

Sea of Geese

Updates

n.b. Changes in Assessment 1 Deliverables have been shown in the updated documents by highlighting the relevant portions in yellow.

Updated requirements

Requirement 1.5 has been amended. Instead of requiring an in-game tutorial system, we now require a user manual. This should be easier to implement as well as being more in line with the requirements for Assessment 2.

Requirement 1.7 was removed, as we judged that having a story was beyond the brief of the assessment.

Requirement 1.8 has been added, which clarifies requirements for the screens system. This has been added because we now know that the screen system is used for our implementation of the game.

Requirements 2.1, 2.11, and 2.12 have been removed. This is because we have found that, with the framework we used, it was easier to implement movement as continuous motion controlled by the arrow keys, instead of the grid-based movement that we originally planned.

Requirement 2.2 has been changed to remove reference to the previously-planned grid-based system.

We feel it is important to point out requirements that are yet to be implemented as of the end of Assessment 2. Requirement 2.3 refers to the two halves of the map, and at the moment only one half is implemented. Requirement 2.6 refers to the finished product, whereas for Assessment 2 only 3 colleges and 2 departments are required. Similarly, 2.8, 2.10, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, and 5.2 are not required for Assessment 2 and are therefore planned to be implemented at a later date. These have all been highlighted in cyan.

Updated Requirements:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedReq1.pdf

Methods, plans update

Our original plan did not specify which IDE we would use. This is a major omission as our choice of IDE will be used from Assessment 2 to the end of the project. This has now been clarified as the IntelliJ IDE.

The different nature of Assessment 2 from Assessment 1 has necessitated a change in assigned roles. These roles are more abstract than the ones in Assessment 1. This should hopefully mean that the roles require minimal change as we move into Assessment 3.

By assigning the role of Meeting chair, we have also made the role of Scrum Master more consistent as they will be the same person.

Development has been assigned to two members of the team. It was felt that as development is such a large part of the assessments from now on, it would be best to allocate two members instead of one. This allows for one to check the ideas for implementation of the other, and vice versa. It also allows for one to be overhead one aspect of development, while the other heads up another section.

Later in the development cycle, as we were approaching the end of the assessment, more of our members started focusing on development, in order to ensure that we had the game finished in time and that the code was clean and easy to comprehend.

Updated Method Selection and Planning:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedPlan1.pdf

Risk assessment and mitigation update

Following feedback from Assessment 1 and our experience of work during Assessment 2, we have decided it is important to define the risk ownership in our Risk Assessment and Mitigation document. This has been achieved by adding a new column to the risk table which indicates which member(s) of the team is/are responsible for making sure the risk is avoidable. This should help us to avoid risks developing in the project as having specific people looking out for specific risks means that potential problems should be identified much earlier than otherwise.

In addition, we have now colour coded the “Likelihood”, “Impact”, and “Damage Extent” columns of the risk assessment table with a spectrum of colours, from dark red representing the most negative option, to green representing the most positive option. This will allow us to see at a glance which risks are the most important to avoid, as well as allowing team members to see how severe the risks are which they are assigned to.

We have also clarified the categories for “Impact”. Instead of a scale of minor, trivial, moderate, harmful, and severe, we now use the scale of trivial, minor, moderate, major, and severe. This should hopefully be more intuitive for team members and others to understand.

As far as the risks themselves are concerned, the risks we identified during Assessment 1 still stand, and so we have not removed any of them.

Updated Risk and Mitigation:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedRisk1.pdf

Bibliography

[1] Updated Requirements document:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedReq1.pdf

[2] Updated Method Selection and Planning document:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedPlan1.pdf

[3] Updated Risk Assessment and Mitigation document:

https://davidjnorman.github.io/SEPR/assessment_2/UpdatedRisk1.pdf