# MEETING MINUTES: SUMO DIGITAL GROUP PROJECT

**Date of Meeting : 1st May 2019**

**Time of Meeting : 11.00am – 11.55am**

Attendees:- Fraser King, Mihai Giurea, Harry Wadman, Mircea Lazar

Apologies from:- N/A

## Item One - Post-mortem of Previous Week

As previously highlighted in the pre-Easter meeting minutes (dated 03.04), the primary objective of the previous sprint was to near completion of the week 12 deliverables outlined in the group’s week 6 presentation. Significant progression was made during the previous sprint in ascertaining this objective, with the group adding in a number of previously designed rooms as Unity prefabs and implementing vital ‘on event’ code (player death state etc…).

Moreover, the group also conducted further playtesting, with all feedback aggregated on Google Forms – the link for this survey can be found here - <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1T-lQX3N2dpYNe4urAywULPAub5KTLwnGmOGWc86RmTc/> . The feedback gathered from this playtesting is aggregated in Item Four below.

## Item Two – Tasks for the Current Sprint

The task breakdown for Sprint 11 is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Team Member** | **Task Title(s)** | **Est.Time** |
| Fraser King | **\*TO BE UPDATED WHEN SPRINT IS LIVE ON JIRA\*** |  |
| Mircea Lazar |  |  |
| Harry Wadman |  |  |
| Mihai Giurea |  |  |

## Item Three – Analysis and Review of Feedback

The group received feedback from two primary sources as part of this sprint – ‘regular’ playtesters who aggregated their thoughts of the latest build in Google Form surveys and feedback from Joe Kinglake of Sumo Digital. The group’s analysis and response to this feedback from each source is found appropriately below.

**Joe Kinglake Feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback Received** | **Group Response** | **Actions Taken** |
| **“**Boomstick (Group 16) provided a very succinct presentation of the described genre and how they were attempting to subvert the conventions of it. I could easily see this being an enjoyable mechanic in a roguelike dungeon crawling experience” | The group is very pleased that Joe agrees that our game suitably meets the given brief and that the core mechanic has the potential to formulate an enjoyable ‘dungeon crawling experience’ . | *N/A* |
| “Something to consider would be some kind of risk vs reward gameplay in both the second to second gameplay & the moment to moment to keep the experience continually fresh and driven by player skill and understanding of the system – perhaps something like a reload and clip mechanic that prevents the player from moving whilst reloading and in-world obstacles that explode and damage the player on impact placed carefully in the levels?” | The group agrees with Joe’s analysis that the game would benefit from further iteration on the core mechanic(s) to provide the player with more meaningful decisions in the “second to second & [..] moment to moment gameplay”. Potential solutions on how to approach this design challenge were formulated and conceptualised early in development (as evidenced in the numerous design research documents found in the ‘Research’ folder of our GitHub repository). Ultimately, due to scope constraints over the course of the project, the group were unable to implement any ‘clip and reload’ or ‘secondary weapon’ style solutions to this issue – our limited programming resources instead were focussed on fully implementing the procedural dungeon generation system and enemy controllers. Given further development time, these are features we would love to implement and iterate upon in the game!  The recommendation of exploding barrels is very interesting and, due to ease of implementation (the group already possesses the necessary assets), will be implemented into the next build of the game. | As a compromise, the group proposes to further iterate upon the player character variables for reload delay and knockback strength to fine-tune the existing core mechanic. This also ties in nicely with existing player requesting minor tuning to the core mechanic.  Implementation of exploding barrels. |

**Player Feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback Received** | **Group Response** | **Actions Taken** |
| Iteration on player character variables – e.g. “I feel that the knockback on the gun was a little too far.” | Whilst most playtesting feedback has indicated that players intuitively understand the core mechanic within seconds of playing, there has been mixed feedback on the firing delay/reload time and knockback rate. The group agrees that further tweaks can be made. | Lowered Reload Delay  Slightly Lowered Knockback Distance |
| Additional weapons for variation | The group agrees that varying weapons would keep the player experience ‘fresh’ between runs and randomised mechanics such as this are typically seen as ‘pillars’ of the roguelike genre. Unfortunately, due to the scope of the project, the group does not possess the resources necessary to implement additional weapons into the game.  The group has considered procedurally generating the variables of the player character for each run, however this possesses issues on numerous fronts. Firstly, if knockback distance or reload speed were to dramatically change between each run, the barrier to entry when learning the new mechanic would be much higher – the player will always be uncertain of how the player character responds to their input. Furthermore, with no upgrade system present (like with many contemporary roguelikes), a player with bad-RNG at the start of a run would be shackled until the end of the run. | *N/A* |
| Rooms feel empty/lack interaction | It is clear that, both from player feedback and Joe’s feedback, existing rooms lack interactivity and, in extreme situations, seem sparse and lacking props.  This issue primarily stems from the group’s use of asset packs – existing packs lack numerous props and, despite creating new props “in-house”, variation is still lacking.  The group proposes to try and address this issue through the implementation of exploding barrels, as also recommended in Joe’s feedback. This adds an additional layer of interactivity to rooms, as well as a further risk/reward dynamic. As previously mentioned above, this is not resource intensive due to the group already possessing the necessary assets. | Implementation of Exploding Barrels |
| Presence of bugs | Numerous playtesters reported the presence of bugs within the latest build of the game. These include warped walls, dungeon rooms not connecting correctly and debug code being tied to right click.  All issues currently identified should be fixed in the next build. | Fixing Identified Bugs |

## Item Four – Objective of the Current Sprint

The current sprint is focused on iterating in accordance with the latest player/Joe’s feedback and with meeting as many of the week 12 deliverables as possible (as stated in our Week 6 presentation). These deliverables and how the group plans to achieve them are outlined below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **How will this be achieved?** |
| Fully Implemented Procedural-Dungeon System, Inclusive of 20+ hand curated dungeon rooms | Addition of four remaining room prefabs (16 are in the latest build). |
| 2 – 4 varied AI controllers, driving a range of modular enemies | The group agrees that, since the loss of our second programmer Sion, this objective is out of scope. This deliverable has been ‘downsized’ and now only a single enemy controller exists. |
| Numerous ‘Game Feel’ scripts implemented (e.g. Screen-shake, Pause On-Hit etc…) | Implementation of screen-shake and pause-on-hit scripts. |
| Full implementation of dungeon, character and weapon assets | This deliverable has already been achieved. |
| A playtested, iterated and generally polished core mechanic | As outlined in Item Three above, making the recommended adjustments in accordance with all given feedback. |

**Meeting Ended :- 11.55am**

**Minute Taker:- Fraser King**