

## **5. Updates on Assessment 1 Deliverables**

In all of the updated deliverables the following key is followed, in order to show complete traceability and transparency of updates made:

Black - Unchanged text

Red - New text

Blue - Removed text

### **a) Updated Requirements**

i.

#### **Assessment 1 Requirements**

#### **Assessment 2 Requirements**

ii.

Several changes were made to the statement of requirements. In order to fit the page limit restrictions, the constraints table as well as two functional requirements (FR\_ENGINE\_SPECS and FR\_ENEMY\_HEALTH) have been removed from the document as these were unchanged - they can still be found in the assessment 1 deliverable.

One additional user requirement was added as it was realised that it was forgotten from the original report, this is UR\_FORTSHOOT. This UR is crucial requirement for the gameplay and so was added with *Shall* priority.

An *Assumptions* column was added to the FR and NFR tables in order to make any assumptions made by the team clearer for each requirement. Previously, this was merged with the *Risk* column but it was decided that this could be confusing so it is better to distinguish between them.

Several FRs, for example FR\_GOALS, have been relocated to NFRs where it has been realised that they are more suitable as they describe the criteria for the game and so are non-functional; not functional.

More detail was added to several FRs so that they are less vague. An example of this is including the rate of health regeneration in FR\_REGEN. All requirements should now have an appropriate level of specifics. The detail of the fit criteria has also been improved, such as the specified standards in NFR\_MAINTAINABILITY.

## **b) Methods, Plans update**

i.

[Assessment 1 Method and Plan](#)

[Assessment 2 Method and Plan](#)

ii.

### **Software Engineering Methods**

No changes were made to this section of the documentation due to its proven adequacy in providing our team with a methodology outline which has resulted in our team's current engineering approach. Due to the lack of change, this section of the report has been omitted in the updated version as to ensure that the page limits were obeyed in this deliverable. This omitted information is still very much applicable to the project but has been simply been removed for clarity's sake – it can still be accessed by viewing the original Assessment 1 deliverable. This page conservation is done as advised by Dimitris.

### **Tools Overview**

Where none were supplied earlier, all tools now have an alternate described and discounted so that the reader can fully understand the choices made.

Two additional tools are now described: LibGDX for our game development framework, and Eclipse as our chosen Integrated Development Environment. It was realised that these crucial tools were mistakenly not mentioned in the earlier deliverable.

### **Team Organisation**

Clarity on the appointment of group roles was added as it was realised that it was not obvious how roles were literally assigned. Previously, information was only given on the criteria used.

We believe that the roles themselves have proved suitable and so do not require any change.

### **Project Plan**

The Gantt chart used for deliverable planning has been updated to include more detail for phases 3 and 4 of the project. This will allow us to monitor our progress in the next assessments and contribute to an even workflow. The same method of showing start/finish dates, tasks, dependencies etc was followed as in the previous version. Details of this are described in the *methods and planning* document.

### **c) Risk Assessment and Mitigation Update**

i.

#### Assessment 1 Risk

#### Assessment 2 Risk

ii. [tldr: one update made]

The majority of the risk assessment document was left unchanged due to agreement of the Risk Owners that the previous mitigation was, for the most part, satisfactory. This decision was made during the weekly meetings in which risks were monitored in parallel with our development – obviously, these meetings will continue into Phase 3 and 4 of the project. It was also decided that there would be no need to change the current risk owners as these again were satisfactory.

The exception to this being the addition of one new risk, identified as PJ13 and highlighted in the new risk documentation. This risk was appended due to agreement in the risk meetings that it was having a somewhat significant impact on the teams' productivity and individual relationships within the team. As members were repeatedly late to scheduled meetings, the punctual members felt it showed a lack of respect and dedication to the project which impacted our ability to work together. It also meant that planned tasks for meetings either must be hurried when there is a hard finish time, or that meetings finished a lot later than agreed in order to get everything done. Because of this, the risk was assigned a 'Moderate' severity rating. Mitigation methods mean that the likelihood of this risk is saved from being 'High' category.