

## Change Management

### Initial Changes and Discussions

The most urgent changes required for the game will be corrective changes, which will ensure that the game is fully functional before our continuation of the implementation. Ignoring these corrective changes could prevent our progress.

Additionally, before making changes to the implementation and documentation, the team will discuss and list any major additions (additive changes) required for the game. Doing this will allow the team to gain a general understanding of the large changes that need to be implemented and will ensure that these additions are tracked throughout the whole process.

### Changes to the code

During the implementation phase, additional changes may have to be made when unforeseen problems are identified. If this occurs, a change suggestion will be made and the group will discuss how to overcome the issue, which may end in the code or documentation being updated. However, before a change is accepted, the requirements will have to be consulted and if the change affects or overlooks a requirement, then an alternative fix may have to be found. Also, changes to the requirements documentation will only take place if the change is considered absolutely necessary for the game to function.

The only case where a change would not be first discussed would be when a change urgently needs to be made by a team member. In this situation, the change would be implemented, documented and then discussed by the group at the next meeting, ensuring that all team members are aware of the modification.

If the group decide to implement a change, it will be assigned to one or more team members. Once the change has been completed the addition will be tested, committed and then pushed onto GitHub, along with a note explaining what has been changed.

This allows the group to keep track of who completed the change and when the change was completed. These notes will be logged in a table along with the name, date & time of completion and a reason why the change has happened. Using both the GitHub notes and the table, the group will be able to see exactly what changed, even in a situation where the table was not updated at the time. This will avoid future confusion about what has been changed or implemented and will mean that other team members will not attempt to implement a change they had not realised was already completed, which will avoid wasting their time.

Additionally, if a deletive change is discovered during implementation, it will be discussed and treated like any other change.

Also, once the implementation of essential changes is complete, any perfective changes will be discussed. These improvements can then be completed and the same change management procedure will take place, ensuring that all types of changes are fully documented.

Change Table URL:

<https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/ChangeTable.pdf>

### Changes to the documentation

Updates to the documentation will be based off the changes recorded in the change table, meaning that the documentation is only adjusted for changes that have been implemented. Doing this will avoiding a situation where the documentation states a change to the code that in reality has not been completed, ensuring the documentation remains accurate for the game.

As with the changes to the code, any changes to the documentation will be clearly recorded. In addition, the group is using Google Drive and Google Docs for all of the documentation, meaning that the name, time and date of the last update will be recorded on the document.

## **Updated GUI Report Justification**

### Justification of Changes:

Many of the changes to this report involved adding descriptions and justification of the new features that had been implemented during this phase of implementation, meaning that the report remains up to date with the current state of the game.

Some of the descriptions in the original document referenced GUI elements that did not exist in the game, therefore these sections have been corrected so that the document is accurate for the game it is describing. Additionally, some changes have been made to the format of the document in order to make the document easier to read, rather than repeating features for additional explanation.

### URL of the updated material:

[https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-GUI\\_Report.pdf](https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-GUI_Report.pdf)

## **Updated Testing Report Justification**

### Justification of Changes:

The original testing report contained both unit tests and GUI tests. This was changed to contain unit tests and requirements tests, as requirements tests are more suitable for testing the user experience and overall completeness of the implementation. The GUI tests were removed as the GUI was being tested adequately through the requirements tests. Test statistics were added to the end of the testing report to give the reader a clear overview of how the test phases went.

### URL of the updated material:

<https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-TestingReport.pdf>

### Updated Requirement Test Table:

<https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-RequirementTests.pdf>

### Updated Unit Test Table:

<https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-UnitTests.pdf>

## **Updated Methods and Planning Justification**

### Justification of Changes:

When updating the methods and planning strategy, we firstly looked at the previous team's methods and planning approach to this project and discussed them as a group. Through comparing their approach and ours, we decided whether we could draw upon any aspects that they used in their approach as well as if their approach was better suited for the project.

We discovered that they had a very similar development methodology (agile with the same collaboration tools bar Trello) and as such decided to leave ours unchanged unless we came into any particular difficulties throughout the course of developing the project. Their use of Trello was potentially something we could change but we felt comfortable using our to-do list method - everyone can quite clearly see what remains to be done and who needs to be doing it.

As for their organisation, we thought that having a more formal process for reviewing the work was interesting and have made sure that we reference the to-do list as guidance for what work should be reviewed in addition to letting whoever had done the work explain it.

As there were no major changes we used our original strategy as it has been working and the team is comfortable with it.

### URL of the updated material:

[https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-Methods\\_and\\_Planning.pdf](https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-Methods_and_Planning.pdf)

## **Updated Risk Assessment and Mitigation Justification**

### *Justification of Changes:*

The original risk assessment and mitigation are both up to date as they were written to be applicable to all stages of development. Therefore, there is no reason to change the content of the risks as they still apply the project. However, the one change made was to reassign the owners of each risk to the members of our team. This was simply done by replacing each of the members from the old development team with our team's members. Also, when making the update, it was important that the workload for the risks remained balanced and evenly distributed between team members.

### *URL of the updated material:*

[https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-Risk\\_Assessment.pdf](https://github.com/as2378/unlucky/raw/master/docs/files/Assessment3/Assessment3-Risk_Assessment.pdf)