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**What We Did Well**

**Charles:**

1. This sprint we had a much more developed understanding of how to assign tasks and distribute the workload equally. This lead to a more efficient method of solving the project tasks.
2. Because of the difficulties experienced in the first sprint1, all team members dedicated more time towards finishing the tasks on time. This punished our team the first sprint as we were under the impression that the task could be finished quickly however the improved dedication resulted in more work being completed.

**Mikhail:**

1. During this sprint I found that our time management was better than last sprint for the first half. This is clearly identified when comparing both sprint 1 and 2 burn down charts. I think this was mainly due to the fact that this time we prioritized this subject over others and wanted to be a more effective team.
2. Our communication was yet again still in very good condition. Our time to respond to website queries, artifacts and other was very quick (probably one hour max), with majority being answered in the first couple minutes.

**Ashley:**

1. This sprint, our dev team had a much better understanding of the tools being used and were thus able to build more complex features in a more efficient amount of time. I was pleasantly surprised at the speed in which we were able to implement certain features.
2. As others have said, communication between group members was top notch. Although there were a couple of hiccups, most issues about the project were solved fairly quickly and painlessly between us.

**Joshua:**

1. During this sprint we maintained good communication and with our extended knowledge on git we were able to have a steady flow of work progression throughout the project. We were able to allocate tasks quite effectively and efficiently.
2. With our feedback from last sprint we were able to divvy up tasks more effectively, distributing a wider variety to each of our members. This helped in maximising our portfolios to include a more diverse representation of work we completed.

**Fahd:**

1. The communication of the team was very efficiently due to the online group we had. We tried to take part in giving our opinions and improving our work from the feedback of sprint I.
2. As sprint I, we kept our quality but this time we did more control in the tasks assigned to be in time with all our duties. As a result of, that we were able to allocate better tasks and solve any enquiry in short time.

**What Could Be Improved**

**Charles:**

1. This sprint we had difficulties during the middle of the sprint finding time to work on the project due to split interests in other units. This caused a period of time where no substantial work was performed. This could be improved by a better team management where only one or two members are able to neglect this assignment at any one moment.
2. Another major difficulty found was the relative inexperience with git merging which sometimes caused a developer to reprogram their section when an error occurred. This could be fixed through both the user of multiple branches and greater knowledge on how to git merge correctly.

**Mikhail:**

1. Like I said previously in ‘what we did well’ in how we managed to successfully maintain a better burndown distribution for the first half, unfortunately it wasn’t the case for the other half. This was mainly derived from other university subjects once again and members having to prioritise them as this one was on schedule during that point of time.
2. Lastly the developers had difficulty throughout numerous days where a part of the code would stop working. This was due to how ineffectively we operated GitHub. Due to this, most of us spent the our time fixing what got broken during a merge, pull or fetch. This time could of been eliminated with developers worked in separate branches and double/triple checked that all website functionality is working before pushing/merging to master branch.

**Ashley:**

1. As was the case with the last sprint, time management once again managed to be a tricky thing to maneuvre. The lack of any real deadlines resulted in the website being developed in a haphazard timeframe, which makes it harder to track.
2. I noticed that our team was having problems with Github, mainly that we would commit our code to the master branch rather than our own, resulting in files being overwritten and changed while still being worked it. It certainly caused confusion when members would have to chase errors that weren’t caused by their own code.

**Joshua:**

1. Same as last time we had a bit of difficulty in maintaining a steady workflow throughout the project. It wasn’t as detrimental this time though because we were generally better organised. This is a hard area to improve as we were very busy with other assessment and commitments outside university, however, fitting in work wherever we could may have helped.
2. As mikhail said, we did break each others code a few times during merges, (probably mostly me doing the breaking), I should have operated under a different branch rather than committing to the master. Most of the breaks had to do with the database which pulling from git doesn’t really effectively merge together like it does with code.

**Fahd:**

1. As always, time is not a good alliance, even having everything organized and scheduled, something is missing at the end. Additionally, we had more responsibilities as work and other subjects that we needed to dial and balance with.
2. Operating some programs as GitHub, database and SQL was not easy and sometimes demanding. It required time and practice to have better performance in the website features.

**What Will Change Going Forward**

Going forward this team could be improved through understanding the true abilities and knowledge of each of the individuals better. This would further increase the efficiency of the group as well as reducing the learning curve required for some user stories. Another thing to change in future is the time management of the team, creating and enforcing rigid timelines for tasks to be completed would greatly increase the output and quality of the project. Also, while communication was generally very good, focusing on implementing a more rigid Github branch system would help greatly in reducing the amount of mystery code breakages.