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# Actions from previous review

## Have the previous actions been made?

Yes. Two extra days have been used on the project this week.

## Were they effective?

Yes. More progress was made, however, not enough to catch up the project.

## What could be changed to increase effectiveness next time?

Plan the extra days.

# Timescale

## Plan Position

Implement IoT driver Software

## Actual Position

Create Software Design Document

## Reason for Difference

Software design progress has not been as quick as planned due to the project members not having experience in design.

# Testing

## Have new unit tests been put into place?

No.

## Are they relevant to the code being tested?

N/A

## Do they test only the unit they are supposed to test?

N/A

## Is code coverage above the mandated percentage?

N/A

# Actions for next review

Change the plan to allow for an extra two weeks for the design to be created.

# Additional Comments

Design should have been allocated extra time from the beginning, due to design being a weak point of the project team.