

Changes

Cohort 1, Team 3

Ari Kikezos

Arya Enkhnasan

Ben Green

Calum Wright

Lilac Graham

Skylar Garrett

Overview of our process for updating deliverables:

Our team made use of GitHub to attain the code developed by the previous team and track our changes to the project. The commit history allowed us to see who made what changes to what files when, which made the task of reviewing other team members' code before merging it to the main project far easier than alternative methods (for example, emailing versions of the entire project around on every change). We also made use of Google Docs' edit history functionality to see what changes had been made to essay-like deliverables (Risk2, Impl2, etc.) and to write our own documents and documentation. This document is also hosted on Google Docs using a Google Drive Shared Drive which allowed us to make more detailed notes and include justification on what material changes had been made to the project as a whole

Changes to deliverables from Assessment 1:

Requirements:

URLs of the original document : <https://eng1-group9.github.io/website/Req1.pdf>

URLs of the updated document:

<https://nsq511.github.io/ENG1-TIV-Part-2/assessment2/Req2.pdf>

Changes made to the Requirements document:

- **Added new requirements:** New requirements added outlining the new parts of the project that need to be implemented.
Justification: The scope of the game has been expanded (achievements, leaderboard, larger map, more events) and the requirements documentation needs to reflect that.
- **Rearranged Document:** Changed the layout of the document from paragraphs to table format. All requirements stayed in the order and location they were in, just changed to be in a table.
Justification: Removed extraneous information that wasn't necessary and allowed for each requirement to be IDed and prioritised.

Architecture:

URLs of the original document: <https://eng1-group9.github.io/website/Arch1.pdf>

URLs of the updated document:

<https://nsq511.github.io/ENG1-TIV-Part-2/assessment2/Arch2.pdf>

Changes made to the Architecture document:

- **Added Librarian class diagram:** A new Librarian class diagram was added to represent the newly introduced negative event logic.
Justification: The Librarian plays a central role in triggering and managing negative events, so a dedicated class diagram was required to clearly justify its responsibilities and interactions within the architecture.

- Added hidden and conditional events class diagram:** A new class diagram was added to explain how hidden and conditional events operate within the system.
Justification: These events involve internal conditions and state-based logic that are not directly visible to the player. The diagram provides an architectural justification for how these events are evaluated and triggered within the existing system structure.
- Figure 1 (Monolithic closed-layered architecture diagram):** The diagram itself was not changed, but its description was updated to justify the updated game logic.
Justification: The system architecture remains monolithic and closed-layered, making changes to the diagram unnecessary, while the description required updating to reflect the revised game logic.
- Other diagrams and descriptions:** All other diagrams and their descriptions were updated to reflect the updated game logic.
Justification: These diagrams directly model game behaviour and interactions that changed during development, so updates were required to maintain accuracy.
- General documentation:** The rest of the architectural documentation was kept the same, except for the first paragraph.
Justification: The system structure, architectural characteristics, design decisions, and design principles remained unchanged. The first paragraph was updated only to indicate that the document reflects the current version of the game.

Method selection and planning:

URLs of the original document: <https://eng1-group9.github.io/website/Plan1.pdf>

URLs of the updated document:

<https://nsq511.github.io/ENG1-TIV-Part-2/assessment2/Plan2.pdf>

Changes made to the Method selection and planning document:

- Method Selection:** This section was kept the same.
Justification: We used the same methodology (Agile) and frameworks (XP and Scrum) as the previous group, so this section was not changed.
- Documentation:** This section was kept the same.
Justification: We used Google Docs for documentation, which was the same as the previous group so this section was not changed.
- Communication:** An extra paragraph was added describing the method of communication used in the second half of the assessment.
Justification: The previous group used Discord and WhatsApp as their primary methods of communication, whereas we used Slack.
- Version control:** This section was kept the same.

Justification: The previous group used GitHub for version control, which was the same version control system that we used.

- **Organisational approach:** An additional paragraph was added at the end of this section.

Justification: The second half of the assessment did not require us to use Gantt charts, and we also held online meetings over the holidays, whereas the previous group held meetings in person every week.

- **Project plan:** The project plan was updated to include the report of every week leading up to the holidays.

Justification: The previous document only contained reports up until week 6

Risk assessment and mitigation:

URLs of the original document: <https://eng1-group9.github.io/website/Risk1.pdf>

URLs of the updated document:

<https://nsq511.github.io/ENG1-TIV-Part-2/assessment2/Risk2.pdf>

Changes made to the Risk assessment and mitigation document:

- **General documentation:** The original document included risk identification, analysis, planning and monitoring. Risk analysis, planning, and monitoring were clear and well formatted, while risk identification differed slightly from our approach. Additionally, a “Type” field was added in the monitoring section.

Justification: We decided to keep risk analysis, planning, and monitoring as they were clearly described and properly formatted, but removed risk identification to maintain consistency with our own risk approach, and added the “Type” field in the monitoring section to improve the structure and clarity of risk categorisation.

Changes to the risk table:

- **Added column:** A new column added to the risk table to specify the type of each risk.

Justification: In the previous version, the type was implied through the ID (e.g., “TM1” to indicate team member associated risk), which was unclear. To improve clarity, a dedicated type column implied and simplified the IDs to a standard format such as R1 for “Risk 1”.

- **Updated R3:** This risk has been updated because, in the previous version of the risk table, the risk type for R3 was described as a technology risk, but it is actually a requirements risk.

Justification: Not following the client's requirements is a requirements-related risk, not a technology-related risk.

- **Updated R11:** Losing track of documents related to the project's progress was previously defined as a people related risk. In the updated version, it has been corrected and classified as a project related risk.

Justification: This risk impacts project organisation and progress, so it is more accurately classified as a project risk.

- **Added R2:** The game may run poorly or fail to perform as expected on devices with lower hardware capabilities.

Justification: The reason for including this risk is to ensure the player has no issues with performance regarding low-end hardware.

- **Added R14:** The scoring system may cause confusion and misunderstanding for users.

Justification: This risk is included to ensure that the scoring system is clear from the client's and player's perspective.

- **Added R15:** The maze design may be too easy or challenging, reducing player engagement and overall satisfaction.

Justification: This risk was added because complex or confusing maze design could discourage players, so it needed to be addressed.

- **Added R16:** The game might contain violent or inappropriate content that does not align with the client's requirement.

Justification: This risk was included to ensure the game meets the client's requirements by avoiding any violent or inappropriate content.

- **Added R17:** Players may be unable to pause, quit or restart the game at will, which might lead to accessibility issues and a negative user experience.

Justification: This risk was added to ensure a positive user experience by allowing players to quit, pause or restart the game at any time.

- **Added R18:** Some features may not be clearly defined, which could lead to misunderstanding and affect the user's performance.

Justification: This risk was included to prevent misinterpretation of the system's functionality.

- **Added R19:** The game's objectives may be difficult for users to understand, reducing engagement and hindering a positive user experience.

Justification: This risk was added to ensure the objectives are easily understood, creating a positive user experience.

- **Added R20:** The game might have limitations that prevent all users, including those with disabilities, from accessing or enjoying it fully.

Justification: This risk was added to ensure the game provides basic accessibility features.

- **Added R21:** Uneven distribution of work among team members may cause delays in project completion.

Justification: This risk was included to ensure tasks are assigned evenly, avoiding delays and maintaining project process.

- **Added 22:** Insufficient communication among team members might lead to misunderstanding and confusion, affecting project progress.

Justification: This risk was added to emphasize the need for regular and clear communication, ensuring smooth collaboration.