Updated Requirements Justification

Updated Requirements Key

In the updated requirements, the changed requirements are highlighted, such that the original requirements are shown in yellow and the updates to the original are shown in blue.

Justification for Changes

Design and Implementation Constraints (2.8)

We decided to switch from an isometric view to a bird's eye view due to the extensive time that would be required to create an isometric view. To produce an isometric view that could clearly present the state of the game and be visually appealing, we would need to model some portions of the map. It was decided that the gain from this would not outweigh the time expended.

Game controls (3.2.1)

We decided to add keyboard controls to certain part of the game in particular data entry. The keyboard will be used when deciding how many units to allocate to each territory, how many to move between territories and how many units to attack with. We decided to change this as it allowed for greater ease of use because if a with only a mouse the user would have to click up the number of units they wanted to select.

Spawn Units (4.1.2 - REQ 1.1)

We decided to increase the number of units spawned per territory from 1 to 10. This was done to give the game a larger sense of scale along with giving the user more flexibility in how they move and allocate their units. By multiplying the number of units by 10, players can split up the units they get from a territory and allocate them to numerous territories.

Updated Methods and Planning Justification

Updated Methods and Planning Key

In the updated methods & planning documentation, the changes are highlighted so that the original version is shown in yellow and the updated version is shown in blue.

As a group, we identified the changes to the method and planning by evaluating the effectiveness of the planning and its usefulness for this assessment. We also considered how the plan might be affected by our next assessment and the changes we could make to improve it. Finally, we then noted any changes or clarifications to our initial approach that we should make based from these observations.

Justifications for changes

Software Engineering approach

This was updated because we felt our initial explanation wasn't particularly clear with what exactly our approach consisted of and how it related to Scrum. Updating this gave our plan a more formal structure which will hopefully allow us to refer to it more often if guidance is necessary. We are happy with having chosen a Scrum-like approach and consider it to be well justified given the project we are developing. Our collaboration tools have remained fairly similar, however in the next assessment we may wish to communicate with the developers of the project we are taking over so that has been taking into account. As we are working more with code development than in the previous assessment, planning around that has also been considered such as with precautionary unit testing.

Team organisation

This was updated to reflect the changes made in the previous section. We have not changed how work is allocated as we are happy with it, however it has been made clear how we were adapting to allocating work while developing code. We have also added our plans for continuing the project in the event of any difficulties. Again, this is to clarify the process so we may refer to it for guidance.

Gantt chart

The Gantt chart was updated to show the detailed approach of assessment 3 for the group, as assessment 2 has come to an end. The Gantt chart showing the overall plan was not changed as it showed the overview for assessment 3, which is still very similar, but the specific plan could not be demonstrated due to the time scale used on the x-axis. Therefore, the new Gantt chart was created. The new Gantt chart shows an overflow section, this is time that has not been currently allocated to any specific task and will be used when/if required. This addition has been put in place in the event of any difficulties during the project so that there is adequate time to fix any problems. This slot is not completely empty as the implementation phase will run in parallel, however not all group members will need to focus on implementation at this time, so the tasks can be split if necessary.

Updated Risk Assessment Justification

Justification for changes

For the risk assessment there are only a few changes that have been made because the original risks covered most of the possible issues which could arise.

One of these changes is to the format of the risk register, in which the table of risks and the table describing mitigation techniques have been merged into a unified risk register. This was done as the merged table is easier to maintain and use, as all the information related to a risk can been seen at once.

Also, a couple of extra risks have been added to the register. This is because it is important that the risks stay relevant to the current stage of development and any new risks that occur should be assessed as soon as they become apparent.

Additionally, a description of our risk monitoring process has been included in order to clarify how risks will be monitored by the team, and how any problems that arise from risks will be dealt with.

Finally, a risk updating section has been added to the documentation which describes the process the team took to make sure that the risks are updated if necessary. This section has been added to clarify when existing risks will be updated, and new risks will be documented.