Change Report

Group 12 - T12

Assessment 2 updated version

Members:

Ruslan Allahverdiyev (ra1354)
Billy Brudenell (bb1085)
Harry Erskine (hde501)
Usman Khan (muk509)
Adi Laskowski (akl532)
Ben Remmer (br894)
Ollie Stoole (os878)

2.a)

To update documents we request the team 13 google drive documents, so we could update and change them where necessary on our own shared google drive. This will make updating and changing documents easier.

With the code and website we forked team 13 github repositories so we could edit and change their code with changing the original. We then set about making changes and committing to the new forked repository that all are team member had access to.

2. b) Updated Deliverables

Originals can be found : https://t12official.github.io/t12squared/#version-control-repository
New version can be found :
https://t12official.github.io/t12squared/#edited-assessment-1-documents

i. Requirements

Updated requirements with the new features as specified by customer and specification (3/04/2023)

User requirements Changes

UR_DIFFICULTY	The game should have different levels of difficulty	Making the game a difficulty level unplayable due to it being to hard	Shall
UR_POWER_UPS	The game should have 5 special power ups	Power ups make game to easy and not as fun	Shall
UR_SAVE_GAME	Allow players to save the state of the game at any point and resume a saved game later	Game not saving correctly meaning users will lose progress	Shall

Functional requirements Changes

FR_ENDLESS_MODE	The game must have an endless mode where customers will keep arriving more and more often until you lose. Keeps track of most customers served in given time limit		UR_PLAYABLE

FR_REPUTATION	There should be a reputation system. You start with 3 reputation points: you lose the game if you lose all reputation points.		UR_LOSS UR_WIN
FR_BURN	The if a item is left cooking for too long then it will burn		UR_LOSS
FR_DIFFICULTY	Have 3 different difficulty levels that can be selected from the main menu screen	The hard mode could be unplayable and easy mode may not give any challenge at all	UR_WIN UR_PLAYABLE UR_DIFFICULTY
FR_POWER_UPS	Have 5 different power ups that appear and chef can pick up		UR_PLAYABLE UR_POWER_UPS
FR_SAVE_GAME	The system will allow the user to save progress		UR_PLAYABLE UR_SAVE_GAME

ii. Changes to architecture:

Ingredients class diagram. We have expanded the ingredients class diagram to allow for new ingredients to be added to the game. We added Pizza dough, cheese and potatoes in order to meet the new recipe requirements.

The hud class diagram saw two changes. Firstly, we added a class StartScreen into the class diagram as it is implemented in the games code but not included in the architecture documentation. We also added an idle screen class which will allow us to implement an idle screen into the game.

The final state diagram received an update as well. The update here simply added the fail state of a player losing all of their reputation points into the game.

iii. Method selection and planning

Since the team we took over from used essentially the same resources, methods and libraries, there were few changes that we had to make.

There was a lack of scrum meeting organisation by the other team, so we included our team's way of planning weekly scrum meetings. This was done via when2meet.com and we have attacked screenshots to show how these were organised, at the end of our method selection and planning document.

Another change we made was how our team was organised. From experience in our group, we find it better to have a looser team structure than that of the previous team, they opted for assigning certain tasks to certain people.

The previous team also used trello to assign tasks to people and keep track of their progress, while our team used our weekly scrum meetings to organise and assign tasks to team members, so we removed that part of their documentation.

We also removed their project Plan due to information redundancy. In its place was our own plan outlining the critical path with a short description. And after that we added our scrum meeting planning as described above.

Under the Project Plan part, we removed details about Assessment 1’s Gantt diagram to make room for some images.

iv. Risk assessment and mitigation

Changed the title page of the risk assessment in order to reflect the updated ownership of the documents to avoid confusion. (02/05)

Change the headings from subtitles into Heading 1 for ‘Risk Assessment and Mitigation’ and Heading 2 for ‘Risk Management Process’ and ‘Risk Register’ in order to improve the ease of access via the outline, also to make it consistent with the title page fonts and size.(02/05)

Removed some empty space above ‘Risk Assessment and Mitigation’ heading in order to increase usable space. (02/05)

Changed the wording of Risk Monitoring description to make it more concise. (02/05)

Added a justification for why the risks were split by category and types as the original document did not clarify this. (02/05)

The ‘owner’ column was updated to correspond with our team, people were assigned risks to manage based on the part of the project they focused on (e.g people responsible for testing were assigned mainly testing related risk). For any risk that was deemed broad enough to affect every area of the project, the whole team was made aware to be vigilant and manage the risk accordingly, this was done to spread out the risks more evenly so a single person does not get overwhelmed with too many risks to watch over. (03/05)

As the fundamental objective of the project was practically on par with the first part of the assessment, the same risks would apply to this stage of the project, thus, it seemed redundant to change the majority of the risks. However, a number of new risks were added that dealt more so with the acquisition of a different team's project as well as testing, the added risk are: R6, R7, R8 and R9. (03/05)

Due to the way in which categories are organised in the table, risk of a certain category had to go into a specific place, which would change the ID of the proceeding risk. Therefore, whenever a new risk was added, the risk following it would have their ID incremented appropriately.

Changed the wording of risk in R24 to make it more concise in order to free up some space. (03/05)

In risk R10, the ownership is split into teams of two in order to correspond with the mitigation strategy and so that people are aware with whom they are working on the specific part of the project so they can both watch over the risk for themselves and the person. Having a single person or a single team of two watch over the entire risk could have proven to be too much for a person as they would have to be constantly keep track of all areas o the project simultaneously, with the teams of two, people are less likely to to get overwhelmed as they'll only have to keep track of the other person in a part of the project that they're also working in. (03/05)