

Damn Parking, Sprint 1 Retrospective

Team Members: David Vasquez, Kevin Llamas, Joe Mota, Saul Burns

Sprint: Sprint 1

Team Retrospective

What went well

During Sprint 1, our team successfully moved from several independent project ideas to a single project that the entire team could continue developing. Each team member contributed to the initial market research by investigating different problem areas and conducting interviews. Our initial ideas included a Small-Business Cash Flow Forecaster, Tax Helper, Autopilot, AI Bike Fit, and Free Parking Handshake & Live Parking Intelligence.

After the first phase of research, we narrowed our focus and conducted additional research around the strongest candidate ideas. This process helped us move beyond our initial assumptions and use interview evidence to guide the project selection. The parking research identified recurring experiences involving crowded parking areas, difficulty locating desirable spaces, driving around searching for parking, and uncertainty about availability.

The team was also able to translate the selected idea into a more defined project by establishing its business objective, scope, constraints, assumptions, success criteria, and stakeholders.

What did not go well / Where we struggled

One challenge during Sprint 1 was consolidating a large amount of research produced by multiple team members. Because the team began with several different project ideas, the information was initially distributed across different problem areas and interviews. Narrowing those findings into one project required additional discussion and organization.

Another challenge was transitioning from a broad parking problem into a realistic software project. The original parking concept included a parking-handshake mechanism in which users could register departing parking spaces, while the project later expanded toward live parking intelligence and camera-assisted availability detection. The team therefore had to determine which features belonged in the prototype and which should remain outside the current project scope. The original Phase 1 research describes the token-based parking handshake concept, while the current charter emphasizes parking availability, a map, user updates, and camera-based occupancy detection.

Causes of friction

The primary source of difficulty was **scope definition rather than the initial generation of ideas**. The research identified several parking-related problems and possible features, but not all of them could realistically be implemented within one academic project.

The team also needed to convert informal research findings into formal project-management artifacts. Information discovered through interviews had to be translated into a clear business objective, scope boundaries, assumptions, stakeholders, and measurable success criteria.

Concrete change for Sprint 2

For Sprint 2, the team will establish clearer ownership and acceptance criteria for each deliverable at the beginning of the sprint. Before development or documentation begins, the team will confirm which features and requirements are currently in scope and identify one team member responsible for reviewing consistency across the project's documents and Living Portal.

Project Retrospective

What changed in the project

The largest change during Sprint 1 was the transition from multiple candidate project ideas to **Damn Parking** as the team's selected project. The team initially researched several unrelated problems across areas such as finance, parking, and cycling.

After narrowing the candidates, additional parking research provided evidence of recurring parking difficulties. Interview participants described experiences such as packed parking facilities, driving repeatedly around an area, parking farther away, arriving late while searching for desirable parking, and wanting to know parking availability before reaching a destination.

As a result, the project became a working prototype centered on communicating parking availability. The current scope includes a website where users can view available parking, check selected locations, update information when leaving a parking space, use a basic parking map, and demonstrate how camera data could determine whether spaces are available or occupied.

Decisions made and why

A major decision was to limit Damn Parking to a **prototype rather than attempt a complete city-wide parking system**.

This decision keeps the project aligned with what the team can reasonably demonstrate during the course. The charter therefore, excludes city-wide camera installation, a complete city-wide parking network, payment processing, and commercial deployment.

The team also chose to incorporate two potential sources of parking information: camera-derived parking occupancy information and information contributed by users. This direction addresses the availability uncertainty observed during the team's parking interviews.

Planned versus actual outcome

The initial plan began as an exploration of several potential business problems rather than a commitment to Damn Parking. By the end of Sprint 1, the team had moved further than simply choosing an idea: the project had been narrowed into a defined prototype with scope boundaries and an initial implementation direction.

However, some aspects of the concept required additional refinement as the sprint progressed. In particular, the relationship between the original Parking Handshake concept and the newer live parking intelligence/camera-based concept needed to be clarified so that the project remained achievable within the semester.

Although the team completed the major objectives planned for Sprint 1, some documentation and scope decisions took longer than expected. The team originally expected to finalize the project direction and supporting documents earlier in the sprint, but additional discussion was required to clarify the transition from the original Parking Handshake concept to the broader live parking intelligence concept. As a result, some documentation was completed closer to the Sprint 1 deadline than originally intended. No significant monetary expenses were incurred during Sprint 1 because the majority of the work involved research, planning, documentation, and prototype development.

Impact on Sprint 2

Sprint 1 gives the team a clearer baseline for Sprint 2. The next sprint should use the Project Charter as the boundary for evaluating the project's business case, estimates, and ROI rather than continuing to expand the product with additional features.

The team should specifically evaluate the feasibility and value of the project's core components, including parking availability information, the map interface, user-contributed information, and the camera-based occupancy concept. Any new feature should be evaluated against the established scope before being added.