UNIVERSITY
of York

BSc, BEng and MEng Degree Examinations 2019–20

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

Software Engineering Project (SEPR)

Open Group Assessment

Module	Software Engineering Project (SEPR)
Year	2019/20
Assessment	2
Team	The Dicy Cat
Members	Michele Imbriani Daniel Yates Luke Taylor Isaac Albiston Martha Cartwright Riju De Sean Corrigan
Deliverable	Risks Assessment and Mitigation Update

RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION UPDATE 2

URL: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UD0frmavJWK5oMfXCEIceYgVXL2Dz5iM/view

The team decided to stick with the methods of risk assessment and mitigation that were established in assessment 1: little to no changes in this section were therefore made.

The reason behind this choice is that the table format adopted proved to be highly efficient in providing the team with a good understanding of where the potential issues could lie. Given the many similarities in terms of tasks that need to be performed in assessment 2 and assessment 3, the team is confident that using the same approach will therefore be efficient in the future as well.

The most relevant changes made to this section were the modification of some of the likelihood and/or severities of some risks: the team was now able to identify, adjust and come up with appropriate mitigation strategies for some of the risks that were either underestimated or not considered. These changes are highlighted in the Risks Assessment Table in LIGHT BLUE and with a **remarked border**.

The reason for most of the changes made is that contrary to the previous assessment -in which the members had little to no experience and knowledge of libraries and tools for video-game development- the team can now rely on the experience obtained to re-asses the risks using the same principles and methods stated in Assessment 1 (see URL to team's website).

Because all the risks from the previous iteration still apply, they were inherited without being subject to change. However, because assessment 3 carries new challenges and risks that were not present in the previous assessment, new risks have been added to the risks table, which are highlighted in the updated risk table in YELLOW.

Here is a list:

- Testing is more requiring than estimated
- Missing and/or incomplete documentation in the new project
- Libraries and tools from the new project not coinciding with the one already used
- New project contains concealed architecture mistakes
- Syntax of new project difficult to understand
- Creators of new project unable/refusing to answer queries about their project

Furthermore, as suggested in the assessment 1 feedback, risks belonging to the same categories have been grouped within the same table section. No specific rationale was followed for the ordering of the groupings of categories.

Finally, a new risk mitigation strategy has been implemented specifically for addressing the problem encountered in assessment 2 concerning unit testing. It can be found in the Updated Risks Assessment and Mitigation document on the team's website (follow URL). Despite this strategy not being adopted from a textbook, the team believes that it is a natural and easy-to-stick-with strategy for mitigating risks, for it makes everyone on the team feel actively involved in the process by assigning a team member to a task. Nonetheless, we are open to the possibility of resorting to a different risk mitigation strategy, should the current one show signs of weaknesses or flaws. Everyone in the team is confident that, by sticking to the designated role, the success of this strategy will be guaranteed.