

End of Sprint (Highlight) Report

RAG Status	Overall	Scope	Resource	Timelines	Costs
This Sprint	AMBER	AMBER	AMBER	AMBER	GREEN

Project Name	App Refresh Project
Project Manager	Ryan Twumasi-Lartey
Date	16/01/25

1. Progress Update this reporting period	2. Objectives for next reporting period
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Store location software completed • Developers blocked on key payment features due to licence access • Customer-related backlog items moved to next sprint • Design backlog prioritised due to blockers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise security features for audit readiness • Unblock payment backlog items by resolving licence access • Rebalance UX/UI resource with Website PM • Begin CRM requirement discovery discussions with Customer Lead
3. Key Meetings and Decisions Required	4. Escalated Issues and Risks (More detail available in logs)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership support to enforce agreed 50/50 UX/UI split • Confirm procurement timeline for developer licence resolution • Align CRM scope early to avoid future sprint disruption 	<p><i>Title & Owner</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dev licence access blocking progress – PM (R001/I001) 2. InfoSec not ready for audit – PM (R002) 3. UX/UI team overallocation – PM (R003) 4. Vendor SLA breach post-acquisition – PM (I003) 5. QA coverage risk due to Test Lead leave – Scrum Master (I002)

RAG Definition For Project Status

RAG Status	Green	Amber	Red
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear on deliverables • Clear on what's in/out of scope • Interdependencies with other projects/activities understood and being managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major deliverables clear but scope still moving/lack of clarity (including change requests not yet approved) • Plan in place to address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant uncertainty in scope and deliverables
Resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team in place, no significant gaps in resourcing • No risk to project delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap in resourcing but plan in place to address • Project delivery at risk but manageable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource not in place/ roles not identified • Impact on ability to deliver project
Timelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear on timelines/critical path • On track to deliver to milestones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline slipping against planned dates although not yet missed any key project milestones that would result in a delay in project completion • Plans in place to mitigate risk and stakeholders aware 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress has slipped behind plan to the point that delivering the overall project on schedule is not recoverable without intervention
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs clearly defined and corresponding budget allocated to the project • Project forecast to be on track/under budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining uncertainty about costs Budget identified but not yet signed off Project is projecting to overspend and there is a risk that they may seek approval for additional funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs not understood • Budget not available • Project has overspent or there is a high likelihood of the risk of overspend.
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Red sub-categories • No more than 1 Amber sub-category with clear plan to bring back to Green • No risk or issue material to project success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Red sub-categories • More than 1 Amber sub-category • Risks and issues exist with plans to manage them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or more Red sub-category • Significant risk or issue without appropriate treatment plan

6 - END OF SPRINT REPORT RATIONALE

RAG Status Justification – Sprint 2

Overall – Amber

- The project is rated Amber due to resourcing gaps; timeline slips on MVP-critical items and missed Sprint 2 scope. While not at red status, multiple Amber categories meet the threshold defined in the RAG Matrix.
- RAG Source Justification: *“No more than 1 Amber sub-category = Green. More than 1 Amber = Amber.” (RAG Matrix)*

Scope – Amber

- Key MVP features were delayed in Sprint 2, especially customer experience items like returns and faulty product reporting.
- Source Evidence: Sprint Standup Notes state: *“Customer experience related items have been pushed to next sprint.”*
- This indicates that although scope is clear, execution is slipping due to operational constraints — consistent with the Amber definition: *“Major deliverables clear but scope still moving.”*

Resources – Amber

- Two developers are blocked due to missing licences. UX/UI time is 75% allocated to the Website project, breaching the agreed 50/50 split. The Test Lead is away for all of Sprint.
- These active gaps meet the Amber definition: *“Gap in resourcing but plan in place to address.”*

Timelines – Amber

- Timeline risk is increasing. Payment feature delays may impact the Sprint 4 board demo. While mitigation is underway, Sprint 2 delivery was affected.
- Source Evidence: *“This will delay testing and deployment of some features.” (Sprint Standup Notes). “The board meeting...coincides with Sprint 4.” (Chief of Staff Email)*
- This aligns with the Amber definition: *“Timeline slipping against planned dates although not yet missed key milestones.”*

Costs – Green

- No cost overruns or budget issues are reported. The project is operating within existing team capacity.
- Source Evidence: The scenario provides no indication of cost overruns, budget gaps, or funding constraints.

- According to the RAG Matrix, Green is appropriate when: “Costs clearly defined, and project is on track/under budget.”

Progress Update This Reporting Period

Store location software completed

- *Source:* Standup Notes — “All store location development work has completed.”
- *Rationale:* Fully delivered feature; only item listed as "done."

App design work underway but delayed due to UX/UI team imbalance

- *Source:* Standup Notes — “Website PM is using around 75% of UX/UI team time...”
- *Rationale:* Affects sprint velocity; visible impact on UI delivery.

Developers blocked on key payment features due to licence access

- *Source:* Standup Notes — “Two developers require licences... have not been able to work...”
- *Rationale:* Blocker for MVP-critical payment capability.

Customer-related backlog items moved to next sprint

- *Source:* Standup Notes — “Customer experience related items have been pushed to next sprint.”
- *Rationale:* Impact on delivery scope — feature slippage.

Design backlog prioritised due to blockers

- *Source:* Standup Notes — “Focus has been shifted to design related backlog items.”
- *Rationale:* Demonstrates reactive planning but still progress.

Objectives for Next Reporting Period

Prioritise security features for audit readiness

- *Source:* Audit Lead Email — “Please ensure all information security related development has been completed... external audit in 2 weeks.”
- *Rationale:* Urgent regulatory deadline.

Unblock payment backlog items by resolving licence access

- *Source:* Standup Notes
- *Rationale:* Core MVP function is being delayed.

Rebalance UX/UI resource with Website PM

- *Source:* Standup Notes — resource conflict (75% vs agreed 50%).
- *Rationale:* Delaying sprint output — leadership intervention may be needed.

Begin CRM requirement discovery discussions with Customer Lead

- *Source:* Product Owner Email — “What do you think the best things to develop after the app?”
- *Rationale:* CRM is next in roadmap — discovery does not disrupt delivery.

Key Meetings and Decisions Required

Leadership support to enforce agreed 50/50 UX/UI split

- *Source:* Standup Notes
- *Rationale:* Resource strain is a repeated blocker; decision needed to rebalance.

Confirm procurement timeline for developer licence resolution

- *Source:* Standup Notes
- *Rationale:* Still unresolved — direct impact on MVP delivery and team morale.

Align CRM scope early to avoid future sprint disruption

- *Source:* Product Owner & Customer Lead interest
- *Rationale:* Starting CRM too early could hurt MVP focus — manage expectations.

Escalations Required

1. Developer Licence Access Blocking Progress (R001 / I001) – Project Manager

- **Escalation Justification:** Two developers have been unable to work on core payment functionality due to missing tool licences. This directly affects a critical MVP feature: "multiple ways to pay."
- **Source:** Sprint Standup Notes
- **Quote:** *"Two of the developers require licences to key development tools relating to payments... This will delay testing and deployment of some features."*
- **Why It Needs Escalation:** Resolution requires procurement or leadership action. The delay is outside the development team's control.

2. UX/UI Team Overallocation (R003) – Project Manager

- **Escalation Justification:** The Website Refresh Project is using 75% of the shared UX/UI team, despite the agreed 50/50 resource split. This has delayed App design progress and risks the MVP timeline.
- **Source:** Sprint Standup Notes

- **Quote:** *"The Website Project Manager is using around 75% of UX/UI team time rather than the 50% that you agreed."*
- **Why It Needs Escalation:** Negotiation with the Website PM has begun, but senior leadership may need to enforce the original agreement.

3. 3rd Party Vendor SLA Degradation (I003) – Project Manager

- **Escalation Justification:** The external app support vendor has repeatedly failed to meet the agreed Service Level Agreement (SLA) following an acquisition, impacting the resolution of live system issues.
- **Source:** Scenario context
- **Quote:** *"There have been a few incidents where support has not been received within the existing Service Level Agreement (SLA)."*
- **Why It Needs Escalation:** If vendor performance doesn't improve next sprint, this may need to be escalated to the leadership team to ensure service continuity.

Items Managed Within Project Team (No Escalation Required)

4. Information Security Features Incomplete (R002) – Project Manager

- **Management Plan:** Security development tasks have now been prioritised for Sprint 3, ahead of the external audit.
- **Source:** Audit Lead Email
- **Quote:** *"Please ensure that all information security related development has been completed by then as [auditors] have a special interest in this project."*
- **Why No Escalation Needed:** Mitigation plan is in place; currently manageable within project control.

5. QA Coverage Risk (I002) – Scrum Master

- **Management Plan:** With the Test Lead on leave during Sprint 3, QA coverage is being redistributed among developers and other resources.
- **Source:** Sprint Standup Notes
- **Quote:** *"The Test Lead is on annual leave for all of Sprint 3."*
- **Why No Escalation Needed:** This is a short-term resourcing issue with a clear mitigation plan. Scrum Master is managing this within the team.

Escalated Risks and Issues – Sprint 2 Summary

As Project Manager for the App Refresh Project, I have reviewed the current risks and issues impacting delivery. Some of the items above are escalated beyond my remit due to external dependencies, unresolved resourcing constraints, or wider strategic implications that may require leadership intervention. Other risks remain within project control and are actively being mitigated.