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Risk List

| Risk Description | Risk Level |
| --- | --- |
| R1. Distance Coding | Medium |
| R2. Communication between groups | Medium |
| R3. Covid Risk | Low |
| R4. Code complexity | Very low |
| R5. Bug Testing | Very low |
| R6. Version Management System | Very low |
| R7. Internal planning | Very low |
| R8. A team member dropping out | Very low |

### R1. Prevention and management of risk 1

### *Impacts*

Distance coding could make it more difficult to stay on the same page when working on the project.

### *Indications*

We aren’t meeting regularly and have difficulty understanding what others are working on.

### *Mitigation Strategy*

Regular meetings online to update each other on what we are working on as well as a text group where we can stay up to date or ask questions.

### R2. Prevention and management of risk 2

### *Impacts*

With the groups not always being in full contact with each other it could be difficult to stay up to date with what they are planning or working on. If they decide to change the scope on any aspect of their work and don’t tell us it could leave the project in jeopardy.

### *Indications*

Not knowing how the other groups are working/doing.

### *Mitigation Strategy*

Regular meetings online to update each other on what we are working on as well and if we need to have a more conventional meeting to update each other.

### R3. Prevention and management of risk 3

### *Impacts*

If any of the group members either get sick or we can’t have meetings in person due to risks from covid it could affect the projects outcome.

### *Indications*

If anyone becomes sick with covid or is unable to show up to meetings if they think they may be sick.

### *Mitigation Strategy*

Have more online than in person meetings to stay safe while we stay up to date.

### R4. Prevention and management of risk 4

### Impacts

Since we are operating in groups it is important that everyone can understand the code so that various people can take over or continue with that part if need be. Because if the code is too complex it may be impossible for the person taking over to understand the code.

### Indications

A good indication could be that nothing gets done in time.

### Mitigation strategy

The group can discuss beforehand at what level each person is when it comes to coding and they can then adjust the future code based on that information.

### R5. Prevention and management of risk 5

### *Impacts*

Without access to the other groups code or the physical devices it may be more difficult to bug test specifically to them.

### *Indications*

If we are having trouble with the testing or if it all works prior to testing the actual real devices or other groups code.

### *Mitigation Strategy*

Keep up to date on how the other groups are working on their parts as well as understanding what information will be required for the server to function.

### R6. Prevention and management of risk 6

### *Impacts*

If any of us have difficulty with GitHub, then it could affect how much an individual contributes to the project and therefore the project itself could suffer.

### *Indications*

If someone hasn’t updated their branch in a while or they don’t merge regularly.

### *Mitigation Strategy*

Keep your branch up to date and merge regularly and do not be afraid to ask for help with GitHub.

### 

### R7. Prevention and management of risk 7

### *Impacts*

If we do not plan what we must accomplish in the upcoming weeks properly, it might lead to complications such as not being able to finish certain features.

### *Indications*

If the subgroup is approaching a deadline without much work completed.

### *Mitigation strategy*

Making sure beforehand that every step is thoroughly planned so the group can account for time.

### R8. Prevention and management of risk 8

### Impacts

It would increase the workload by a lot for one person enormously since our subgroup has divided the coding into client/server respectively.

### Indications

We would be notified if that was the case.

### Mitigation strategy

The other team members would make sure to cover for the one that has the increased workload.

### Changes in priorities of risks

Since this project is approaching it’s final stage, many of the risk levels have naturally changed. Basically most of the risk levels have been reduced one or more levels since most of the project is almost fully functional and nearing completion. Alternatively if the project had not proceeded well, there might have been a need to put a lot of the risks higher. For example if the code was not being completed within the respective deadlines, maybe the internal planning risk should be set to high instead of low because the resources may have not been allocated correctly from the start. So the risks and their respective risk levels can alter significantly throughout the project’s runtime depending on the specific project.