Project quality risk

Project risk identification:

We use SWOT analysis for project risk identification.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strength | | | Weakness | |
|  | Easy to enter data acquisition | Embedded algorithm blocks | Encapsulated user interface | The user interface is not pleasing | The scenarios are not diverse enough |
| Opportunity | Video data is diversified, and framing efficiency is improved | Easy to change algorithms for different effects | Easy to design and handle user interface modules | The interface can be optimized based on user feedback or member self-testing | As the software becomes more stable, different scenarios and functions can be added |
| Threat | Select or convert to supported data input formats (video, images) whenever possible | Choose the most efficient and stable algorithm possible | Adjust the interface as much as possible to make it user-friendly | It may directly lead to a decline in user experience and affect the market of software | Lack of interactivity and choice |

Quality risk assessment:

The quality risks included:

1. The user interface is not user-friendly.
2. The algorithm is not efficient.
3. The recommendation function is not smooth.
4. The test is not comprehensive enough

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Probability level | The possibility of happening |
| 0.9 | Very high |
| 0.7 | high |
| 0.5 | middle |
| 0.3 | low |
| 0.1 | Very low |

Assessment of the degree of risk impact:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Impact degree project objectives | Very high  0.9 | High  0.7 | Middle  0.5 | Low  0.3 | Very low  0.1 |
| cost | Greater than 20% cost increase | 10%-20% cost increase | 5%-10% cost increase | Less than 5% cost increase | Not obvious cost increase |
| Progress | Overall project delays greater than 20% | Overall project delays 10%-20% | Overall project delays 5%-10% | Overall project delays less than 5% | No noticeable delays |
| quality | The project product has no practical use | The quality drops to the point that it is unacceptable to the user | The decline in quality only affects very strict requirements | quality is  imperceptible | Loss of quality is almost imperceptible |

Risk assessment results:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risks | Probability | effect | sort |
| The user interface is not user-friendly. | 50% | 3 | 3 |
| The algorithm is not efficient. | 50% | 4 | 1 |
| The recommendation function is not smooth. | 40% | 4 | 2 |
| The test is not comprehensive enough | 30% | 3 | 4 |