### Team members present:

- Nguyễn Lê Hoàng Kha
- Trần Hiếu Tâm
- Phan Thái Khang
- Phạm Gia Tuấn Khải
- Nguyễn Tuấn Tuấn

### Team members absent:

• None

#### What worked well:

- 1. Team completed all the requirements of PA1 on time.
- 2. Team completed 50% of the requirements of PA2 including (use-case models and use-case specifications)
- 3. Members were willing to contribute comments on improving the project.

## What went wrong:

- 1. Tasks of PA2 (use-case specifications) were not completed on time.
- 2. Back-end features coding progress was delayed than expected.

### **Problems:**

Problems	What cause the problem
Difficulty in completing PAs requirements.	Team did PAs before theory classes which led to having difficulty in understanding and completing all

	PAs requirements.
Use-case specifications (Librarian part) were not submitted on time.	<ul> <li>Members in charge had a lack of time as he had presentations for other subjects.</li> </ul>
Back-end features coding progress was delayed.	<ul> <li>Members lacked coding experience and not fully understood all features requirements.</li> <li>Unclear use-case specifications.</li> </ul>

# What can be done differently in the next sprint to improve

# the project:

- 1. Members need to communicate more to solve the problems.
- 2. Complete use-case specifications and models as soon as possible which will help in the coding process.
- 3. Arrange more off-line meetings to solve problems and ask about code.

### What lessons we could learn:

- 1. Complete documentation first which will make coding more precise and easier.
- 2. Team's leader have to track members more frequently.