

# PROJECT PLAN AND STUDY DIARY

Version 1.13 from 12.03.2017

---

## G22 – Yet Another Group

### Yet Another Game (YAG)

---

*TUT – Pervasive Computing – TIE-21106 Software Engineering Methodology*

*Document status:* Draft

*Authors:*

Milla MÄKINEN <milla.makinen@student.tut.fi>

Mengyang CHEN <mengyang.chen@student.tut.fi>

Daniel BEREZVAI <daniel.berezvai@student.tut.fi>

Alexandre KIRSZENBERG <alexandre.kirszenberg@student.tut.fi>

## Revision History

Revision	Date	Author(s)	Description
1.0	28.01.2014	Marko L.	Initial version
1.1	11.02.2014	Marko L.	Deleted finnish text
1.2	18.01.2017	Tensu	Sections 1.4.x, cosmetic tuning
1.3	26.1.2017	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.
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
1.10	14.02.2017	Alex K.	Sprint 1
1.11	14.02.2017	Daniel B.	Doubled the length of each paragraph in our sprint 1 review. Detail rich explanations, miscellaneous fixes, and spellcheck. Clever titles introduced (I remembered to update Table of Contents too!). New tool: LaTeX. (A. K.)
1.12	12.03.2017	Alex K.	LaTeX version.
1.13	12.03.2017	Alex K.	Sprint 2

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Project Resources</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Personnel . . . . .	2
1.2	Process description . . . . .	2
1.3	Tools and technology . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Study Diary</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Sprint 1 . . . . .	4
2.1.1	Everything went well (almost everything) . . . . .	4
2.1.2	We had difficulties — communication and missed dead- line . . . . .	4
2.1.3	What were the main learnings . . . . .	5
2.1.4	For the next sprint, we decided to change our work habits and one tool . . . . .	5
2.2	Sprint 2 . . . . .	5
2.2.1	All is well in the world . . . . .	5
2.2.2	Difficulties? . . . . .	5
2.2.3	What we learned . . . . .	6
2.2.4	Moving on . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Risk Management Plan</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Personnel risks . . . . .	7
3.1.1	Risk P1: short term absence of one person . . . . .	7
3.1.2	Risk P2: long term absence of one person . . . . .	7
3.1.3	Risk P3: someone drops out . . . . .	8
3.2	Technology risks . . . . .	8
3.2.1	Risk T1: someone force-pushes to Gitlab . . . . .	8
3.2.2	Risk T2: Processing turns out to be a very bad choice .	8
3.3	Customer risks . . . . .	8
3.3.1	Risk C1: customer changes requirements . . . . .	8
3.4	Management risks . . . . .	8
3.4.1	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 and 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 BEREZVAI** <daniel.berezvai@student.tut.fi> <http://3ice.hu/>  
Product Owner, game modder (Warcraft 3),
- **Alexandre KIRSZENBERG** <alexandre.kirszenberg@student.tut.fi>  
Programmer with 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, and pass the course get the credits. To measure the success of the project, we will see whether the 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 technology

The tools used in this project are listed in Table 2. 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 2: Tools used in the project

Purpose	Tool	Contact Person	Version
Documentation	L <sup>A</sup> T <sub>E</sub> X <a href="https://www.latex-project.org/">https://www.latex-project.org/</a> with pdflatex	A.K.	1.4
Communication	WhatsApp <a href="http://www.whatsapp.com">http://www.whatsapp.com</a>	M.M.	–
	Skype <a href="http://www.skype.org">http://www.skype.org</a>	M.C.	–
Version management	GitLab <a href="http://rd.gitlab.tut.fi">http://rd.gitlab.tut.fi</a> Accessible through the course selection or <a href="https://gitlab.rd.tut.fi/sweng-2017/g22--yet-another-group">https://gitlab.rd.tut.fi/sweng-2017/g22--yet-another-group</a>	M.M	–
Agile Management	AgileFant <a href="https://app.agilefant.com">https://app.agilefant.com</a>		–
Programming language of choice	Processing <a href="https://processing.org/">https://processing.org/</a>	D.B.	3.2.3

## 2 Study Diary

This chapter holds our journal of lessons learned during the course. Detailed analysis of each Sprints' contents shall follow.

### 2.1 Sprint 1

For this first sprint the product owner proposed a very minimalist approach as we familiarized ourselves with the several new tools at our disposal. The official requirement was to fulfill two user stories per sprint, and conveniently enough, the first two tasks were as simple as; one: reading input from the user (their name) and then two: printing out a personalized backstory for them.

#### 2.1.1 Everything went well (almost everything)

Right from the get go we had a very good understanding of how to achieve our goals. As such, it was easy to start working on the project and rapidly deliver outstanding results for the first sprint. In fact we completed our intentionally very light sprint 1 workload before it even officially began.

As to not fall into despair from lack of work, we selected additional tasks to complete. In the end, we have four additional user stories more or less in a completed state, in addition to the first two proposed solutions that were refactored several times until they met everyone's ever higher standards for good code.

#### 2.1.2 We had difficulties — communication and missed deadline

Working in a team can be difficult, especially when it comes to communicating between team members. None of us were very familiar with Agilefant, so we did most of the communication on WhatsApp and in person.

One failure was that we missed the delivery deadline. All our tasks were complete weeks ago, but we never submitted them to Repolainen because we constantly kept adding new things. In the future, we will create calendar entries for each deadline with automatic email notifications set up to give us a reminder two days in advance.

### **2.1.3 What were the main learnings**

We should use Agilefant more often, in order to make sure that we're all on the same page. It also helps in defining clear objectives for individuals and for the team as a whole.

### **2.1.4 For the next sprint, we decided to change our work habits and one tool**

We decided to try and take more advantage of the tools at our disposal. Since our team works mostly in quick and very productive iterations, it might be interesting for us to synchronize our efforts in real-life sprints.

As we have had difficulties taming Microsoft Office, a proposed move to TeX was initiated. It will improve our work process greatly. No more crashes due to faulty edit conflict resolution, nor unnecessary struggling with the laggy online version of Word that performs especially poorly on MacBooks.

## **2.2 Sprint 2**

The goal of this sprint was to implement the core features of the game. Indeed, in order for our product to actually *feel* like a game, we needed the notions of an objective and obstacles.

### **2.2.1 All is well in the world**

It's been smooth sailing on this sprint. With our experience working as a team with Agilefant and Processing, a lot of features we'd planned came together nicely.

### **2.2.2 Difficulties?**

The difficulties are really starting to show on the road that lies ahead. Some questions were brought up during this sprint that will only be answered during Sprint 3. Hopefully, the answers will not be too painful for us.

One such question is the issue of performance. While performance is very dependent on the computer the game runs on, we noticed some frames

dropped on the current version of the game. A situation that could get worse as we add more and more logic and objects on each game scene.

### **2.2.3 What we learned**

Compared to Sprint 1, the learnings were much lighter this time around.

### **2.2.4 Moving on**

While some features are best left to be implemented later, it is sometimes useful to prepare the road for future work. Some big architecture changes on this sprint should really ease the implementation of some of Sprint 3's user stories.

However, more architecture changes will probably be needed later on.



## 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 Personnel risks

#### 3.1.1 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.

#### 3.1.2 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.

### 3.1.3 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.

## 3.2 Technology risks

### 3.2.1 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.

### 3.2.2 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.

## 3.3 Customer risks

### 3.3.1 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.

## 3.4 Management risks

### 3.4.1 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.