Iteration 2 Retrospective

What went well?

- 1. Time tracking is clear and provides insightful reports regarding the time spent by each team member
- 2. Most of the user stories match the INVEST criteria (with a few exceptions to be discussed later)
- 3. The client is satisfied with our progress so far
- 4. Multiple branches in our git
- 5. Git is much more organized for the merging after we assigned a Product QA
- 6. Frequent and small commits.

What could have been done better?

- 1. We were doing ad hoc in some areas when documenting tasks for user stories, a more agile approach would be better.
- 2. The user story as commits messages drown out the actual git commit message.
- 3. The landing page should not have a subscription offer as the application is currently free.

What will we try next?

- 1. We'll switch to Clockify instead of Toggl for time tracking as Toggl free trial will have finished.
- 2. The GIT commits messages to be used as the title and the user story as the description.
- 3. Time tracking should be able to sort by user stories
- 4. The user story for the dashboard (14.2) should be broken down. Each widget should have its own user stories.
- 5. Have detailed and clearly defined processes in our backlog, the definition of done needs to be more detailed and specific.
- 6. Tasks in the user stories need to be allocated to each member separately (avoid ad hoc).
- 7. The landing page subscription plan should be changed to RMO.

What questions do we have?

- 1. Are there any alternatives to Toggl time tracking besides Clockify?
- 2. Do non-functional user stories need to have story points?
- 3. How can we enhance the confidentiality and integrity of user information/this application?