

## RISK MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS IN DIGITAL RETAIL COMPANIES

Davin Prayoga PAHLEVI<sup>1</sup>, Shafa KAMILA<sup>2</sup>, Yehezkiel William RASSI<sup>3</sup>, Amelia Putri Indah CAHYANI<sup>4</sup>, Astriani Puspita MAHARANI<sup>5</sup>, Ahmad Setiawan NURAYA<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>Faculty of Economics and Business, STIE Indonesia Banking School, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Davin Prayoga Pahlevi

Email: [davin.20231111030@ibs.ac.id](mailto:davin.20231111030@ibs.ac.id)

### Article Info:

Received: 2025-07-12

Volume: 4

### Keywords:

Risk Management,  
Enterprise Risk  
Management,  
Operational Risk,  
Market Risk,  
Reputational Risk,  
Digital Retail.

Revised: 2025-08-17

Numbers: 3

### Abstract:

This study aims to describe the implementation of risk management in a digital retail company operating in the personal care and household products sector. The research focuses on risk identification, risk assessment, and mitigation strategies implemented by the company in facing the dynamics of the online retail business. The study used a qualitative-descriptive method through interviews with management, observation of operational processes, and review of internal documents. The analysis results indicate that the company faces various risks in human resources, operations, market, competition, and reputation. Assessment using a likelihood-impact matrix places most risks in the moderate category, requiring consistent control to prevent operational disruptions and reduced competitiveness. The company implemented a combination of strategies to strengthen standard operating procedures (SOPs), improve service quality, monitor the market, and mitigate internal and external risks to maintain business stability. These findings indicate that the implementation of risk management in the digital retail company has been quite successful, but still requires ongoing evaluation to make the company more adaptive to changes in the digital business environment.

Accepted: 2025-09-15

Pages: 204 - 211

## INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation in the retail industry is driving significant changes to operational processes, transaction systems, and corporate reporting mechanisms. This shift toward technology-based activities creates new opportunities, but also increases vulnerability to operational risks and recording errors that can impact business stability. In these circumstances, implementing risk management is a crucial element in ensuring effective and accountable business processes.

Digital retail companies, particularly those engaged in the distribution of household and personal care products, need to ensure that their data management systems, sales transactions, and internal controls support compliance with audit standards and tax regulations. Implementing good governance not only enhances operational integrity but is also a crucial prerequisite for maintaining business sustainability. As explained by Kamaludin et al. (2021), the quality of governance and internal control is closely linked to managerial behavior and corporate risk.

In the digital context, operational and reputational risks are becoming increasingly complex due to the reliance on information technology and high market dynamics. Research by Adi and Arijanti (2024) shows that exposure to reputational risk increases with the use of digital media in business activities. Furthermore, a study by Azizah et al. (2022) confirms that financial risk management plays a significant role in maintaining company stability, especially in sectors facing rapid change.

Although various studies have addressed digital risk management, most have focused on large companies or the large-scale e-commerce sector. This research gap arises from the lack of



This open-access article is distributed under a  
Attribution (CC-BY-NC) 4.0 license





**Table 2. Risk Identification/Risk Appetite**

Types of Risk	Code	Risk	Source of Cause
HR (Human Resources) Risk	SDM1	High Employee Turnover	Lack of sense of ownership and less competitive incentives or benefits.
Operational Risk	OP1	Defective Product	Negligence in the checking or production process.
	OP2	Operational System Disrupted	SOPs are not implemented properly, or systems and technology are not updated.
Market and Competition Risks	PK1	Threat of Low-Price Competitors	Many new competitors are offering similar products at lower prices.
	PK2	Left Behind in the Digital Age	Inactive and not utilizing digital technology optimally.
	PK3	Irrelevant Products	Rapid changes in market trends and failure to adapt to consumer preferences.
Reputational Risk	RP1	Damaged Brand Image	Miscommunication or negative comments spread quickly in the digital world.

Companies conduct risk assessments to measure the magnitude of potential risks and their impact on operational continuity, allowing higher-urgency risks to be prioritized. In this study, the assessments were conducted using a frequency scale of 1–5, which reflects the likelihood of a risk occurring. The results were used to map risks based on their occurrence and consequences.

**Table 3. Risk Assessment/Risk Tolerance**

Types of Risk	Code	Risk	Frequency	Impact	Risk Value
<b>Human Resource Risk</b>	SDM1	High employee turnover	2	2	Low
	OP1	Defective product	1	4	Medium
<b>Operational Risk</b>	OP2	The operational system is disrupted (SOP is not executed or system disruption)	3	5	High
	PK1	Threat of competitors offering lower prices	3	3	Medium
<b>Market and Competition Risks</b>	PK2	Companies are lagging in utilizing digital technology	1	5	Medium
	PK3	The product is irrelevant due to changing market trends	2	4	Medium
<b>Reputational Risk</b>	RP1	Brand image damaged due to negative comments/communication	2	3	Medium



Risk severity assessment is performed using the Likelihood-Impact Matrix, where the frequency and impact scales are placed on the x- and y-axes. This matrix produces three levels of risk severity: green for low risk, yellow for medium risk, and red for high risk.

5					
4					
3			PK1		OP2
2		SDM1	RP1	PK3	
1				OP1	PK2
	1	2	3	4	5

**Figure 3.** Likelihood-Impact Matrix

Based on the mapping results into the matrix, risks are grouped as follows:

1. Low Risk. This category includes risks with a low assessment value and is relatively easy to control, requiring regular monitoring. Risks in this group include high employee turnover (SDM1), outdated digital technology utilization (PK2), irrelevant products (PK3), and defective products (OP1).
2. Medium Risk. Risks in this category have a medium value and require more intensive monitoring and a structured mitigation plan. These risks include operational system disruptions (OP2), the threat of lower-priced competitors (PK1), and damage to brand image (RP1).
3. High Risk. Based on the risk tolerance calculation, no risks fall into the high-risk category. This finding indicates that all risks are within the company's tolerance limits and can be managed through preventive measures and consistent monitoring.

**Risk Financing.** The process of providing funds to mitigate potential losses when a risk actually occurs, either through internal or external mechanisms. ISO 31000 (2018) emphasizes that risk financing strategies must consider the risk characteristics, liquidity capacity, and the organization's risk tolerance level. In practice, internal financing is achieved through the preparation of reserves or the allocation of specific funds to cover risks within the organization's tolerance limits, as explained in the risk management concept by Royyan (2023) and Fadjar Harimurti (2012).

Meanwhile, external financing involves transferring or sharing the burden of losses to other parties when the risk has a potentially significant impact, allowing the company to maintain its operational stability. Studies by Azizah et al. (2022) and Situmorang et al. (2023) show that an appropriate risk financing strategy can strengthen a company's resilience to financial disruptions while supporting the effectiveness of overall risk management.

In digital retail companies, risk financing is achieved by combining these two funding sources. Companies set aside internal funds to cover routine operational losses, while major risks such as logistics asset damage, system disruptions, or delivery failures are managed through insurance. Companies also maintain liquidity by controlling costs and avoiding high-interest financing, opting instead for partnerships to share risk.

**Risk Mitigation.** crucial stage in risk management aimed at reducing the likelihood of a risk occurring and mitigating its impact. This stage is carried out after the risk identification and



This open-access article is distributed under a Attribution (CC-BY-NC) 4.0 license

assessment process, allowing the organization to prioritize management based on the risk levels mapped in the risk matrix. Hopkin (2018) explains that mitigation can be achieved by reducing the likelihood of a risk occurring, reducing its impact, or a combination of both.

**In the HR risk category (HR1).** The risk level is still tolerable, so the company focuses control on retention and job satisfaction. These measures include regular appreciation programs, regular employee satisfaction surveys, pre-shift briefings, and internal knowledge-sharing training.

**For Operational Risk.** OP1, which is at a moderate level, strengthening quality control is a priority. Implemented measures include the regular use of quality checklists, the application of checkmarks at critical process points, routine calibration of production equipment, and weekly evaluations to ensure continuous improvement. Operational risk OP2 also requires controls to prevent disruptions to work activities, including the installation of SOP boards in key work areas, inspection rotations between supervisors, procedure reminders within workgroups, and recognition for units that achieve high levels of compliance.

**Market and competition risk (PK1).** Considered intolerable because it impacts revenue and market position. Mitigation is carried out through monitoring competitor prices, implementing measured discounts or bundling, reactivating existing customers, and implementing fast customer response time standards. PK2 risk requires long-term attention, with strategies including involvement in community activities, simple collaborations with local MSMEs, participation in public events, and optimizing the business's digital profile. For PK3, the risk is still acceptable with active monitoring through customer surveys, product variant testing, analyzing social media complaints, and minor design or packaging updates.

**Reputation risk (RP1).** Requires strict management because it impacts customer image and trust. Management includes developing complaint response templates, establishing a rapid response team, educating the public through informative content, monitoring reviews daily, responding quickly to negative reviews, and engaging in social activities.

Overall, mitigation measures are implemented proportionally according to risk tolerance and are designed to maintain operational stability, improve procedural compliance, maintain competitiveness, and strengthen customer trust.

The results of the risk management analysis using the ERM approach indicate that the company faces seven major risks grouped into four types: human resource risk (HR1), operational risk (OP1 and OP2), market and competition risk (PK1, PK2, PK3), and reputation risk (RP1). Risk level assessments were conducted by classifying risk responses into three categories: Low, Medium, and High.

Through dissemination and discussion, the company agreed that control should be focused on Medium and High risks. Meanwhile, Low risks were deemed acceptable with regular monitoring. Control recommendations were designed to reduce the likelihood and impact of these risks through implementable measures, such as employee satisfaction and retention programs, strengthened quality control and SOP compliance, market monitoring, and accelerated customer response times. This approach is expected to improve operational process effectiveness, maintain market competitiveness, and strengthen the company's long-term reputation.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of a risk management analysis conducted through observations, interviews, and a literature review related to the implementation of Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) in digital retail companies, it can be concluded that the company faces four main risk groups: operational, market and competitive, human resources, and reputational risks. These risks have



This open-access article is distributed under a  
Attribution (CC-BY-NC) 4.0 license

been mapped using a likelihood-impact matrix, providing a prioritized picture of risks that need to be addressed in a structured manner.

Most risks fall into the medium risk category, indicating that they are within tolerable limits but require routine and ongoing control. The absence of high-risk risks indicates that the company's risk management is relatively stable, particularly in operational and strategic aspects of its business.

The recommended mitigation implementation refers to the COSO ERM and ISO 31000 frameworks, including improving SOP compliance, quality control, market monitoring, accelerating customer response, and utilizing digital technology. The company has also implemented a combination of internal and external risk financing to ensure funding availability in the event of operational disruptions.

Overall, the implementation of risk management is still in its development stage but shows positive progress in improving operational effectiveness, market competitiveness, and the company's reputation in the digital retail sector. Going forward, the company is advised to focus on strengthening mitigation efforts for medium-risk categories, accelerating the digitalization process, improving employee competency, and optimizing risk financing mechanisms to be more adaptive to industry changes.

For further research, the study could be expanded to include quantitative analysis based on operational data or a comparison of ERM implementation across several digital retail companies to obtain a more comprehensive picture.

## REFERENCES

- Adi, T. W., & Arijanti, S. (2024). Reputational risk in the social media era: A case study of crisis management strategies for major brands in Indonesia. *Oikonomia: Journal of Management, Economics, and Accounting*.  
<https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/oikonomia/article/view/411/597>
- Azizah, R. S. N., Az Zahra, A., & Nurdiansyah, D. H. (2022). Analisis manajemen risiko keuangan pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di BEI. *Eqien – Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 11(03).  
<https://stiemitagien.ac.id/ojs/index.php/OJS/article/view/1028/849>
- Fadjar Harimurti. (2012). Manajemen risiko, fungsi dan mekanismenya. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kewirausahaan, Unisri*.  
<https://ejurnal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/Ekonomi/article/view/176/143>
- Ferdinand, A., & Ciptono, F. (2022). Competitiveness of Indonesia's toiletries industry. *Journal of Industrial Strategy. Jurnal Manajemen Teori dan Terapan Universitas Airlangga*. <https://ejournal.unair.ac.id/jmtt>
- Fortune Business Insights. (2025, 27 Oktober). Toiletries Market Size, Share & Industry Analysis, By Type, By End-user, By Distribution Channel, and Regional Forecast, 2025-2032. Fortune Business Insights. <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/toiletries-market-110070>
- ISO. (2018). ISO 31000: Risk Management – Guidelines.
- Kamaludin, K., Nikmah, N., & Hijroini, H. (2021). Manajemen risiko, kualitas corporate governance, status keuangan perusahaan, dan perilaku opportunistik manajerial. *Journal Fairness*, 5(2).  
<https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/fairness/article/view/15308/7529>
- Loso Judijanto, & Zulfikri, A. (2024). Eksplorasi bibliometrik tentang perkembangan konsep manajemen risiko perusahaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan West Science*.  
<https://wnj.westsciences.com/index.php/jakws/article/view/1163/1002>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications.





- Moleong, L. J. (2019). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nola Padang, F. K., Anggara, A., et al. (2025). Strategi manajemen risiko siber dalam perusahaan e-commerce di Indonesia: Tinjauan sistematis. *Kohesi: Jurnal Sains dan Teknologi*, 6(7). <https://ejournal.warunayama.org/index.php/kohesi/article/view/10092/8876>
- Rahayuningsih, W. (2025). Mengaji pengaruh manajemen risiko keuangan terhadap kinerja organisasi: Studi kualitatif pada lembaga keuangan di Indonesia. *Inovasi Pembangunan: Jurnal Kelitbangan*, 13(1). <https://jurnal.balitbangda.lampungprov.go.id/index.php/jip/article/view/1035/664>
- Royyan, A. (2023). Konsep manajemen risiko. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Ekonomi dan Keuangan Syariah*. <https://journal.staiypiqbaubau.ac.id/index.php/jupiekes/article/view/322/321>
- Situmorang, C. V., Elisabeth, D. M., & Simanjuntak, A. (2023). Risiko dan manajemen risiko terhadap kecurangan pengendalian dan akuntansi manajemen. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Bisnis Krisnadwipayana*, 10(1). <https://jurnal.unkris.ac.id/index.php/jabk/article/view/275/205>
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

