SHOWROOM

Change Report

Risky Python: Luis Jesús Cepeda

Jaime Antolín

Álvaro López

Francisco Gómez

Diego Movilla

Index:

Specification:

In one of the requests was asked to add the introducion of a key to all the different meanings of all the diagram pieces. However, we consider that a connoisseur of the different types of diagrams should be able to understand their meaning.

Design:

One of the requests is the lack of the Use Case 11 (Log out) in the CRC Cards. However, this Use Case was already included in the "User Interface" and the "Admin Interface" cards.

Risks:

We have not included the "ScoreCard" sheet they suggested as we think the format in which we have written every risk, makes the document legible and pretty eye-catching.

Moreover, we did not merge the document into just 1 page, basically, as a personal point of view, because it would give the impression of incomplete information. However, we think that having 2 pages does not make the comprehension more difficult.

Indeed, they suggested separating contingency plans and risks. We though that the fact of having a structure such as:

1. Risk 1 - Impact - Probability - Contingency Plan

2. Risk 2...

would make it easier to read and it would give a clearer view of the risk management document, specially, a clearer view of each risk separately, rather than changing page and founding its contingency plan, going backwards again...

Even though it looks like we have not changed much, we have applied several modifications to our document which makes it much more complete.

Planning:

Request 1 was rejected because it stated that it was confusing to have previous iterations of other groups. This is a requirement for the submission.

Nothing was done about request 3 because this is not the place to explain how the different classes connect between each other. If you want to learn about that, look at the CRC Cards or at the Specification.

Request 4 was rejected, the Gantt chart for iteration 1 wasn't made because we are on the second iteration now so we plan ahead, not for what has already been done.

Request 7 was rejected because extending the final time for integration and testing would put us out of the deadline that we have established by a wide margin. We also believe that, as we are testing and implementing after every iteration, everything will be ready at the end and most of the work should be already done.

Request 8 was rejected because we believe that it would be a waste of resources having our 5 staff members working on one class at the same time, especially with a class like the 'admin interface' which isn't that demanding. We prefer to split our resources effectively in order to meet our deadlines.