggest thing we could have done differently during this project from the beginning is to approach how we distributed work in a different way. In the beginning, our understanding of the requirements was a little off, and this led to us distributing some unnecessary tasks to group members. We also could have done more work to understand the tools we were working with, because if we had understood that the KML files would be able to display data in the correct way, we would have worked with that from the beginning.

**1.5 Recommendations for Future Projects**

The biggest recommendation we have is make sure that your purpose and goals for the project are all aligned amongst your team members, mentor, and sponsor. Lack of clarity in these can result in low efficiency and wasted time that would be valuable for meeting the requirements of the project.

**2. Project Size and Effort Estimates**

**2.1 Size Estimate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Estimate** | **Actual Size** |
| SLOC | 1000 Lines | ~700 Lines |
| Help Document | 6 Pages | 1 Page Readme on Gibhub |

In the end, our estimates ended up being somewhat close to what we actually spent on the project. It would appear that our user story point estimates were a good benchmark for our project, and our understanding of what would need to go into the project was accurate.

**2.2 Effort Estimates**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Estimate** | **Actual Size** |
| Coding | 300 Hours | ~120 Hours |
| Testing | 10 Hours | ~5 Hours |
| Documentation | 20 Hours | 35 Hours |
| Total | 330 Hours | 160 Hours |

Originally we expected to be writing and testing code in the National Map along with working with data, but in the end just ended up working with the data. Because of this our amount of time testing and coding has actually been a lot smaller than we original expected from our project.

**2.3 Project Effort Breakdown**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Area** | **% Effort** |
| Training | 40% |
| Requirements | 10% |
| Design | 10% |
| Coding | 25% |
| Testing | 5% |
| Mid-term and Final Reports | 10% |