# Sprint Review: GotoGro-MRM

#### **Team Details**

Team Name:	MSP 14
Tutorial:	Tue 2:30 ATC325
Tutor:	Dr Kaberi Naznin

Members:		
Dylan Jarvis	102093138	
Rabya Tayal	103144215	
Simon Tran	103602807	
Thomas Babicka	103059885	
Cody Cronin-Sporys	103610020	
Nicholas Dyt	101624265	

#### Stakeholder Feedback

Demonstration to stakeholder was conducted. All target items were able to be demonstrated except for low stock popup. **Table 1** summarises the feedback on the design at the end of Sprint 2.

Table 1. Feedback

Item	Justification
UI Redesign	- Much better, cleaner design makes it easier to use.
_	- Achieved the goal of improving readability.
	- Low stock popup did not trigger correctly. Demonstrated that the popup is
	created and calculated properly but doesn't show.
CSV reports	- Proved to be working but wasn't working at the start of demonstration.
-	- Data captured is acceptable and provides business value.
	- Small bug with button not working, required a fix.
PDF reports	- Very good visuals, working in real-time with the preview is great.
	- Small bug with button not working, required a fix.
View member	- Member sales report working well.
sales record	- Date brackets work.
	- Adding sales are added in near real time.
Predict	- Prediction algorithm is very simple, but the idea is there.
inventory	- Recommended action to buy as a table at the end of the weekly report is
,	valuable.

These items are minor fixes but have been added to the overall production document to make sure they are attended to in sprint 2.

## **Progress Justification**

All items were able to be demonstrated. This sprint was more flexible than Sprint 1 due to the majority of the work already being completed. Table 2 summarises the time breakdown for the major tasks:

**Table 2. Time Estimation** 

Item	Time Estimation	Actual Time
UI Redesign	5	8
CSV reports	8	6
PDF reports	6	6
View member sales record	6	10
Predict inventory	16	9
Total	41	39

The total time was 39 hours. There was less time spent on planning this sprint which meant, these estimates were less accurate. There was a mix of overbudgeting and underbudgeting in time with the biggest outliers being the inventory prediction, taking 9/16 hours, and the UI redesign, taking 8/5 hours.

The reason for the UI design taking longer than expected is because it was one of those tasks which didn't have a defined end. We kept adding improvements, specifically with the edit button, navigation tabs, hamburger menu amongst others. Additionally, once that was done, we implemented a bunch of warning popups to solidify the input checking process.

The reason the predicting inventory task took a lot less time than expected was because we initially though that the prediction algorithm would be complex. We decided halfway through the sprint that to demonstrate proof of concept, it did not have to be too complicated. Further, since we wanted the results to be displayed in the report, the prediction had to be simple enough to generate using SQL.

### **Organisational Feedback**

On the whole the itemisation of each task was more general this time around as a lot of it was up to interpretation. What to put in the csv and pdf reports was flexible, so after confirming that we had the rough outline working, the design stage was more collaborative with each member adding little pieces after one another.

Many group members had external pressures from other assignments, so this collaborative approach worked well. Furthermore, the visual nature of the ignition software made it very easy to see at a glance what the member before had implemented.