

Our Team - Team 55

Richard van Wyk	(N9510796)
Anneke Kotze	(N9451013)
Brenton Buchbach	(N9694544)
Brendan Rothwell	(N8540683)
Sara Alraddadi	(N8779333)
Bhupinder Saini	(N8983631)
Aditya Raja	(N9062611)

Emily Fong
2 George Street
Brisbane City, QLD 4000

September 12, 2016

Dear Ms. Emily Fong,

We are writing in regards to the end of sprint presentation given by your group (#54) to us (#55) on the Courier Application we requested. We would like to comment on the preparedness and professionalism, the performance in comparison to expectations and finally technical performance of both your development team as well as the product that was demonstrated to us on September 8, 2016.

Your development team was somewhat prepared: all completed work was set up and ready for demo, however improvements can be made for future presentations to ensure a more reliable and extensive progress report. Specifically, a list of user stories as well as acceptance criteria would be beneficial when analysing the product and by extension the progress made. A presentation could also be prepared to highlight important information as well as provide a central reference point for all relevant content such as burndown charts, webpage links and user stories.

The product presentation was very clear and coherent: it was easy to identify what had been done, and therefore what still needs to be done. It was presented with confidence, and questions were effectively answered by the developers. The content was at a high enough level for our team and avoided unneeded details, which was appreciated. The explanations of how the product functions so far as well as its limitations was also made clear. The presentation did not appear to be prepared however, and seemed to be improvised, which could be worked on for future presentations to ensure a smooth presentation. No issues were experienced during the demo of the product. It seemed as though everyone was involved in the product development, however the presentation was mainly presented by one or two members. In future, it might help to have multiple members presenting so that it is clear who worked on what, as well as to get a larger variety of perspectives on any issues that arose and problems that were overcome. More preparation would also be beneficial as less time would be spent thinking about what to show or talk about next.

Most of the user stories agreed to on the sprint plan were not completed or attempted. For the stories that were in the demonstration, they have all been completed fully and pass the relevant acceptance criteria, which is commendable. The team was very confident in the presentation of the existing features, and were not expecting any errors or issues throughout the demonstration. Although there was no deviation from the sprint plan, the team simply did not get the amount of work they expected to done. The product so far does at least deliver some business value, however it is very limited so far, as the main features implemented were user registration and login. Although we recognise the importance of these features and agree that they should have been completed first, they do not provide much business value by themselves. This will hopefully be rectified by the end of the first release.

Your team members showed great consideration for end users and our business as the addition of features that had not been previously discussed received acclaim from our group: allowing the user to remain logged in via IP and having multiple delivery addresses received praise universally.

Even though several user stories had not been completed on time it is appreciated that your team was able to fully justify and analyse why your team fell behind schedule. In future however, it is important that estimates match up to reality as much as possible, and development plans are carefully considered before time is unnecessarily spent. It appears as though your team should have also done more research into your chosen framework Laravel, as time has been spent on database design that was made redundant by your chosen framework. We appreciate the honesty and recognition by the

team with regards to this, as it suggests the same problem will be avoided in future. Besides this one issue of the framework, it seems to be appropriate for the task, and your decision to use it was well justified. We also believe more time could have been spent on user interface design for each user story within your first sprint plan, even if they were non-functional or separate, as it would have given our team a more comprehensive demonstration.

Another identified issue is that your team had early Git collaboration issues which may have resulted in lost development time. It may be because of this, and issues with your chosen framework, that led to a stagnated start to development, as evident by your burndown chart. However, we do congratulate your team on the amount of work done in the final week as it appears that the team worked hard to ensure a great deal of work was completed to present to us by the 8th.

Overall we are pleased with the quality of work done by your team and thank you for a clear, professional and insightful presentation into the progress being made on the Courier Application. We hope that your team is able to take our suggestions under advisement for the next sprint and presentation, please contact us if you have any further questions regarding the development of the Courier Application or any of the feedback given. We look forward to seeing your team make further progress with the application and wish you luck with your next sprint.

Sincerely,

Brendan Rothwell