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**Impact map feedback:**

Pros:

Well designed, looks decent. Also main actors of the system are presented with corresponding features. Actors are well-written and explained. It is also good that the team tried to cover negative impacts on the system.

Cons:

The SMART criteria for the goal of the project are unclear. It is hard to understand when the goal is achieved. In out opinion, development team is redundant on the impact map. We agree that development team itself affects the goal of creating some tool, but the point is that the goal is not to create: we do not create a tool for sake of just creating it, we create a tool to fulfill some goal, and that goal should be placed on the top of impact map. Regarding competitors: means of enriching the part of business analysis (analysing the competitors) are not supposed to be within the impact map as they are not features of the system. Purpose of impact map is to determine the scope of features according to user stories, not the roles and responsibilities of a group.

Proposal:

The goal can be formulated more precisely. From your stakeholder you can get more details on why they need this system and who will use it. Based on this information you can remove actors and actions that do not affect the system.

**INVEST table feedback:**

Pros:

Backlog + invest seem very solid. Invest table is well-defined, it does not take much time to get how to estimate user story and what do numbers mean.

The scales were taken from lecture slides, but redefined with more details which made the descriptions clearer. For example, in “size-appropriate” there is a description of what they consider to be feature-sized. These changes are explicitly mentioned in report, also a good point.

They have done reflection on impact map and then changed actors and user story so that now they affect the initial goal of the whole project instead of just “create tool”.

All user stories are estimated well, we agree with all numbers. Selected scales (1-3) are well reasoned and intuitive. Therefore, metrics are relatively easy to follow while evaluating user stories.

Moreover, report includes changelog so it’s easier to track progress of the team.

In addition, the format of a user story follows canonical form “As a … I want to … so that I ...”, which helps to understand the purpose of each feature.

Evaluation of user stories is supported by well-written logical reasoning which makes whole justification a lot easier to follow.

Cons:

The roster of actors in the backlog differs from the one in the impact map. Even if the team decided to not include development team and competitors for fixing the mistake, there new actors, like “medical worker”, that were not mentioned before at all.

DEEP criteria includes prioritisation, and we didn’t see any kind of prioritization in backlog, order seems unclear.

Proposal:

The connection with the impact map should be stronger than it is given. According to DEEP criteria user stories should be prioritized. In spite of that, it is a very good work.

**Overall feedback:**

The team performed very well while preparing artifacts 3-4. Despite there were some minor inconsistencies in impact map, the reports fully describe the needed information and reflect the goal of artifacts. Also the team fastly responds to feedback which allows them to make a better performance next times.