Team iPatch

Assessment 2: Updated Deliverables

Christian Pardillo Laursen

Filip Makosza

Joseph Leigh

Mingxuan Weng

Oliver Relph

Updated Requirements:

Updated Requirements Link:

After reviewing our assessment 1 feedback, we believe our overall process and specificity of our requirements were well suited to our project. This leads us to believe that as of now no major changes are required to the table of requirements.

We did however make some minor 'quality of life' changes to the requirements. Requirement 2.a was removed from our requirements as we came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to the overall game as a whole and also was not a requirement originally specified to us by the client.

In addition to this we also made changes to requirement 9.c as during the implementation of our game we discovered showing the colleges as enemies and the departments as entities worked better with the rest of our program and overall gameflow. This is because the departments are designed to help the player whereas colleges are enemies and can shoot as well as be shot. We therefore felt they should be separately defined objects rather than under the united object 'Island'.

Moreover, we decided that it would be in our best interest to colour code our requirements table in order to see which requirements had been fulfilled (green), were currently in progress (orange) and which had yet to be attempted (red). This allows us to see our progression and when used in conjunction with the gantt chart, allows us to properly re-evaluate any necessary changes to our chart based on which requirements had already been met.

Upon further inspection of our feedback from assessment 1, the fact that some of our original approach was not justified appropriately, for example, not explaining our simplification of the recommended template, has been appended and such choices have been rationally explained.

Updated Methods and Tools:

Updated Methods and Tools Link:

After reviewing our feedback for our previous 'Method Selection and Planning' we have come to the conclusion that our method selection, and our team organisation is currently not in need of any major changes. However our Tools section could be in need of some more justification and comparison as to why we chose certain tools over others.

Our initial change was to specify our use of Git against other version control systems. We added a justification comparing Git to other version control systems such as subversion and how the distributed nature of git was the main selling point to us as a team.

In addition to this, we also compared our use of GitHub to other options like BitBucket and GitLab; and our other software choices to other popular choices and why our choices were chosen specifically for our team.

In terms of team roles, we felt the position of report editor needed reassigning however the rest of the team seemed happy with their roles and so were left unchanged. We also elected a team of main developers consisting of Christian, Filip and Joseph due to their previous experience and confidence in their coding abilities.

Our Gantt chart was followed during the initial implementation of our project however some tasks took longer than initially predicted and so we had a period of time where we completed many tasks in a short period. So although we didn't follow it completely to plan, we managed to catch up and so the Gantt chart is still valid as of the end of assessment 2. When we decide which project to take on for assessment 3, we will update the Gantt chart with new tasks and sub-tasks which are valid to the new project.

Update of Risk Assessment

Link to Updated Risk Assessment:

Upon reviewing our feedback from assessment 1 we decided the best course of action would be to make some small changes to our risk assessment and mitigation.

Firstly, we added a process at the top of the risk table describing how we would go about adding a new risk were one to arise, and also how to remove a risk should it become irrelevant.

In terms of new risks, we did not feel as if any new risks had come to mind during the implementation of our project and so the original risks in the table have been left unchanged. However we did decide to add some new risks in anticipation of getting a new project for assessment 3. We added risk 15,16 and 17: Risk 15 describes the risk of the new project using a different framework and how we would mitigate that; Risk 16 describes what we would do if the new project has critical errors; and Risk 17 describes what we would do if the new project has bad code formatting, has little documentation or is very 'cluttered'.

Our current system of identifying severity and likelihood of risks seems to work very well for our project and so we have kept the same system, in addition, mostly all of the risks seem to have the same likelihood and severity except Risk 13. Risk 13 describes the risk that team members have different ideas on how the game should operate leading to conflicts in development. We decided to change the severity of this risk from medium to high as now that we are further into the production of the project, an issue like this could set us back weeks of work.

In addition to these changes, we found from our assessment 1 feedback that we needed to show our discussion on who would be responsible for each risk. We felt that as a team the risks themselves were all very broad to our roles and so all team members have equal responsibility in ensuring the mitigation of all risks. This discussion has been added to the bottom of the risk table.