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**Internet Shop Contingency Plan**

1. Introduction
   1. Background
   2. Scope
2. ??? (remove it or someone will add something? On steps mindmap it’s the “resources” thing)
3. Risk prioritizing criteria

Following risk prioritizing rules have been chosen:

* Prioritizing by probability of occurrence
* Prioritizing by criteria of impact, as percentage of annual income

Which has been gathered in following tables:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Probability of occurence criteria | Point value | Case |
| Rare | 1 | An event can occur only in exceptional circumstances (event that occurs once in 5 years), it concerns individual cases. |
| Unlikely | 2 | It is unlikely that this event will occur (event that occurs once per 2 years), it applies to a few cases. |
| Moderate | 3 | The event is likely to occur in the near future (event that occurs once per year), it applies to some matters |
| High | 4 | The occurrence of the event is very likely (event that occurs at least once per year). It is expected that such an event may occur several times a year. |

Table 1. Probability of occurrence criteria.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level of impact | Point value | Case |
| Trivial | 1 | Negligible effect on the objectives and tasks of the organization, no legal effect; slight financial effect, no impact on employee safety, no impact on the image of the organization.  Less than 0,1% of annual income |
| Minor | 2 | Little impact on the achievement of goals and tasks, without legal effects, little financial effect; no impact on employee safety, little impact on the image of the organization.  0,1 – 1% of annual income |
| Moderate | 3 | The average impact on the implementation of objectives and tasks, potential threats may lead to the failure to perform basic tasks within a specified scope, moderate legal consequences, average financial effect, no impact on employee safety, medium risk of losing good image.  1 – 5% of annual income |
| Major | 4 | Serious impact on the implementation of the task, including a serious threat to the date of its implementation and achievement of the goal; extensive legal consequences; threat to employee safety; high financial losses; loss of a good image of the organization in the environment and in public opinion.  More than 5% of annual income |

Table 2. Level of impact criteria.

Risk values have been calculated as multiplication of impact and probability.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | | Impact | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Probability | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| 3 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 |
| 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |

Table 3. Risk values

We consider risk as: Low – [1 to 2], Medium [3 to 7], High [8 to 16]

1. Risk identification and prioritizing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Probability | Impact | Risk |
| Technological Issue | | | |
| Infrastructure failure | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Software virus | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface problems | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Data corruption | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Hacking attempts | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| Users data leakage | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Fraud (e.g. access without authorization) | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Unavailability of product suppliers | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Gap in the software used | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Internal software errors | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Political Issue | | | |
| Changes of law | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Competitive Issue | | | |
| Unfair competition | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Piracy sites | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Significant decrease in the number of customers | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Lack of goods providers | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Resources Issue | | | |
| Physical theft of computer equipment | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Hardware failure | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Service delays | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Loss of power supply | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Physical damage | | | |
| Flood | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Fire | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Cost issue | | | |
| Budget exceeded | 1 | 3 | 3 |