**Updates on Assessment 1 Deliverables**

**Stakeholders:** Richard Paige, University of York Communications Office

**Team:** Barney Morgan, Cameron Smith, Harry Berge, Jake Phillips, Matthew Wilkie, Rob Weddell

**PROVIDE REFERENCE TO UPDATED DOCUMENTS!**

**Updated requirements.**

Given the fact that the specification for the game did not change and the scope of the game did not increase (risk 4) there were minimal changes to the overall requirements. When we received our feedback we took this on board to try and make the necessary changes to improve our documents that little bit more.

However, it was found that some requirements had been omitted from the initial requirements, such as req (ADD THIS) which specifies that areas of the game should be initially locked and inaccessible until progressing through the storyline. By adding these requirements it allowed the development team to become more focused and solved any ambiguity in development.

In addition to this, some requirements have been altered due to their lack of testability. This was brought to our attention after the the assessment 1 feedback and, after reviewing the requirements as a team, lead to a necessary changes to remove any ambiguity in our requirements. Requirement 2.6 has been changed so that we can test the impact on what was before defined as ‘skill’, and show the benefits of learning the game mechanics and how this affects the player’s experience in the game. Similarly, requirement 3.3 has been changed due to its difficulty to validate how clearly the code is written and how well a new development team will be able to take over the code.

Furthermore, we have decided to remove the requirement 2.9. We previously labelled this requirement as a stretch requirement and have now decided to remove this feature because of the limiting time constraints and we feel if we implemented this feature it would be an inefficient use of our time.

… (Can't really do this until we get feedback)

**Method, plans update.**

Due to the meticulous planning done within assessment 1, it was found that the plan for the project remained comprehensive enough without making any major changes. The team still followed a collaborative agile method, however it was clear that certain jobs were better suited for certain team members. Due to this, the workload was roughly split into 3 different categories: The implementations of game mechanics (coding), the development of graphics, and the documentation of the group’s progress. This meant that whilst there was a large backlog of tasks open to the team to choose from, certain members opted to focus on the tasks which were most applicable for their skillset. These tasks roughly related to the team roles allocated in the previous method plan.

Whilst the Gantt charts were roughly accurate to the flow of the teams work, they were found to be rather limiting with the agile method. This meant that there was much more overlap than expected, with some aspects being completed in a different order and a different timeframe than originally planned. Additionally, updating our original documents for Assessment 2 took longer than expected, therefore, it has become clear that we will need to allocate more time for this in later submissions. It was decided to update the Gantt charts [link] in order to reflect this change. (UPDATE THE CHARTS)

**Risk assessment and mitigation update.**

The risk assessment we produced for assessment 1 was still appropriate as we proceeded onto assessment 2. The table format used is easy to understand, with each row providing useful information about each risk and which team members are responsible for each risk. This is followed up with the likeliness and impact of each risk as well as how to mitigate the potential risk, helping to reduce any risk arisal. This means only minor updates are needed in this section of the documentation.

One development needed in this document is a process for updating the risk register throughout the project. This development has becomes necessary due to further risks being found during the project that were not previously thought of and thus not put into the original document. For this reason as well as the assessment 1 feedback suggesting we implement an updating process, we have specified a method for updating the risk and mitigation table with any new risks that we come across throughout the project or any new potential risks that we may discover when progressing through the project. This method is in keeping with that previously used for the assessment 1 document as we have decided that method works well for us as a team.

ADDITIONAL RISKS FOUND DURING ASS. 2/TAKEOVER RISKS?
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