

Date: Apr 1, 20XX

#	Cause (condition/situation)	Event	Impact	Risk owner	Category	Probability risk rating	Impact risk rating	Risk score	Trigger	Response																		
1	Insufficient Stakeholder Feedback (R1): Addresses Mary Smithers' concern about feedback availability, critical for QA (WBS 1.5, 2.3, 3.2).	Low survey response or delayed feedback	High (delays Design/Development phases, impacts quality)	Cal Hamer	R	3	4	12	<50% response rate, <3 stakeholders provide feedback	Monthly Surveys, Bi-weekly Sprint Reviews																		
2	Inadequate Hiring (R2): Reflects Mary Smithers' concern about talent, tied to WBS 4.4 and \$15,000 personnel budget.	Few qualified applicants or recruitment delays	High (affects Development, Test, Launch phases)	Priya Service	R	3	4	12	<5 qualified applicants, recruitment agency not contacted on time, technician skills gap	Define job requirements, Engage agency early																		
3	Poor Quality Training (R3): Addresses Mary Smithers' concern, linked to WBS 3.4.	Negative training feedback or material delays	Medium (impacts Launch phase, user satisfaction)	Ram Samuels	R	3	3	9	>30% training dissatisfaction, training content not ready, <80% team attendance at training	Develop training, Conduct pilot session																		
4	Data Feed Issues (R4): Technical risk impacting analytics (WBS 2.1, 5.3), tied to \$5,000 data feed budget.	Failed API tests or inconsistent data	High (impacts core analytics functionality)	Priya Service	R	3	4	12	>10% API failure, >2 data feed misses, delayed API documentation	Validate APIs In Design, test feeds in prototype																		
5	Security Vulnerabilities (R5): Critical for invoicing and compliance (WBS 2.5, 3.1), using \$20,000 security budget.	Failed security tests or vulnerabilities	High (impacts customer trust, legal compliance)	Priya Service	R	2	5	10	critical vulnerability in test, >5 high-severity alerts, compliance audit flags	Conduct penetration testing, Use security budget																		
6	Scope Creep (R6): Common Agile project risk, managed via CCB (Communication Plan).	Excessive CCB change requests	High (affects cost, schedule)	Cary Manning	R	3	4	12	>3 change request in single meeting, new features requested, >10% over budget	Use CCB to approve changes, prioritize Cal Hamer																		
7	Enhanced Market Positioning (O1): Leverages analytics to gain market share, aligning with C-Suite goals and WBS 2.1, 5.3.	Positive feedback or new market data	High (increases market share, revenue)	Ram Samuels, Cal Hamer	O	4	-4	-16	>80% satisfaction, >2 new segments identified, AHL gaining >5%	Prioritize analytics, refine via sprint reviews																		
Total Risk Score									51	Risk Exposure																		
<table><tr><td>Probability risk rating</td><td></td><td>Impact risk rating</td></tr><tr><td>5: High</td><td></td><td>5: High</td></tr><tr><td>4: High to moderate</td><td></td><td>4: High to moderate</td></tr><tr><td>3: Moderate</td><td></td><td>3: Moderate</td></tr><tr><td>2: Moderate to low</td><td></td><td>2: Moderate to low</td></tr><tr><td>1: Low</td><td></td><td>1: Low</td></tr></table>											Probability risk rating		Impact risk rating	5: High		5: High	4: High to moderate		4: High to moderate	3: Moderate		3: Moderate	2: Moderate to low		2: Moderate to low	1: Low		1: Low
Probability risk rating		Impact risk rating																										
5: High		5: High																										
4: High to moderate		4: High to moderate																										
3: Moderate		3: Moderate																										
2: Moderate to low		2: Moderate to low																										
1: Low		1: Low																										