**Sprint 2 Report**

Based on the Sprint 1 retrospective that was carried out at the start of sprint 2, we made changes to the way we proceeded in Sprint 2.

* During the first sprint many of the GitHub commits were not properly named or described. Noting this, during Sprint 2 we made sure that each commit was properly titled and had a relevant description.
* Our repository branching during sprint 1 was messy, inefficient and poorly described, so we aimed to improve on that during Sprint 2, potentially with the use of the GitFlow branching method. We created a development branch, then made sure that developers working on discrete tasks each created a properly named branched, which could be properly merged later in the project.
* Our Sprint 1 backlog story points did not add up for some of the sub tasks, so for Sprint 2 we tried to make sure we were keeping to the set values for all sub tasks.
* During Sprint 1 we stored the Sprint Backlog in a google document, updating it there instead of committing versions of it to the GitHub. This made it more difficult to see how the project evolved throughout the Sprint. During Sprint 2, we stored the Sprint Backlog in a local document that was then committed to GitHub regularly.
* The user stories we created in Sprint 1 were too technical according to the clients and were not centred around the experience of the users enough. At the beginning of Sprint 2 we went over the user stories to make sure they were representative of what they were supposed to be.
* During Sprint 1 we did not proper make use of unit testing, which was a specification of the project and could have made development easier. We resolved to make better use of this technique during Sprint 2. An example of this is the DataSetFormatter java class which utilised Test Driven Development.
* A code review was not done during Sprint 1, which might have helped us create better work and prevent errors that take up development time. We had aimed to do this during Sprint 2 but did not get around to doing it.
* We did not create a sprint Burndown chart during Sprint 1, which might have helped us manage our time better. We only made this at the end of sprint 2, so it didn’t provide much benefit.
* During Sprint 1 we did not perform a return on investment calculation, which might have helped us determine where our priorities were and how many people to assign to what work. To make sure we were getting these benefits, at the start of Sprint 2 we performed return on investment calculations.
* Regarding the Client Meeting/Sprint 1 Review, there were several things that could be improved upon: we didn’t introduce ourselves when we entered the room; we hadn’t tested connecting the laptop to a TV before the meeting; we didn’t communicate what we were going to present well enough; we didn’t start discussing the next sprint until late into the meeting; and we didn’t take charge of the meeting, and let the customer decide what we were talking about. To make sure that this didn’t happen again we discussed these failures before the meeting and aimed to do better.