ENG1 Assessment 1: Risk Assessment

Greenfield Development

Group 6

Members

Mark Faizi

Ben Faulkner

Christian Foister

Lewis Hanson

Ziyad Rashad Hassan

James Haworth

Risk Assessment

Our team adopted a structured risk management process to identify, assess, and mitigate risks throughout the software development lifecycle. Given the small-scale nature of the project, we maintained a straightforward yet effective approach to ensure that all potential risks were adequately addressed.

- 1. Risk Identification: Risks were initially identified during the planning phase and continually reviewed throughout development. Regular team discussions ensured that any emerging risks were promptly identified.
- 2. Risk Assessment: Each identified risk was evaluated in terms of its likelihood of occurrence and potential impact on the project. A simple scale of Low (1), Medium (2), and High (3) was used to quantify both likelihood and impact.
- 3. Risk Mitigation: Mitigation strategies were devised for each risk, focusing on either reducing the likelihood of the risk occurring or lessening its impact on the project. Preventative measures and contingency plans were established where necessary.
- 4. Risk Ownership: Each risk was assigned to a team member responsible for monitoring and managing the risk. The owner would act if the risk materialised or showed signs of escalation.
- 5. Risk Monitoring: Risks were reviewed at regular project milestones, ensuring that mitigation plans were up to date, and any new risks were properly managed.

Our risk register is structured with the following columns

b) Risk Register

Risk	Description	Likelihoo	Impact	Mitigation	Member
ID		d			
R1	Team member	Medium	Mediu	Ensure thorough	
	unavailable due	(2)	m (2)	documentation of	
	to illness or			tasks and	
	personal reasons.			knowledge	
				sharing across the	
				team. Assign	
				secondary	
				responsibilities to	
				other team	
				members.	

R2	Misunderstandin	Medium	High	Hold regular	
	g of customer	(2)	(3)	meetings with the	
	requirements			customer for	
	leading to			clarification.	
	incorrect			Ensure all	
	implementation.			requirements are	
				documented	
				clearly and signed	
				off by the	
				customer.	
R3	Integration	Medium	High	Conduct frequent	
	problems	(2)	(3)	code reviews and	
	between different			perform early	
	modules			integration	
	developed by			testing. Clearly	
	team members.			define module	
				interfaces and	
				communication	
				protocols.	
R4	Scope creep	Low (1)	High	Define the project	
	resulting from		(3)	scope at the	
	evolving			outset and handle	
	customer			changes through a	
	demands or			formal change	
	feature requests.			request process.	
				Communicate	
				scope limits to the	
				customer	
				regularly.	
R5	Delays due to	Low (1)	Mediu	Select	
	reliance on		m (2)	well-documented,	
	external libraries			widely used	
	or tools.			libraries. Include	
				buffer time in the	
				project schedule	
				to account for	

				potential issues with third-party	
				tools.	
R6	Lack of sufficient	Medium	High	Implement	
	testing leading to	(2)	(3)	test-driven	
	undetected bugs			development	
	or usability			(TDD) and conduct	
	issues.			both unit and	
				integration testing	
				throughout	
				development.	
R7	Insufficient time	Medium	High	Set internal	
	for bug fixing and	(2)	(3)	deadlines for	
	polishing before			feature	
	the deadline.			completion to	
				allow time for	
				testing and	
				refinement.	
				Prioritise key	
				features and	
				critical bugs.	

Rating System

• Likelihood:

- o Low (1) Unlikely to happen
- o Medium (2) May occur
- High (3) Likely to happen

• Impact:

- o Low (1) Minor effect on the project
- Medium (2) Moderate effect on the timeline or quality
- o High (3) Significant disruption to the project