Peer Review Business Letter

Tutor: Dr. Syed Zaidi Blackboard Team Number: 110

Student Number	Team Member Name
N9455396	Michael Leontieff-Smith
N9136703	Amos Fox
N8608369	Kirwan Elmsly
N8686009	Tom Hughes
N9454195	Nicolaas Van Breda
N9438645	Thanh-ha Nguyen
N9686100	Christos Amarandos



Team 04 Company Headquarters Brisbane, Queensland, 4152 Mobile: 04 5264 2941

Telephone: 07 2974 3415

Date: 11/09/2016

Email: representative@team04tech.com.au

To Mr. Houtsma,

Developer Representative for Team 04

Regarding: Sprint One development of the Music School Web Application (Team 04)

Team 5,

It is with tremendous pleasure that I, Michael Leontieff, Client representative for Team five and my companions contact you today in regards to the development update for sprint one of the Music Store Application which was exhibited to us on the 9th (Friday) of September 2016.

We were collectively impressed by your presentation, and overall are pleased with your current progress. However we do have some minor suggestions which could bring improvements to your upcoming release one presentation.

First and foremost, It was extremely pleasing to see the developer so confident and clear with the product they were delivering. Through the working demonstration and the explanation of the features implemented thus far, you confirmed to us that you had prepared a well defined, structured plan to complete the project and you articulated this fluently prior to the hands on demonstration. However, there was no mention of both estimated and actual time for the developed user stories so it was difficult to gauge how much time was actually spent implementing this sprint. As a paying client, it is imperative that we know how much time is being spent on certain features to determine if our investment is returned, and if features are discovered to be taking longer than expected to implement they must be brought to our attention.

As a client, the functionality demonstrated from Sprint One had fervently fulfilled our expectations. This is in spite of the exception of a user story which couldn't be demonstrated due to unexpected deployment issue. Despite this, you professionality articulated the issue and gave us a detailed description of the missing component that successfully remediated the situation. In light of this, we suggest that next time you deploy beforehand, with adequate time to test the production version before presenting to us. Despite this pitfall, you successfully delivered on all user stories agreed upon during the sprint phase without deviation of any kind and we are confident that you have met your expectations regarding the functionality of the first sprint. Moving on, a component of the presentation that was absent was the direct mention of acceptance criteria during the presentation. However, through your demonstration, we were able to conclude that most of your functionality does indeed pass acceptance criteria but it is

imperative that you cover this in the next presentation. Overall, I believe that the product developed so far delivers useful business value to my Music Teaching School, and I would like to see the acceptance criteria being referred to more during the demonstration. Ultimately, the system itself delivers a high level of business value, even though the presentation had room to improve.

From a technical perspective, we were very impressed with your grasp of the development platform you utilised to implement the project, as you showed both a confidence in developing with it and a broad knowledge in how it operates. Alongside this, your explanation of the technical aspects of this system were perfectly tailored for a non-developer clientele, which greatly improved the effectiveness of this component of the presentation. Your rationale behind choosing the system architecture was also well founded. One minor defect was present in the system regarding privileged account creation however you handled the issue well and it did not detract from the presentation. Again, we politely suggest running through the system beforehand to iron out any issues.

We felt that the demonstration of Sprint One was presented with a satisfactory level of professionalism. The non-formal setting made us feel comfortable and confident in asking questions, and the explanations we received were clear to those of us with a non-technical background. While the presentation seemed to be more ad-hoc in nature, we appreciate that it still followed a logical flow through the implemented features of Sprint One. We felt that the presentation was confidently performed, and appreciated the fact that the presentation was smooth and free from any major technical issues. We did note, however, that the majority of the presentation was delivered by only two team members. While we appreciate that a project of this size requires decisive leadership, we would prefer if in future presentations all members of the development team be involved where possible. Finally, while we were very satisfied with the answers we received during the demonstration, we were concerned when one of your team members failed to allow a member of our team to finish asking his question, leading to a misinterpretation of the question being asked. We politely suggest for future presentations or demonstrations that you allow our team members the time to fully frame their questions before responding, to allow for more efficient communication between our teams going forward.

In conclusion, both my team and I are satisfied with the progress of the project thus far. Based on the most recent demonstration we feel that both the product development and the communication between client and developer teams has been of high quality, and we feel assured that our project is in the right hands. While this letter has outlined some minor recommendations for future presentations and development, we do this purely to improve the strong working relationship between our two teams.

Kind regards,

Michael Leontieff (Team Representative)

M Leontieff

Team 05