| Identified Risk | Risk description | Response | Overall risk level | Probability of occurrence [| Impact level [2] |
|-----------------|---|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| RISK 01 | More changes to requirements than anticipated | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 02 | Launch of new large language models (LLM) | Mitigate | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 03 | Underestimation of project size | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 04 | Project running behind schedule | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 05 | Disagreements within the project team | Mitigate | | Medium | Medium |
| RISK 06 | Key personnel leaving the team | Mitigate | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 07 | Underestimation of budget needed for the project | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 08 | Dependency on 3rd party APIs | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 09 | Market changes resulting in less uptake | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 10 | There may be a lack of testing resources like testers that may hinder testing efforts. | Mitigate | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 11 | There may be incomplete testing. Test cases may not cover all scenarios, leading to undiscovered bugs and issues. | Mitigate | | Medium | High |
| RISK 12 | There may be a tight development schedule for VotaFun, leaving little time for testing. A tight schedule may also lead to incomplete testing, as the QA team may not have time to run all test cases. | Mitigate | | Medium | Medium |
| RISK 13 | Human errors during testing may lead to wrong testing results. The QA manager may not properly design the test cases, or testers may not follow the execution steps in the test case. | Mitigate | | Medium | High |
| RISK 14 | Requirements inflation where clients ask to add new features not identified during the planning phase. Depending on the size of these features, it may threaten the project timeline and risk the project team missing the dateline. | Mitigate | | Low | High |
| RISK 15 | Different developers have different experience levels or coding styles that may lead to poor code quality. Adding new features or maintaining the software becomes more difficult. Poor code quality may introduce more bugs as well. | Avoid | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 16 | The lack of client engagement may result in the developer team adding redundant features. The developer team will waste time developing redundant features. | Mitigate | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 17 | The project team may lack the urgency to work during the earlier stages of the project due to the assumption of a long project timeline. | Mitigate | | Low | Medium |
| RISK 18 | The project ran behind schedule due to poor timeline estimates or unforeseen circumstances that prevented the team from meeting the release cycle. | Mitigate | | Medium | Medium |
| RISK 19 | Key personnel may leave the team. The shortage of experienced team members may result in the project team not meeting the release cycle. The remaining team members will face an increased workload, which may decrease morale. | Accept | | Low | Medium |

[1] High – Greater than 70% probability of occurrence

Medium – Between 30% and 70% probability of occurrence

Low – Below 30% probability of occurrence

[2] High – Risk that has the potential to greatly impact project cost, project schedule or performance.

Medium – Risk that has the potential to slightly impact project cost, project schedule or performance.

Low – Risk that has relatively little impact on cost, schedule, or performance