
Project plan + study diary

Yet Another Game (YAG)

version 1.9

TUT	Pervasive Computing	TIE-21106 Software Engineering Methodology
Author: Group 22		Printed: 29.01.2017 18:03
Distribution: Farshad Ahmadi, Tero Ahtee, Kari Systä		
Alexandre Kirszenberg, Milla Mäkinen, Mengyang Chen, Daniel Berezvai		
Document status: draft		Modified: 29.01.2017 18:03

VERSION HISTORY

Version	Date	Authors	Explanation (modifications)
1.0	28.01.2014	Marko L.	Initial version
1.1	11.02.2014	Marko L.	Deleted finnish text
1.2	18.01.2015	Tensu	Sections 1.4.x, cosmetic tuning
1.3	26.1.2015	Marko L.	Final toucher
1.4	16.01.2017	Kari S.	Adaptation for 2017 needs
1.5	25.01.2017	Daniel B.	Initial shared document version bump
1.6	29.01.2017	Alex K.	Expand on risks.
1.7	29.01.2017	Chen	Process description
1.8	29.01.2017	Daniel B.	Final touches, layout fix, merge
1.9	29.01.2017	Milla M.	Tools, technologies, fixes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PROJECT RESOURCES.....	4
1.1 PERSONNEL	4
1.2 PROCESS DESCRIPTION	4
1.3 TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGIES	4
2. STUDY DIARY	5
2.1 SPRINT 1	5
2.1.1 What went well.....	5
2.1.2 What difficulties we had.....	5
2.1.3 What were the main learnings	5
2.1.4 What did we decide to change for the next sprint.....	5
2.2 SPRINT 2.....	5
2.2.1 What went well.....	6
2.2.2 What difficulties we had.....	6
2.2.3 What were the main learnings	6
2.2.4 What did we decide to change for the next sprint.....	6
2.3 SPRINT 3.....	6
2.4 SPRINT 4.....	6
3. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	6
3.1.....	6
3.2 PERSONNEL RISKS	7
3.2.1 Risk P1: short term absence of one person.....	7
3.2.2 Risk P2: long term absence of one person.....	7
3.2.3 Risk P3: someone drops out.....	7
3.3 TECHNOLOGY RISKS	7
3.3.1 Risk T1: someone force-pushes to Gitlab	7
3.3.2 Risk T2: Processing turns out to be a very bad choice.....	7
3.4 CUSTOMER RISKS	8
3.4.1 Risk C1: customer changes requirements.....	8
3.5 MANAGEMENT RISKS	8
3.5.1 Risk M1: divide between management and personnel.....	8

1. PROJECT RESOURCES

This chapter holds the project resources.

1.1 Personnel

- Milla Mäkinen <milla.makinen@student.tut.fi>
Scrum Master, Programmer & totally an artist. Industrial engineer, programmer at heart. Some five years of game dev experience mainly in C++ and Javascript. Specializes in having no life.
- Mengyang Chen <mengyang.chen@student.tut.fi>
Coder familiar with Javascript and C++, interested in web programming and game programming.
- Daniel "3ICE" Berezvai <daniel.berezvai@student.tut.fi>
Product Owner, Game modder (Warcraft 3, etc), studied over 20 programming languages, personal website: <http://3ice.hu/>
- Alexandre Kirszenberg <alexandre.kirszenberg@student.tut.fi>
Programmer, Previous experience as a Frontend Software Engineer. Interested in Software Development.

1.2 Process description

The goal of our project is to make an interesting game, immerse ourselves in the SCRUM methodology, and of course pass the course and get the credits. To measure the success of the project, we will evaluate whether all the user stories are fulfilled at the end.

Basically we are going to use WhatsApp for discussion with each other and allocate the works evenly to everyone in the team, and use email to inform some general information to everyone in the team.

To ensure the success of the project, one will inform other team members when facing some really tough tasks, so coding nights or jams will be held to solve the task together.

1.3 Tools and technologies

The tools used in this project are listed in table 1. Most of them are not affected by versioning as everyone is automatically updated to the latest version. If version difference issues arise, the contact person will decide which version everyone in the team will use.

Table 1.2: Tools used in the project.

Purpose	Tool	Contact person	Version
Documentation	MS Word (word processing) office.microsoft.com	D.B	2016
	MS Word Online (shared editing) Office 365	D.B	N/A
Communication	WhatsApp, http://www.whatsapp.com/	M.M	any
	Skype (internet calls) http://www.skype.org	M.C	any
Version management	GitLab http://rd.gitlab.tut.fi Accessible through the course selection or https://gitlab.rd.tut.fi/sweng-2017/g22---yet-another-group	M.M	N/A
Agile Management	AgileFant https://app.agilefant.com	M.M	N/A
Processing	Programming language of choice https://processing.org/	D. B.	3.2.3

2. STUDY DIARY

This chapter holds our journal of lessons learned during the course. More detailed analysis of previous Sprints' contents.

2.1 Sprint 1

2.1.1 What went well

2.1.2 What difficulties we had

2.1.3 What were the main learnings

2.1.4 What did we decide to change for the next sprint

2.2 Sprint 2

2.2.1 What went well

2.2.2 What difficulties we had

2.2.3 What were the main learnings

2.2.4 What did we decide to change for the next sprint

2.3 Sprint 3

2.4 Sprint 4

3. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table 3: Project risks.

Risk ID	Description	Probability	Impact
P1	Short term absence	3	1
P2	Long term absence	2	1
P3	Someone drops out	2	2
T1	Someone force-pushes to Gitlab	2	1
T2	Processing turns out to be a very bad choice	1	3
C1	Customer changes requirements	3	2
M1	Divide between management and personnel	1	3

3.1

3.2 Personnel risks

3.2.1 Risk P1: short term absence of one person

Root cause: A member will be absent for several days.

Importance: Little importance, one of us can manage the project on their own anyway.

Avoidance: It would still be nice to warn the project members so that we don't rely on the concerned person to do any work.

Response: Someone else takes responsibility for the person's work.

3.2.2 Risk P2: long term absence of one person

Root cause: A member will be absent for several weeks.

Importance: Similarly to a short term absence, we can manage without one person for a prolonged period of time.

Avoidance: A warning will do.

Response: Someone else takes responsibility for the person's work.

3.2.3 Risk P3: someone drops out

Root cause: A member drops out of the course

Importance: This is slightly more impactful than a prolonged absence.

Response: We will have to reorganize the project around the three or fewer remaining members.

3.3 Technology risks

3.3.1 Risk T1: someone force-pushes to Gitlab

Root cause: Lack of knowledge in the technology brings someone to erase all progress on Gitlab.

Importance: Little importance, other members will have a copy of the project's history.

Response: Find out whoever has the most recent copy and push again.

3.3.2 Risk T2: Processing turns out to be a very bad choice

Root cause: As we iterate over the project, we realise Processing will severely hinder our progress moving forward.

Importance: Extremely unlikely given our constraints.

3.4 Customer risks

3.4.1 Risk C1: customer changes requirements

Root cause: The customer changes their mind on a part of the project.

Importance: Will depend on the size of the change.

Response: Create or modify user stories, rework and refactor the concerned parts of the project.

3.5 Management risks

3.5.1 Risk M1: divide between management and personnel

Root cause: The management and the personnel do not see eye-to-eye.

Importance: Very unlikely considering the management and the personnel are one and the same on this project.