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### 1. Stakeholder Identification

The following table identifies key stakeholders for the Requirements Gathering Agent project, categorized by their role and influence:

| Stakeholder | Category | Description | Type | Group/Individual |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Developers | Internal, Primary | Core development team responsible for building and maintaining the agent. | Internal | Group |
| Product Owner | Internal, Primary | Defines product vision, prioritizes features, and manages the product backlog. | Internal | Individual |
| PMO | Internal, Secondary | Project Management Office, providing oversight and governance. | Internal | Group |
| Marketing | Internal, Secondary | Responsible for promoting and marketing the Requirements Gathering Agent. | Internal | Group |
| Business Analysts | Internal, Secondary | Responsible for analyzing project requirements and translating business needs. | Internal | Group |
| End-Users (Project Managers, Business Analysts) | External, Primary | Project managers and business analysts who use the Requirements Gathering Agent. | External | Group |
| Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama | External, Secondary | Providers of AI services integrated into the Requirements Gathering Agent. | External | Organization |

### 2. Stakeholder Assessment

**Power/Interest Grid:**

| Power | High Interest | Low Interest |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **High** | End-Users (PMs, BAs), Developers, Product Owner | PMO |
| **Low** | Marketing, Business Analysts | Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama |

**Influence/Impact Matrix:** (Illustrative example - specific scores would be determined through stakeholder interviews and analysis)

| Stakeholder | Influence Score | Impact Score |
| --- | --- | --- |
| End-Users (PMs, BAs) | 9 | 9 |
| Developers | 8 | 7 |
| Product Owner | 7 | 8 |
| PMO | 6 | 6 |
| Marketing | 4 | 5 |
| Business Analysts | 5 | 4 |
| Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama | 3 | 6 |

**Stakeholder Attitudes & Engagement:**

* **End-Users (PMs, BAs):** High interest, initially neutral to slightly positive attitude. Engagement requires demonstrations, feedback sessions, and clear documentation.
* **Developers:** High interest and supportive. Engagement through regular stand-ups, code reviews, and sprint planning.
* **Product Owner:** Highly supportive and actively engaged. Regular meetings and priority setting are crucial.
* **PMO:** Moderate interest, requiring regular updates and adherence to reporting requirements.
* **Marketing:** Moderate interest, focused on success metrics and marketing materials.
* **Business Analysts:** Moderate interest, providing requirements and feedback during development.
* **Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama:** Low direct engagement; focus is on API stability and service level agreements.

### 3. Stakeholder Prioritization

* **High Priority:** End-Users (PMs, BAs), Developers, Product Owner
* **Medium Priority:** PMO, Marketing, Business Analysts
* **Low Priority:** Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama (managed via SLAs and API documentation)

### 4. Stakeholder Requirements and Expectations

* **End-Users (PMs, BAs):** Accurate, efficient, easy-to-use tool generating PMBOK-compliant documents; reliable AI integration; comprehensive documentation and support.
* **Developers:** Clear requirements, well-defined architecture, maintainable codebase, timely feedback, and appropriate tools/resources.
* **Product Owner:** On-time delivery, adherence to budget, high-quality product meeting market needs, successful launch and adoption.
* **PMO:** Project adherence to schedule, budget, and risk management plans; regular reporting and communication.
* **Marketing:** Marketing materials, success metrics, and a strong value proposition for the product launch.
* **Business Analysts:** Accurate translation of business requirements into technical specifications.
* **Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama:** Stable and reliable API services meeting performance requirements.

### 5. Communication Preferences

| Stakeholder | Preferred Communication Method(s) | Frequency | Information Requirements |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| End-Users (PMs, BAs) | Email, Online Forums, Documentation | Monthly, On-Demand | User guides, tutorials, release notes |
| Developers | Daily Stand-ups, Slack, Code Reviews | Daily, Weekly | Technical specifications, code changes, bug reports |
| Product Owner | Weekly meetings, Email, Jira | Weekly | Progress reports, backlog updates, risk assessments |
| PMO | Weekly reports, Email | Weekly | Status reports, risk register, budget updates |
| Marketing | Email, Presentations, Marketing Reports | Monthly, Ad-hoc | Marketing materials, launch plans, success metrics |
| Business Analysts | Email, Meetings | Bi-weekly | Requirements documents, feedback on specifications |
| Azure/Google/GitHub/Ollama | API documentation, Service Level Agreements | As needed | API updates, service outages, performance reports |

### 6. Engagement Strategies

* **High-Influence Stakeholders:** Regular meetings, proactive communication, feedback loops, and early involvement in design and testing.
* **Resistant Stakeholders:** Address concerns directly, provide clear rationale, demonstrate value, and offer training/support.
* **Champions:** Maintain open communication, acknowledge contributions, and involve them in key decision-making processes.

### 7. Risk Assessment

| Risk | Probability | Impact | Mitigation Strategy | Contingency Plan |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AI provider API issues | Medium | High | Multiple AI provider support; robust error handling and fallback mechanisms. | Switch to alternative provider; manual intervention |
| Stakeholder resistance to adoption | Low | Medium | Demonstrations, training, clear communication of benefits. | Targeted marketing campaigns; adjusted release plan |
| Scope creep | Medium | High | Formal scope management process; change control board. | Prioritize features based on stakeholder needs; adjust budget/timeline |
| Delays in AI model training | Low | Medium | Close collaboration with AI provider; contingency plans for model availability. | Use alternative models or simpler algorithms |
| Insufficient resources | Low | Medium | Resource allocation planning; contingency budget. | Adjust project scope; negotiate timeline extension |

This stakeholder analysis provides a framework for effective stakeholder management throughout the Requirements Gathering Agent project. Regular updates and adjustments to this document will be necessary to reflect evolving stakeholder needs and project circumstances.