

## **Risk Assessment and Mitigation**

Cohort 1, group 9:

Chris Sewell

Fedor Kurochkin

Matt Durham

Max Peterson

Oladapo Olaniran

Wojtek Tomaszewski

Yuqi Fu.

Updated by Cohort 1, group 2:

Yusuf Almahmeed

Jane Boag

Charmaine Chamapiwa

Charlie Coyne

Anupam Cunden

Bertie Kerry

Leo Xu-Latti

## **Risk Identification**

Collectively, through discussions and brainstorming sessions the team identified potential risks. The assessment brief and client preferences specified in the interview served as a baseline to ensure that all aspects of development were considered. The confirmed risks were then categorised into different groups in order to streamline their management.

## **Risk analysis**

Each risk was evaluated and assigned a likelihood and severity rating based on collective team judgment, which was then colour coded accordingly. This process will significantly assist in controlling potential issues that will have a great effect on the project if not accounted for.

Likelihood measurement shows how likely is a specific risk to become an issue.

- Low - Unlikely to happen (0% - 40% chance)
- Moderate - Could possibly happen (41% - 60% chance)
- High - Very likely to happen (61% - 90% chance)

Severity indicates the impact a risk could have on the project if it occurs.

- Low - Minor impact that is easily managed
- Moderate - Noticeable impact requiring attention
- High - Major impact and potential disruption beyond original scope

## **Risk planning**

Each risk was followed up with analysis focusing on how an issue could be completely avoided or at least minimised. The team implemented a planning system which helped arrange deadlines and track progress in order to minimise risks across the board.

Additional brainstorming sessions were held to develop specific solutions to problems in case of minimisation strategies failing. Team members responsible for the discussed aspect of the project were then assigned as the owners of the risk.

## **Risk monitoring**

To provide structure and consistency to risk management, a register containing the fields described below was constructed.

- ID - Unique identifier of the risk (P for project; T for technical; P&P for people&project, PR for product).
- Description - What the risk is
- Likelihood - How likely the risk is to happen
- Severity - How big of an impact the risk might have on the project
- Mitigation/Avoidance - How to avoid or minimise the risk
- Monitoring - How to monitor the risk
- Owner - Team member responsible for the mitigation strategy execution and monitoring of the risk

## Risk Register

ID	Description	Likelihood	Severity	Mitigation Avoidance	Monitoring	Owner
P&P1	Team members getting sick, falling behind or struggling with the task.	High	High	Have at least 2 people working on all aspects of the project.	Communicate with the team and see if any team member is expected to be unavailable.	Jane
PR1	Not accurately following the new set of game/client requirements.	Low	High	Communication between team members and clear representation of client preferences and requirements.	Communicate with the client to discuss iterations of the project to maintain a clear scope of the game.	Jane
PR2	Project website not up to date if changes are made to the project.	Moderate	Moderate	Author of the deliverable performing a backward data continuity check within the website.	Regular progress report checks on any new information requiring links uploaded to the website.	Bertie
P1	Lost/forgotten documentation.	Moderate	High	Potential restoration of deleted documents or reversion to previous drafts.	Deep inspection of final versions of deliverables and any additional required documents.	Anupam
T1	Tool/Asset availability (3rd party assets no longer supported, copyright issues,	Low	Moderate	Use Generative AI to produce copyright free assets and use the most popular and best kept up	Check each time a new asset or tool is used that is suitable for use in the game.	Leo

	problems embedding incompatible features etc).			to date tools.		
PR3	Bugs or Errors in the Game.	High	Moderate	Regularly test the game during the development process and check for these bugs.	Potentially have a person play the game in search of its limitations and potential bugs.	Charmaine
P&P2	Mistakes in data interpretation between teams within the group.	Moderate	Moderate	Ensure consistent and clear communication between all team members.	All documentation must be accessible to all members of the team to allow for more feedback.	Anupam
T2	Inconsistency in game versions on GitHub resulting in unaccounted for branches.	Moderate	High	If necessary, reverting to older versions. Otherwise merging the branches into the single newest version.	All new versions of the code must be announced and described in detail before being uploaded to GitHub.	Bertie
P2	Not meeting the deadlines therefore delaying progress.	Moderate	High	Altering initial requirements or rearranging deadlines in a way which allows for more time being spent on a task.	Regular progress checks through google sheets containing additional task and deadline information.	Charlie
P3	Losing track of documents related to the progress of the project.	Low	Low	Keep an organised file structure with support for previous versions.	Performing checks on file's locations and versions with additional draft documents included in the same directory.	Yousif

PR4	Misunderstandings regarding game mechanics.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	Performing a large volume of discussions focused on understanding the task and planning the solution ahead of time.	Perform checks during various progress milestones to ensure the direction of development is going according to plan.	Charlie
P4	Misunderstandings regarding documentation formatting.	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	Performing initial visualisation of the deliverable's format.	Swapping and checking final versions thoroughly to ensure structural integrity and requirements being met.	Anupam