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The risk factors which affect the probability that the project will be completed on time and within budget, and will deliver a quality product, come from four sources - project management, project staff, the nature of the project itself, and the maturity of the departmental management culture. These factors are itemised below, in the form of pairs of statements typifying low and high risk, on either side of a scale 1 to 4. One number in each of the scales is ringed to indicate my assessment of the risk attached to each factor. The ringed figure is multiplied by the weighting factor I have inserted in column (d) to give the figure in column (e).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (a) Low Risk | (b) Scale | (c) High Risk | (d) Weighting Used | (e) Total  ( b x d ) |
| **Project Management:** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Full time, experienced project manager. | 1 2 3 4 | Inexperienced or part time project manager | \_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_\_  ( 5 - 7 ) | \_\_\_18\_\_\* |
| 2. User management is experienced and likely to be active participators | 1 2 3 4 | Inexperienced user management, with little participation expected | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_  ( 4 - 6 ) | \_\_\_15\_\_\* |
| **Project Staff:** |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Users expected to be of good quality, actively involved, with relevant knowledge of the system. | 1 2 3 4 | Little user involvement and little relevant knowledge expected | \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_3\_\_\_\* |
| 4. High standard of supervision and narrow span of control. | 1 2 3 4 | Span of supervision too wide and level of control inadequate | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 4 - 6 ) | \_\_\_8\_\_\_ |
| 5. The technical team is experienced, of good quality and with appropriate skills. | 1 2 3 4 | Inexperienced team lacking the appropriate skills | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_12\_\_\_ |
| 6. Staff is dedicated to the project. | 1 2 3 4 | Staffs have other responsibilities such as system maintenance. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_4\_\_\_ |
| 7. Low staff turnover. | 1 2 3 4 | High staff turnover. | \_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_  ( 4 - 6 ) | \_\_\_18\_\_\_ |
| **The Nature Of The Project:** |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Staff are experienced in quality reviews and committed to their use. | 1 2 3 4 | No quality reviews carried out in the past. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_  ( 4 - 6 ) | \_\_\_15\_\_\_ |
| 9. A typical system development cycle, with requirements definition, system specification, system design etc. | 1 2 3 4 | A system development cycle having no formal definition, system design and build merge etc. | \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_9\_\_\_ |
| 10. No unique or new features. | 1 2 3 4 | Pioneering, new hardware, or software etc. | \_\_\_\_2\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_2\_\_\_ |
| 11. Current main operations will be affected minimally. | 1 2 3 4 | Significant impact on mainstream operations. | \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_6\_\_\_ |
| 12. Hardware & Software requirements determined and documents based on proven standards. | 1 2 3 4 | Requirements not documented, or based on proven standards; limited safety margins for contingencies. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_12\_\_\_ |
| 13. Little or no modification to existing application software. | 1 2 3 4 | Extensive modification needed. | \_\_\_\_2\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 5 ) | \_\_\_6\_\_\_ |
| 14. Little or no other development work being undertaken concurrently. | 1 2 3 4 | Other Projects being developed concurrently. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 5 ) | \_\_\_15\_\_\_ |
| 15. Little or no dependency on existing or developing systems not under the control of project staff | 1 2 3 4 | Dependant on other facilities not under the control of staff on this project. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 6 ) | \_\_\_8\_\_\_ |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (a) Low Risk | (b) Scale | (c) High Risk | (d) Weighting Used | (e) Total  ( b x d ) |
| 16. Project duration of one year or less, or small number of workdays compared with other completed projects. | 1 2 34 | Project duration more than one year or a large number of workdays. | \_\_\_\_2\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_4\_\_\_ |
| 17. Little constraint on completion date beyond availability of resources. | 1 2 3 4 | Mandatory completion date. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_10\_\_\_ |
| 18. Plans and estimates are based on reliable data. | 1 2 3 4 | Planning and estimation data are unreliable. | \_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 6 ) | \_\_\_18\_\_\_ |
| 19. Investment appraisal and estimates prepared and well documented, using proven standards. | 1 2 3 4 | Approximations used or estimates not properly documented, or based on proven standards. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_20\_\_\_ |
| 20. Suppliers are large well established companies. | 1 2 3 4 | Suppliers are new or one-man businesses. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_16\_\_\_ |
| 21. Few user departments. | 1 2 3 4 | Several user departments | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 4 - 6 ) | \_\_\_8\_\_\_ |
| 22. The work affects few sites, which are easily accessible to the team. | 1 2 3 4 | Many, or remote sites are involved. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_15\_\_\_\_ |
| **The Maturity Of The Departmental Organisation:** |  |  |  |  |
| 23. A well developed set of standards in use. | 1 2 3 4 | Few standards are available. | \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_6\_\_\_\_ |
| 24. A well defined quality policy exists. | 1 2 3 4 | The quality policy is well defined. | \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_\_  ( 3 - 5 ) | \_\_\_\_20\_\_ |
| 25. Clear delegation of authority is practised. | 1 2 3 4 | Centralised management with little delegation. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_15\_\_\_\_ |
| 26. Good relationship with Departmental Trade Union Side and with staff. | 1 2 3 4 | Relations with DTUS and staff are poor. | \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_  ( 2 - 4 ) | \_\_\_20\_\_\_ |
| **TOTALS** | **69** |  | **\_\_\_103\_\_\_\_** | **\_\_309\_\_\_** |

High risk is greater than\_\_\_\_\_\_267.8\_\_\_\_\_\_( Total of column (d) x 2.6 ) {>260}

Low risk if less than\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_206\_\_\_\_\_\_( Total of column (d) x 2.0 ) {< 260}

(See note 1 (e))

My assessment of the risk of this Project (see note 1 (f) & 2) is

Very High\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ) Tick one

High \_\_\_\_\_\_309\_ Low \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ )

My recommendations for the risks identified by 3 or 4 marking against any of the above factors are attached (or in the Project Initiation Document if appropriate).

Signed:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(Project Manager)

**Notes:**

1. The assessment sheets should be completed as follows:

(a). Assess a weighting for each of the risk factors, and enter in column (d). A recommended range is shown in brackets for each factor.

(b).Any weighting may be used, but the reason for any figure outside the recommended range should be recorded (see note 2 below).

(c).Multiply the ringed number by the appropriate weighting, and enter the result in column (e). **Column b x d**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LOW** | **MEDIUM** | **HIGH** | **VERY HIGH** |
| **0 -65** | **66 - 180** | **181 - 360** | **361 - 496** |

**Column d**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 73 | 100 | 130 |
| X 2.6 | 189.8 | 260 | 338 |
| X 2.0 | 146 | 200 | 260 |

High risk if over 260, low risk if below 260

(d). Assess if there are any additional risks not included in the assessment sheet. If there are, enter them on a continuation sheet, and assess them as 1 (a) to 1 (c) above. Total the continuation sheet and carry the totals to the final sheet.

(e). Total the weighting factors in column (d). Multiply the resulting figure by 2.0 to obtain the low risk limit, and by 2.6 to obtain the high risk limit. Enter these two limits against “Low risk” and “High risk” respectively on the final sheet.

(f). Total column (e) and enter the result on the final sheet.

(g). Assess the risk of the whole project, bearing in mind the spread of markings in column.

(b), any relevant departmental standards, and experience with other projects. NB The risk factors marked with asterisk in column (e) are regarded as critical to the success of the project. If any of them receives a marking of 4 in column (b), or if 2 or more receive a marking of 3, the project must be assessed as high risk, or very high risk, whatever the total score may be.

2. Any areas of high risk within the project, the reasons for selecting any weighting factors which are outside the recommended range, and the overall assessment, should be recorded and itemised in the Project Initiation Document, along with recommendations to counter the risk, for approval by the Project Board. Thereafter, the degree of risk must be kept under review, to ensure that a low risk project does not become a high risk without the change being noticed. The risk should be reassessed before each End Stage Assessment (except the last one) is held, and reported to the Project Board as part of the request to commence the next stage. All changes to assessed risk from the previous submission must be pointed out and commented upon.

3. If the assessment indicates that the project has little or no chance of successful completion, the IT Executive Committee must be informed (by the Project Board).