Risk Assessment and Mitigation

Cohort 4: Group 2

Greyhounds

Olwenn Gillespie
Glenn Asher
Praise Konji
Jennifer Oakley
Alice Cavens
David Naji
Igor Dylewski

Explanation and Justification of the changes made

For the risk assessment and mitigation, I thought it best to re-do the whole risk register for clarity rather than just noting a few changes. Jumping between a “changes” section and the original register would make it harder to read, and we also needed to replace all the original owners with our own team members.

The main changes included:

- Removing the handoff-related risks- R5 W3 and R14 W1
- Changing owners as the original owners were the Team 6 members
- Updating mitigations where the original team relied on a Kanban board (R6 W2, R1 W1, R8 W2), because we did not use a Kanban board and had to adopt alternative strategies
- Removed R10 W2, because the implementation team now has experience using LibGDX and GitHub
- Minor typing error fixed in R12 W2 - changed LibJDX to LibGDX
- Removing the separate Management Risk Register Table from the end of the document since those entries described past events for the original team. We kept the document focused on proactive risks for our own project and will document any occurred issues separately in our team log

The URL for team 6’s website is: https://team-6-eng.github.io/Escape_University_Website/index.html

ID	Type	Description	Likelihood	Severity	Mitigation	Owner
R1 W1	Organisation	The project may not be prioritised due to individual’s disorganisation. The project is also a university assignment which means team members have other modules to focus on too	High	Medium	Ensure that we have set meeting times that are suitable for everyone and have internal deadlines for subtasks. We will also check in on each other’s progress regularly	Olwenn and Glenn
R2 W2	Organisation	Somebody may misunderstand project requirements	Medium	Low	Ensure that we are communicating with each other on tasks and that each task gets reviewed by a different member after completion. We will also constantly reference the task requirements and peer review each other’s work	Everyone
R3 W2	Organisation	Too much pressure on a single individual	Low	Medium	Ensure equitable work distribution. We will each take on approximately 15 marks’ worth of work	Glenn

R4 W1	Organisation/ People	People may be unable to meet deadlines	Medium	High	Since extending the deadline isn't an option, we will have an earlier internal deadline for the project. We will also be reasonable when taking on tasks and ensure that significant tasks such as coding are monitored	Igor
R6 W2	Organisation	Prioritising certain deliverables over others. For example, getting distracted by the coding and not completing the documentation and writeup as we go.	High	Medium	We will ensure that people are distributed across tasks and that every task has somebody assigned to it.	Glenn
R7 W3	Organisation	Adding unnecessary detail to our implementation or to our documentation that will not benefit us, will eat into the limited time that we have.	Medium	Low	We will follow a KISS strategy. When coding, we will prioritise the key features mentioned by our client. When writing documents, we will refer to the brief and the requirements document.	Alice
R8 W2	People	Somebody may leave the university or have to take leave due to personal issues or illness that leads to them being unable to continue working on the project.	Medium	Low	Ensuring that none of the critical tasks are on one person will reduce low bus factor.	Glenn
R9 W2	People	Disagreements between team members. This could occur in the form of different ideas in the direction of the project	Medium	Medium	If there are disagreements within a subgroup we can present them to the entire group and get unbiased input on which approach will best fit the requirements	Jennifer
R11 W3	Technology	Relying on softwares: relying on the version control software	Low	High	We are relying on software that is industry standard so is reliable. However, the impact would be high so we will locally store the code as	Praise

					well as storing it in a Git repository	
R12 W2	Technology	Relying on softwares: relying on the java development tools - LibGDX game engine	Medium	Medium	We are relying on software that is industry standard so it is quite reliable	Igor
R13 W3	Technology	Collaborative coding issues. Using GitHub will allow us to collaborate on code. However, this comes with issues such as merge conflicts	Low	Medium	We will watch the VLE videos on how to use GitHub and consult with one another about the best approach when merge conflicts occur	David
R15 W1	Resource	Having no budget means we will only use free assets. This poses risks with licensing and could threaten getting out work done in time.	High	Low	Before starting the project, we researched the free tools that we could utilise. This involved thorough research into the best libraries and assets	Olwenn
R16 W1	Resource	Time restrictions. We only have about six weeks to do part two of the project	Medium	Medium	We will prioritise implementing the required features.	Alice and Igor
R17 W2	Resource	Hardware and software limitations: we must code in java and use GitHub for version control. No additional hardware is allowed. AI usage also has restrictions	High	Low	Our plan for implementation will be simple and fit the restrictions. Also ensure everybody is aware of the restrictions	Olwenn and David
R18 W2	Security	Using free assets	Medium	High	Ensure that we have correct licensing	Alice
R19 W1	Security	Our game and documentation shouldn't be visible to other teams	Low	Medium	The repository will be private until it is time to submit. Our documents will also be private	David