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Introduction

What?
- An independent survey of Agile tool usage

Why?
- Lack of independent surveys and adoption guidelines
- Too many tools!
Introduction

How?

- A simple web survey created with Google docs, spread around LinkedIn groups, Yahoo! Groups,
The Survey

Part I
- Company
- Role
- Team type
- Agile methods used

Part II
- Tools used
- Most satisfactory aspects of tools in place
- Least satisfactory aspects of tools in place
- Desired features
- Comments
Results in Brief

- 121 responses from different companies
- 35 countries
- Over 14 different roles
Part I: Roles

Distribution of respondents’ roles:

- Consultant
- Owner/Founder
- Other
- High-Level Management
- Mid-Level Management
- Developer
- Low-Level Management
Part I: Teams

Reported team types:
Part I: Agile method

Agile methods and practices used:

- FDD
- DSDM
- Crystal
- TDD
- Kanban
- XP
- Scrum with XP
- Scrum
Part II: Tools Used

- Other
- Assembla
- XPlanner
- TFS
- JIRA
- VersionOne
- ScrumWorks
- Mingle
- Trac
- Rally
- Custom Tool
- MS Project
- Spreadsheets
- Physical Wall and Paper
Part II: Tools Used

- Physical wall and paper: 43%
- Spreadsheets: 26%
- MS Project: 23%
- Other (including 31 different APM tools!): 8%
Part II: Physical vs. APM

Summary of physical vs. APM tool usage:

- Physical Walls and Paper: 61%
- Agile Project Management Tools: 65%
- Both: 31%
Part II: Tools by Team Type

Usage of different types of tools in collocated and distributed teams:

- Custom or In-House Tools
- Traditional Project Management Tools
- Spreadsheets
- Physical Walls and Paper
- Agile Project Management Tools

Collocated teams
Distributed Teams
Part II: Positive Aspects

Most satisfactory aspects of the tools in place:

- Integration with Other Systems
- Availability of Reports
- Price
- Customizability
- Ease of Use
Part II: Negative Aspects

Least satisfactory aspects of the tools in place:

- Too Many Customization Options
- Price
- Usability Issues
- Lack of Custom Reports
- Lack of Integration Options
Part II: Negative Summary

Summary of mentioned negative aspects:

- 93% At least one negative aspect
- 7% No negative aspects
Part II: Comments

Comments grouped by features:

- Planning Elements: 0%
- Comprehensive Tool: 4%
- Requirements Management: 8%
- Budget Tracking: 13%
- Flexibility: 17%
- Ease of Use: 21%
- Project Status Tracking: 25%
- Interface Improvements: 25%
- New Ideas: 25%
- Virtual Board Features: 25%
- Integration: 25%
- Improved Reporting: 25%
Conclusions...
Thank you!
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