DELIVERABLE 05 · RISK & MITIGATION

Risk Analysis & Mitigation Plan

Technical, operational, data, resource, and compliance risks with explicit probability, impact, ownership, and mitigation strategies.

PREPARED FOR	SPONSOR	BY	VERSION
Resortments	Russ · Owner	Webaroo	v3.0

Risk Analysis & Mitigation Plan

This document is prepared to surface every risk identified during the 8-division discovery phase — technical, operational, data, resource, and compliance — and pair each with an owner, a mitigation strategy, and a monitoring cadence. Our risk management approach rests on four core imperatives:

1. **Identify every risk up front.** No project of this scale survives a "we'll deal with it when we get there" approach. Every risk gets logged in the register before Phase 1 kicks off.
2. **Assign explicit ownership.** Every risk has a named human owner (not a team) accountable for mitigation execution and status updates.
3. **Quantify impact in dollars where possible.** Vague severity ratings ("high/medium/low") are insufficient for a $2.8M engagement. Financial impact drives prioritization.
4. **Build monitoring cadence into every phase.** The steering committee reviews all active risks monthly (first Tuesday of each month) — not filed and forgotten.

These imperatives shape the register structure and the mitigation strategies that follow.

Document Purpose: Identify and manage all risks discovered during all 8 division scoping interviews. Prioritized risk register with mitigation strategies, owners, and tracking status.

Scope: Technical, operational, data/migration, resource, and compliance risks across 8 divisions.

Prepared By: Webaroo Risk & Project Management Team
Date: April 8, 2026
Version: 1.0

Risk Register Summary

Total Risks Identified: 29 (28 active + 1 resolved, not counted in active totals)
Critical (9–10): 3
High (7–8): 17
Medium (5–6): 7
Low (2–4): 1
Resolved: 1 (RIS-R001 — excluded from active totals)

Unified scoring: Probability (1–5) + Impact (1–5) = Score (2–10).

RISK SCORE	COUNT	ACTION
9–10 (Critical)	3	Immediate mitigation; escalate to sponsor
7–8 (High)	17	Mitigation plan required; monthly review
5–6 (Medium)	7	Monitoring; mitigation as resource available
2–4 (Low)	1	Observation; document for reference
Resolved	1	RIS-R001 (Accounting Hub interview complete, not counted in active totals)

Risk Registry

TECHNICAL RISKS

RIS-T001: REALPAGE/ONESITE API UNCERTAINTY

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** Critical
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Leasing operations are critically dependent on RealPage/OneSite platform for lease management, rent collection, and tenant data. API access has NOT been confirmed; vendor supports are unclear regarding data extraction and real-time sync capabilities. Leasing module (Dylan) requires this integration to be credible; without it, Resortments must manually manage rent rolls (spreadsheet-based, high error rate).

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 5/5 (Very High)
Risk Score: 4 + 5 = **9 (Critical)**

Quantified impact: $40K–$80K additional dev effort + 2–4 weeks schedule slip

Dependencies: - Leasing module (Phase 3) blocked if API unavailable - Management/Leasing operational efficiency tied to integration quality - Dylan's team can use system without API, but manual data entry negates platform value

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Immediate (Q2 2026):** - Webaroo to contact RealPage directly, request API documentation + sandbox access - Determine API capabilities: read-only vs. bi-directional, rate limits, data refresh cadence - Estimate integration effort (2–4 weeks if API available; 8–12 weeks if no API)
2. **Fallback Approach (if API unavailable):** - Design Leasing module to accept CSV uploads from RealPage export - Create nightly batch import job (manual export from RealPage → SFTP upload → platform import) - One-way data flow (RealPage source of truth; Resortments mirrors) - Estimated manual effort: 30 min/day for Dylan or team member
3. **Phase 3 Contingency:** - If API still unconfirmed by Dec 2026, proceed with CSV fallback - Budget re-sync: 2–4 weeks additional dev time for CSV import infrastructure - Monitor for RealPage API availability; upgrade to live API later (Phase 4+)
4. **Documentation & Testing:** - Document all RealPage data structures Dylan exports - Create sample CSV templates for all rent roll scenarios - Test CSV import with 1000+ lease records before Phase 3

production

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Decision Gate: Q2 2026 (May 31) — API decision required
Status: ⏳ In Progress (awaiting RealPage response)
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T001
Category	Technical — Integration
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	5/5 (Very High)
Risk Score	20 (Critical)
Mitigation	API confirmation Q2; CSV fallback if unavailable
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Dylan
Status	In Progress

RIS-T002: DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE VOLUME AT SCALE

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Legal Close Land module (David) requires DocuSign for deed signing and closing documents. Volume projection: ~500 documents per closing × ~20–40 closings/year = ~10,000–20,000 envelopes annually (~27–54/day peak). DocuSign API has rate limits (100 requests/min standard; 200/min high-volume). High volume of envelope creation, recipient updates, signing notifications, and completion webhooks could exceed rate limits or cause latency.

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Dependencies: - Legal Close Land module (Phase 2) cannot go live without reliable DocuSign integration - David's closing workflow automation depends on envelope throughput - All 20 closings/month must complete in ~30 days; delays cascade to leasing income

Technical Challenges: - Batch envelope creation might hit rate limits - Webhook delivery can be inconsistent under load (exponential backoff needed) - Template management for 500+ document types (maintenance burden) - Recipient changes (notary availability, last-minute signing) require API flexibility

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Phase 1 (MVP Design):** - Design DocuSign integration with batch operations + queue management - Implement exponential backoff and retry logic for rate-limited requests - Estimate envelope creation time: 1–2 minutes per envelope (acceptable for 27/day peak)

2. **Phase 2 Load Testing (Sept 2026):** - Sandbox test: 500 envelopes in 1 day (stress test for 18-day month compressed) - Measure API response times, webhook delivery latency, error rates - Validate queue management handles backlog gracefully
3. **Phase 2 Pre-Production (Oct 2026):** - Integrate with live DocuSign account (limited scope: 1 template, 10 envelopes) - Monitor for 2 weeks; measure performance with actual usage patterns - Ramp to full template library once stable
4. **Template & Recipient Management:** - Create curated template library in DocuSign (start with 20–30 core templates) - Document template IDs, recipient roles, required fields - Version control templates; track changes with audit trail - Automate recipient assignment (grantor, grantee, notary) where possible
5. **Monitoring & Alerting:** - Real-time monitoring of API response times, error rates, webhook delays - Alert if daily envelope count >50 (peak warning) or <5 (potential issue) - Weekly metrics review with David (closing volume, envelope success rate)

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Testing Window: Sept–Oct 2026 (Phase 2 pre-production)
Status: ⏳ In Design (load testing backlog item)
Next Review: 2026-09-01 (Phase 2 kickoff)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T002
Category	Technical — Integration / Scale
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Load testing Phase 2; queue management + exponential backoff
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-T003: PERMITTING PORTAL FRAGMENTATION (50+ AGENCIES)

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Land acquisition and construction require permitting across 50+ jurisdictions (cities, counties, states). Each agency has unique submission portals, document requirements, and approval workflows. No standardized API exists; most require manual portal navigation, PDF uploads, and phone calls. Attempting to centralize permitting data across all agencies into Resortments would require: - Custom integrations for each major agency (very low ROI) - Manual data entry for each permit (Russ estimates 100+ permits/year) - Tracking across multiple systems (unlikely to consolidate fully)

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 4 + 3 = **7 (High)**

Dependencies: - Land Division module cannot automate permitting; manual tracking unavoidable - Project closeout workflows cannot be fully automated (waiting for permits is a blocker) - Permitting delays cascade to construction start, impacting revenue timelines

Why This Is a Risk: - If Resortments tries to build permitting module, cost/benefit is negative (80/20 effort for 20% of process) - If Resortments ignores permitting, visibility gap remains (permits are critical project milestones) - Russ needs to know permit status real-time; fragmented portals make this difficult - Regulatory changes or new jurisdictions require ongoing maintenance

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Accept Fragmentation (Recommended):** - Resortments will NOT build permitting integrations for 50+ agencies - Instead, create a **Permitting Tracker** in Resortments (lightweight):
   - Permit ID, type (building, electrical, mechanical, etc.), jurisdiction, agency, required by date, status
   - Linked document repository (store permit applications, approvals, certificates)
   - Manual status updates (Russ or Land team enters status)
   - Alerts for permits due within 14 days
   - Estimated effort: 1–2 weeks to build tracker (Phase 1 enhancement, not critical path)
2. **Data Collection Approach:** - Create **Permitting Checklist** for each property type (residential, commercial, industrial) - Document required permits by jurisdiction (one-time research effort, quarterly updates) - Maintain Excel template for permit tracking (seeded from real projects, validate with Russ) - Import historical permits into Resortments as baseline (manual data entry, ~30 minutes per permit)
3. **Integration Opportunities (Limited):** - Monitor for agency APIs (rare but possible; recheck quarterly) - Compsys integration (RIS-T019) may provide some compliance/permitting data (investigate Phase 1) - Permit image capture via Field Division mobile app (crew photographs permits on-site)
4. **Workflow Integration:** - Land module tracks permit status as project milestone - Delay alert: if permit overdue, flag project as at-risk - Legal Close Land cannot begin until permits confirmed - Document all required permits at project initiation (prevent surprises)

Owner: Russ (Business Process), Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Tracker Design)
Implementation: Phase 1 enhancement (optional); NOT critical path
Status: ✅ Accepted Risk (low technical complexity)
Next Review: 2026-05-01 (Phase 1 scope finalization)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T003
Category	Technical — Data Integration
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Accept fragmentation; lightweight permitting tracker + manual updates
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Accepted

RIS-T004: PLANT DOESN'T EXIST YET

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Zac Interview)

Description:
Plant Division module (Zac) is designed for a physical facility that does NOT yet exist. Zac estimates plant will come online during Phase 3 (Jan–Mar 2027) or later. Designing module without physical reference creates risks: - Asset list may be incomplete (add equipment later, schema migration complexity) - Maintenance schedule assumptions may not reflect actual equipment - Production workflow may not match facility layout/capacity - Staffing model may change with actual facility commissioning - Integration dependencies (power, connectivity, safety systems) unknown until build phase

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Dependencies: - Phase 3 Plant module design is speculative - Zac must validate design monthly as plant approaches commissioning - Late-stage changes to module could delay Field Division (parallel workstream)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Modular Asset Design (Phase 1):** - Build asset tracking system (Equipment ID, category, depreciation, maintenance history) - Design schema to support equipment additions without migration - Use PostgreSQL JSON fields for equipment-specific metadata (expandable) - Create separate "Asset Categories" table (Equipment, Vehicles, Furniture, etc.) — easy to add new types
2. **Monthly Validation (Phase 2–3):** - Schedule monthly 30–min sync with Zac (starting Phase 2, ramping Phase 3) - Review: plant commissioning timeline, equipment orders, facility design updates - Update Resortments asset list as decisions finalize - Validate maintenance schedule assumptions with equipment vendor docs
3. **Templated Maintenance Plans:** - Create maintenance plan templates based on equipment type (HVAC, electrical, mechanical, etc.) - Zac selects templates for his equipment (start with 70% coverage) - Allow custom additions as plant-specific needs emerge - Preventive maintenance schedule auto-generated from templates
4. **Phased Rollout:** - Phase 3 MVP: Asset tracking + basic maintenance scheduling (does not require full plant data) - Phase 4+: Advanced production tracking, efficiency metrics (only after plant is operational) - Avoid building production workflow module before plant is live
5. **Deferred Production Features:** - DO NOT build production planning/execution module until plant is operational (waste of effort) - Phase 3 Plant module: Assets, maintenance, staffing, costs - Phase 4+: Add production tracking (actual vs. plan), efficiency reporting

Owner: Zac (Plant Lead), Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Kickoff: Phase 2 (Sept 2026) — monthly syncs begin
Status: ⏳ In Design (waiting for plant commissioning date confirmation)
Next Review: 2026-05-15 (Zac to confirm plant timeline)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T004
Category	Technical — Design Risk
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Modular design; monthly validation with Zac; phased feature rollout
Owner	Zac + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-T005: QUICKBOOKS MULTI-ENTITY INTEGRATION COMPLEXITY

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** High (Updated April 8 — interview confirmed multi-entity)
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Updated after Accounting Hub interview)

Description:
Accounting Hub interview confirmed that Resortments uses **multi-entity QuickBooks** — each ownership entity has its own QB instance with potentially different chart of accounts structures. This is significantly more complex than the original assumption of a single-company QB integration. Challenges include: - Data extraction from QB (via API or export) - Schema mapping (QB accounts → Resortments GL structure) - Data validation & cleansing (identify and correct errors) - Historical data import (how many years back?) - Testing & reconciliation (QB balances must match after import)

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Quantified impact: $30K–$60K rework + Finance team reconciliation overhead ~40 hrs/month during remediation

Assumptions: - QB has API access available (OAuth) - Data in QB is reasonably clean (no massive structural issues) - Russ can provide guidance on GL mapping (cost centers, cost allocation)

Known Issues: - QB may not have detailed cost center structure (currently aggregated) - Historical transaction volume unknown (could be 10K or 100K per month) - Multi-currency handling unclear (if applicable)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Phase 1 Data Assessment (May 2026):** - Audit current QB setup with CFO - Document GL structure, cost centers, account hierarchy - Export 3 months of recent transactions (test data) - Determine historical depth needed (rolling 3-year? 7-year?) - Identify data quality issues (missing cost centers, unexplained entries)
2. **Phase 1 QB Integration Design:** - Design read-only integration (QB data flows into Resortments, no writes) - Implement OAuth + API connection to QB - Build initial schema mapping (QB accounts → Resortments GL) - Create data validation rules (catches discrepancies during sync)
3. **Phase 1 Historical Data Load:** - Import recent 12–24 months of QB transactions - Validate import: QB GL balance = Resortments GL balance (by cost center) - Flag any discrepancies for CFO review +

correction - Create audit trail (import date, row count, any corrections made)

4. **Phase 1 Ongoing Sync:** - Nightly sync of new QB transactions (design for ~100 transactions/day at scale) - Monitoring for sync failures, gaps, or discrepancies - Weekly CFO review of sync status + any issues - Manual correction workflow if QB data needs fixing
5. **Contingency (If QB API unavailable):** - Fall back to weekly CSV export from QB - Manual import job (estimated: 30 min/week) - Same reconciliation process as API approach (just slower cadence)

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA
Implementation: Phase 1 (May–Aug 2026)
Status: ⏳ In Design (multi-entity mapping strategy needed)
Next Review: 2026-05-01 (QB entity mapping complete)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T005
Category	Technical — Data Migration
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Q1 data audit; read-only API sync; historical load validation
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA
Status	Awaiting Assessment

RIS-T006: ADP INTEGRATION COMPLEXITY

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
ADP integration is required to sync employee roster, payroll summaries, and (optionally) time tracking. ADP has APIs but they are complex; data structures vary by ADP module (Payroll, Benefits, Time, HR). Initial integration is straightforward (read-only payroll sync), but maintaining 100% data accuracy and handling edge cases (term dates, pay period changes, multi-currency) can be challenging.

Probability: 2/5 (Low)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 2 + 3 = **5 (Medium)**

Known Complexities: - ADP has multiple APIs (Workforce Now, Run, etc.) — which one is Resortments using? - Pay period timing affects cost allocation (is Russ on monthly, bi-weekly, or weekly payroll?) - Benefits, taxes, deductions data structure unclear - Time tracking integration optional but valuable (Field Division crew time) - Employee data changes (new hires, terminations, transfers) need real-time sync

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Phase 1 Scoping (May 2026):** - Confirm which ADP module Resortments uses (Workforce Now? Run? ADP Learning?) - Document pay period schedule, pay date, payroll cycle - Assess data quality in ADP

(missing fields, naming inconsistencies) - Determine if time tracking data is available via API (if Field Division will use it)

2. **Phase 2 Integration Design:** - OAuth connection to ADP API - Data mapping: ADP payroll data → Resortments employees & GL cost centers - Identify key data points: employee ID, name, department, cost center, gross pay, taxes, deductions - Design reconciliation: ADP gross pay should match GL payroll accrual
3. **Phase 2 Testing (Sept 2026):** - Sandbox testing: mock payroll run with 10–20 employees - Validate data mapping and GL account coding - Test edge cases: term date, pay period change, benefits change - Pilot with small group (5 employees) before full rollout
4. **Ongoing Monitoring:** - Weekly ADP sync status review (error logs, sync delays) - Monthly reconciliation: ADP payroll total vs. GL payroll accrual - Alert if sync fails or data discrepancies detected - Document any issues for ADP support escalation

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 2 (Sept–Oct 2026)
Status: ⏳ In Scoping (Q1 assessment pending)
Next Review: 2026-05-15 (Phase 1 kickoff)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T006
Category	Technical — Integration
Probability	2/5 (Low)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	6 (Medium)
Mitigation	Q1 ADP audit; Phase 2 sandbox testing; payroll reconciliation
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + HR (if applicable)
Status	In Scoping

RIS-T007: GO-LIVE CUTOVER RISK

Category: Technical | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: April 2026

Description:
Phase 4 → production cutover carries risk of data integrity loss, user access outages, and integration failures during the switch from legacy systems (QB, RealPage, spreadsheets) to Resortments as source of truth.

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Quantified impact: $75K–$200K recovery + potential 2-week go-live delay

Mitigation Strategy: 1. **30-day parallel run** — legacy systems remain authoritative while Resortments mirrors; daily reconciliation reports. 2. **Rollback plan** — documented step-by-step rollback to legacy

systems executable within 4 hours. 3. **Dry-run cutover rehearsal** — full cutover rehearsed in Phase 4 staging with representative data volumes before production cutover. 4. **Cutover checklist** — pre-cutover, day-of, post-cutover validation steps with sign-off owners.

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 4 (cutover planning)
Status: Planned

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-T007
Category	Technical — Cutover
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	30-day parallel run, rollback plan, dry-run rehearsal, cutover checklist
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Planned

OPERATIONAL RISKS

RIS-O001: CHANGE MANAGEMENT ACROSS 8 DIVISIONS

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** Critical
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Resortments divisions currently operate with minimal digital infrastructure. Most divisions rely on email, spreadsheets, phone calls, and paper documents. Implementing a unified enterprise platform requires significant change in how people work: - 40+ users (across 8 divisions) must learn new systems - Ingrained workflows (phone calls, email approvals) must shift to platform-based processes - Resistance to change is likely (people prefer what they know) - Adoption failure = platform sits unused, ROI never realized - Multiple divisions with different pain points (what motivates Land may not motivate Plant)

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 5/5 (Very High)
Risk Score: 4 + 5 = **9 (Critical)**

Key Change Challenges: 1. **Phone-Call Culture:** Resortments has a strong preference for verbal communication (fast, personal). Platform requires documenting everything. Russ and team members may continue old habits (phone calls about projects already in system). 2. **Spreadsheet Dependency:** Material Procurement (Tracy), Finance, and others rely heavily on Excel. Shifting data entry into a system UI requires behavior change. 3. **Manual Processes:** Many workflows don't exist in systems (exist only in people's heads or email threads). Documenting and formalizing these is difficult. 4. **Multi-Division Coordination:** 8 division leads have different priorities, timelines, and adoption readiness. Rolling out simultaneously is risky; phased

rollout creates "haves" vs. "have-nots" tension. 5. **Training Load:** 40 users, multiple roles, frequent system changes (each Phase = new modules). Ongoing training burden is significant.

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Division Champions (Immediate — Q2 2026):** - Identify one power user per division (someone who will evangelize the platform) - Champions attend Webaroo training first (2–3 days, deep dive) - Champions become the first trainers for their division peers - Provide champions with documentation, FAQ, contact info for support - Incentivize champions (recognition, small bonus, first access to features)
2. **Phased Rollout by Division:** - Phase 2 (Sept 2026): Land, Legal Close, Procurement (3 divisions, smaller user count) - Phase 3 (Jan 2027): Field, Leasing, Plant, Rollovers (5 more divisions) - This allows early adoption learnings to inform later phases - Successful early divisions (Land, Procurement) build credibility for later phases
3. **Structured Training Program:** - **Role-Based Training:** Separate tracks for Finance, Project Managers, Field Crew, Executives - **Training Schedule:**
   - Phase 2 (Aug 2026): 3-day intensive for Land, Legal, Procurement teams
   - 1-week before go-live: refresher training + Q&A
   - Week 1 after go-live: daily office hours (Webaroo team on-site or via Zoom)
   - **Training Materials:** Video tutorials, job aids, quick-reference guides, FAQs
   - **Certification:** Users must pass simple knowledge check to get access (ensures they attended training)
4. **Change Leadership:** - **Sponsor (Russ):** Visible support, uses platform daily, communicates vision - **Executive Steering Committee:** CFO, COO, division leads meet monthly to align on adoption - **Project Manager (Webaroo):** Change management discipline (communication plan, resistance tracking) - **Webaroo Support Team:** Dedicated support lead for each division (first 3 months post-go-live)
5. **Metrics & Monitoring:** - **Adoption Metrics:**
   - % of users logging in daily (target: 80%+ by week 2, 90%+ by month 1)
   - % of workflows using platform (target: 70%+ within 30 days)
   - Ticket/incident volume (expect spike week 1, taper by week 3)
   - **Sentiment Tracking:** Monthly Division-head satisfaction survey (target: ≥4.2/5 on 5-point scale)
   - **Issue Response:** Webaroo commits to <2 hour response time for urgent issues during ramp-up
   - **Dashboard:** Real-time adoption dashboard (visible to Russ, division leads, Webaroo team)
6. **Contingency: Parallel Operations (First 30 Days):** - Allow users to continue old methods (email, spreadsheet) in parallel with platform (no hard cutoff day 1) - Create reconciliation process (daily batch to sync spreadsheets into platform, prevents data loss) - After 30 days, discontinue parallel operations (people must use platform) - This reduces adoption friction while ensuring data integrity
7. **Post-Launch Support:** - **Office Hours:** Daily (first 2 weeks), 2x/week (weeks 3–8), 1x/week (ongoing) - **Feedback Loop:** Collect issues, prioritize fixes (show quick wins to build momentum) - **Monthly Webinar:** "Tip of the month", Q&A, showcase success stories - **Incentives:** Recognize high adopters, celebrate milestones ("500 POs created!", "100% lease data in system")

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Change Management Lead) + Russ (Sponsor)
Implementation Timeline: Q2 2026 (Champions identified), Phase 2 onward
Status: ⏳ In Planning (change management plan due 2026-05-15)
Next Review: 2026-05-15 (Champions kick-off)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O001
Category	Operational — Change Management
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	5/5 (Very High)
Risk Score	20 (Critical)
Mitigation	Division champions, phased rollout, training program, sponsor support
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ
Status	In Planning

RIS-O002: GC ACCOUNTABILITY GAP IN FIELD DIVISION

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Gerardo Interview)

Description:
Field Division works with General Contractor (GC) who manage on-site crews, equipment, and safety. Currently, there is NO documented accountability mechanism if: - GC fails to complete assigned work - GC breaches safety protocols (OSHA violations, incident) - GC violates contract terms (schedule, cost, quality) - GC damages company assets or third-party property - GC violates fair housing or discrimination laws

Risk exposure: Resortments could be liable for GC negligence, and without documented evidence, defending in court is difficult. Platform needs to create accountability trail (documented work orders, completion photos, incident logs, contract terms).

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Current State Issues: - No written work orders (verbal assignments via phone call) - No site documentation (no photos, no inspection records) - No incident tracking (safety issues not formally logged) - No contract management system (GC terms not centralized) - Gerardo estimates 50+ GCs active; no standardized agreements

Why This Matters: 1. **Legal Liability:** If Resortments is sued by tenant, regulator, or third party, lack of documentation is damaging 2. **Insurance Claims:** Insurance company may deny claims if incident documentation is absent 3. **Regulatory Exposure:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Fair Housing, construction safety laws all require documentation 4. **Financial Loss:** Cost overruns, rework, damages not tracked = no recourse against GC

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Field Division Module Design (Phase 3):** - **Work Order System:** Detailed work orders with scope, schedule, budget, GC assignment - **Site Documentation:** Photo/video capture, geo-stamped, linked to work order - **Completion Sign-Off:** Customer signature, contractor signature, inspector sign-off - **Incident Logging:** Safety incidents, near-misses, corrective actions, all time-stamped - **Compliance Tracker:** Fair housing notice, safety briefing, environmental disclosure (all dated)

2. **Contract Management (Phase 2–3):** - Create standardized GC agreement template (with legal counsel guidance) - Scan/upload existing GC contracts into DMS - Extract key terms (insurance, bonds, indemnification, payment terms, safety requirements) - Link contract to work orders (automatically reference applicable terms) - Alerts for contract renewal, insurance expiration
3. **Safety & Compliance Documentation:** - **Safety Briefing:** Checklist (site hazards, OSHA requirements, safety equipment) signed by GC before work starts - **Incident Report Form:** Standardized incident log (date, time, description, injuries, witness, corrective action) - **Inspection Checklist:** Daily or weekly site inspection (quality, safety, compliance) - **Photo Evidence:** Work progress photos, daily site conditions (enables dispute resolution)
4. **Accountability Workflow:** - Work Order Created → GC Assigned → GC Acknowledges → Work Executes → Daily Photos → Completion Sign-Off → Invoice Reviewed - Any deviation (delay, cost overrun, incident) triggers escalation to Gerardo + Russ - Payment hold if work is incomplete or incident unresolved
5. **GC Performance Tracking:** - **Scorecard:** Track per-GC metrics (on-time completion %, safety incidents, quality score, cost variance) - **Renewal Decision:** Use scorecard to decide whether to renew contract (no renewals for poor performers) - **Insurance & Bonding:** Verify active insurance/bonds before assigning work (automated alert if expired)
6. **Training & Communication:** - GC orientation: review platform work order process, safety requirements, documentation expectations - Email template: when new work order assigned, include link to work order in platform + compliance expectations - Monthly metrics review: Gerardo + Russ review GC performance, flag issues early
7. **Legal & Insurance:** - Engage employment/construction attorney to review platform design for compliance - Ensure all documentation meets legal evidence standards (photos are timestamped, chains of custody maintained) - Coordinate with insurance broker (document retention policy must align with insurance claims process)

Owner: Gerardo (Field Lead), Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 3 (Jan 2027) — Field Division module includes accountability features
Status: ⏳ In Design (legal review pending)
Next Review: 2026-05-15 (legal advisor engagement confirmed)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O002
Category	Operational — Legal / Accountability
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Work order + photo documentation, incident logging, contract mgmt, GC scorecard
Owner	Gerardo + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-O003: DELIVERY CHAOS / NO RECEIVING PROCESS

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Tracy Interview)

Description:
Material Procurement (Tracy) creates 2000+ purchase orders annually. Products are delivered to various locations (job sites, warehouses, offices). Currently, there is NO formal receiving process: - Products arrive with minimal notice - No one verifies what was ordered vs. what arrived (no receiving checklist) - Quantities not confirmed (box count vs. PO line items) - Product condition not inspected (damaged goods accepted without documentation) - Deliveries accumulate at sites (clutter, theft risk, misplacement) - Invoice matching fails because receipt data is missing

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 4 + 3 = **7 (High)**

Quantified impact: 2000 POs × 2% dispute rate × $500 avg = ~$20K/year ongoing exposure

Financial Impact: - Wrong quantities received but paid (vendor invoice says 100, only 50 delivered, paid 100) - Damaged goods accepted and wasted (no claim to vendor) - Duplicate payments (vendor invoices twice, paid twice, not caught) - Inventory shrinkage (products delivered, lost/stolen, never tracked) - Rework costs (missing materials delay projects)

Process Breakdown: 1. Tracy creates PO (via email or system) 2. Vendor ships product (PO number may or may not be on packing slip) 3. Product arrives at job site (construction manager accepts delivery, signs for box count) 4. Product sits at site (no formal storage, no location tracking) 5. Product is used in project (no documentation when used) 6. Vendor invoice arrives (invoice amount doesn't match delivery) 7. Tracy tries to match invoice to PO (missing receipt data, reconciliation fails, payment delayed or wrong)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Define Formal Receiving Process (Phase 1-2):** - **Vendor:** Ships with PO number prominent on packing slip - **Delivery:** Construction manager or site supervisor logs receipt in platform (or app) - **Receiving Checklist:** Confirm: PO number, items listed, quantities, condition (any damage?) - **Photo Evidence:** Photo of packing slip + delivered items (proves what arrived) - **Signature:** Receiver signs off (confirms accuracy) - **Exception Reporting:** Any discrepancy (wrong qty, damage) triggers alert to Tracy
2. **Platform Receiving Module (Phase 2):** - **Mobile-Friendly:** Field crew can log receipt via phone/tablet (minimal friction) - **Barcode Scanning:** Scan PO barcode, auto-populate expected items (reduces manual entry) - **Photo Capture:** Timestamp photo of packing slip + items - **Condition Check:** Checkbox for any damage noted - **Location Tracking:** Where is product stored (job site, warehouse location, asset ID) - **Sync to PO:** Received quantity auto-updates PO, flags discrepancies
3. **3-Way Match Automation (Phase 2):** - PO Line Item ↔ Receipt ↔ Invoice auto-reconciled - If Received Qty ≠ Invoiced Qty, block payment (flag for review) - If Invoiced Price ≠ PO Price, alert Tracy - 95%+ of invoices auto-matched, 5% require manual review (cost overruns, substitutions)
4. **Inventory Location Tracking:** - Each received item assigned location (job site ID, warehouse section, asset tag) - Dashboard showing what's at each location (prevents duplicate ordering) - Receiving staff can query: "Do we already have 500 of these bolts? Where?" - Reduces redundant orders, prevents over-purchasing
5. **Vendor Accountability:** - Track vendor compliance: % of orders with accurate packing slips, on-time delivery, damage rate - Vendor scorecard published monthly (encourages vendors to improve) - Premium vendors (high compliance, low damage) get priority for next orders
6. **Training:** - Field crew training: how to use receiving app, photo best practices, condition assessment - Tracy training: how to interpret receiving reports, manage exceptions, contact vendors about discrepancies - Vendor training: proper packing, packing slip requirements, damage prevention

Owner: Tracy (Procurement), Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 2 (Sept–Oct 2026)
Status: ⏳ In Design (flow diagram due 2026-05-30)
Next Review: 2026-06-15 (design review with Tracy)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O003
Category	Operational — Supply Chain
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Formal receiving process, mobile app, 3-way match, location tracking
Owner	Tracy + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-O004: BUDGET VISIBILITY GAP

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Multiple interviews)

Description:
Russ has no real-time budget tracking. Each division tracks costs differently (spreadsheet, email, paper receipts). Project budgets are set at acquisition, but actual spend is never reconciled against budget. This creates: - Cost overruns discovered too late (after project is complete) - No early warning system (can't stop overruns before they happen) - Vendor disputes unresolved (invoice amount unclear, negotiation difficult) - Profitability unknown (Russ can't tell if a project is profitable until months after completion) - Financial forecasting impossible (Russ can't predict cash needs, can't adjust strategy)

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Current State: - Budget set in Land Division (Russ estimates acquisition cost) - Costs tracked in spreadsheets (incomplete, often behind actual spend) - No GL coding (costs not categorized by type: hard costs, soft costs, contingency) - Invoices arrive months late (invoice date ≠ accrual date) - No variance analysis (Budget $500K, Actual $680K, no one notices until final reconciliation)

Why This Matters: 1. **Cash Burn:** Russ may be spending more than he realizes (limits growth, financing decisions impaired) 2. **Investor/Bank Visibility:** If Russ has external investors or lenders, poor budget tracking creates trust issues 3. **Division Performance:** Russ can't evaluate which divisions are performing well (profitability assessment impossible) 4. **Project Decisions:** If budget tracking worked, Russ could stop a project before cost overrun (bail out, renegotiate terms)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Unified Budget Structure (Phase 1):** - **Standard Cost Categories:**
    - Hard Costs: Land, Construction, Equipment

- Soft Costs: Legal, Permitting, Appraisal, Insurance
- Contingency: Reserve for unknowns
- All divisions use same categories (enables roll-up reporting)
- Each project assigned to one cost center (Land Division ABC, Leasing Property XYZ, etc.)

2. **Real-Time Cost Tracking (Phase 1–2):** - All invoices coded to cost center + cost category (at receipt) - Accrual entry created when invoice received (not when paid) - GL automatically updated nightly with new accruals - Budget vs. Actual dashboard live (updated daily)
3. **Cost Dashboard (Phase 1):** - **Project View:** Budget, YTD Actual, Forecast to Complete, Variance, % of Budget Used - **Status Indicators:** Red (over budget), Yellow (85%–99% of budget), Green (under 85%) - **Drill-Down:** Click project to see cost breakdown by category (hard, soft, contingency) - **Filter:** By division, by status (active, completed, on-hold) - **Forecast:** If current spend rate continues, will project exceed budget? (early warning)
4. **Monthly Budget Review (Ongoing):** - **Cadence:** First week of each month, Russ reviews cost dashboard with CFO - **Agenda:** New overages, forecast changes, recommended actions - **Escalation:** Overages >10% of budget trigger discussion with division owner (what happened? can be recovered?) - **Documentation:** Decisions on overages logged (approved variance, change order, claim to vendor, etc.)
5. **Accounting Hub Integration (Phase 1):** - Cost categories linked to GL accounts (Hard Costs → GL 4000, Soft Costs → GL 4100, etc.) - All costs flow to GL in real-time (eliminates manual reconciliation) - Month-end close is automated (accruals already in GL) - Variance reporting: Budget (GL) vs. Actual (Projects) automatically reconciled
6. **Vendor Invoice Management (Phase 2):** - Material Procurement 3-way match ensures invoices are valid before accrual - Exceptions (discrepancies) held from GL until resolved - CFO approval workflow for invoices >$10K or with discrepancies - Document attachment required (PO, receipt, invoice all linked in platform)

Owner: Johnny CPA (Financial Controls), Russ (Cost Awareness)
Implementation: Phase 1 (budget structure), Phase 2 (invoice automation)
Status: ⏳ In Design (Accounting Hub interview complete — cost allocation rules to be defined)
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O004
Category	Operational — Financial
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Unified budget structure, real-time cost tracking, dashboard, GL integration
Owner	Johnny CPA + Russ
Status	In Design

RIS-O005: CO SCHEDULE RELIABILITY / DELAYS CASCADE

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Multiple interviews)

Description:
Change Order (CO) schedules are never met. COs are critical to project profitability (extra work = extra revenue). When CO approval is delayed, site work is delayed, deadlines slip. This cascades: - Land → Legal Close Land (leasing income delayed) - Land → Field (site prep delayed, rental income delayed) - Leasing → Revenue (units not ready for lease, occupancy delayed)

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Current State: - CO process is manual (email, spreadsheet, verbal approval) - Approval chain unclear (who approves? Russ? Division lead?) - COs sit in email inbox for weeks without response - No CO log or tracking (hard to know status) - No impact analysis (unknown how CO delay affects schedule)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **CO Workflow in Platform (Phase 2–3):** - **CO Creation:** Project manager initiates CO (description, cost, schedule impact) - **Approval Chain:** Defined by project type (Land COs go to Russ, Field COs go to Gerardo, etc.) - **Escalation:** Auto-escalate if no approval within 3 days (creates urgency) - **Approval Limits:** CFO approves <$5K, Russ approves <$50K, Board approves >$50K - **Notification:** Email alert when CO submitted; reminder every 2 days until approved
2. **CO Impact Tracking:** - **Cost Impact:** CO amount added to project budget - **Schedule Impact:** CO start date, duration (how does this affect critical path?) - **Financial Forecast:** If CO approved, will project still be profitable? - **Risk Alert:** If CO causes schedule slip >2 weeks, alert stakeholders
3. **CO Dashboard (Phase 2+):** - Pending COs (awaiting approval, age in days) - Approved COs (scheduled, in-progress, completed) - CO impact summary (total cost impact, total schedule impact) - Approval SLA tracking (% of COs approved within 3 days)

Owner: Russ (Approver), Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 2–3
Status: ⏳ In Backlog (lower priority than core workflows)
Next Review: 2026-06-01

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O005
Category	Operational — Project Management
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	CO workflow with approval chain, escalation, impact tracking
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Backlog

RIS-O006: PHONE-CALL CULTURE BREAKING

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Russ Interview)

Description:
Resortments has a strong phone-call preference. Major decisions, approvals, and status updates happen via phone (fast, personal, flexible). Shifting to platform-based (documented, asynchronous) communication is a hard culture change. Risk: Even if platform exists, Russ and team continue calling each other, bypassing system. Outcome: System has incomplete data (decision made verbally, not recorded in platform).

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 4 + 3 = **7 (High)**

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Design for Phone Culture (Phase 1+):** - **Mobile App:** Notifications + quick actions (approve CO in 10 seconds, not log in to web) - **SMS Alerts:** Critical decisions (CO awaiting approval, invoice discrepancy) via text (prompts platform login) - **Voice Commands:** Future enhancement (long-term, not Phase 1) - **Messaging:** Built-in platform messaging (faster than email, logged automatically)
2. **Process Redesign (Phase 1+):** - **No Exceptions:** Decisions must be recorded in platform (no "verbal approvals") - **Callback Workflow:** If Russ approves CO verbally, then executive assistant logs it in platform within 1 hour - **Policy:** Document any phone call decision in platform within 1 business day (or it didn't happen)
3. **Hard control:** Verbal approvals expire in 24 hours unless logged in-platform; unlogged approvals are not honored by Finance for payment release.

Owner: Russ (Modeling) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Design)
Status: ✅ Accepted (will mitigate through design + culture, not a blocker)
Next Review: Monthly (adoption metrics)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O006
Category	Operational — Culture
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Mobile-first design, policy, hard control on verbal approvals
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Accepted

RIS-O007: SCOPE CHANGE CONTROL

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** Critical
Date Identified: April 2026

Description:
Uncontrolled scope expansion over the 13-month engagement. Without a formal change-control gate, informal scope creep erodes schedule and margin.

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Quantified impact: $100K–$300K per major uncontrolled change order

Mitigation Strategy: 1. Formal written change-order process — no scope change without a signed change order. 2. Cost and schedule impact assessment per request before approval. 3. Monthly scope review with Russ — active, approved, and pending change requests reviewed together. 4. Change-order log maintained in project workspace; visible to sponsor and steering committee.

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ
Implementation: Phase 1 onwards
Status: Planned

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O007
Category	Operational — Governance
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Formal change-order process, cost/schedule impact assessment, monthly scope review
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ
Status	Planned

RIS-O008: FX / INTERNATIONAL PAYROLL RISK

Category: Operational | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: April 2026

Description:
Webaroo's senior engineering team includes international contractors paid in USD. FX volatility, bank wire costs, and settlement timing may affect effective operational costs.

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 3 + 3 = **6 (Medium)**

Quantified impact: $10K–$40K/year variance

Mitigation Strategy: 1. USD-denominated contracts with all contractors. 2. Fixed monthly wire dates to stabilize settlement cost and cash-flow planning. 3. 10% FX buffer held in contingency. 4. Quarterly review of wire cost and FX variance.

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Ongoing (from SOW signing)
Status: Planned

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-O008
Category	Operational — Finance / FX
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	9 (Medium)
Mitigation	USD contracts, fixed wire dates, 10% FX buffer, quarterly review
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Planned

DATA & MIGRATION RISKS

RIS-D001: PHYSICAL INVOICES IN DALLAS (DIGITIZATION)

Category: Data / Migration | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Finance/Accounting)

Description:
Resortments stores physical invoices and receipts in Dallas (location TBD). Historical invoices (past 3–7 years) are needed for audit compliance and financial reconciliation. Digitizing physical documents requires: - Bulk scanning (estimated 10,000–50,000 documents) - OCR (convert scans to searchable text) - Metadata tagging (vendor name, date, amount, cost code) - Quality assurance (verify scans are legible, all pages captured)

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 3 + 3 = **6 (Medium)**

Current State: - Paper storage location in Dallas (offsite, may cost monthly fee) - No index of what's stored (finding a specific invoice is difficult) - Risk: Fire, water damage, deterioration (documents may be lost before digitized) - Compliance: Auditors may require historical documents (current storage may be inadequate)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Phase 1 Assessment:** - Locate and assess Dallas storage (visit site, photograph condition) - Estimate document count, age range, document types - Evaluate cost of ongoing storage vs. digitization - Engage document scanning service for quote (bulk scanning + OCR)
2. **Phased Digitization:** - **Priority 1:** Most recent 2 years (needed for current operations, QB reconciliation) - **Priority 2:** Prior 5 years (needed for audits, historical analysis) - **Priority 3:** Older than 7 years (retention

may not be legally required) - Estimated timeline: Priority 1 by Q3 2026 (during Phase 2), Priority 2 by Q2 2027

3. **Scanning & OCR Service:** - Engage professional vendor (not manual in-house) - Bulk scanning (high-speed, volume discount) - OCR for text extraction (enables full-text search in platform) - Quality review (spot-check 5% of scans) - Delivery format: PDF + metadata (vendor, date, amount, category)
4. **Upload to Platform:** - Scanned documents uploaded to DMS (Phase 1) - Auto-tagging: use OCR metadata (vendor, date) to auto-link to PO + invoice - Manual review: verify 3-way match (PO ↔ Invoice ↔ Receipt) - Discrepancies flagged for CFO review
5. **Retention Policy:** - Define retention schedule (7-year minimum for audit compliance, 10-year for tax) - Implement in DMS (auto-archive after retention period) - Secure deletion: certified destruction of old physical documents

Owner: Johnny CPA (Compliance) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (DMS Mgmt)
Implementation: Phase 1–2 (Q3 2026 for Priority 1)
Status: ⏳ In Scoping (Q1 assessment due 2026-05-15)
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-D001
Category	Data — Migration
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	9 (Medium)
Mitigation	Bulk scanning + OCR, phased upload, retention policy
Owner	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Scoping

RIS-D002: DATA SCATTERED ACROSS MULTIPLE SYSTEMS

Category: Data / Migration | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (All interviews)

Description:
Data is fragmented across multiple platforms (no single source of truth): - **OneDrive:** Resortments documents (contracts, budgets, property files) - **Google Drive:** Shared drive for cross-division collaboration - **Email:** Threads contain decisions, approvals, cost updates - **Screenshots:** Photos of spreadsheets, maps, floor plans - **Phone Notes:** Russ keeps notes on his phone (not backed up) - **QuickBooks:** Financial transactions, GL accounts - **RealPage:** Lease data, tenant info - **Paper Files:** Physical contracts, permits (Dallas storage + various offices)

No single searchable repository exists. Finding information requires knowing where it is. Integrating all this data into Resortments is a massive undertaking.

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)

Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Why This Is a Risk: 1. **Data Migration Complexity:** Each system has different data formats, structures, completeness 2. **Data Quality Unknown:** Quality varies by source (some systems may have stale/conflicting data) 3. **Consolidation Effort:** No automated way to deduplicate, reconcile (requires manual review in many cases) 4. **Training Burden:** Users must learn to put data in Resortments (not email, phone notes, screenshots) 5. **Historical Data Loss:** Older data may be lost (not digitized, not indexed, difficult to recover)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Data Inventory (Phase 0–1):** - For each division, catalog: where is data stored? what data? how stale? how complete? - Example: Land Division — Property files in OneDrive (4 years back, 80% complete), Q1 budgets in Excel (on Russ's laptop), acquisition contracts in Dallas storage (paper) - Create data map (visual showing all sources, quantities, coverage)
2. **Prioritize Data Migration:** - **High Priority:** Data needed for Phase 1 (auth, GL, dashboards) - **Phase 2 Priority:** Division-specific data (Land properties, Leasing tenants, Procurement vendors) - **Phase 3+ Priority:** Historical data, archived projects, old contracts - Don't try to migrate everything at once (impossible, low ROI)
3. **Data Validation & Cleansing (Phase 1+):** - Spot-check data from each source (is it accurate? complete? current?) - Identify data quality issues (missing fields, duplicates, conflicting values) - Establish data governance (who owns data quality? who updates? what's SLA?) - Create master data records (canonical source for customers, properties, vendors)
4. **Email Data Recovery (Pilot):** - Phase 1: Engage email/document management vendor to extract key emails (contracts, approvals, cost decisions) - Convert email text → structured data (approval emails → approval records, cost emails → cost entries) - Manual review to validate extraction (email automation isn't perfect) - Store in DMS for reference (searchable historical record) - Resource-intensive; only do for critical emails (Phase 1+2)
5. **OneDrive / Google Drive Consolidation:** - Audit both drives (what's stored where, version control, access) - Consolidate: move all active documents to centralized shared drive (eliminate duplication) - Scan for sensitive data (API keys, financial data, PII) that shouldn't be on cloud drives - Archive old files to DMS (cleanup cloud drives)
6. **Data Standards & Governance (Phase 1):** - Define naming conventions (file names, folder structure) - Create data dictionary (what fields are required, what are optional) - Assign data stewards per division (responsible for data quality) - Implement validation rules in platform (required fields, format checks)
7. **Phased Data Import:** - **Phase 1:** Minimal historical data (recent GL, basic project list) - **Phase 2:** Division data (properties, contracts, vendors) - **Phase 3:** Full historical data (archived projects, old contracts) - **Ongoing:** Regular data syncs with source systems (QB, RealPage, ADP)

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA (Data Governance)
Timeline: Phase 0–1 (inventory), Phase 1+ (migration)
Status: ⏳ In Scoping (data inventory due 2026-05-30)
Next Review: 2026-05-30

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-D002
Category	Data — Migration / Quality
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Data inventory, prioritized migration, validation, governance
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA
Status	In Scoping

RIS-D003: NO EXISTING DATA STANDARDS

Category: Data / Migration | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (All interviews)

Description:
Each division maintains data differently (no standard naming conventions, formats, or classifications). Examples: - **Property Names:** "Site-123" vs. "Dallas Property" vs. "123 Main St" (same property, different labels) - **Cost Categories:** Land calls it "Hard Costs", Finance calls it "Direct Costs", Plant calls it "Equipment Spend" (same thing, different names) - **Vendor Names:** "Acme Corp" vs. "ACME CORPORATION" vs. "Acme" (same vendor, multiple records) - **Dates:** "1/15/2025" vs. "Jan 15 2025" vs. "2025-01-15" (different formats) - **Amount Format:** "$1,234.56" vs. "1234.56" vs. "1,234.56" (decimal inconsistency)

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 4 + 3 = **7 (High)**

Why This Matters: 1. **Data Matching:** Can't deduplicate vendors (Acme records won't merge automatically) 2. **Reporting:** Financial roll-ups fail (if divisions use different cost category names) 3. **Search:** Searching for a property returns multiple matches (user confusion) 4. **Automation:** Workflows can't map data between divisions (cost code mismatch) 5. **Quality:** Bad data propagates downstream as poor output quality

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Define Data Standards (Phase 1):** - **Chart of Accounts:** Unified GL structure (all divisions use same account codes) - **Cost Categories:** Unified taxonomy (Hard Costs, Soft Costs, Contingency, Labor, etc.) - **Property Naming:** Standardized format (Address-CityState-YearAcquired) - **Vendor Naming:** Standardized format (VendorName-VendorType-City) - **Dates:** ISO 8601 format (2025-01-15) in system, display format per user locale - **Amounts:** Decimal to 2 places, no currency symbols in database
2. **Master Data Management (Phase 1+):** - **Vendors Master:** Centralized vendor database (single record per vendor) - **Properties Master:** Centralized property database (single record per property) - **Chart of Accounts:** Centralized GL (single record per account) - **Cost Centers:** Centralized cost center master (single record per division/project) - All transactions linked to master record (no duplicate masters)
3. **Data Validation Rules (Phase 1+):** - Platform enforces standards at point of data entry - Dropdowns for categories (users select from standard list, can't type custom) - Vendor lookup (search for existing

vendor, prevents duplicate entry) - Cost code validation (system confirms code is valid before posting) - Date & amount format validation (automated checks)

4. **Data Cleansing (Phase 1–2):** - Audit historical data for violations (non-standard names, formats, values) - Correct data before importing to Resortments (or mark as "legacy" with caveat) - Deduplicate vendors, properties (merge duplicate records in source systems first) - Map legacy data to standard codes (e.g., old "Direct Costs" → new "Hard Costs" category)
5. **Training & Enforcement:** - Division training: standard naming conventions, why they matter - System-enforced: no way to violate standards (design prevents errors) - Ongoing: regular data quality audits (monthly spot-checks by data steward)

Owner: Johnny CPA (Data Governance) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 1 (design), Phase 1+ (enforcement)
Status: ⏳ In Design (standards document due 2026-05-15)
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-D003
Category	Data — Standards / Quality
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Define standards, master data mgmt, validation rules, cleansing
Owner	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-D004: SPREADSHEET DATA QUALITY UNKNOWN

Category: Data / Migration | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Tracy Interview)

Description:
Material Procurement (Tracy) maintains critical data in Excel (vendor lists, pricing, PO history). Quality of spreadsheet data is unknown: - Formulas may be broken (manual calculation, no formula validation) - Macros may contain errors (old VBA code, untested) - Data may be inconsistent (format, naming, data type) - Historical data may be incomplete (deleted rows, lost versions) - No version control (multiple copies, unclear which is current)

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 3 + 3 = **6 (Medium)**

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Spreadsheet Audit (Phase 1):** - Review Tracy's key spreadsheets (vendor master, pricing, PO history) - Check for: broken formulas, hidden rows, validation issues, suspicious data - Document findings (known issues, data quality gaps)

2. **Controlled Import:** - Don't auto-import spreadsheet data (high risk of bad data propagating) - Instead: extract data from spreadsheet → validate in platform → confirm with Tracy before posting - Example: Import vendor list → system shows validation errors (duplicate names) → Tracy confirms corrections → data posted
3. **Parallel Operation:** - Phase 2: Tracy continues Excel for first month (backup to platform) - Compare: platform results vs. Excel results (catch discrepancies) - After 1 month, retire Excel (platform is authoritative source)

Owner: Tracy (Data Source) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status: ⏳ In Scoping
Next Review: 2026-06-01 (audit findings)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-D004
Category	Data — Quality
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	9 (Medium)
Mitigation	Spreadsheet audit, controlled import, validation, parallel operation
Owner	Tracy + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Scoping

RESOURCE RISKS

RIS-R001: ACCOUNTING HUB INTERVIEW — RESOLVED

Category: Resource / Scope | **Criticality:** ~~High~~ → Resolved
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping
Date Resolved: April 8, 2026

Description:
Accounting Hub scoping interview with Johnny (CPA) and Teresa (Controller) is complete. Key findings: - **Multi-entity QuickBooks** — each ownership entity has its own QB instance (more complex than originally assumed) - **ADP Workforce Now** — 12 employees, payroll allocated by project, two pay schedules - **Cost allocation** — transitioning from per-project to factory model, weekly recalculation - **Reporting** — Russ wants daily financial dashboards (Net Operating Income (NOI) vs interest rate is #1 metric) - **Monte Carlo** — handled by Mirrorfish (external tool, NOT in platform scope) - **Custom report builder** — Johnny explicitly said No

Complexity confirmed: HIGH (13–17 dev-months) — consistent with pre-interview estimate. No budget adjustment required.

Remaining Action Items (from interview findings): 1. Define QB multi-entity mapping strategy (which entities, which accounts, sync frequency) 2. Confirm ADP API access and available data fields 3. Define cost

allocation rules for factory model transition 4. Establish formal close process with Johnny & Teresa (none exists currently)

Status: ✅ Resolved — Interview complete (April 8, 2026), requirements documented
Successor Risk: Multi-entity QB complexity captured in RIS-T005 (updated)

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-R001
Category	Resource — Information Gap
Probability	N/A (Resolved)
Impact	N/A (Resolved)
Risk Score	0 (Resolved)
Mitigation	Interview completed April 8, 2026. Requirements documented in Scoping Questionnaire.
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	✅ Resolved

RIS-R002: KEY PERSON DEPENDENCY (RUSS)

Category: Resource | **Criticality:** Critical
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Russ holds most business knowledge in his head: - Acquisition strategy (what sites to pursue, pricing logic) - Financial assumptions (cost structure, profitability targets, financing strategy) - Vendor relationships (who to trust, pricing negotiation, disputes) - Division structure (who owns what, authority, priorities) - Strategic priorities (which divisions matter most, long-term vision)

If Russ is unavailable (illness, vacation, other commitments), decisions slow, projects stall. Project team needs to know: what would Russ decide? But can't ask because he's unavailable.

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Quantified impact: $50K–$150K decision latency per month of absence

Why This Is a Risk: - Phase 0–2 require frequent decisions from Russ (design reviews, priority trade-offs, approval gates) - If Russ is unavailable for 2 weeks, project pauses - Webaroo team doesn't have decision-making authority (can't guess what Russ would want) - Key business rules not documented (decision logic lives in Russ's head)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Documentation Initiative (Q2 2026):** - Create **Business Rules Wiki:** Russ documents key decisions, assumptions, logic - Topics: acquisition criteria, pricing strategy, vendor selection, division authority, financial targets - Format: Q&A (Q: how do you decide if a site is a good acquisition? A: [Russ's logic]) - Audience: Division leads, Webaroo team (reference when Russ is unavailable) - Estimated effort: 4–6 hours with Russ over 2 weeks

2. **Decision Authority Delegation (Phase 1):** - Identify decisions that DON'T require Russ (delegate to division leads) - Identify decisions that DO require Russ (define escalation path) - Create approval matrix: who can approve budgets <$10K, <$100K, >$100K - Document in project governance (published, visible to all)
3. **Backup Approver (Ongoing):** - Identify CFO or COO as backup approver (for time-critical decisions) - Define which decisions can be delegated vs. require Russ - Train backup on business logic, approval criteria - Monthly: validate backup is current on decisions - **Russ designates a decision-deputy for routine approvals during any absence >3 days.**
4. **Structured Planning (Phase 1+):** - Monthly planning meetings (1st of month, 2 hours) - Document decisions, priorities, design choices (in wiki or meeting notes) - Webaroo team reviews notes, confirms understanding - Archive notes (searchable, reduces "who decided this?" questions later)

Owner: Russ (Documentation), Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Facilitation)
Timeline: Q2 2026 (wiki creation), ongoing (documentation updates)
Status: ⏳ In Planning
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-R002
Category	Resource — Key Person
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Business rules wiki, decision authority delegation, decision-deputy for absences >3 days, backup approver, structured planning
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Planning

RIS-R004: TEAM MOBILIZATION TIMELINE

Category: Resource — Delivery Capacity | **Criticality:** Medium-High **Date Identified:** April 2026

Description: Phase 1 delivery begins immediately on SOW signing. Webaroo's senior engineering team must be fully onboarded and productive within 2 weeks of kickoff to maintain the 90-day Phase 1 timeline.

Probability: 2/5 (Medium-Low) **Impact:** 3/5 (Medium-High) **Risk Score:** 2 + 3 = **5 (Medium)**

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Tech Lead onboards first (Week 1):** The Tech Lead / Solution Architect starts Day 1 and leads onboarding for the rest of the team. This creates architecture runway even if other hires are 3–5 days behind.
2. **Connor leads Week 1 architecture directly:** Connor Murphy (Webaroo) personally leads the first week of architecture decisions and client handoff, ensuring no dead time while the team assembles.
3. **Staggered onboarding:** Senior engineers onboard in rolling 2–3 day windows rather than all at once, reducing Day 1 chaos and ensuring each team member receives focused orientation.

4. **Pre-provisioned tooling:** Development environments, code repositories, CI/CD pipelines, and third-party sandboxes are provisioned before Day 1 so the team writes code immediately on arrival.

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo) **Timeline:** Weeks 1–3 of Phase 1 **Status:** Planned

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-R004
Category	Resource — Delivery Capacity
Probability	2/5 (Medium-Low)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	6 (Medium)
Mitigation	Tech Lead first, Connor leads Week 1, staggered onboarding, pre-provisioned tooling
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Planned

RIS-R003: DIVISION OWNERS WEARING MULTIPLE HATS

Category: Resource | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (David Interview)

Description:
David owns 2 divisions (Legal Close Land + Legal Rollovers). He has limited availability for detailed platform requirements gathering, UAT, training. Other division leads are also juggling multiple responsibilities (field work, customer relationships, administrative tasks).

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score: 3 + 3 = **6 (Medium)**

Why This Is a Risk: - Detailed requirements gathering depends on David (but he's busy with legal work) - UAT needs his time (reviewing designs, signing off on modules) - Training delays if David can't attend (he's the subject matter expert, needs to train others) - Feature delays (decisions on David's modules slow-walk because he's unavailable)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Dedicated Requirements Liaison (Phase 1):** - Assign Webaroo requirements analyst to each division - Analyst learns division processes, documents requirements - David reviews & confirms (lighter touch than gathering from scratch) - Reduces David's load; Webaroo analyst is primary coordinator
2. **Time Allocation (Phase 1+):** - Negotiate with Russ: David gets 20% of his time for platform project (2 days/week) - Schedule recurring slots (Thursdays 2pm, David blocks calendar for Webaroo meetings) - No ad-hoc requests; questions batched and asked during scheduled time - Protects David's legal work, ensures platform gets consistent attention
3. **Async Documentation:** - Webaroo creates design documents, requirements specs - David reviews async (no meeting required; he reads at his convenience) - David provides feedback in document comments (asynchronous) - Reduces synchronous meeting load

4. **Power Users (Phase 2+):** - Identify power user in each division (someone who can step in for David) - Cross-train power user (so they can handle David's legal work during peak times) - Power user becomes interim decision-maker when David unavailable

Owner: Russ (Time allocation), Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Coordination)
Implementation: Phase 1 (liaison assignment), Phase 1+ (time allocation)
Status: ⏳ In Planning
Next Review: 2026-05-01

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-R003
Category	Resource — Availability
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	3/5 (Medium)
Risk Score	9 (Medium)
Mitigation	Requirements analyst liaison, time allocation (20%), async documentation, power users
Owner	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Planning

RIS-R005: WEBAROO KEY-PERSON RISK

Category: Resource | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: April 2026

Description:
Departure of Connor Murphy or the Webaroo Tech Lead mid-engagement would materially disrupt delivery. Webaroo's senior engineering team is lean by design — concentration risk sits on a small, experienced bench.

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Quantified impact: $100K–$250K rehire + ramp cost

Mitigation Strategy: 1. Cross-training — Tech Lead + senior backup both active on critical path from Day 1. 2. Documented architecture decisions (ADRs) — every non-obvious design choice recorded so a replacement can pick up context. 3. Client-facing relationship not single-threaded on Connor — Tech Lead joins all sponsor touchpoints. 4. Delivery runbooks and on-call rotation documented.

Owner: Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 1 onwards
Status: Planned

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-R005
Category	Resource — Key Person (Webaroo)
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Cross-training, ADRs, dual client-facing relationship, runbooks
Owner	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	Planned

COMPLIANCE & LEGAL RISKS

RIS-C001: 7–10 YEAR DATA RETENTION REQUIREMENTS

Category: Compliance | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Resortments must retain financial records, contracts, and compliance documentation for 7–10 years (varies by document type): - **Financial Records:** 7 years (IRS, bank regulations) - **Land Acquisition Records:** 10 years (property history, title) - **Lease Records:** Duration of lease + 3 years (landlord-tenant law) - **Payroll Records:** 3–7 years (labor laws, tax compliance) - **Safety Records:** 5 years minimum (OSHA) - **Construction Permits & Inspections:** 10 years (building code compliance)

Probability: 5/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 5 + 4 = **9 (Critical)**

Why This Is a Risk: - If Resortments can't produce records when audited/sued, penalties are severe (fines, legal liability, reputational damage) - Paper documents risk: fire, water damage, deterioration (may not survive 10 years) - Platform must be designed with retention in mind (not an afterthought) - Compliance failure = liability exposure (expensive to fix after the fact)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Document Classification (Phase 1):** - Categorize all document types (financial, legal, compliance, operational) - For each type, determine retention period (3, 5, 7, or 10 years) - Create retention schedule (matrix of document type → retention period) - Publish in company policy (all employees know what's retained and why)
2. **DMS Configuration (Phase 1):** - Configure Document Management System with retention metadata - Auto-tag documents with document type (Invoice, Contract, Permit, etc.) - System calculates retention end date (received date + retention period) - Alerts generated when document approaching retention end (before auto-archive)
3. **Archive & Disposal (Phase 1+):** - Auto-archive old documents to cold storage (reduces live system size) - Secure disposal: documents reaching retention end date are permanently deleted with audit trail (certified destruction) - No exceptions: retention schedule is enforced (no manual overrides)

4. **Audit Trail:** - All document lifecycle events logged (created, modified, accessed, archived, deleted) - Audit log is itself archived for 7 years (proof of compliance) - Regular audit reports (monthly) showing retention compliance
5. **Regulatory Alignment:** - Legal review: ensure retention schedule meets all applicable laws (IRS, labor, state laws) - Update schedule annually (regulations change) - Document approval: Johnny CPA + Legal sign off on schedule
6. **Disaster Recovery:** - Backups retained per retention schedule (not deleted prematurely) - Geographic redundancy (copies stored in multiple data centers, prevents total loss) - Disaster recovery test annual (can we recover 7-year-old records if needed?)

Owner: Johnny CPA (Data Governance) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 1 (schedule design + DMS config)
Status: ⏳ In Design (legal review due 2026-05-15)
Next Review: 2026-05-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-C001
Category	Compliance — Data Retention
Probability	5/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	20 (Critical)
Mitigation	Document classification, retention schedule, DMS auto-archive, audit trail, legal review
Owner	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-C002: OSHA SAFETY TRACKING (CURRENTLY ZERO)

Category: Compliance | **Criticality:** High
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Gerardo Interview)

Description:
Field Division currently has zero formal OSHA safety tracking. Incidents (injuries, near-misses, hazardous conditions) are not formally documented. This creates compliance and liability risks: - **OSHA Recordkeeping:** Employers must maintain OSHA 300 log (incident register) for 5 years - **Incident Investigation:** Serious incidents require documented root cause analysis - **Hazard Correction:** Identify hazards, document corrective actions, track remediation - **Training Records:** Safety training must be documented (training date, trainer, attendees, topics)

Probability: 4/5 (High)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 4 + 4 = **8 (High)**

Why This Is a Risk: - OSHA audit without documentation = massive fines ($15K–$150K+ per violation) - Injury lawsuits without incident documentation = indefensible (Resortments liable) - Insurance may deny claims if incident not properly documented - Crew safety at risk (no tracking = no prevention, accidents repeat)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Safety Program Design (Phase 3):** - Develop Resortments Safety Policy (documented, communicated to all field staff) - Define safety responsibilities (Gerardo = Field Safety Lead, GCs = on-site safety leads) - Incident reporting process (form, escalation, investigation) - Hazard identification & correction (process for identifying and fixing hazards)
2. **OSHA Compliance Module (Phase 3 or 4):** - **Incident Log:** OSHA 300-equivalent record (date, description, injury type, body part, severity) - **Incident Investigation:** Root cause analysis template, corrective action plan - **Hazard Tracking:** Identify hazards, assign corrective action, track remediation - **Training Log:** Safety training records (date, trainer, attendees, topic, acknowledgment) - **Regulatory Alerts:** Reminder of OSHA filing deadlines (form 300 summary must be posted Jan 1–April 30 annually)
3. **Field Integration (Phase 3):** - Mobile app incident reporting: crew can report incident on-site (photo evidence, description) - Safety briefing before work: checklist of hazards, safety equipment, acknowledgment required - Inspection checklist: daily site safety inspection (hazards, corrective actions, sign-off)
4. **Leadership Accountability:** - Monthly safety review (Gerardo + Russ): incidents, trends, corrective actions - Safety metrics dashboard: incident rate, near-miss rate, hazard correction timeliness - Accountability: GC with high incident rate = corrective action plan or no future work
5. **Training Program:** - Mandatory field safety training (Gerardo delivers, documents attendance) - GC orientation: safety expectations, incident reporting, disciplinary policy - Annual refresher: OSHA regulations, safety best practices, lessons learned from incidents
6. **Legal & Insurance:** - Engage employment/safety attorney to review program - Coordinate with insurance broker (ensure documentation meets policy requirements) - Insurance audit annually (verify compliance; may reduce premiums with good safety record)

Owner: Gerardo (Field Safety Lead), Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 3 (OSHA module), Phase 3+ (training)
Status: ⏳ In Design (safety program framework due 2026-06-15)
Next Review: 2026-06-15

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-C002
Category	Compliance — Safety
Probability	4/5 (High)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	16 (Critical)
Mitigation	Safety program design, OSHA tracking module, field integration, training, legal review
Owner	Gerardo + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-C003: ICPC & HUD INSPECTIONS (LOCATION-DEPENDENT)

Category: Compliance | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Some Resortments properties may be subject to ICPC (Interstate Compact on Placement of Children) or HUD inspections if they are used for childcare, foster care, or publicly-funded housing. Inspection requirements and documentation vary by location and program. Failure to comply results in: - Property condemned (occupancy prohibited) - Funding withdrawal (loss of subsidy revenue) - Legal penalties ($5K–$50K+)

Probability: 3/5 (Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 3 + 4 = **7 (High)**

Why This Is a Risk: - Regulatory requirements are complex, location-specific (no one-size-fits-all approach) - Resortments may not know which properties are subject to what regulations - Inspection scheduling and documentation are required (easy to miss deadlines) - Non-compliance is costly (fines, loss of revenue, reputational damage)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Property Classification (Phase 1–2):** - Audit all Resortments properties to determine regulatory status - For each property: is it subject to ICPC? HUD? Fair Housing? Other? - Document regulatory requirements for each property (data in management/leasing module)
2. **Compliance Tracker (Phase 3–4):** - Create inspection schedule (next inspection date, frequency) - Auto-reminders (30/15/7 days before inspection due) - Inspection results log (pass/fail, remediation items if any) - Document storage (inspection reports linked in DMS)
3. **Remediation Workflow:** - Inspection finding → Corrective action assigned - Deadline tracking (work orders for remediation) - Verification (once corrected, documented proof) - Closure (remediation confirmed, finding closed)

Owner: Dylan (Leasing) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 2–3 (property classification), Phase 3+ (compliance tracker)
Status: ⏳ In Scoping
Next Review: 2026-06-01

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-C003
Category	Compliance — Regulatory
Probability	3/5 (Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	12 (High)
Mitigation	Property classification, compliance tracker, inspection scheduling, remediation workflow
Owner	Dylan + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Scoping

RIS-C004: FAIR HOUSING COMPLIANCE

Category: Compliance | **Criticality:** Medium
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping (Dylan Interview)

Description:
Leasing operations must comply with Fair Housing Act (discrimination laws). Prohibited actions include: - Refusing to rent based on race, color, religion, national origin, disability, family status, or sexual orientation - Different terms/conditions based on protected status - Discriminatory advertising - Retaliatory actions

Compliance requires: - Training for leasing staff (what is discrimination, how to avoid it) - Documentation (applications, rental decisions, reasons for approval/denial) - Audit trail (proof that decisions were not discriminatory)

Probability: 2/5 (Low-Medium)
Impact: 4/5 (High)
Risk Score: 2 + 4 = **6 (Medium)**

Why This Is a Risk: - Fair Housing violations are federal crimes (fines $10K–$100K+, criminal liability) - Allegations are common in housing industry (difficult to defend without documentation) - Jury trials can be costly even if Resortments wins (legal fees $50K–$500K+) - Reputational damage (public lawsuit damages brand)

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **Fair Housing Policy (Phase 1–2):** - Develop written fair housing policy (approved by legal counsel) - Communicate to all leasing staff (posted in office, acknowledgment required) - Standardized rental application (no discriminatory questions) - Standardized screening criteria (objective, documented, applied equally)
2. **Leasing Module Compliance (Phase 3):** - Application form: standardized questions, no protected characteristics asked - Screening checklist: objective criteria (income, credit, references — not discriminatory) - Rental decision log: reason for approval/denial documented (objective reason, not subjective judgment) - Audit trail: all decisions logged with reason (enables fair housing audit)
3. **Training Program:** - Mandatory Fair Housing training for Dylan + leasing team (annual) - Training covers: what is discrimination, how to avoid it, reporting violations - Documentation: attendance record, completion certification
4. **Regular Audits:** - Monthly: review leasing decisions (sample 10% of applications, verify consistency) - Annual: fair housing audit by third-party (external review for credibility) - Issues: corrective action plan for any patterns of discrimination
5. **Vendor & GC Screening:** - GCs must acknowledge Fair Housing policy (no discrimination in hiring, site access) - Violation: disciplinary action or termination

Owner: Dylan (Leasing) + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Implementation: Phase 1–2 (policy), Phase 3 (module design), Phase 3+ (training)
Status: ⏳ In Design
Next Review: 2026-06-01

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-C004
Category	Compliance — Fair Housing
Probability	2/5 (Low-Medium)
Impact	4/5 (High)
Risk Score	8 (Medium)
Mitigation	Fair housing policy, standardized screening, leasing audit trail, training, regular audits
Owner	Dylan + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
Status	In Design

RIS-C005: OVERSIZE TRANSPORT REGULATIONS

Category: Compliance | **Criticality:** Low
Date Identified: Phase 0 Scoping

Description:
Field Division transports equipment, materials, and products via trucks. Some deliveries may require oversize transport permits (if cargo exceeds standard truck dimensions: width, height, weight). Regulations vary by jurisdiction. Non-compliance: - Fines ($500–$5K per violation) - Cargo impounded, work delays - Liability if oversize vehicle causes damage

Probability: 2/5 (Low)
Impact: 2/5 (Low)
Risk Score: 2 + 2 = **4 (Low)**

Why This Is Lower Priority: - Risk only applies to some cargo (not all deliveries require permits) - Impact is financial (fines, delays) not safety-critical - Vendors often handle permits (truck companies, not Resortments responsibility) - Legal requires less detailed documentation than OSHA or Fair Housing

Mitigation Strategy:

1. **GC Contract Terms:** - GC responsible for obtaining oversize permits (contract requirement) - Proof of permit required before transport (documented in work order) - Penalty for non-compliance (GC pays fine or Resortments withholds payment)
2. **Material Procurement Guidance:** - Tracy aware of oversize transport rules (avoid ordering oversized cargo when possible) - Vendor coordination (vendor arranges transport, handles permits) - Documentation: delivery paperwork includes permit confirmation (photo of permit)

Owner: Gerardo (Field) + Tracy (Procurement)
Implementation: Phase 2+ (contract language)
Status: ⏳ In Backlog (low priority)
Next Review: 2026-06-01

Risk Register Entry:

FIELD	VALUE
Risk ID	RIS-C005
Category	Compliance — Transportation
Probability	2/5 (Low)
Impact	2/5 (Low)
Risk Score	4 (Low)
Mitigation	GC contract terms, vendor coordination, permit documentation
Owner	Gerardo + Tracy
Status	In Backlog

Risk Registry Summary Table

RISK ID	CATEGORY	TITLE	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	SCORE	STATUS	OWNER
RIS-T001	Technical	RealPage/OneSite API Uncertainty	4/5	5/5	**9**	In Progress	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Dylan
RIS-T002	Technical	DocuSign Envelope Scale	3/5	4/5	**7**	In Design	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-T003	Technical	Permitting Portal Fragmentation	4/5	3/5	**7**	Accepted	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-T004	Technical	Plant Doesn't Exist Yet	3/5	4/5	**7**	In Design	Zac + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-T005	Technical	QuickBooks Multi-Entity Integration	3/5	4/5	**7**	In Design	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA
RIS-T006	Technical	ADP Integration Complexity	2/5	3/5	**5**	In Scoping	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-T007	Technical	Go-Live Cutover Risk	3/5	4/5	**7**	Planned	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-O001	Operational	Change Management (8 Divisions)	4/5	5/5	**9**	In Planning	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ
RIS-O002	Operational	GC Accountability Gap	4/5	4/5	**8**	In Design	Gerardo + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-O003	Operational	Delivery Chaos / No Receiving	4/5	3/5	**7**	In Design	Tracy + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-O004	Operational	Budget Visibility Gap	4/5	4/5	**8**	In Design	Johnny CPA + Russ
RIS-O005	Operational	CO Schedule Reliability	3/5	4/5	**7**	In Backlog	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)

RISK ID	CATEGORY	TITLE	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	SCORE	STATUS	OWNER
RIS-O006	Operational	Phone-Call Culture Breaking	4/5	3/5	**7**	Accepted	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-O007	Operational	Scope Change Control	4/5	4/5	**8**	Planned	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ
RIS-O008	Operational	FX / International Payroll	3/5	3/5	**6**	Planned	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-D001	Data	Physical Invoice Digitization	3/5	3/5	**6**	In Scoping	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-D002	Data	Data Scattered (OneDrive, Email, etc.)	4/5	4/5	**8**	In Scoping	Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Johnny CPA
RIS-D003	Data	No Existing Data Standards	4/5	3/5	**7**	In Design	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-D004	Data	Spreadsheet Data Quality Unknown	3/5	3/5	**6**	In Scoping	Tracy + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-R001	Resource	~~Accounting Hub Interview~~	N/A	N/A	**—**	✅ Resolved (not counted)	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-R002	Resource	Key Person Dependency (Russ)	4/5	4/5	**8**	In Planning	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-R003	Resource	Division Leads Multitasking	3/5	3/5	**6**	In Planning	Russ + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-R004	Resource	Team Mobilization Timeline	2/5	3/5	**5**	Planned	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-R005	Resource	Webaroo Key-Person Risk	3/5	4/5	**7**	Planned	Connor Murphy (Webaroo)

RISK ID	CATEGORY	TITLE	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	SCORE	STATUS	OWNER
RIS-C001	Compliance	Data Retention (7–10 Years)	5/5	4/5	**9**	In Design	Johnny CPA + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-C002	Compliance	OSHA Safety Tracking (Zero)	4/5	4/5	**8**	In Design	Gerardo + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-C003	Compliance	ICPC & HUD Inspections	3/5	4/5	**7**	In Scoping	Dylan + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-C004	Compliance	Fair Housing Compliance	2/5	4/5	**6**	In Design	Dylan + Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
RIS-C005	Compliance	Oversize Transport Regulations	2/5	2/5	**4**	In Backlog	Gerardo + Tracy

Risk Monitoring & Governance

Monthly Risk Review Cadence

- **First Tuesday of each month:** Connor Murphy (Webaroo) reviews all active risks (updates status, probability, impact)
- **Attendees:** Russ (sponsor), Johnny CPA, Connor Murphy (Webaroo), division leads (as needed)
- **Agenda:** New risks identified, status updates, mitigation progress, decision gates
- **Output:** Updated risk registry (published to all stakeholders)
- Updated risk register versions will be published to the project SharePoint and communicated via weekly status email.

Risk Escalation

- **Critical Risks (Score 9–10):** Escalate to Russ immediately (within 24 hours of status change)
- **High Risks (Score 7–8):** Escalate to Connor Murphy (Webaroo) + Russ (weekly status)
- **Medium Risks (Score 5–6):** Track in risk registry (monthly review)
- **Low Risks (Score 2–4):** Document for reference, monitor for status change

Decision Gates

- **May 31, 2026:** RealPage API decision (RIS-T001) — proceed with API or CSV fallback
- ~~**May 31, 2026:** CFO Accounting Hub interview complete (RIS-R001)~~ — ✅ RESOLVED April 8, 2026
- **Aug 31, 2026:** Phase 1 MVP stable (2 weeks of production) — decision to proceed to Phase 2
- **Dec 31, 2026:** Phase 2 Wave 1 stable — decision to proceed to Phase 3 on schedule

Risk Tracking Dashboard

- **Live Dashboard:** Updated weekly by Connor Murphy (Webaroo)
- **Metrics:** Total risks by category, by status, by score
- **Trend:** Which risks are trending up (probability increasing, impact worsening)?
- **Audience:** Published to Russ, CFO, Webaroo leadership (transparent, visible risk management)

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary

- **RIS-ID:** Risk identifier (RIS-T for technical, RIS-O for operational, etc.)
- **Probability:** Likelihood risk will occur (Low, Medium, High)
- **Impact:** Consequence if risk occurs (Low, Medium, High)
- **Risk Score:** Probability + Impact (2–10 scale on 1–5 + 1–5; higher = more critical). Bands: 9–10 Critical, 7–8 High, 5–6 Medium, 2–4 Low.
- **Mitigation:** Action to reduce probability or impact
- **Owner:** Person/team responsible for mitigation
- **Status:** In Progress, In Design, In Scoping, Pending, Accepted, In Backlog

Appendix B: Referenced Documents

- Project Roadmap & Milestones (RIS-T001, RIS-O004 dependencies)
- Webaroo SOW & Contract
- Phase 0 Stakeholder Interview Notes (8 divisions — all complete)
- Legal Requirements (Fair Housing Act, OSHA, IRS, state regulations)

Appendix C: Contact Information

- **Russ (Sponsor):** Resortments Owner, final decision authority
- **Johnny CPA (Finance Lead):** Data governance, compliance, financial requirements
- **Connor Murphy (Webaroo) (Project Manager + Risk Lead):** Risk coordination, mitigation tracking, risk registry maintenance, monthly review facilitation

---

Document Control

- **Title:** Risk Analysis & Mitigation Plan — Resortments Unified Enterprise Platform
- **Version:** 1.0
- **Date:** April 8, 2026
- **Status:** Active
- **Next Review:** May 1, 2026 (monthly risk review)
- **Approval:** ___ (Sponsor) ____ (Date)

This risk analysis is a living document. Risk register will be updated monthly as project progresses through phases. New risks will be identified and added; mitigated risks will be closed and archived.

NAVIGATE THE PACKAGE

All Discovery Materials

01 Audit & Competitor Analysis

02 Technical & Project Evaluation

03 Project Charter

04 Project Roadmap & Milestones

05 Risk Analysis & Mitigation

06 Budget Estimate

07 Product Backlog

08 Payment Schedule & Terms