

PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT

Group ID: 01

Date: 08/09/2020

	Document History					
Version	Date	Editor	Comment			
0.1	08/09/2020	Yusai	Create the document			
0.5	02/10/2020	Kyle	Finish the first edition, waiting the review			
1.0	05/10/2020	Kyle	Finish the correct			

Contents

Risk Identification	3
Risk analysis and prioritization	4
Risk Planning	
Risk Monitoring	

Risk Identification

Actors

• Personnel shortfalls

some team members may not have the experience or skills for some of the tasks to complete in a timely manner possible impacts include

- → tasks become delayed
- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Development technically to difficult

Development team taking on tasks that they might be outside of their skill set and not be able to complete on time because of a lack of experience or technical knowledge possible impacts include

- → Project tasks take longer
- → Project takes longer
- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Staff sickness

Team members having to take time off work in account of falling sick Or potentially multiple team members falling sick at the same time possible impacts include

- → Delays in project tasks
- → Project becomes over budget and over time

Structure

Unrealistic time and cost estimates

Time and cost estimates by the project team for project and tasks are too optimistic and potentially not achievable possible impacts include

- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Late changes to requirements

Any changes by the client to the requirements in the late stages of the project possible impacts include

- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Theft of data

Loss of project data to theft due to lack of system security possible impacts include

- → Loss of work
- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Natural disaster

In the event of a natural disaster such as earthquake or tsunami at the geographical location of project possible impacts include

- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- → Loss of hardware and data

Tasks

• Developing the wrong user interface

Where the development team creates a user interface that does not match the specification because they do not understand the requirements regarding the user interface possible impacts include

- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Developing the wrong software functions

The development team do not have a clear understanding of the requirements for software functions possible impacts include

- → Project becomes over budget and over time
- Gold plating

Development team adding in functionality to the system that stakeholders did not ask for or need possible impacts include

→ Project becomes over budget and over time

Technology

- Real time performance problems
 Performance problems with the use of the system, slow to respond, hangs at tasks or crashes possible impacts include
 - → Project task take longer
 - → Project becomes over budget and over time

Risk analysis and prioritization

- R1. Real time performance problems
 - (450,000) * (0.60) = 270,500
- R2. Late changes to requirements
 - (390,000) * (0.60) = 234,000
- R3. Gold plating
 - (380,000) * (0.60) = 228,000
- R4. Development technically to difficult
 - (430,000) * (0.40) = 172,000
- R5. Developing the wrong software functions
 - (425,000) * (0.40) = 170,000
- R6. Developing the wrong user interface
 - (420,000) * (0.40) = 168,000
- R7. Unrealistic time and cost estimates
 - (400,000) * (0.40) = 160,000
- R8. Personnel shortfalls
 - (385,000) * (0.35) = 134,750
- R9. Staff sickness
 - (385,000) * (0.25) = 96,520

R10. Theft of data

• (480,000) * (0.20) = 96,000

R11. Natural disaster

• (500,000) * (0.05) = 25,000

Budget = 375,000

	High	R11,			
	Significant		R10,		R1,
impact	Moderate			R4, R5, R6,	
	Low		R9,	R7, R8,	R2, R3,
		Low	Moderate	Significant	High

Probability

Probability level	Range
High	Greater than 50% chance of happening
Significant	30-50% chance of happening
Moderate	10-29% chance of happening
Low	Less than 10% chance of happening

Impact level	Range
High	Greater than 30% above budgeted expenditure
Significant	20 to 29% above budgeted expenditure
Moderate	10 to 19% above budgeted expenditure
Low	Within 10% of budgeted expenditure.

Risk Planning

Risk Acceptance

Risk Avoidance

Risk reduction

R2 Late changes to requirements

Some risk reduction measures include Implement change control, agree and sign off on agreed requirements early

Risk exposure before: this risk has a 60% chance of occurring at a potential cost of \$390000

Risk exposure after: implementation of the measures to solidify the user requirements would reduce the chance to 20% at an additional cost of \$2500

RRL = (((60*390000)/100)-((20*390000)/100))/2500 = 62.4

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R3 Gold plating

Some risk reduction measures include Requirements scrubbing, prototyping, design to cost, stockholder approval

Risk exposure before: 60% chance of gold plating with potential cost of \$380,000

Risk exposure after: with additional prototyping and time spent with stockholders to establish requirements at a cost of \$1000 reduces the chance to 20%

RRL = (((60*390000)/100)-((20*390000)/100))/1000 = 156

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R5 Developing the wrong software functions

Some risk reduction measures include Improved software evaluation; formal specification methods; user surveys; prototyping; early user manuals

Risk exposure before: 40% chance of the wrong software functions being developed with a potential cost of \$425,000

Risk exposure after: with additional time spent to document and establish specific requirements for functions from clients would reduce the chance of occurring to 20% at a cost of \$1000

RRL = (((40*425000)/100)-((20*425000)/100))/1000 = 85

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R6 Developing the wrong user interface

Some risk reduction measures include Prototyping, user involvement

Risk exposure before: there is a 40% chance of developing the wrong user interface with a potential cost of \$420000

Risk exposure after: with additional time spent prototyping the project and having users involved in the project would cost \$1500 and reduce the chance of this risk to 15%

RRL = (((40*420000)/100)-((15*420000)/100))/1500 = 70

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R7 Unrealistic time and cost estimates

Some risk reduction measures include the uses of multiple techniques for estimations; design to cost; incremental development; analysis of past projects.

Risk exposure before: there is a 40% chance of this risk occurring with a potential cost of \$400,000

Risk exposure after: with additional time spent on analysis of past projects and the use of multiple estimating techniques and the use of incremental development costing \$2000 and reducing the chance to 30%

RRL = (((40*400000)/100)-((30*400000)/100))/2000 = 20

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R8 Personnel shortfalls

Some risk reduction measures include job matching, asses team members and utilize their skills; teambuilding and training; early scheduling of key personnel.

Risk exposure before: with a 35% chance of this risk occurring with a potential cost of \$385,000

Risk exposure after: with additional time spent on selecting and hiring the right team member for the right tasks based on their strengths and skill sets, training team members that may be lacking skills, with a potential cost of \$10,000 would reduce the chance of this risk to 10%

RRL = (((35*385000)/100)-((10*385000)/100))/100000 = 9.6

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R10 Theft of data

Some risk reduction measures include Implement buck ups off site and increase security protocols in servers and physical security on site.

Risk exposure before: this risk has a 20% chance of occurring with a potential cost of \$480000

Risk exposure after: implementing off site backups and upgraded security would cost \$20000 and reduce the risk to 5%

RRL = (((20*480000)/100)-((5*480000)/100))/20000 = 3.6

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

Risk transfer

R11 Natural disaster

Some risk reduction measures include implementation of buck ups off site and across multiple geographical locations to third party companies

Risk exposure before: this risk has a 5% chance of occurring with a potential cost of \$500000

Risk exposure after: implementing off site backups to third party companies across multiple geographic locations would reduce the risk of losing data to this risk to 1% at a cost of 40000

RRL = (((5*500000)/100)-((1*500000)/100))/40000 = 0.5

RRL < 1 therefore not worth implementing

Risk mitigation

R1 Real time performance problems

Some risk reduction measures include Testing, prototyping and get end user input

Risk exposure before: this risk has a chance 60% of occurring with a potential cost of \$450000

Risk exposure after: with time taken to perform proper testing and communication with users to catch these issues early in the development would reduce the potential impact to \$395000 at an additional cost of \$5000

RRL = (((60*450000)/100)-((40*450000)/100))/5000 = 6.6

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R4 Development technically to difficult

Some risk reduction measures include Technical analysis, prototyping, training

Risk exposure before: this risk has a 40% chance of occurring with a potential cost of \$430000

Risk exposure after: with some additional time taken to perform technical analysis of the project, prototyping and additional training for team members would reduce the impact cost to \$385000 with an additional cost of \$8500

RRL = (((40*430000)/100)-((40*385000)/100))/8500 = 2.1

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

R9 Staff sickness

Some risk reduction measures include Implementation of critical chain buffer in scheduling

Risk exposure before: this risk has a 25% chance of occurring with a potential cost of \$385000

Risk exposure after: with some additional time spent on scheduling to include critical chain buffer to account for staff sickness would cost an additional \$600 and would reduce the potential cost impact to \$379000

RRL = (((25*385000)/100)-((25*379000)/100))/600 = 2.5

RRL > 1 therefore worth implementing

Risk Monitoring

Risk Register

MISK MEGISTEI					
Risk record					
Risk ID	R1	Risk title	Real time p	erforma	nce problems
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status	
Risk description Performance pro crashes	blems with the us	e of the system,	slow to resp	ond, har	ngs at tasks or
search the syster	on is could cause proj m to find why, and nd time to find an	I fix the issue, th	•		
	d in depth, run pro formance issues e		t users input	often,	
	T	T	Impa	ct	
	probability	Cost	Impa Durati		quality
Pre-mitigation	60%	390,000	Barati	011	quanty
Post-mitigation	20%	390,000			
Incident/action h	nistory				
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/o	comment	<u> </u>

Risk ID					
	R2	Risk title	Late change	es to requ	irements
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status	
Risk description Any changes by t	he client to the re	quirements in t	he late stages	of the pr	oject
And cost more to	the project to be on implement.				ly in the
project Probability/impa	ct values	I	Impa		
	probability	Cook	Impac Duratio		بيانا منيم
Pre-mitigation	60%	Cost 390,000	Duratio	ווע	quality
Post-mitigation	20%	390,000			
Incident/action h		330,000			
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/co	omment	

Risk record	T	T	T		
Risk ID	R3	Risk title	Gold plating		
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20 st	tatus	
Risk description					
for or need	am adding in funct	tionality to the s	ystem that stak	eholde	ers did not ask
Impact description The impact is the functionality.	on at the developmer	nt team waist tin	ne and effort or	n this u	nwanted
	isk mitigation III team members rack of what requ			asked t	for by the
Probability/impa	ct values				
	probability		Impact		
	probability	Cost	Duration		quality
Pre-mitigation	60%	380,000			
Post-mitigation	20%	380,000			
Incident/action h	nistory				
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/con	nment	

Risk record					
Risk ID	R4	Risk title	Development technically to difficult		
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20 sta	tus	
•	am taking on tasks lete on time becau	, -			
Impact descripti This can cause to and taking longe	asks to be delayed	and potentially	the entire projec	Costing more	
Recommended reform technical Probability/impa	al analysis of the p	roject, prototyp	e the project.		
			Impact		
	probability	Cost	Duration	quality	
Pre-mitigation	40%	480,000			
Post-mitigation	40%	385,000			
Incident/action I	history				
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/comr	 nent	

Risk record					
Risk ID	R5	Risk title	Developing the wrong software functions		ng software
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status	
Risk description The developmer software functio	nt team do not hav ns	e a clear unders	tanding of th	ne require	ements for
Impact description The impact is the indented to be n	at the client could	end up with syst	tem that is n	ot what t	hey had
early user manu	ion methods of thals to help find the	•			otyping and
Probability/impa	ict values	T			
	probability		Impa		11.
Dro mitigation	40%	Cost	Durati	on	quality
Pre-mitigation Post-mitigation	20%	425,000 425,000			
Incident/action I		423,000			
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/o	comment	
				_	

Risk record						
Risk ID	R6	Risk title	Developing interface	the wro	ong user	
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status		
	lopment team createause they do not u					
team to complet	on could be created t cely redo the interf ding over budget to	face costing time				
Recommended r formal specificat and client appro	tion methods of the val of designs	e requirements	of the user in	nterface,	prototyping	
	T	Γ	Imna	-1		
		Impact				
	probability	Cost			quality	
Pre-mitigation	, ,	Cost 420.000	Durati		quality	
Pre-mitigation Post-mitigation	40%	420,000			quality	
Pre-mitigation Post-mitigation Incident/action h	40%				quality	
Post-mitigation	40%	420,000		on		

Risk record						
Risk ID	R7	Risk title	Unrealistic	realistic time and cost		
			estimates			
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status		
Risk description						
	timates by the pro	oject team for p	project and ta	sks are to	o optimistic	
and potentially n	ot achievable					
Impact description	on					
	d take longer and	cost more than	first estimate	ed.		
Recommended r	isk mitigation					
	nultiple estimatio	ns techniques t	o cross refere	ence and a	analysis of	
	are similar as a ba	•			•	
design to cost.		,	·	'	•	
J						
Probability/impa	ct values					
	1 1 111		Impa	ict		
	probability	Cost	Durat	ion	quality	
Pre-mitigation	40%	400,000				
Post-mitigation	30%	400,000				
Incident/action h	nistory		•			
•		T	T			
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/	comment		
	Ī	I	1			

Risk record							
Risk ID	R8	Risk title	Personnel shortfalls				
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status			
Risk description some team mem	bers may not have	e the experience	e or skills for	some of tl	he tasks		
Impact description causing delays in	on task completion a	and potentially t	he entire pro	oject.			
to tasks early, an	nembers and utilized training of team				ey personal		
Probability/impa	ct values						
	probability		Impact				
		Cost	Durat	ion	quality		
Pre-mitigation	35%	385,000					
Post-mitigation	10%	385,000					
Incident/action h	nistory						
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/comment				

Risk record					
Risk ID	R9	Risk title	Staff sickness		
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status	
Risk description					
Team members ha				_	
Or potentially mu	Itiple team memb	pers falling sick a	it the same i	time	
Impact description	n				
This can cause tas	sk delays in the pr	oject potentially	causing the	e project t	o run over
time					
Recommended ris	sk mitigation				
Schedule early an	-	cal chain buffer	to allow for	any time	delays in
critical path				,	, .
•					
Probability/impac	t values				
	probability Impact				
	probability	Cost	Durat	ion	quality
Pre-mitigation	25%	385,000			
Post-mitigation	25%	379,000			
Incident/action hi	istory				
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/comment		

Risk record						
Risk ID	R10	Risk title	Theft of data			
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status		
Risk description	,					
•	ata to theft due to	lack of system s	security			
Impact description	on					
With the loss of	project data can co	ost the project a	lot of mone	y and tim	ne to recover	
	sing delays in the	project and cost	ing the com	pany mor	ney and	
intellectual prop	erty					
Recommended r	isk mitigation					
	er system security	•			te back ups of	
project data and	use physical secu	rity measures fo	r on site sec	urity		
Probability/impa	ct values					
	probability	Impact				
	probability	Cost	Durat	ion	quality	
Pre-mitigation	20%	480,000				
Post-mitigation	5%	480,000				
Incident/action h	nistory					
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/comment		i	

Risk record	Γ	T	1			
Risk ID	R11	Risk title	Natural disaster			
Owner	Kyle murphy	Date raised	2/10/20	status		
Risk description In the event of a location of proje	natural disaster sı ct	uch as earthqua	ke or tsunan	ni at the ge	ographical	
recover these an	assive loss of data d cost a lot of time				•	
Recommended r Implement off si	isk mitigation te backups across	multiple sites				
Probability/impa	ct values					
	probability Impact					
	probability	Cost	Durat	ion	quality	
Pre-mitigation	5%	500,000				
Post-mitigation	1%	500,000				
Incident/action h	nistory					
Date	Incident/action	Actor	Outcome/	Outcome/comment		