

Interview 1

- Natural (non static) Communication
 - Whenever needed and only when of interest
 - PMs have to aggregate lots of knowledge, teams need partial (same meeting though)
 - Forced meetings from upwards that give little value for the team (PM, SM/LM)
- Lack of Vision
 - Work not communicated well downwards to the teams, only until the OPO level.
 - Should be communicated more by PMs and PGs maybe OPOs
 - Vision is not communicated downwards (not a priority by PgMs)
- Void of Responsibility
 - Too much of it for the team
 - Troublesome finding responsible co-worker
- Diversity of WPs
 - Diversity of WPs, would have preferred to focus on one domain

Interview 2

- Overloaded solution responsibility
 - Not enough support for the teams, too many responsibilities and not enough competence
 - XFTs have to maintain their technical environment
 - Stalling in process by unfamiliarity
- Information overflow
 - Too much information, don't know how to filter
 - Hard to know what is going on in the organisation, not well communicated
 - Hard to reach out and to deduct value from all the info you get
 - PGs as Bottlenecks
 - N° of teams growing but PGs not
 - Decision responsibilities: unclear for XFTs with respect to PG
 - Blurred between TMs and PGs
 - Hard issues
 - XFT-SM only responsible for soft impediments SMs acting as relief valve
 - Team interdependence
 - Makes it impossible to demand of teams to know other teams' domain and status

Interview 3

- Information flood & filtering
 - Too much and too little information reaches XFTs: filtering wished for
 - Lack of a middle man to take out parts of responsibilities and facilitate communication
 - Often do not know who to contact about an issue
 - A lot of communication based on personal contacts
- Very short-term goals for work
 - No agreement on the level of detail work should be provided to the team, different views from different perspectives

- Not enough feedback between PgM and the team
- Lack of immediate goals
- Feedback transparency & roundtrip time
 - Feedback during solving the impediments not present
 - Roundtrip takes long and outcome not visible at times
 - No transparency in handling of impediments
 - Things happen very quickly when there is one (SM's manager stepping in in the absence of a SM)
- Information discovery by accident
 - Not sufficiently aware of what is going on in the organisation
 - What are other teams working on?
 - Are there any new ideas for doing this and this and this
- Technical environment
 - Interrupts sprints lowers planned velocity
 - No internal interference leads to production

Interview 4

- Organisation's transition towards agile
 - Short term planning (flexible backlog) leads to faster feedback for XFTs
- Sprint interruption
 - Previous sprint feed back into current one (affects burn down)
 - Unplanned work coming from other teams
- Information sharing
 - No macro view on the organisation on a bigger scale, what team is working on what etc
 - Team exhibition is a good way to mitigate this
 - Team knowledge spread best through demos when sprints in sync
 - Hunt for information, especially at initial stage
 - Especially for a WP from an unknown domain/area
 - Teams share their information based on what they think other would like to know
 - In Wikis for later look up and async information gathering
- Interdependent stories cause loads of communication and upfront analysis
- Line Management pulls but does not push information

Interview 5

- Sprint Interruption
 - Black work: unplanned work or TRs (<30% of time)
 - TRs can be reassigned with good argument
 - TRs differ in severity (hot to cold) and can be postponed
 - Impediments
 - Solved by SM and when no SM present also no impediments
 - Mostly hardware related
- Lack of Vision
 - Short term present: one year up front

- (Pending) Asked for in retrospective

Interview 6

- Communication between teams
 - Co-location allows information spreading
 - Also threat of over communicating
- Lack of Vision
 - Communicated only short time frame
 - Needed to understand overall sense in work
 - APO <-> team communication is wished for
- No real connection to DM: lack of understanding towards his role
- Responsibility overload
 - Balance between XFTs being broad but also about distinct borders
 - Team performs best when there are stories fit for everyone's competence
 - Overall field too big and complex to grasp all areas
 - Better to split up work by specialised responsibilities (e.g. testing)
- Information sharing
 - Lacks points of entry: too many independent wikis
 - Information finding trouble some due to lack of common portal
 - Communication on small scale fine, large scale almost not present

Interview 7

- LN integration
 - Communication between departments hard as lines are separated
 - Maybe due to personality
 - Circular communication whenever solution can not be found
 - Need to be more involved in the transformation
- Lack of Vision
 - Not communicated to teams but demanded
 - Hard to define as it changes over time
 - Could increase motivation for team
- Sprint interruptions
 - Picnic doesn't have a second team in the product to talk with
 - Single experts in the ANTSYS - need to provide competence to other teams, takes time from sprint
- Information flow
 - WP driving shifts communication focus
 - Amount of mails cause trouble to filter
 - Broadcasting is due to unknown receiver
 - Meetings with co-workers from different fields are hard to follow
 - Responsible for the main track -- coordinates deliveries, a bottleneck

Interview 8

- Low responsibilities
 - Solve issues as low as possible, only bubble up if needed
 - Not always possible due to coordination need even XFTs expect more
 - Smaller world for teams wanted but not always possible
- Balance the transformation
 - Losing depth by cross view even though depth has been there (not supported by organisation)
 - Strong feature focus over product focus causes decrease in code and architectural quality
- Information sharing
 - "Pseudo triangle": OPO, Project Managers and DM
 - Parallel communication flow at different speeds both or solely one path
 - Creates rumours and uncertainty for XFTs - both are waste
 - Two programs different time horizons and types of work but same product
 - Communication takes program direction, line tries to balance but improvement needed
 - Threat of destructing other team's work by overlaps

Interview 9

- Role definitions
 - Transformation did not make PO to OPO responsibility change clear
 - No need for clear definition, depend on context
- Sprint interruptions
 - Priorities change: decided to continue work (with PgM)
 - Decisions from management (possible)
 - TR and product care - can also be emphasised upon
 - Teams work more independently during the sprint if assigned to a large main task
- Horizontal team communication
 - Lack of mingling: do not informally communicate
 - Only reach out when needed, then also efficient
 - Problems: no discussions => unknown effects on code of others
- Line integration
 - Teams with similar focus are integrated at different lines
 - Communication needs to travel up a line as it can not shortcut
 - Overlaps cause need for sync meetings to integrate lines with one another
- XFTs empowerment: competence up to themselves according to MGMT
 - some tend to split the specialisations between team members
 - learn new competences & distribute knowledge via pair work
 - should have domain competence

Interview 10

- Endless transition
 - Initial goals reached but continuous improvements continue
 - Organisation (DF) quite homogenous and same spot of transition

- Information sharing
 - Sufficient on the higher level (names numerous meetings)
 - Lack of spreading between teams: don't get out of focus tunnel and share
 - causes double work, different guidelines, reinventing the wheel (not looking out for existing solutions)
 - Solution: structured intranet not a lot of independent ones
- No immanent friction between PgM, OPO and DM
 - If there are problems - JIT communication

Interview 11

- Line integration
 - Give not-so-necessary tasks to the teams
 - LN should move towards PgM and not the other way round
 - Are outside the loop and are separated - effort to keep them integrated
 - Define methods and translate words to match
- Information sharing
 - Fetching over sharing (known issue)
 - XFTs should get total picture of task - not always communicated
 - if the team needs a big picture to solve a complex task
 - Differs between teams: depends on personality and team type
 - Information circling well in Lindholmen (part of the role to know)
 - Cut off between different sites within organisations (CI, system sites)
- Need to adapt methods to different teams based, do not push the same for everybody
- (Sometimes) Too much influence on XFTs at times, bypassing the OPO and their plans

Interview 12

- Agile in the Large
 - Not fully elaborated on within organisation (focus on Scrum mostly)
 - Real world: Customer commitment, long release cycles with late additions
 - Customers are different but moving towards continuous delivery with them
- XFTs towards customers
 - Closer link to motivate teams
 - Not always direct contact between APO and customers
- Information is sufficient but needs filtering
- Workload around XFTs
 - Too many teams per OPO
 - More work in stock than current setup allows to handle
- Teams tend to escalate problems too late

Interview 13

- XFT's workflow & interruptions
 - Unclear responsibilities & WoW

- Originating from non-approved PD process
- LM absence affected the team only administratively
- Control over backlog allows for better planning and following work
- Worse sprints when confirmation of other parties needed
- Interruptions might come from an OPO as unplanned work
- Unclear communication ways in a big organization
 - Hinder progress and cause frustration for an XFT
 - Create extra-responsibility for a knowledgeable person in an area
 - Issues get lost when approached on a personal level
 - Solution: define these ways by having a weekly meeting where one can bring up and delegate an issue
- Between teams communication
 - Only with APC teams
 - Presentation at a sprint review on work done - good way of knowing about other teams
 - Team exhibition to know about other teams than APC
- Information flow and handling
 - Lack of information evaluation: tips & tricks vs approved WoW
 - Huge amounts of unfiltered information on the Intranet - hard to know which is valid
- Vision for the product
 - Not sufficiently communicated
 - Gives an overview of the surroundings so one can establish relevant contacts