

Risk Assessment and Mitigation



Cohort 3 Group 6 - Carbon Goose

Members: Bailey Horsley, Owen Jones, Rory Ingram, Ken Jacob, Abishek Kingslin Raj, Louis Polwarth, Adam Johnson

For the updated risk assessment, our team refined and expanded our risk management process, incorporating lessons learned from the risk assessment performed by the initial team. The approach continued to focus on identification, analysis, planning, and monitoring, ensuring a comprehensive and structured approach to risk management.

We revisited the identification phase, focusing on risks that could come from new implementations and unexpected problems during development. The team conducted additional brainstorming sessions to ensure both ongoing project risks and newly emerging risks were captured. During analysis, each risk was assessed for likelihood and severity, prioritizing those with the most significant potential impact. This step helped us focus on high-priority risks while still keeping track of lower-priority ones. Mitigation efforts involved the creation of action plans tailored to the nature of each risk. These plans were designed to lower the chances of risk happening or reduce their impact if they did. We also assigned specific responsibilities to team members to ensure clear accountability and effective monitoring throughout the second assessment. Risks were frequently reassessed, with new insights integrated as the project progressed. Regular updates to the risk register and ongoing team discussions allowed us to manage issues and adapt to project requirements.

The risk register includes risks identified in the second phase of the project. Each entry was carefully documented with unique identifiers, clear descriptions, and actionable mitigation plans.

Risk Register Format: Our risk register is a tabular document that includes the following columns for each risk:

- ID: a unique number assigned to each risk for tracking purposes.
- Type: the category of risk (Project, Product, or Business).
- Description: a brief explanation of the risk.
- Likelihood: an estimate of how likely is the risk to occur (low, moderate or high).
- Severity: an estimate of the impact it would have on the project (low, moderate or high).
- Mitigation: steps to take to reduce or manage the risk.
- Owner: the person or persons in charge of mitigating the risk depending on roles.

Risk Register

ID	Type	Description	Likelihood	Severity	Mitigation	Owner
R1	Project	Delay in receiving editable deliverables from the selected team reducing productivity	Low	High	Contact the team early as possible to set clear deadlines for update deliverables.	Entire team
R2	Product	Unit testing files incompatible with the project	Medium	High	Ensure testing frameworks are compatible and conduct integration	Louis Polwarth, Rory Ingram

					testing	
R3	Project	Lack of understanding of code from the selected team by team members causing misinterpretation of code and delayed progress	High	High	Conduct code walkthrough sessions and refer to documentation.	Entire team
R4	Project	Websites and deliverables not updated	Low	Medium	Assign specific team members to regularly update the website and documents.	Abishek Kingslin Raj, Bailey Horsley
R5	Project	Missed deadlines by some group members causing progress delay	High	High	Implement stricter task tracking and provide support for struggling members.	Entire team
R6	Project	Poor communication leading to unfinished tasks	High	High	Schedule regular team meetings and use communication tools effectively	Entire team
R7	Product	Game incompatible with certain code editors	Low	Low	Use standardized tools for development and testing. Conduct tests on different devices to pinpoint the source of error	Owen Jones, Louis Polwarth
R8	Project	Incomplete user evaluation participants' list	Medium	Medium	Confirm participants well in advance and maintain a backup list.	Rory Ingram
R9	Project	Lack of proper	Medium	Low	Establish clear	Entire team

		documentation leading to unclear implementation.			coding standards and enforce documentation for all changes	
R10	Product	Bugs due to insufficient testing	High	High	Increase testing coverage and conduct thorough quality review during user evaluation.	Louis Polwarth, Rory Ingram
R11	Product and Project	Final product not meeting stakeholder requirements	Medium	High	Revisit requirements regularly with stakeholders during development.	Owen Jones, Rory Ingram, Adam Johnson
R12	Product	Illogical events causing user confusion	Low	Medium	Clear instructions and on-screen prompts could be added. Feedback from user evaluation should be reviewed.	Owen Jones