Wandi Cravings on Wheels: Wande's Food Truck Project

Teaching Note

Synopsis

This case follows Wande, a Nigerian entrepreneur and founder of *Wandi Cravings*, as she seeks to expand her brand into the UK through a food van in Leicester. Having grown her business in Lagos through instinct, networks, and persistence, Wande now confronts a very different environment — one defined by regulation, limited capital, and new consumer expectations. The food van appears to be the most viable entry point: mobile, flexible, and relatively low-cost. Yet once the decision is made, Wande realises that her idea remains hazy and unstructured. The narrative highlights the challenges of defining a project without formal project management training. What counts as deliverables? How should outcomes and success be measured? How can time and resources be realistically managed under visa constraints and ongoing obligations to Nigerian outlets? Stakeholder pressures — from regulators, suppliers, designers, staff, event organisers, and diaspora communities — complicate the picture, while uncertainties around licensing delays, weather, consumer uptake, and cost inflation add further risk. Students are invited to step into Wande's shoes and apply core project management tools: Work Breakdown Structures, scheduling, stakeholder analysis, risk registers, and scope definition. The case provides raw exhibits but leaves the structuring to the classroom.

Relevant Course and Levels

This case is designed for postgraduate students in project management and Entrepreneurship. It is particularly relevant for modules on Project Planning and Control, Small Business Management, or Entrepreneurship in Emerging and International Contexts.

Learning Objectives

This case is designed to help students achieve the following learning outcomes:

1. Construct a Project Scope Statement that differentiates project deliverables from ongoing operational goals.
2. Translate an unstructured entrepreneurial task list into a hierarchical Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) with clearly defined work packages and dependencies.
3. Develop a Project Schedule using Critical Path Method (CPM) analysis to determine the viability of the six-month launch window.
4. Analyse competing stakeholder expectations using appropriate stakeholder frameworks (e.g., power–interest grid, salience model).
5. Design a basic risk register that identifies key project risks, evaluates their severity, and proposes realistic mitigation strategies.

Research Methodology

This case is based on conversations with Wande, co-author of this teaching case and the founder of *Wandi Cravings* in early 2025. The interview explored her entrepreneurial journey in Nigeria, her transition to the UK, and the dilemmas she faced in attempting to launch a food van without prior project management training. Follow-up conversations provided additional detail on her decision-making process, resource constraints, and interactions with stakeholders

such as local council regulators, vehicle suppliers, and members of the diaspora community. The narrative has been anonymised in some places to protect the identities of third parties (e.g., suppliers), but Wande herself is presented as a character closely reflecting the real entrepreneur's voice, aspirations, and challenges. The case is intended for teaching purposes only. It does not aim to provide a comprehensive business history of *Wandi Cravings* but instead uses Wande's experience to highlight project definition, planning, and execution dilemmas faced by first-time entrepreneurs entering new markets.

Links to Theory and Practice

This case sits at the intersection of entrepreneurship and project management, illustrating how an entrepreneurial vision must be translated into structured, deliverable form through project management principles. Wande's challenge in launching her food van in Leicester demonstrates that passion and intuition, though valuable, are insufficient in a regulated, resource-constrained environment. The case therefore provides a bridge between the informal, emergent practices of entrepreneurship and the formal disciplines of planning, scoping, and control that underpin effective project delivery.

The first theoretical connection lies in project scope and success criteria. According to the Project Management Body of Knowledge Guide (PMBOK®, PMI, 2021), scope definition forms the foundation of project planning, requiring explicit articulation of deliverables, boundaries, and acceptance criteria. Kerzner (2017) warns that without such clarity, projects risk scope creep and misaligned expectations. Turner (2009) further observes that in entrepreneurial settings, scope is often emergent and iterative. Wande's difficulty in defining what "launching a food van" actually meant captures this tension: her project began as a vision but required translation into measurable outputs and success measures.

A second link concerns the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), a tool for decomposing complex initiatives into manageable components (Meredith and Mantel, 2017). Wande's chaotic "to-do list" exemplifies the unstructured pre-WBS stage. By transforming her scattered notes into a hierarchical WBS, students learn how structured decomposition clarifies deliverables, reveals dependencies, and provides the foundation for accountability and sequencing.

The time–cost–quality trade-offs inherent in Wande's supplier decisions invite application of classical scheduling methods such as the Critical Path Method (Lock, 2020) and milestone mapping. Leach (1999) argues that in resource-constrained contexts, project managers must balance speed and cost explicitly. Wande's decision between a fast but expensive supplier and a cheaper but delayed option mirrors this real-world dilemma, showing how schedule optimisation is both analytical and strategic.

The case also foregrounds stakeholder management as a determinant of project legitimacy and success. Mendelow's (1991) power–interest grid and Mitchell, Agle and Wood's (1997) salience model provide complementary lenses for analysing the competing claims of regulators, suppliers, designers, event organisers, and diaspora customers. Bourne (2015) notes that in entrepreneurial projects, stakeholder alignment is particularly critical because new ventures often lack institutional legitimacy. Wande's efforts to satisfy regulatory authorities while retaining cultural authenticity for diaspora consumers capture this dynamic vividly.

Finally, risk management offers a unifying framework for addressing the uncertainties that permeate the case — licensing delays, weather variability, consumer adoption, and inflation. Hillson (2009) and Chapman and Ward (2011) advocate structured risk identification and mitigation through tools such as risk registers and contingency planning. Yet, as Knight (1921) reminds us, entrepreneurial contexts often involve uncertainty rather than quantifiable risk. Wande's experience reflects this distinction: she cannot compute probabilities precisely, but she can plan adaptively through buffers, phased launches, and flexible supply chains. While traditional tools such as the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), Critical Path Method (CPM), and structured budgeting derive from predictive, plan-driven project management, entrepreneurial environments require greater adaptability. Contemporary research on uncertainty management (Chapman & Ward, 2011; Hillson, 2009) and minimum viable project design (Lenfle, 2016) emphasises incremental planning and learning under volatile conditions. Hybrid approaches (Conforto et al., 2016; Serrador & Pinto, 2015) show that combining predictive structure with Agile-informed flexibility is particularly effective for early-stage ventures. This balance fits Wande's situation: regulatory milestones and supplier lead times require firm sequencing, while menu refinement, branding choices, and market testing demand iterative adjustment as new information emerges.

Teaching Plan

The case is most effective in a 90-minute workshop with 25–40 students, working in small groups (3–5). It should be taught as a *practical tool-building exercise* rather than a theory lecture. To support instructors with different teaching styles and experience levels, the case can be facilitated using several alternative approaches. For less experienced cohorts, instructors may provide partial scaffolds — such as a WBS template or pre-labelled workstreams — to help students organise the unstructured to-do list. More advanced groups can work with fully open inquiry, debating which tasks belong in scope and defending their sequencing choices. Instructors may also incorporate short ranking or voting exercises to resolve supplier trade-off decisions, or use brief role-play segments (e.g., "regulator," "supplier," "diaspora customer") to expose stakeholder tensions. These flexible facilitation options help adapt the case to different classroom dynamics while keeping the core learning outcomes intact. The recommended order of activities (WBS → scheduling → stakeholders → risk → integration) mirrors standard PM planning logic and provides a clear escalation from definition to execution.

Step 1. Narrative Immersion (15 minutes)

- **Instructor action:** Begin by summarising Wande's story (or ask a student volunteer to do so after reading). Pose the opening question: *"What does 'launching a food van' actually mean as a project?"*
- **Purpose:** To surface ambiguity and get students reflecting on the difference between *vision* and *structured execution*.
- **Expected output:** Students identify multiple interpretations (buying a van, first day of trading, securing licences, etc.), revealing why project definition is challenging.

This step also sets up the sequencing for subsequent activities by helping students articulate what "completion" looks like before breaking the work down.

Step 2. Structuring Work – To-Do List into WBS (25 minutes)

- **Material:** Exhibit 2 (messy to-do list).
- **Task:** Groups cluster items into logical work packages and draft a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) on flipchart or whiteboard.
- **Instructor prompt:** "Where does this project start? Where does it finish? What belongs in scope and what does not?"
- **Expected output:** Students produce first-, second-, and sometimes third-level WBS diagrams, debating scope boundaries (e.g., is social media launch part of the project or ongoing operations?).

Step 3. Planning Under Constraints – Budget & Supplier Trade-offs (25 minutes)

- **Material:** Exhibit 1 (rough budget) + Exhibit 3 (supplier meeting notes).
- **Task:** Groups build a **simple schedule** (milestone chart or Gantt) and discuss supplier options.
- **Instructor prompt:** "If you had six months and limited funds, which supplier path would you choose, and how would this shape your timeline?"
- **Expected output:** Draft schedules with different critical paths (fast but costly vs slower but cheaper options). Recognition that supplier choice directly affects risk and viability.

Step 4. Stakeholder Mapping (20 minutes)

- **Material:** Stakeholder examples from case narrative.
- **Task:** Groups place actors (regulators, suppliers, staff, diaspora, festival organisers) on a **power/interest grid** or salience model.
- **Instructor prompt:** "Who matters most at the start? Who becomes critical later? How do you keep expectations aligned?"
- **Expected output:** Visual maps highlighting regulators as high-power stakeholders, diaspora as high-interest, and the tensions between them.

Step 5. Risk Analysis (20 minutes)

- **Material:** Case narrative (licensing delays, weather, consumer uptake, inflation). Optional Exhibit 4 (risk notes).
- **Task:** Draft a **risk register** with columns for risk description, likelihood, impact, and mitigation/contingency.
- **Instructor prompt:** "Which risks can be reduced? Which must be accepted? How might they interact?"
- **Expected output:** Registers that prioritise licensing and supplier delays as high impact, with weather and uptake seen as harder to control. Discussion of buffers, contingency budgets, and adaptive strategies.

Step 6. Integration & Reflection (15 minutes)

- **Task:** Groups briefly present outputs (WBS, schedules, maps, registers). Instructor facilitates comparison.
- **Instructor prompt:** "If you were Wande, what is the very first action you would take tomorrow morning? Why?"
- **Expected output:** Students integrate learning across tools, recognising that structured project management provides a pathway from vision to execution.

Because groups often produce different WBS structures and schedules, instructors should use these contrasts deliberately to deepen analysis. For example, one group may build a WBS centred on marketing and branding activities, while another prioritises regulatory compliance or vehicle procurement. To reconcile these differences, instructors can prompt students with questions such as:

• "What assumptions about project scope led each group to structure their WBS this way?"

• "If you had to merge Group A's 'branding-first' structure with Group B's 'compliance-first' structure, what becomes non-negotiable?"

• "Which sequencing better protects Wande against her visa deadline?"

• "How does the critical path change if branding is deprioritised or if licensing is delayed?"

These prompts help students recognise that variations in WBS design often reflect different interpretations of scope, risk tolerance, and stakeholder priorities — and that integrating multiple perspectives is itself a core project management skill.

Instructor Note for Exhibit 1 (Budget Outline)

Exhibit 1 in the case is intentionally incomplete and contains several missing or vague cost categories. Instructors should use the exhibit to prompt students to identify information gaps, challenge unrealistic assumptions, and refine the financial baseline. The exhibit works best as the starting point for discussions on constraints, prioritisation, and how budgeting interacts with scheduling and supplier decisions.

Instructor Note for Exhibit 2 (Messy To-Do List)

Exhibit 2 deliberately preserves the ambiguity and disorganisation of early entrepreneurial planning. Instructors should emphasise that the goal is not to "correct" the list but to transform it into a structured Work Breakdown Structure (WBS). Students should debate scope boundaries, identify dependencies, and recognise how unstructured inputs can be decomposed into manageable work packages.

Instructor Note for Exhibit 3 (Supplier Comparison Notes)

Exhibit 3 provides the basis for analysing supplier trade-offs under time, cost, and risk constraints. Instructors can encourage students to compare the implications of each option on the critical path, cash flow, and launch viability. This exhibit also supports broader discussions about decision-making under uncertainty and the time–cost–quality tension common in small-business projects.

Discussion Questions

1. Based on Wande's background and her rough notes, how would you define the *scope* of the food van project? What should count as deliverables, objectives, and success measures?

2. Wande's "to-do list" is long, messy, and overlapping. How can you translate it into a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) that clarifies work packages, dependencies, and priorities?
3. Looking at her rough budget and supplier notes, how could you build a project schedule that fits within her capital and six-month horizon? Which supplier option would you recommend, and why?
4. Who are the key stakeholders in Wande's project, and how do their expectations differ? Using a stakeholder grid or salience model, how should she manage these relationships to keep the project on track?
5. What are the major risks facing Wande's venture (licensing, weather, demand, costs)? How can these be translated into a risk register with likelihood, impact, and possible mitigation actions?

Discussion Question Answers

Q1. Based on Wande's background and her rough notes, how would you define the scope of the food van project? What should count as deliverables, objectives, and success measures?

At this stage, Wande's idea of "launching a food van" is an *unstructured vision*, not yet a project. Defining scope requires separating what is *inside* the project from what belongs to longer-term business operations. According to the PMBOK® Guide (PMI, 2021), the scope statement should include deliverables, exclusions, constraints, and success criteria.

- **Project deliverables (finite, tangible outcomes):**
    1. A roadworthy van purchased and legally owned.
    2. Kitchen conversion compliant with UK food safety standards.
    3. Council licences and food hygiene certification approved.
    4. Branding and logo applied to van.
    5. Menu tested and initial supply chain secured.
    6. Launch day trading event in Leicester.
- **Project objectives (broader intentions linked to strategy):**

    1. Establish a recognised UK presence for Wandi Cravings by completing the launch of a branded food van in Leicester within six months.
    2. Test the viability of Nigerian street food in Leicester by achieving at least 200 customer transactions across the first three months of trading.
    3. Operate the food van within a maximum start-up budget of £20,000, including vehicle purchase, conversion, and initial stock.
    4. Commence trading within six months to comply with post-study visa conditions and demonstrate early business viability.

- **Success measures (measurable criteria):**
    - Formal: all regulatory approvals secured; trading commenced within six months.
    - Commercial: achieve break-even point within 6–9 months.
    - Customer: positive feedback from diaspora and non-diaspora groups; repeat purchases observed.

- Strategic: evidence of demand that justifies scaling (e.g., event bookings, catering enquiries).

Students often conflate *ongoing business goals* (profitability, brand recognition) with *project deliverables*. Instructors should guide them to articulate a scope baseline: deliverables (what the project will produce), constraints (time, cost, visa horizon), and success criteria (how progress will be judged).

Q2. Wande's "to-do list" is long, messy, and overlapping. How can you translate it into a WBS that clarifies work packages and dependencies?

The "to-do" list in Exhibit 2 shows the confusion of unstructured entrepreneurial planning: tasks are mixed (strategic, operational, regulatory, marketing), repeated, and sequenced incorrectly. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)(Meredith & Mantel, 2017; PMI, 2021) decomposes the project hierarchically into deliverables and work packages.

Step 1: Identify major deliverables/workstreams

1. Vehicle acquisition & conversion
2. Regulatory compliance
3. Menu development & supply chain
4. Branding & marketing
5. Staffing & operations
6. Launch event

Step 2: Break down each deliverable into work packages

1. Vehicle Acquisition & Conversion
1.1 Identify and compare suppliers
1.2 Select supplier and purchase van
1.3 Kitchen conversion (install cooker, extractor, storage)
1.4 MOT, roadworthiness check, and basic repairs
1.5 Vehicle branding wrap (design and fitting)

2. Regulatory Compliance
2.1 Complete Level 2 Food Hygiene course
2.2 Apply for council food safety inspection
2.3 Apply for street trading licence
2.4 Secure insurance (vehicle and public liability)

3. Menu Development & Supply Chain
3.1 Select launch menu (jollof, wraps, puff-puff, etc.)
3.2 Test and refine recipes
3.3 Identify and contract suppliers (spices, plantain, packaging)
3.4 Pilot menu tasting with diaspora community

4. Branding & Marketing
4.1 Logo design
4.2 Social media setup (Instagram, Facebook)

4.3 Launch promotional campaign (flyers, ads, collaborations)
4.4 Professional photography of menu/van

5. Staffing & Operations
5.1 Decide on staffing model (solo vs part-time staff)
5.2 Recruit and train staff (if required)
5.3 Set up payment systems (card reader, cash float)
5.4 Secure parking/storage for van

6. Launch Preparation & Event
6.1 Identify launch location/date (Leicester market/festival)
6.2 Register/apply for event participation
6.3 Stock initial supplies for launch
6.4 Conduct soft launch/trial run
6.5 Official launch event

Step 3: Sequence dependencies

- Van must be acquired before conversion.
- Kitchen conversion precedes inspection.
- Regulatory approval precedes trading.
- Branding ideally happens before launch marketing.

Structured decomposition prevents circular thinking and reveals hidden dependencies. Encourage groups to draw WBS trees and compare: some may emphasise technical (vehicle, licences), others marketing or launch. Use this diversity to show WBS flexibility, while stressing the need for completeness and logical hierarchy.

Q3. Looking at her rough budget and supplier notes, how could you build a project schedule that fits within her capital and six-month horizon? Which supplier option would you recommend, and why?

This question integrates budget, schedule, and supplier trade-offs and requires students to justify their assumptions explicitly.

- **Budget constraints:** Rough budget shows £16.8k–£23.5k plus gaps. Supplier B (£24.5k) already risks exhausting her funds. Supplier C is cheapest but slowest. Supplier A is middle ground but with quality concerns.
- **Schedule analysis (simplified critical path):**
    1. Vehicle decision & purchase (weeks 1–4).
    2. Kitchen conversion (weeks 4–8, Supplier A; weeks 1–6, Supplier B; up to 3 months, Supplier C).
    3. Regulatory approval (after conversion, allow 2–4 weeks).
    4. Branding (parallel with approvals).
    5. Stock procurement & staff recruitment (weeks 8–10).
    6. Launch (target within six months).

A sample schedule is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Work Breakdown and Timeframe

Work Package / Task	Duration (weeks)	Dependencies	Timeframe
1. Vehicle Acquisition & Conversion			
1.1 Identify and compare suppliers	2	–	Weeks 1–2
1.2 Select supplier & purchase van	1	1.1	Week 3
1.3 Kitchen conversion (fit-out)	4	1.2	Weeks 4–7
1.4 MOT & inspection	1	1.3	Week 8
1.5 Vehicle branding wrap	2	1.3 (parallel with 1.4 possible)	Weeks 7–8
2. Regulatory Compliance			
2.1 Food Hygiene course	1	–	Week 2
2.2 Apply for council inspection	2	1.3, 2.1	Weeks 7–8
2.3 Apply for street trading licence	2	2.2	Weeks 8–9
2.4 Secure insurance	1	1.2	Week 4
3. Menu Development & Supply Chain			
3.1 Select launch menu	2	–	Weeks 1–2
3.2 Recipe testing	3	3.1	Weeks 3–5
3.3 Contract suppliers	2	3.2	Weeks 5–6
3.4 Pilot tasting with diaspora group	1	3.2	Week 6
4. Branding & Marketing			
4.1 Logo design	2	–	Weeks 2–3
4.2 Social media setup	1	4.1	Week 4
4.3 Launch promotion campaign	4	4.2	Weeks 6–9
4.4 Professional photography	1	4.1	Week 5
5. Staffing & Operations			
5.1 Staffing decision	1	–	Week 5
5.2 Recruit & train staff	3	5.1	Weeks 6–8
5.3 Set up payment systems	1	–	Week 7
5.4 Secure parking/storage	1	–	Week 6
6. Launch Preparation & Event			
6.1 Identify launch date/location	2	2.3	Weeks 9–10
6.2 Register/apply for event participation	2	6.1	Weeks 10–11
6.3 Stock initial supplies	1	3.3	Week 11
6.4 Soft launch/trial run	1	6.3	Week 12

6.5 Official launch	1	6.4	Week 13 (~end of Month 3)

Source: Authors own work

- **Trade-off assessment:**
  - *Supplier A*: Moderate cost, 4–8 weeks. Risk: older van, basic kitchen.
  - *Supplier B*: Expensive but immediate, higher quality, warranty. Risk: exhausts capital, less cash buffer.
  - *Supplier C*: Cheap, but conversion delays could push beyond 3 months, threatening launch before festival season.

Recommendation: From a project management perspective, Supplier A is most balanced — but Supplier B may be justified if risk appetite is low and access to extra cash is possible. Supplier C is high risk for a time-constrained project.

Teaching angle: The goal is not a single "correct" choice, but for students to articulate criteria (cost, speed, reliability, compliance). Encourage them to build Gantt charts or milestone maps to visualise critical paths and debate trade-offs.

Q4. Who are the key stakeholders in Wande's project, and how do their expectations differ? How should she manage these relationships?

Stakeholder complexity emerges because each actor has distinct goals and varying influence.

- **Regulators (council officers, food safety inspectors):** High power, high urgency. Must be engaged formally, with compliance-first approach.
- **Suppliers (vehicle, ingredients):** Medium power, medium interest. Affect costs and timelines; require negotiation and contract clarity.
- **Designers/branding consultants:** Medium interest, lower power. Important for visibility but not critical to regulatory approval.
- **Diaspora community:** High interest, moderate power. Provide legitimacy, early customer base, and word-of-mouth. Must balance authenticity with broader appeal.
- **Event organisers (festivals, markets):** High power during festival season; gatekeepers of visibility. Require professional engagement.
- **Staff (if recruited):** High operational impact. Their reliability affects day-to-day delivery.

Mendelow's (1991) power/interest grid shows regulators and event organisers in "manage closely"; diaspora in "keep informed"; suppliers in "keep satisfied." Mitchell et al.'s (1997) salience model adds urgency, showing regulators and festival organisers as definitive stakeholders.

Push students to consider conflicting expectations: diaspora authenticity vs mainstream palatability; cost-saving vs branding. The real lesson is that stakeholder mapping is not static — influence shifts across the project life cycle.

Q5. What are the major risks facing Wande's venture? How can these be captured in a risk register with likelihood, impact, and mitigation actions?

Students should recognise both business risks and project management risks as shown in table 2.

- **Licensing delays** – High likelihood, high impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Apply early; maintain communication with council; prepare required hygiene training.
- **Weather variability** – Medium likelihood, high impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Flexible locations; consider indoor trading partnerships; build contingency menu with low waste risk.
- **Consumer uptake uncertain** – Medium likelihood, high impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Market testing; menu pilots with diaspora communities; adapt spice levels/portion sizes.
- **Cost inflation** – High likelihood, medium impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Lock in supplier contracts; diversify sources; keep small contingency fund.
- **Operational strain** – Medium likelihood, medium impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Decide early on staffing; clarify Nigeria management responsibilities; avoid overextension.
- **Vehicle breakdown** – Medium likelihood, high impact.
  - *Mitigation:* Choose supplier with warranty; budget for maintenance.

Table 2: Risk register sample

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Licensing delays	High	High	Early application; proactive follow-up
Weather	Med	High	Backup locations; flexible menus
Consumer uptake	Med	High	Pilot menus, adapt to demand
Cost inflation	High	Med	Lock contracts; contingency
Van breakdown	Med	High	Warranty supplier; maintenance fund

Source: Authors own work

Frameworks: PMBOK risk process (PMI, 2021); Hillson (2009) on risk registers; Chapman & Ward (2011) on uncertainty management.

Teaching angle: Move beyond listing risks to interdependencies (e.g., van delay + licensing = missed festival). Stress that entrepreneurial projects often face *uncertainty* (Knight, 1921) rather than quantifiable risk, requiring adaptive rather than predictive planning.

Epilogue

Wande did not launch the food van within the six-month window. After comparing supplier timelines and costs, she initially leaned toward the mid-priced option (Supplier A). However, a combination of delays, visa uncertainty, and unexpected costs in her personal finances forced her to pause the project before committing to a vehicle purchase.

Her council paperwork and food hygiene certification were completed, and she made progress on menu testing and branding concepts. But by the time she reached the point of making a firm financial commitment, her available capital had narrowed too much to proceed confidently, and the risk of launching under pressure felt too high. Rather than push forward with insufficient resources — and risk jeopardising both the business and her immigration plans — she chose to halt the project and revisit it once circumstances were more stable.

Although the food van did not launch as planned, the process clarified her model, exposed the true cost and regulatory requirements of entering the UK street-food market, and strengthened her understanding of structured project planning. Wande has kept the concept alive and intends to relaunch when the conditions are more favourable.

References

Bourne, L. (2015) *Stakeholder Relationship Management: A Maturity Model for Organisational Implementation*. 2nd edn. Farnham: Gower.

Chapman, C. and Ward, S. (2011) *How to Manage Project Opportunity and Risk: Why Uncertainty Management Can Be a Much Better Approach than Risk Management*. 3rd edn. Chichester: Wiley.

Hillson, D. (2009) *Managing Risk in Projects*. Aldershot: Gower.

Kerzner, H. (2017) *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. 12th edn. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Knight, F.H. (1921) *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Leach, L.P. (1999) *Critical Chain Project Management Improves Project Performance*. *Project Management Journal*, 30(2), pp.39–51.

Lenfle, S. (2016). "Floating in Space: A History of the Minimum Viable Product Concept in Innovation and Project Management." *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(7), 1306–1318.Lock, D. (2020) *Project Management*. 11th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mendelow, A.L. (1991) 'Environmental Scanning: The Impact of the Stakeholder Concept', *ICIS Proceedings*, pp. 407–418.

Meredith, J.R. and Mantel, S.J. (2017) *Project Management: A Managerial Approach*. 9th edn. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. and Wood, D.J. (1997) 'Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts', *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), pp.853–886.

PMI (Project Management Institute) (2021) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)*. 7th edn. Newtown Square, PA: PMI.

Turner, J.R. (2009) *The Handbook of Project-based Management: Leading Strategic Change in Organizations*. 3rd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.