

CHARTING REPORT

Group C2.04.05
12/02/2023

Author(s):

Carlos Bermejo Soria, carberson@alum.us.es

Daniel Gallardo Martos, dangalmar@alum.us.es

Pedro González Marcos, pedgonmar2@alum.us.es

Fernando José Mateos Gómez, fermatgom@alum.us.es

Carlos Zarzuela Reina, carzarrei@alum.us.es

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
1. Executive summary	3
2. Revision table	3
3. Introduction	3
4. Contents	3
4.1. Members	3
4.2. Member performance	4
4.3. Expulsion of one of the team members	5
5. Conclusions	5
6. Bibliography	6

1. Executive summary

This report is intended to be used as an introduction to our work team and every member. We are hoping to succeed in this project and our intentions are clarified in this document as well.

2. Revision table

No	Date	Description
1.0	13/02/2023	Initial draft of the document
1.1	16/02/2023	Update regarding the follow up indications.


3. Introduction

In this document we will establish the principles of our teamwork and project, as well as specify who will take part on the project so they can be properly identified. All of the team members have, at least once, worked with some of the other teammates. We all know the capacities and skills of our team coworkers and how we work together, so we think this group is appropriate to reach our goals. Carlos Zarzuela (the team manager) reached all of us and formed the group as soon as that option was presented to us.

4. Contents

4.1. Members

The team members for the project are the specified below:

Photo	Surname, name	Corporate mail
	Bermejo Soria, Carlos	carbensor@alum.us.es
	Gallardo Martos, Daniel	dangalmar@alum.us.es

	González Marcos, Pedro	pedgonmar2@alum.us.es
	Mateos Gómez, Fernando José	fermatgom@alum.us.es
	Zarzuela Reina, Carlos	carzarrei@alum.us.es

All of us have committed to work on this project in a cooperative way. We all have read and understood the *Syllabus* and we accept its conditions and evaluation terms. Our intentions are clear: we want to pass this subject and even achieve good grades (8 or superior).

4.2. Member performance

The work of all the team members has been satisfactory so far in each of the projects we have taken part on as a group. Here some specifics about each one of us:

- **Carlos Bermejo Soria.** Good grades and he has achieved the previously established goals in other projects. He does not have a problem communicating his job and helping. He does have problems with constancy, keeping the work up to date and especially finds trouble focusing.
- **Daniel Gallardo Martos.** He has very good grades and a proactive attitude. However, he tests little in general and is not very good at writing.
- **Pedro González Marcos.** Enjoys searching information about encountered problems and is open to learning from teammates and projects. He does have some problems communicating with teammates, but is willing to improve interacting with the group and keeping up with others' work.
- **Fernando José Mateos Gómez.** Average grades. Combining work and studies at the same time. Is willing to talk and mediate, offering solutions but talks a lot and has troubles explaining himself to others.
- **Carlos Zarzuela Reina.** Good grades, learns fast, has a very analytical mind and good knowledge about the technologies. However, he has not done much testing in general and has trouble in explaining his thoughts to others.

How will good work be rewarded?

Good job will always be recognised by others, especially if it was required for the deliveries. Those who deal with a larger workload and have managed to complete it, can trust their teammates to compensate for the extra effort in future deliveries.

To be considered “good job” it has to be properly delivered on time and must reach all the goals that could have been specified in previous meetings and must fulfill the necessities that the requirements impose. If someone goes beyond the requirements and implements extra features or does an excellent job at developing some feature (e.g. creating a really pleasing graphic interface), it will be also considered by the team if we have a chance to speak about our partner’s work.

How will bad work be punished?

All of the team members know each other’s capacities and limits and we know all of us are people devoted to the project and willing to work. Bad work will be recognised as such and we will ask the responsible person to change the way they work, always respecting their possible personal situation or individual difficulties.

To be considered a “bad job” it has to whether not achieve the previously established or be out of schedule. The coding work must pass any acceptance test in the end (if that specific requirement needs testing) and it definitely must not produce any execution or compiling error. Documentation should be as formal as it can be (that includes no misspelling, no bad words and a similar style in all the documents).

The work that is not consulted to the other team members or not communicated on time is also considered “bad job”. All of the coding or documentation decisions must be communicated to the rest in a meeting or via messaging.

4.3. Expulsion of one of the team members

If one of the team members doesn’t contribute to the project through the *Sprints* and it is not possible to know the reason or to get in contact with them, the option of firing that person will be considered. That person would have the option to leave and make the project individually or to abandon completely.

In order to stay in the team, one must achieve the following:

- Complete at least 50% of the tasks (done) assigned to them on time, unless there’s a reasonable excuse (the other team members must discuss whether or not it is a reasonable excuse).
- Assist regularly to meetings and laboratory classes. Always with the exception of personal problems or circumstances that make it impossible to assist the sessions (in these cases it must be justified or proved).
- Having good behavior towards the other team members. Team members must not abuse others (verbally or physically) or the others would have the right to vote them out.

5. Conclusions

We are a work team with knowledge on the field and experience working together. We know how to act whenever anything on this document is breached.

We have reached our goals in previous works so we hope nothing is different this time.

6. Bibliography

<Intentionally blank>

SIGNED:

Carlos Bermejo Soria @ 14/02/2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'C. Bermejo Soria', written in a cursive style.

Pedro González Marcos @17/02/2023

Firmado por GONZALEZ MARCOS
PEDRO - ***2754** el día
17/02/2023 con un certificado
emitido por AC FNMT Usuarios

Fernando José Mateos Gómez @ 14/02/2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'F. Mateos Gómez', written in a cursive style.

Daniel Gallardo Martos @ 14/02/2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Daniel Gallardo Martos', written in a cursive style.

Carlos Zarzuela Reina @15/02/2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized capital letter 'C' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal stroke that extends to the right.