

## Requirements Updates

Original Requirements Document (Assessment 1) [link](#)

Updated Requirements Document (Assessment 2) [link](#)

### Elicitation

The choice of approach was justified and reflected upon having completed the Brainstorming session and Client Interview.

Different approaches were discussed (Prototyping and Reverse Engineering), and the reason behind not choosing these methods was explained.

The choice of changing the Statement of Requirements template was explained.

### Statement of Requirements

Each requirement is either fulfilled or will be fulfilled in the later stages of the project timeline.

The requirements given in the Second Assessment have been met.

The phrasing of the fit criteria has been changed so they clearly define when the requirement can be deemed to be fulfilled, rather than how this requirement will be fulfilled.

## Method Selection & Planning Updates

Original Method Selection & Planning Document (Assessment 1) [link](#)

Updated Method Selection & Planning Document (Assessment 2) [link](#)

Updated Planning Gantt Chart Document [link](#)

## Software Engineering Methods

The general quality of writing was, hopefully, improved upon through re-writing of the document.

Corrected the error of calling SCRUM a methodology.

The choice of the SCRUM framework was developed through inspecting more aspects of the framework.

## Development & Collaboration Tools

Google Drive was added as an alternative for Version Control, being contrasted to GitHub. The use of GitKraken was also included, as it had been previously left out.

Microsoft's One Drive and Google Drive were added as alternatives in File Sharing and the choice of choosing Google Drive was explained further.

The Communication section was further developed, discussing the preference for in-person meetings, using a Facebook Messenger Group as a method of organising meeting times and locations. ASANA's communication methods were also included, alongside the explanation as to the team's lack of use of tools such as Slack.

## Team Organisation & Structure

The role of SCRUM Master was split between Eleanor and Merry, with a focus on documentation and programming respectively. This decision was delayed due to the team's inexperience in software engineering and was to allow everyone to experience the role, prior to making a group decision. Additional roles were not assigned, so to stick to the self-organising team often seen in Agile Development.

## Project Plan

The Gantt charts for Assessment 3 and 4 have been reviewed and updated, with the link to the document included in the references. We broke each assessment down into sub-tasks. This will make it easier to see the length of time team members should aim to spend on individual tasks. We also noticed that we had previously forgotten to include the user manual in our plan for assessment 2, so the Gantt chart was amended to include this.

## Risk Assessment Updates

Original Risk Assessment Document (Assessment 1) [link](#)

Updated Risk Assessment Document (Assessment 2) [link](#)

One update was made to the Risk Assessment document.

The Risk Likelihood of the Risk with ID PJ1 was decided to be Moderate after risk monitoring meetings decided it would be likely that, especially when programming, the time required would be underestimated, especially if errors were to occur. Mitigation methods would save the likelihood rising to High, as the group can modify assigned tasks to help move around any delays, while also reminding group members of their assigned tasks so delays are not caused by uncertainty and the chance of procrastination is reduced.

PJ1's colour coding was changed accordingly.

The remainder of the document was unchanged.

This is due to the fact, during the weekly risk monitoring meetings, the Risk Owners found no additional risks while no change in Risk Owners was needed.

The group found the risk mitigation methods appropriate and helpful, with weekly meetings to discuss worries or potential risks.