Assessment 1: Greenfield Development - Risk assessment and mitigation

Cohort 1 Team 2

Team Members:

Trace Chinelle
Vidhi Chohan
Apollo Cowan
Siyuan Liu
Aryaman Marathe
Charlie Mason

ID	Type	Description	Likelihood	Severity	Mitigation	Ownership
T1	Technology	Overcomplicated controls for user	M	H	Ensure when testing that the game can be played seamlessly with no prior information about the game.	Siyuan, Aryaman, Charlie & Tracey
T2	Technology	UI or UX is confusing to users	L	M	Try to find the essential components for a user interface and build around that.	Siyuan & Aryaman
T3	Technology	The game engine doesn't support macOS or Windows	L	H	Test the compatibility across multiple platforms early on in the software development process.	Siyuan & Aryaman
T4	Technology	Game logic doesn't work as intended	M	H	Often game testing will help identify game logic not working early on. Testing individual parts of the code will help highlight the cause of the issue.	Siyuan, Aryaman, Charlie & Tracey
T5	Technology	Files get deleted by accident / corrupted	L	H	Ensure that multiple versions are saved to create a backup	Siyaun & Arayman
P1	Person	Lack of communication	L	H	Try to contact group members, if that fails notify staff about the issue	Charlie
P2	Person	Group member misses a meeting	L	M	Before group meetings, plan agendas on the important things that will take place, and ensure meetings are planned with enough notice.	Charlie
P3	Person	A group member is ill or away	M	M	Set deadlines with each other to allow leeway if someone falls ill or is unavailable.	Charlie
P4	Person	Group members don't turn in	L	H	Communicate with group members to	Charlie

		allocated work on time			make it clear that it is important to be punctual with submitting work.	
P5	Person	The quality of work is below the intended standard	M	H	Ensure another group member checks the work that is being submitted	Charlie
P6	Person	Work delegation is unbalanced between members	L	M	Discuss the project before then and delegate work accordingly to ensure a balanced workload for each group member.	Charlie
P7	Person	Conflict between group members	L	H	Communicate often with each other as well as addressing and resolving conflicts early on.	Charlie
R1	Requirements	Requirements are misunderstood	L	H	Plan a meeting with the customer to ensure that every member fully understands the project's requirements and scope before starting.	Apollo & Vidhi
R2	Requirements	Listing too many requirements & features for the game	L	M	Before starting the method selection and planning, we discuss as a group to finalise the requirements needed for this project.	Apollo & Vidhi
R3	Requirements	No prioritising requirements	L	H	Review the requirements to see which are essential to the game's logic and functionality, and with this in mind implement those first into the project.	Apollo & Vidhi
R4	Requirements	Conflicting requirements	L	H	Systematically review all the requirements prior to starting the project and ensure that none conflict	Apollo & Vidhi

					with each other.	
R5	Requirements	Lack of customer and stakeholder involvement	L	H	Involve the customer during the entire process of the software development, and gather the critical requirements of the project.	Apollo & Vidhi

In the risk register, we split the risks into three categories: people, technology, and requirements. The people category relates to the aspects of the interaction between group members and the interaction with the project. The technology category includes both the software and hardware aspects of the UniSim project. Lastly, the requirements risks focus on the project requirements and ensuring that we understand them. Each risk has seven columns associated with it, firstly we have the ID of each risk which can allow for easier referencing throughout the project. Each risk category starts with a different letter to quickly identify the risks. We then have the risk type column showing the different risk categories. The description section helps to outline what exactly the risk is and hopefully gives our team a better chance of identifying the risks before they become an issue. We then rated the risks in terms of how likely they are to occur, L for low, M for medium, and H for high. The likelihood rating is useful as it allows us to know which risks to look out more for and to make sure we know what to monitor. Risks are also assessed for their severity and the impact they would have. Severity is rated the same way as the likelihood to allow continuity for the register. The mitigation column is there as a plan to reduce the impact a risk has on the project as well as the preemptive measures we can take to avoid the risk completely. Lastly, we have the ownership column which is there to help delegate which risk will be monitored by which groupmate, this ensures that all risks are constantly being monitored by at least one person.

We decided to organise our risk management this way to create a concise and detailed description of which risks we need to be aware of as a team. The register allows us to quickly reference a risk and what we need to do in case we need to follow up on a certain circumstance. We can easily monitor and assess each risk and we can get a good understanding of what it entails.