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# Goal

# Perform an end of iteration retrospective\lessons learned

|  |
| --- |
| Review with the team the approach taken to development and collaboration, the effectiveness of the development environment, the suitability of the working environment, and other factors. Discuss what things went well, what could have gone better, and how things could be changed to deliver better results. Capture in the current Iteration Plan the assessment results, stakeholder feedback, and actions to be taken to improve the development approach for the next iteration. Record lessons learned in this iteration with a collection of lessons learned for the entire project. |

# Objectives

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Iteration** | **Primary objectives** (risks and use case scenarios) | **Scheduled start or milestone** |
| Q1 | Maintenance Iterations Q1-4  Objectives:   * Work Items as needed * Security and system patching * Issue Log research and resolution | 6/1/16 – 8/31/16 |

# Evaluation criteria

# Each iteration covers 3 months and 1.6 FTE. The amount of allocated hours is 2920. On average we expect that 8 small (< 20 hrs), 5 med (20 – 80 hrs), 1 large ( > 120 hrs) work items will be done per quarter. This projection is based on conversations with the program and historical data. This evaluation criteria is used to meet the iteration objective.

# Assessment and Lessons Learned

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment target | *Entire Iteration* |
| Assessment date | *September 28, 2016* |
| Participants | **Palacherla, Susmitha C**; **Hinman, Dave**; **Stearns, Douglas**; **Tiongson, John**; **Huang, Lili;** **Hackman, Mark**; **Ingram, Michael**; **McKeag, Dale** |
| Project status | *Green* |

Lessons Learned:

* Found several people with DB access that no longer require access. Action - Review DB access each quarter. Also ensure the person has access to only the data they need to perform their work.

Improvements:

* For each person that has DB access we need to document why they need the access they have.
* Document data and source file retention requirements. Setup auto archiving processes vs. manual.
* Work to automate common reports that the program team generates each week/month.

Concerns and deviations:

* Timeliness of requirements is slow. From when we are asked to do a change request to when the program gives us complete requirements that are not changing takes several days.

Other Comments:

* There is good communications between program and engineering teams.
* Teams has very good working knowledge of the eCL system from both a business and technical level.