Risk Assessment and Mitigation

Cohort 1 Group 10

Cai Hughes<cabh500@york.ac.uk
Ben Slater<bs1463@york.ac.uk
Adeola Adeniji<aa3098@york.ac.uk
Mathew Riedy<mr1723@york.ac.uk
Riad Kasmi<rmk526@york.ac.uk
Simon Konieczny<sk2144@york.ac.uk

Risk Management Process

The team's approach to eliciting requirements consisted of a 4-step iterative process:

Step 1: Risk Identification

In the first step of the risk management process, the team systematically identified threats and risks to the project timeline and the product itself. These were identified through brainstorming sessions, personal judgement, and SWOT analysis. By combining the knowledge of everyone on the team, a comprehensive list could be created. The risks covered a wide range of problems, such as technological, project and product-related, as well as security.

Step 2: Risk Assessment

Once the risks were identified, it was possible to assess them in detail. This involved establishing each risks' type, likelihood of occurrence, impact on the project, and owners as well as writing a brief description. These factors were decided based on expert judgement and the research that the owners did on the subject area. By quantifying the likelihood and impact, the team (especially the owners) could be more aware of potential threats and be mindful to avoid them, or be able to pick the path with least harm to the project.

Step 3: Risk Treatment

In this step the team developed strategies to address the identified risks. This involved appropriate measures to mitigate risks from occurring as well as prioritising risks with high likelihood and impact over others. Risks deemed less severe were treated with less urgency. By establishing ownership of risks team members knew what they were responsible for and could take steps to mitigate specific risks through their work.

Step 4: Risk Monitoring

The final step of the process involved continuous monitoring and tracking of the identified risks, the people in charge of specific areas of the project (the owners of various risks) continuously paid attention to potential pitfalls and mitigated risks. The risk register is also a live document in the sense that it is continuously updated to changing and unforeseen circumstances. The team's clear communication, especially within the task divisions is an integral part of maintaining this iterative process and ensuring the project remains resilient to uncertainties.

The above approach enabled all team members to proactively take ownership of risks and be aware of them from the very beginning of the development process. The risks identified by team members were compiled into the Risk Register, a live document that was modified as the project progressed.

Risk Register:

| ID | Туре | Descripti on | Likelihoo d | Severity | Mitigation | Owner |
|----|----------------|---|----------------|----------|---|---------------------|
| R1 | Technolog y | Technical Challenge s with libGDX | Medium | Medium | Early prototypin g and testing of all features | Ben/Matth ew |
| R2 | Product | Licence Issues on Assets | High | High | Find open licence assets | Ben/Matth ew |
| R3 | Project | Cooperati on and collaborati on issues | Medium | High | Use planned methodolo gy as a guideline for team interaction | Everyone |
| R4 | Project | Develope ment Delays | Medium | Medium | Schedule regular team meetings to make sure everyone is on track | Ben/Matth ew |
| R5 | Project | Inefficient use of resources | Low | Medium | Regularly review project timeline Agile project managem ent | Adeola/Ri ad |
| R6 | Project | Conflicts and errors due to issues with version control | Low | High | Implement version control best practices | Ben/Matth ew/Cai |

| R7 | Project | Scope Creep | Medium | High | Refer to requireme nts for all necessary informatio n on features | Simon |
|-----|----------------|---|--------|--------|---|-----------------------|
| R8 | Product | Incompati bility with various hardware | Medium | High | Test on a wide variety of hardware | Cai/Ben/M atthew |
| R9 | Technolog y | Difficulty in scaling the game | Medium | Medium | Design the game with scalability in mind | Ben/Matth ew |
| R10 | Product | Poor User Experienc e Design | Medium | High | Engage in continuous feedback from users and stakeholde rs | Simon/Ad eola/Riad |
| R11 | Product | Overcompl exity leading to user frustration | High | High | Refer to requireme nts and stakeholde rs to identify key features | Simon/Ad eola/Riad |