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**1.- FINISH LEVEL**

* Deliverable 1 up to 10 points (including custom AssertJ)
* Deliverable 2 up to 10 points (including Cucumber UI tests)
* Deliverable 3 up to 9 points

**2.- FINISHED TASKS**

**A)- Performance tests (level 6)**

For each of our 22 user stories, we performed performance tests (both stress and load tests for a combination of a positive and negative scenario for each user story):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Team Member** | **Performance tests** |
| **Claudia Guerrero** | US7 – US12, US18 |
| **Miguel Macarro** | US1-US6, |
| **Jose Manuel Volante** | US13 – US17, US19-US21 |

The performance tests are described in the report performance.pdf.

**B)- Profiling (level 8)**

We performed 4 profilings using glowroot on the user stories that gave the worst results in the performance testing:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Team Member** | **Profiling** |
| **Miguel Macarro** | Profiling 1 |
| **Claudia Guerrero** | Profiling 2 |
| **Jose Manuel Volante** | Profiling 3 |
| Profiling 4 |

The profilings are detailed in part 1 of the document profiling.pdf

**C)- Code refactoring (level 8)**

Claudia Guerrero performed 3 refactorings based on code smells. They are detailed in the report refactoring.pdf.

**D)- Optimization by refactoring based on profilings (level 9)**

Because of a misunderstanding of the requirements, for level 9 we performed three (instead of one) refactorings based on profilings. Based on the profilings 2, 3, and 4, we improved the corresponding user stories by refactoring the code:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Team Member** | **Optimization based on ..** |
| **Claudia Guerrero** | Profiling 2 |
| **Miguel Macarro** | Profiling 3 |
| **José Manuel Volante** | Profiling 4 |

The refactorings based on profiling are described in the second part of the report profiling.pdf.

**E)- Use of Sonarcloud**

We used Sonarcloud to show the difference in code quality before and after the refactoring. The conclusions are included in the report refactoring.pdf

**3.- RETROSPECTIVE**

**a.- Team retrospective**

Generally, this Sprint went well because all members team work about the same and the tasks that proposed in the planning have been fulfilled.

We had quite a few problems with the performance tests using gatling. We had underestimated the time it took it perform them, making us fall behind schedule for this Sprint. This is one of the reasons why, unfortunately, we could not do a A+ project for this sprint.

The team has done three or four meetings all weeks. So if someone have a problem, the partners help with it in the meetings.

For this reason, nobody has been stuck in any task.

**b.- Individual retrospective**

Regarding individual perspective of each, it is believed that the Sprint went well and we don’t have any problem.

Individual performance in hours about this Sprint 3:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Member** | **Hours** |
| Claudia Guerrero | 55 |
| Miguel Macarro | 55 |
| Jose Manuel Volante | 55 |