Assessment feedback for Security and Risk Management July 2025

The report demonstrates a clear understanding of Pampered Pets' business model and the strategic implications of digitalisation. The selection of ISO 31000 and NIST CSF is appropriate and well explained. However, the discussion could be strengthened by exploring the limitations of these frameworks or comparing them with alternatives like OCTAVE or FAIR.

The application of risk frameworks is sound, and the identification of threats and mitigations is relevant and well structured. The phased implementation plan is practical and clearly laid out. However, the Gantt chart is missing despite being referenced, and some mitigation strategies (e.g. "set KPIs") could benefit from more detail on how they would be monitored or evaluated.

There is some critical engagement, particularly in weighing the risks of digitalisation against the status quo. However, the analysis tends to be descriptive. For example, the risks of international supply chains are listed but not critically evaluated in terms of their impact on brand identity or operational resilience. The synthesis between theory and Pampered Pets' specific context could be more developed.

The report is well organised and easy to follow. Headings and bullet points are used effectively. The writing is mostly clear, though there are minor grammatical issues. Referencing follows Harvard style, but in-text citations are sparse and could be more consistently applied. The missing Gantt chart weakens the presentation slightly.

Personal Reflective comments:

Feedback provided had highlighted several strengths regarding the team assessment, I was particularly pleased that our interpretations of the ISO 31000 and NIST CSF frameworks were seen as appropriate. The feedback had also highlighted several areas for improvement. One point made was that writing was at times descriptive opposed to critical. I understand that within a postgraduate course as this, critical evaluation plays a significant importance. In order to improve I will ensure to prioritise critical analysis, the evaluation of the impact of risks rather than stating them alone in order to make effective critical points throughout my work. A key area for improvement noted was the lack of comparison with frameworks such as OCTAVE or FAIR. The feedback has enabled me to recognise that including comparisons within my work may have provided evidence for critical awareness, in this I have therefore recognised the importance for a more focused effort in the critical evaluation of frameworks. I understand that the absence of a Gantt chart meant that my work missed having key visual tools that would have demonstrated implementation timelines. I have also taken in the

comment made on referencing; in future work I will ensure that in-text citations are used in order to strengthen academic reliability.