Updates on Assessment 1 deliverables

Updated Requirements

During our first scrum meeting at the start of Assessment 2, we discussed the requirements and any changes to them. It was decided that some could be modified/removed. We agreed that requirement 10.c ("*The game should alert the user when they have discovered the murder weapon.*") [1] could be removed as we thought that this made the story too obvious, and made the game less fun, therefore going against requirement 21 (*"The game should be interesting and fun to play"*), as well as the initial brief.

We had another requirements review session during the second scrum in Spring Week 1 in which we discussed the requirements based on whether they were still considered necessary and whether any would be too complex now that we had began coding. We agreed that all requirements seemed suitable, and did not need to be changed.

Method update

4.1 Chosen Methods
The approaches and methods we chose to use in Assessment 1 [2] have continued to be used in Assessment 2. During a review session of Assessment 1, the team was happy with how these were working for the team. As a result, we decided not to alter which methods we used.

4.2 Collaboration Tools
Most of the tools used in Assessment 1 have continued to be used in Assessment 2. However, we have switched from using Java in **IntelliJ Java IDE** [3] to using C# in **Unity** [4], as Unity is intended predominantly for game development and has a lot of the required tools already built in. We have also started using Slack as a dedicated channel for discussion of code development as opposed to Facebook Messenger. This allows team member to see when updates have been made and by who to the code. This helps solve the problem of team communication as it improves organisation. Facebook messenger is now solely used for organising meetings.

4.3 Organisational Methods
We split into two main groups for Assessment 2: a coding team consisting of Henry, Toby and Simon, and a documentation team consisting of Aimee, Connor and Will. These groups were allocated based on personal preference and experience with the relevant areas. Henry and Connor were considered to be sub-team leaders for this assessment with the task of sharing information between sub-team members and promoting conversation and assistance between the sub-team. This allows a quicker response to issues since sub-teams can meet more frequently due to having less scheduling conflicts because there are less people involved. As a result, problems could be resolved and discussed quickly. We felt this was necessary and decided on this resolution during our review meeting of Assessment 1.

4.4 Plan
The plan is based on scrum sprints. Sprints are intended to occur on each of the dates in the plan e.g. Spr/2/Tue. Based on the missing features report done in the implementation section and the requirements for Assessment 2, tasks required to be completed in Assessment 3 were deduced and assigned to team members based on their knowledge of the task area and expertise. The plan was also updated at the start of Assessment 2, during the Assessment 1 review meeting, and throughout Assessment 2 as time progressed to include more in precise tasks. These additions occurred as we became aware of what specific tasks needed to be completed. All changes can be identified in the plan by the task which has been added or changed in this assessment being highlighted in yellow. This is also shown in the key.

Here is a link to a ZIP file containing updated plans for assessment 3 and 4:
http://wedunnit.me/webfiles/ass2/Updated-Plans.zip

Risk assessment and Mitigation Update

Explanation and Justification

We decided to update our Assessment 1 risk register [5] by categorising our risks. This provides more structure to them and allows a faster and more effective risk identification.

We met in week 10 of Spring term before the Christmas holidays to discuss potential risks that could occur with us only able to communicate online for a month, and with very busy schedules. We identified that this increased the potential for a breakdown in communication, as any scrum meetings would not be face-to-face.

We also identified new technical risks that we had not previously considered before starting the implementation. As the files were to be merged over git, we discussed any other potential issues which could arise and that had started to arise in the first few weeks of development at the time. These included more conflicts than anticipated and also issues with checking out branches. These were added to the risk register so that there was a known action plan in place in case this happened again.

References

[1] H. Cadogan, S. Davison, T. Fox, W. Hodkinson, C. Hughes and A. Pearcy, "Software Requirements Specification", *Wedunnit!*, 2016. [Online]. Available: http://wedunnit.me/ass1/webfiles/Req1.pdf [Accessed: 10- Jan- 2017].

[2] H. Cadogan, S. Davison, T. Fox, W. Hodkinson, C. Hughes and A. Pearcy, "Method Selection and Planning", *Wedunnit!*, 2016. [Online]. Available: http://wedunnit.me/ass1/webfiles/Plan1.pdf [Accessed: 10- Jan- 2017].

[3] "IntelliJ IDEA the Java IDE", *JetBrains*, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.jetbrains.com/idea/. [Accessed: 23- Jan- 2017].

[4] "Unity - Game Engine", *Unity*, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://unity3d.com/. [Accessed: 23- Jan- 2017].

[5] H. Cadogan, S. Davison, T. Fox, W. Hodkinson, C. Hughes and A. Pearcy, “UpdatedRisks.pdf”, Wedunnit!, 2017 [Online]. Available: http://wedunnit.me/webfiles/ass2/Updated-Risks.pdf [Accessed: 24 - Jan - 2017]