

Team Retrospective

Cecilia Betancourt Barrita, Saša Bojanić, Jonas Heisterberg, Maximilian Krug, Alexander Lorenz, Shahrnaz Nasir, Lama Rajjo, David Schmidt, Patrick Schmidt, Ingo Sternberg

From our last team discussion, we would like to communicate the following important points from the project. Firstly, on the positive side, there was a good, continuous feeling of teamwork and all of us felt supported by the other members on the team, it was always uplifting and that kept us moving forward. The tech stack we worked with was really good and the respectful and professional communication between us at each stage of the project contributed significantly to the good results in the team. Members, especially on the software developer side, were collaborative and helpful in acting when someone was missing the knowledge or needed extra support on the items and tasks. All the members contributed to the project and there was no feeling that someone was left out of the team. Even in the tough moments, one of us became critical on the job and the rest of the team delivered at its best, therefore the results also were satisfactory, and our industry partner felt satisfied with the product.

Coming to the challenging sides, we noted that the deployment of our software was delayed until the Demo Day, although the IP promised to do so before. Overall, the relationship with the IP was a discussion at many points of the project, due to the indecisiveness, unclear definitions and expectations, that at times led us to frustration when working through the items, implementation and features. At times, the IP forgot meetings, which left us falling behind at some stages of the development. On the internal side, we saw an unbalanced workload and estimations of the items. Due to the meeting of the IP being held before on the afternoon before our team meeting, it was hard for us to comply to everything that needed to be done when the sprint review took place. We wished we could have implemented more features as well. One special technical aspect, the open/locked doors and SiGreen Eco Score were not connected to the IP system because of poor internal communication as well.

Lastly, we would like to address the topics where we feel we could have improved. To start with, we had different channels of communication and within them, there was also disorganized communication on the topics according to the backend or frontend channel, for example, or the different channels lead to a couple of notices not reaching everyone. Regarding the issues, splitting them from the beginning into smaller issues could have helped us do more progress or finish parts of the implementation, instead of bringing back the items or being marked as unfinished. Starting sooner to take over organizational matters would have also helped us to have a smoother start, especially with the communication with the IP, as the communication had the bumps on both ends. Finally, a better work distribution and explanation of each member's roles would have helped to assign tasks better and split the workload accordingly.