Updates on Assessment 1 Deliverables

The Review and Update Process

The process of review was simple and effective for the group due to the frequent nature of our meetings, which afforded us constant opportunities to discuss and consider our position regarding our project guidelines which we had initially decided upon. Though we did choose to alternate some of these post our submission of Assessment 1, the impact was mediated and always beneficial for the team. Mainly, this was attributable to our decision to delegate the re-evaluation of risks and requirements throughout the team, meaning that when anyone believed they had a legitimate concern in their area, there was regularly a chance to discuss and reflect on the raised subject and then decide as a group how to proceed most effectively. Finally, prior to the submission of the Assessment 2 Deliverables, we decided to meet for a final time to review the documents from the first assessment in their entirety, and reflect on any sections that could be improved allowing us to progress through the remainder of the project in the most productive and user-respective way possible.

Note: When viewing the updated versions of the Assessment 1 documents, any post submission addition have been highlighted in green and removal in orange for easy location.

Justification of the Updated Requirements

Although not all of the requirements have currently been met, this is mainly due to the constraints of Assessment 2 requiring us not to develop more than is asked of us for the current stage. Therefore, despite having multiple requirements unfulfilled, we have left the majority of them untouched as we believe they should be perfectly feasible to complete as the project progresses.

One that we have changed, however, is requirement **F2**, regarding the game ending when the player is defeated. We have decided that to end the game after just one player death would seem harsh to the player after asking them to invest time into progressing through this relatively difficult game, and so would directly contradict requirement C3.1 'All aspects of the game should focus on providing a satisfying experience'. Therefore, it has instead alternated to be respective of our new decision, which is that when the player loses a battle, they should respawn with half of their money and all of their points docked. We concluded that this would provide a suitable level of punishment so that the player still felt some risk and thrill in combat, but not too much that they feel cheated or unfairly treated by the game.

On the same reason for changing is requirement **F4.6,** regarding the conclusion of combat mode only when either side's health drop to zero. We agreed that this is also a bit harsh on the player and therefore decided to give them a chance to make up for any mismove by implementing a Flee option in combat. Successfully pull off this move result in the combat immediately ends regardless of both side's current state. However as to not make it to easy we made it so that there is a high chance for Flee to be unsuccessful.

The last requirement we change are **F8.1** and **F8.2**, stating that a college boss can only be attacked after all guarding ships have been defeated. As we decided to change the enemy spawn process to a probability based system and enemies are no longer drew on the screen, this approach is no longer appropriate. Instead, we now guard the ability to challenge the boss behind its high difficulty, meaning that the player can never defeat it unless he has farmed enough upgrades.

You can find the updated Requirements document on our team's website **[1]**

Justification of the Updated Method and Plans

Updated Team Organisation

Shortly after our submission of the Assessment 1 deliverables, we discovered that Matthew, one of our members, would unfortunately be leaving the project, resulting in us working in a team of 5 from then on. This meant that we needed to reorganise our team structure to spread out his responsibilities appropriately within the remaining team, thus leading to us reassigning the role of Audio Designer to Bradley, who also had some prior experience of working with sound editing software.

Further, the responsibility of overseeing, preventing and mediating the risks designated to Matthew were distributed throughout the team (more detail on this will be given in the next section 'Justification of the Risk Assessment and Mitigation'). It is important to remember, however, that the nature of our team is that members are not solely resigned to their duties, though they are accountable for them, and equally other members can assist in them. As such, the roles were effectively taken on by the entirety of the team, so that the impact of a reduced team was minimized.

Method Justification

As a group, we found that we were very happy with our choice to follow an adapted form of the Agile software development principle 'Scrum'. We found that our schedule of tri-weekly meetings was greatly effective in that it allowed for an impressive level of communication, meaning that we were consistently synchronising our individual parts of the project so that we were constantly working towards the same goals. It also provided us with regular times where we could meet and proceed as a unit, making our progress more efficient and effective in the process.

Updated Tools Justification

Due to our extended research and discussion at the outset of the project, we found that the majority of our chosen tools were more than suitable for our needs. The software we chose to use for development were easy to use and provided us with simple ways to work on and update the project simultaneously. Further, we found that our chosen methods of task management were very helpful in keeping the group organised whilst staying on track for our deadline.

However, we did choose to use an additional application that we had not previously decided on in Assessment 1, called 'Tiled' **[2]**. Tiled allows you to create tile maps, which is not only simple to use in a game like this, but also creates a nice aesthetic when utilised well. We chose this free software because it was the recommended software to use with LibGDX, which meant we were given access to many interesting features as well as easy to understand guides and tutorials.

Lastly, we used a plugin for IntelliJ IDEA (our IDE of choice) called "Sketch It!" to generate UML diagrams in PlantUML syntax from our code, greatly increasing the accuracy of these diagrams compared to if we had done this manually, as well as saving us a great deal of time to spend improving the rest of the project.

You can find the updated Method and Planning document on our team's website **[3]**

Justification of the Risk Assessment and Mitigation

Risk Assessment Review

In general, we found that our first edition of the Risk Assessment and Mitigation document was well thought out and appropriately written. Having individuals owning multiple risks that they were responsible for remaining aware of and planning for meant that any possible problems with the project were detected and solved as soon as they arose, if not before.

Moreover, the document was especially useful in this area, as it meant that as soon as the time arose that we did need to review a risk, we already had details on the severity it posed alongside potential strategies to minimise the impact it could have on the project. This meant that any issues could be solved simply and effectively and allowed us to spend our time focusing on the development of the product with little distraction.

Updated Risks Justification

As referenced previously in this document, after one of our team members had to leave the project, the risk assessment was impacted but mainly in how we split up responsibility for the risks he was previously overseeing. The management of **Risk 14** was given to Alex, as in the role of Team Leader he already had to keep up to date on any developments with the client and so found this task suited to his role. Further, **Risk 16** was given to Bradley, as he was the other member of the group who split of to do the user research earlier in the project, meaning that he already had a good idea of what the user base wanted from the game.

Additionally, we decided to alter the likelihood of **Risk 2** as it had previously been decided as having a low probability, but after losing a member we realised that it was more likely than we thought and should be considered a serious potential problem if it were to happen again.

You can find the updated Risk Assessment and Mitigation document on our team's website **[4]**

References

[1] SEPR 'Updated Requirements' Rear Admirals. Available: https://therandomnessguy.github.io/SEPR/Assessment/2/Updates/Upd2Req1.pdf [Accessed 20th Jan. 2019]

[2] Tiled Map Editor Website. Available: https://www.mapeditor.org/ [Accessed 20th Jan. 2019]

[3] SEPR 'Updated Method Selection and Planning' Rear Admirals. Available: https://therandomnessguy.github.io/SEPR/Assessment/2/Updates/Upd2Plan1.pdf [Accessed 20th Jan. 2019]

[4] SEPR 'Updated Risk Assessment and Mitigation' Rear Admirals. Available: https://therandomnessguy.github.io/SEPR/Assessment/2/Updates/Upd2Risk1.pdf [Accessed 20th Jan. 2019]