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Team 113

Team 113 Liaison: Michael Ogden

[ogden\_55@hotmail.com](mailto:ogden_55@hotmail.com)

To the members of Team 113,

Thank you for your presentation last Wednesday. We are writing to you as an opportunity to provide constructive feedback regarding your presentation and product as of Sprint 3. Our below discussion will touch on your preparedness, our expectations, your professionalism and the technical level demonstrated in your presentation.

Firstly, we felt that the preparedness you showed in preparing a video beforehand to demonstrate the code and working of the website was impressive. We observed it to be particularly informative too as the video enabled us to match the code to the functionality. Your product demonstration provided an effective insight into the product’s current status of development and effectively demonstrated working features; however, the physical presentation of your product felt unorganized as it jumped physically around between team members. This was because the separate parts of the project were only accessible locally from separate locations (the entire sum of the project’s parts had not yet been compiled onto one machine). The moving around also made it more difficult to envisage how the completed product will navigate. Overall presentation would have been much smoother if the product were demonstrated as a whole, though it is understandable that at this point in the development cycle its parts are still being worked on separately. We recommend that you consider continuous integration (CI) - a development practice that requires integrating one’s new or changed code into the master branch at least once a day and also that you subsequently consider system integration testing to test the required interactions and verify that all related systems can operate in coordination with other systems in the same environment.

Furthermore, we observed that the presentation was particularly directed towards one or two of the client team members and although some functionality was demonstrated by the team member that developed it, the product explanation was completed mostly by one person that directed the client and development teams. It would be prudent to actively engage all of the client team in the presentation and demonstrations rather than focusing heavily on one team members - though we understand that this was difficult as the product was demonstrated on laptop screens and as clients we found it difficult for all 5 of us to interact with the demonstration as it was very crowded. Complete product demonstration on the large touchscreen coupled with pointed engagement using speech and questions could help enable complete client team engagement.

Your team met our expectations as you were able to complete a majority of the agreed user stories and demonstrate the acceptance criteria. For any tasks which were incomplete or had been changed you were proactive in providing detailed explanations as to why they were incomplete and solutions to resolve them and to prevent the same oversights or mistakes happening again in the future. A major setback for your team were the two team members that had failed to deliver their assigned functionality. We understand that this was out of the control of the rest of your team members and that you have taken steps to resolve this. The team was able to demonstrate a level of confidence in the delivery of the Sprint and assured us that your development was still on track. We feel that the demonstrated abstraction, QR codes and database access functionality deliver satisfactory business value though with cohesive navigation the product could reach its full potential - this is to be expected however at this point in time as the product is not yet complete, though we expect it to deliver complete business value at final release.

With regards to technicality, we feel that the demonstration of the product’s parts was informative as individual team members presented what they had worked on and showed a clear understanding of how their system worked when queried on specifics - such as how they accessed the database to retrieve their data or the inner workings of the QR code generation. With prompting, your team members could break down their technical explanation of their systems into relatively general and cohesive concepts understandable by clients unfamiliar with or uninterested in specific code structures - demonstrating that your team can present at an appropriate level for stakeholders.

The product had been substantially improved since the last peer review - we were especially impressed by the functional admin access and search functions for the database and the uniquely generated QR codes that we could process on our own phones. This provided tangible business value to us as client members or potential stakeholders. We could see that the product was clearly at an effective beta stage. We feel that because your implementation of your product was effective, delivered major functionality and featured appropriate abstraction for users, the system architecture demonstrated was suitable for the product to be delivered. You also delivered articulate rationale when queried about your decisions for the system implementation and architecture. The desired outcome appeared to be achieved, at least locally, in the demonstration of a product that could combine the front-end presentation and integration of the back-end functionality. During the demonstration the only technical difficulties were the previously discussed barriers presented by having not yet compiled the product’s separate parts and some the restrictions on the functionality that was able to be shown because of user stories that had not yet been delivered as of Sprint 3. The demonstration of the system via video was a little unorthodox but memorable with no technical difficulty.

The professionalism of the presentation has room for improvement - as discussed above in your preparedness, the physical moving around to view incomplete sections of the product felt unprofessional, though once at a team member’s station their demonstration and presentation was concise and informative. There was some evidence of the presentation being prepared in advance as your spokesperson directed us to stations in an order. There were no particular issues were encountered during the demonstration, ensuring a satisfactory outcome. All technical inquiries were answered cohesively and with confidence when asked. It was clearly demonstrated that there is a balance of task delegation amongst the team, involving all members of the team in the development of the project.

In closing, we recommend that you consider the development techniques we suggested above such as continuous integration and system integration testing to ensure a) the product can be demonstrated cohesively, b) that its navigation can be envisaged and c) that its separate parts and dependencies are able to function together - some of your technical difficulties were rooted in the fact that functionality had been completed but could not be demonstrated because a separate dependency had inadvertently not been completed. Furthermore, we recommend that you develop a presentation strategy that efficiently engages the entire client team - starting with verbal engagement and a larger demonstration space. Despite these improvements that can be made, we can clearly see that the product development is on track given the functionality demonstrated in your presentation and we feel confident that does and will continue to provide excellent business value.

Warm regards,  
  
**Team 111**Alexandria Griffiths n9458816  
Alexander Stevens n9437681  
Lorenz Esparcia n8599751  
Ronald Leung n9378171  
Akash Mehta n9588868

# Original Draft (including my editing notes)

October 17, 2016

Team 113

Team 113 Liaison: Michael Ogden

ogden\_55@hotmail.com

Dear Team 113,

We are writing as a client team to give you feedback on sprint 3. We appreciate your effort last Wednesday. A number of aspects will be discussed in regards to the demonstration including the preparedness, expectations, and professionalism of the presentation.

[[We observed that your team was moderately prepared for your product demonstration. Again you did not have a pre-written speech and your presentation seemed a little more flustered and ad-hoc than in the previous peer review as scrambled to explain why your product had not met all its goals for Sprint 3. After an explanation of what goals were and weren’t met in Sprint 3 and why, product demonstration jumped around between team members as the separate parts of the project were only accessible from separate locations (the entire sum of the project’s parts had not yet been compiled). The moving around also made it more difficult to envisage how the completed product will navigate. Overall presentation would have been much smoother if the product were demonstrated as a whole, though it is understandable that at this point in the development cycle its parts are still being worked on separately.]] 🡨 part of my contribution to brainstorming

During your discussion of print-friendly labels for customers, we were impressed by the functional QR codes you had developed. ~~There is no denying the fact that they gave their best~~ but our team had to move between people and computers to see what was going on; mostly by one member. The presentation was directed towards one or two of the client team members rather than the entire team (who were physically present and waiting to be presented to) which may be something to improve upon in the future (include recommendations for improvement). One person described sign in process and other person showed other functionality of the website. Moreover, they developed admin access to the customers which allows searching customers by using their last or first name. It had some issues before but it has been significantly improved. (what was the ussue before and how has it been improved?) Team 113 used a video which showed the working of the website. This video conveyed all the aspects of their website. Together we ticked off completed functionality and discussed functionality that hadn’t met the requirements and standards.

~~Below you will find a discussion of Team 111’s thoughts and feedback of Team 113’s presentation of Sprint 3. This discussion will be compared to the necessary criteria as a review, and highlights the aspects of; preparedness, expectations, technical and professionalism of the presentation.~~

Firstly, in regards to preparedness, Team 111 finds that ~~Team 113 was well read and prepared~~ (somewhat prepared) when asked to demonstrate their product; providing an insight of its current status of development, as well as demonstrating working futures. The demonstration included a concise presentation of the appropriate databases, along with front-end features.

For the expectations, Team 113 was able to follow and do what was required to complete a majority of the agreed user stories. The acceptance criteria for most stories were complete, where an explanation was given as to which tasks were incomplete or differed. The team was able to demonstrate a level of confidence in the delivery of the Sprint, adamant that development is at a satisfactory level. (how did they demonstrate satisfactory delivery?) All deviations and differed tasks were explained and communicated between the client and developers, outlining when and how the necessary deviations will be resolved. As for the business value, Team 111 have reason to believe that the current product developed delivers satisfactory business value (what reason? what business value?). Although, given its current level of functionality and aesthetics, the product still has not reached its full potential. This however is not expected as the product is still not yet to be considered completed until the final release. (grammar)

In regards to the technical aspect, the presentation was demonstrated at the appropriate level for the stakeholders, (how?) outlining that the stages of the product is now at a beta stage. The system architecture demonstrated was certainly suitable for the product to be delivered, for the reason being that this system architecture certainly worked with the required needs.(what needs?) The desired outcome was to demonstrate a product that coincides and corresponds the front-end with the back-end aspects of the product. Team 113 was articulate and eloquent when presenting the system architecture and the rationale behind the decision for selection. During the demonstration there were no notable technical difficulty (grammar), although the demonstration of the system via video was seen as comparatively unorthodox.

For the overall professionalism of the presentation, ~~the presentation was clear about its intentions, as well as all explanations being logical and well explained.~~ The product presentation seemed to appear as being prepared in advance, to a certain degree. No issues were encountered during the demonstration which resulted in a smooth satisfactory outcome. All inquisitions(sp.) were fulfilled with confidence when asked. Team 113 clearly demonstrated that there is a balance of task delegation amongst the team, involving all members of the team in the development of the project. (how)

~~As a recommendation, CI can be seen as a development practice that requires integrating one’s new or changed code into the master code repository consistently. With the use of services such as X10 hosting, these services can support relevant process as all developers may have remote access in order to upload code to the shared domain. Ultimately, documentation and planning can be improved in a manner that maximizes efficiency, in such a way that extra arduous and tedious measures are not required. With a little bit of extra effort in planning and process tracking, the successful development of the product in later stage can be achieved with less effort. Work smart, not hard.~~

Warm regards,  
  
**Team 111**Akash Mehta n9588868  
Alexandria Griffiths n9458816  
Alexander Stevens n9437681  
Lorenz Esparcia n8599751  
Ronald Leung n9378171