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# Purpose of This Document

This document is used to record the discussions and action items from the Iteration Retrospective. Iteration Retrospective is held at the end of each iteration to reflect on how the team performed during the iteration.Iteration Goals

The goals of this iteration are the following:

* Create a Bill Payment system that complements the existing Checking and Savings Solution and is easy to use.

# Iteration at a Glance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Previous iteration** | **This iteration** |
| Work days in Iteration | -- | 35 |
| No of team members | -- | 7 |
| Original estimate of work (hours) | -- | 1220 |
| Work moved out of iteration (hours) | -- | 150 |
| Total completed hours | -- | 1122 |
| Total person days | -- | 245 |
| Velocity (hours / person day)  [total completed hours] / [total person days] | -- | 4.58 |

# What Went Well

The team did the following things well:

* We integrated the software as scheduled. Some of the team members worked long hours, but we made the end date.
* We had a good sustainable pace. We were burning hours at a pretty predictable pace.
* Use of iteration tracking workbook in daily standup meetings really helped us remain focused.
* The team delivered a high quality product. There were no high severity bugs found in production.

# What Didn’t Go Well or What We Could Have Done Better

The following things didn't go so well:

* Some of the standup meetings were too long.
  + Root cause: Some of the members were new to the team, and this being our first iteration, we were not following the discipline of daily standup. Team members frequently wandered off into discussions that it would have been better to take offline.
* We did not plan enough time for reviews.
  + Root cause: The actual review of the designs took more time than expected. The review took longer than expected because the reviewers were not available when we thought they would be and we underestimated the time it would take for reviews and incorporating the review feedback.
* Task dependencies between various team members were not clear.
  + Root cause: We did not explicitly define the dependencies between tasks of different team members. Some team members were idle waiting for others to complete their tasks.
* The dependencies on the Checking Account integration team were not managed well, which delayed the UI work.
  + Root cause: The Checking Account Integration team was not aware of our dependencies on them so they were off doing something else when we expected them to work on things we had dependencies on.
* Some of the team members had to work over the weekend.
  + Root cause: “User Adds a Payment Account” user story was more complex than we expected. Also, initially in the iteration the architecture for the feature was not clear. There was active discussion throughout the iteration. The lack of closure caused ripple effects in development—after the architecture was closed, the team had to react very fast to implement it.

# Actions for Improvement

The team has the identified the following actions for improvement (listed in order of priority):

1. For each task in the Iteration Backlog, clearly mark the dependencies on the other tasks.
   1. Each team member should bring up the dependencies in the daily standup meeting as soon as they feel their tasks will be blocked.
2. Identify and plan for external dependencies at the beginning of the iteration. Identify external dependencies for each user story and actively manage them.
3. Team members should remain focused on the daily standup status during the meeting. If someone is going off-track, other team members should alert that person.
4. Plan for review at the beginning of the iteration. Schedule review time in the calendars of the reviewers in the beginning itself so they are available when the team needs them.
5. Complex user stories should be handled first in the iteration, so technical challenges have more time to get resolved.