Updates on Assessment 1 Deliverables

Review and Update Process

Before starting to work on the deliverables for Assessment 2 we had a team meeting during which we reviewed the entire documentation that we submitted for the first part of the assessment. The meeting let us reflect on how we could improve the quality of our work and helped us identify any potential mistakes we made in the documentation we submitted. Also, as part of the review we took Assessment 1's feedback into account.

Following such analysis we brainstormed possible ideas to amend our errors and discussed any new suggestions to change the documentation. From the ideas obtained we validated the actual changes by reviewing the assessment brief and doing additional research when needed.

Updated Requirements Justification

The main issue with our requirements was that we overspecified some Functional requirements. Requirements that were too specific were rephrased to be more independent from a particular implementation.

Requirement C3's rational was altered slightly as it was too restrictive implying that the mouse should only be used for navigation and control in the game. Now it is specified that both the mouse and keyboard can be used for input in navigating features of the game.

Requirement F2 was too design specific; originally specifying that the game should include a toggleable turn timer that can be accessed in the options/setup menu. This only allowed for one possible implementation of the requirement which was too restrictive. It is now required that the turn timer should be an optional feature for the user which gives more room for how it can be implemented.

Requirement F4, similar to F2 was too design specific and was changed so that it now requires the game to have a time limit instead of also specifying the turn time.

In Requirement F15, setup/options was specified in the requirement. For clarity we removed the word options as it leant towards a certain design implementation which was unnecessary in the context of the requirement.

Requirement F16 was actually two requirements in one and contained too much information so we decided to separate it for readability into requirement F16 and F18.

Following a discussion with the client, we were satisfied with the elicitation we had carried out and were not able to find any new requirements that our system needed to meet.

The updated statement of requirements is available on the team website[1].

Updated Methods and Planning Justification

During the initial meeting we thought about what new tools would be necessary to enable the development and the design of the graphical interface, additionally we reasoned about the possibility of changing or adding new team roles.

After the discussion it was clear that additional software was needed to produce high quality graphical assets for the game, with which we would be able to design the GUI. Procreate and Photoshop were selected as the most appropriate design tools for our needs.

In terms of implementation the team agreed to use IntelliJ IDEA as the IDE for the project. Using the same Integrated Development Environment among all members would allow easier troubleshooting for setting up the project and aid development speed.

The tools that had already been chosen during the first phase of the assessment proved to be very useful and really improved the team productivity, therefore they have not been changed.

In regards to team roles, all members were satisfied with their current position. However as we started implementing the game it became clear that we needed a person dedicated to managing version control and ensuring that conflicts would always be solved appropriately before merging branches back to master. Given his previous experience with git, Ryan was nominated Version Control Manager.

Since Assessment 1 feedback stated that our planning was excellent, we made only few changes to it. The Gantt Chart for Assessment 3 has been updated [2] to further breakdown the tasks we had already planned and to cover in more detail certain sub-tasks.

In particular we added a new task regarding the advertisement and presentation of our product, the selection of the new project was also broken down into sub-tasks that we believe will be important to make the best decision about which other team's project to pick up. Additionally, the time schedule has been reorganized to fit the addition of new sub-tasks.

The Gantt Chart for Assessment 4 has not been updated at all because we felt that it was already detailed enough. Doing an additional task breakdown at this stage of the project would probably be of little use, since the project plan is likely to change in the future.

The updated method and planning is available on the team website[3].

Updated Risk Assessment and Mitigation

All 16 of the identified risks from the original risk document remain valid, with no need for modification, due to the fact that any of the identified risks which occured throughout the duration of the development of our program, followed the description outlined in the original document and the mitigation proposed, did indeed mitigate the risk. However it became apparent that there was at least one risk that occurred that was not previously outlined in the original document and had to be added. For this purpose in future, we have specified a method in which we can update the risk table with any new potential risks that we discover or any new risks which we encountered. The new risks were assessed using the same methods defined in the Assessment 1 deliverable.

The risk(s) that were added in the duration of the current assessment:

R18: Tools used cause issues. It became apparent during the setup of the development systems, most team members had an issue with one of the tools we were using (GIT and JUnit). To remedy this we held a group meeting in which team members helped those who struggled with the initial setup and gave an opportunity to voice any more issues or concerns, of which there were none.

R22: Given our inexperience we may not produce adequate testing and therefore it could lead to the produced product not functioning correctly. To remedy this the Test Leader devise a testing strategy that every component of the software is correctly coded and works as intended.

The risk(s) that were added in anticipation of the takeover of the new project:

R17: New project uses different environment and/or framework. Members of our team who are not familiar with the new environment and/or framework (e.g Programming language or Software such as Unity) will have to learn the new system before being able to contribute to the team, thus wasting potentially valuable time. To mitigate this, When choosing the product to take over, be aware and cautious of the environment/ framework used to attempt to minimise the learning curve of the new system.

R19: Project overtaken contains critical errors. If the are critical errors within the new project, time must be spent finding and solving these issues before any progress can be made. To mitigate this, It is critical that in the selection of the new project we ensure and review the project runs as showcased and little to no errors exist.

R20: Project overtaken is difficult to understand. If the code of the project we takeover is difficult to understand then time must be spent both learning the program and cleaning the code to make it easier to understand. To mitigate this, Ensure, during the selection of the new project, we have at least some understanding of the code before choosing the project.

R21: Insufficient documentation of new project. There may not be sufficient documentation on either the project itself or the tools used by the previous team, meaning time must be spent researching this. To mitigate this, When selecting a new project, ensure that sufficient documentation is provided.

The updated risk assessment is available on the team website[4].

References

[1] SEPR "Updated Requirements" Risky Developments [Online]. Available:
http://www.riskydevelopments.co.uk/documents/UpdatedRequirements.pdf
[Accessed 21 Jan. 2018].

[2] SEPR "Updated Gantt Chart Assessment 3" Risky Developments [Online]. Available:
http://www.riskydevelopments.co.uk/documents/UpdatedGanttChartAssessment3.png [Accessed 21 Jan. 2018]

[3] SEPR "Updated Method Selection and Planning" Risky Developments [Online].
Available:
http://www.riskydevelopments.co.uk/documents/UpdatedMethodSelectionAndPlanning.pdf [Accessed 21 Jan. 2018]

[4] SEPR "Updated Risk Assessment" Risky Developments [Online]. Available:
http://www.riskydevelopments.co.uk/documents/UpdatedRiskAssessmentAndMitigation.pdf [Accessed 21 Jan. 2018].