|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk identification | Risk Type | Causes | Likelihood | Severity | How to avoid risk (planning) | How to monitor risk |
| Falling behind schedule | People/Estimation | * Not updating group members on progress * Spending too long on certain tasks * Devoting too much time to research/planning | High | High | 1. Regular meetings 2. Contingency plans 3. Checklists 4. Share realistic completion dates 5. Change schedule when necessary | 1. Update group members on progress 2. Count how many times the schedule has had to be changed |
| Software becomes inadequate for project | Technology | * Improper assessment of software requirements * Unexpected update/change in software | Moderate | High | 1. Keep list of alternatives 2. Thorough research of software choice | 1. Check changes within software updates |
| Failure for group to work congruently towards tasks | People | * Not updating groups members on progress * Not working on tasks together within small groups | Moderate | Moderate | 1. Regular meetings 2. Timetabled hours to perform tasks together | 1. Track group meeting attendance |
| Forgetting about smaller tasks | People | * Not following PERT chart * Thinking of them as insignificant | Low | Low | 1. Follow PERT chat 2. Give each person their own task | 1. Checking checklist for number of incomplete tasks |
| Not identifying a way to change street names, cards, etc externally | Requirement | * Only planning properly for near future tasks | Low | High | 1. Make it a topic at the next meeting 2. Assess software options based on group’s prior knowledge | 1. Keep list of tasks with undecided methods of completion |
| Ensuring flexibility within code | Requirement | * Not identifying parts which should be flexible * Not planning on how they could be made flexible | Moderate | High | 1. Careful planning | 1. Multiple people should test code for flexibility |
| Improper designs for code/UI/ | Planning | * Neglection of planning stage * Unrealistic design | Moderate | Low | 1. Coders review design plans | 1. Always share design ideas with people who will implement it |
| Incorrect interpretation of specification | Requirement | * Not agreeing as a group what certain phrases mean * Not using the same interpretation of the specification | Moderate | High | 1. Create clearer version of specification 2. Ask Watson Games for clarification | 1. Group reviews of group members tasks |