

# Assessment 4: Requirements Elicitation

## Process:

Following the initial release of the following requirements from the user:

- Add support for up to four players. You can decide what is an appropriate mix of AI and human player.
- Add a “capture the chancellor” mode: after carrying out placement of roboticons, etc, there should be a 15 second period in which the Chancellor may randomly appear on the map, and the player must try to capture them for extra points.

We analysed the release as a group and quickly assessed the situation to be as follows:

- The first requirement has been functionally met but the game in its current state needs limiting to 4 instead of 9. The current AI Human mix works very well, min 1 Human and Max 3 AI.
- The second requirement needed some ambiguous areas clearing with the user. So a couple of ideas were created and discussed with the user in the context of a few short questions.

## User Questions:

1. What do you mean by points? We interpreted them as the following:
  - a. The chancellor drops actuable resources like Food, Energy, Ore or money that the player can use immediately
  - b. A more abstract point system, which the user is informed of and factors into the score at the end of the game
2. How do you want this implemented into the Roboticon Install phase?
  - a. We felt the phase should be extended to 45s and the final 15s can be used for the phase as before, but there is a chance the capture the chancellor minigame may occur.
3. How frequent should this random chance be?
4. Do you want this to be available throughout the game, or like our effects limited until after a certain phase?
5. How would you like the GUI implementation of this to look?
  - a. We were thinking having a ‘hiding place’ for the chancellor in each tile. Then for the three sets of 5 seconds in the phase we load one of the hiding tiles. Upon the tile being clicked the chancellor is considered caught and the phase finishes.

## Meta questions:

1. There seems to be a lot of focus on documentation and less coding this assessment, does that assertion fit with your intentions?



# Answers:

## User Questions:

6. What do you mean by points? We interpreted them as the following:
  - a. Both are good options, I was thinking the 'points' would be money so I prefer a.
7. How do you want this implemented into the Roboticon Install phase?
  - a. I like this implementation.
8. How frequent should this random chance be?
  - a. Up to you honestly, play test it, balance the frequency and rewards in a sensible manner
9. Do you want this to be available throughout the game, or like our effects limited until after a certain phase?
  - a. I hadn't thought about that, that's a good idea.
10. How would you like the GUI implementation of this to look?
  - a. I like this implementation it works very well.

## Meta questions:

1. There seems to be a lot of focus on documentation and less coding this assessment, does that assertion fit with your intentions?
  - a. Yes we designed this part of the project to allow teams to focus more on other assessments and let SEPR take a backseat. The focus is more Documentation based.

