Requirements Updates

All of the changes made to the requirements occured in the requirements tables, highlighted in yellow [link]. Most of the changes were motivated by separating the non-essential elements of our design from the requirements as much as possible. Each change made is explained and justified below:

- F3 - The environmental assumption that all uneliminated players would participate in the minigame was removed because it was more an aspect of our design than a key part of the system. Relatedly, the alternative of reducing the number of players participating in the minigame was also removed, since it was no longer relevant.

- F4 - The wording of the requirement itself was changed to be more general. Instead of specifying which player, or players, would receive the bonus, the new version simply states that one or more players should receive a bonus. This was done to further separate our design from the requirements. The environmental assumption which pertained to the previous version of the requirement was removed and replaced with the assumption that the player who captures the PVC should be one of the players who receives a bonus. This change was made so that the more general version of the requirement still met the conditions set for the system in the scenario brief. The alternative which related to the previous version of the requirement was also removed, since it was rendered obsolete by previous changes.

- F5 - The environmental assumption about each sector only being owned by one player at a time was removed, since that same statement was already made in the requirement itself, making it redundant.

- F6 - The requirement was reworded to be more general, no longer specifying the frequency at which players would receive new units, simply stating that players must receive new units. The risk associated with the requirement was also reworded to avoid specifying any particular amount of time. The alternative which was related to the original version of the requirement was also removed, because it was no longer necessary.

In the process of updating the statement of requirements, neither the references of any requirements nor the referencing system itself was changed. While significant changes were made to the wording and the exact specifications made by several requirements, the intent behind each requirement remained more or less unchanged.

Methods Selection and Planning Updates

Original methods selection and planning from Assessment 1: [link]
Updated methods selection and planning for Assessment 2: [link]

Version control

Updated error saying SVN does not support branching when it does.

Organisation

When discussing the teams organisation in the assessment 1 document, it was not clear why specifically Trello was chosen. This has now been updated to reflect the teams desire for a central point of organisation, like a pin board that may be found in an office or similar. A physical pinboard would have of course been impractical for us because of the team living far apart and the hassle of bringing it to meetings. One member would only ever be able to see it away from university labs/meeting areas. Trello was a good option as it also let us set dates for tasks and have checklists to tick tasks off as they were completed.

Structure

As explained in the assessment 1 document, we wanted to give ourselves time when deciding on specific team roles as we believed it would allow us to put the correct people in the correct team roles. Now we have had time to get into development and worked as a team more, we have agreed on specific roles on the team. Based on how assessment 2 section of this project was progressing, we believe that the assigned team roles are suitable for each member. Each member was given an area to be lead of for our project as the team roles are still meant to be what the member is in charge of, instead of that area of the project being their only concern, still adhering to our adoption of an agile method where the development team is self-organising.

Project plan

Slight changes were made to the schedule for assessment 3, allowing the team to spend time to select which product to inherit, so we are all happy with the choice being made. Other changes include adding more detail to the implementation aspect of the assessment, listing what features must be implemented. There is some risk in timetabling these features to implemented at the same time as there is no real organisation to when features should be implemented, however this is because the development team are self organising, as they should be in a scrum. The change report section also now includes all the relevant documents that will need to be written to reflect any changes made to the project by our team.

There is now a link to the timetable that can be found on the website, making it easier to read.

Risk Assessment Updates

In the updated risk assessment document [link], all risks have now been colour-coded according to their potential impact as follows:

- Green - Low
- Yellow - Medium
- Red - High

This should allow for quick and easy identification of the risks which could present the largest problems.

There has also been the introduction of risk ownership - every risk is now allocated an owner who is responsible for the management of and response to this risk. This should ensure that no risks are forgotten about due to miscommunication, as all team members know which risks they are responsible for.