

Date: 19/12/2017

Group name / Project name: 12 / Collaborator

Members: Cansin Canberi, M. Raşit Özdemir, Tahsincan Köse, Burak Hoccoğlu

Assistant: Güneş Sucu

Supervisor: Erol Şahin

Sprint 3 summary

Item ID (from the previous retrospect ive doc)	ID of the related workpackage ID (from the Kick-off doc)	Status	Group's comments	Assistant or supervisor comments
1	3	Continuing	Robotic arm itself will be detected and separately distinguished in the shared workspace.	
2	4	Continuing	Ability to distinguish human alike models with objects.	
3	2,4,7	Complete	Stacking cases/baskets as in sample scenerio.	
4	2	Complete	Motion Planning in arbitrary workspace with statically generated objects(in detail, static with respect to the current objects, but can generate new objects in random poses during simulation.)	

Sprint 4 plan

Item ID	ID of the related workpackage (from the Kick-off doc)	Description	Status
1	3	Robotic arm itself will be detected and separately distinguished in the shared workspace.	Left over from Sprint 3
2	4	Ability to distinguish human alike models with objects.	Left over from Sprint 3
3	3,4	Having known the particular position of the table, object detection will be further optimized through introducing a threshold value that automatically masks out the table.	New
4	2,3,4,5	Integration of Perception workpackage with Motion Planning. Motion planning will be basically a pick&place operation of an object with the input generated by perception.	New

Overall progress

	Sprint 1	Sprint 2	Sprint 3	Sprint 4	Sprint 5
MF1	25%	100%	100%		

MF2	0%	100%	100%		
MF3	0%	20%	100%		
MF4	15%	15%	25%		
MF5	0%	0%	0%		
MF6	0%	0%	0%		
MF7	0%	0%	20%		
MF8	0%	0%	0%		
MF9	0%	0%	0%		
MF10	0%	0%	0%		
MF11	0%	0%	20%		
MF12	0%	0%	0%		
MF13	0%	0%	0%		
MF14	0%	0%	0%		

1

This section will be filled in by your supervisor.

Please grade the items below using the following scale:

1=Poor

2=Minimal

3=Sufficient

4=Above Average

5=Excellent

Criteria	Grade
----------	-------

Progress of the team in this sprint. (Grade percentage: 50%)	
The accuracy of the summary table above (e.g. are the task status declarations correct?). (Grade percentage: 25%)	
Considering the weekly meetings, the attendance and preparation level of the team (i.e. Toplantılara düzenli olarak ve hazır bir şekilde, örneğin bir toplantı gündemi oluşturarak, katıldılar mı?) (Grade percentage: 25%)	