# QCRA & Complex Reporting Comparison: Excel vs Battleground Live

**When to Consider Switching from Excel:**

- Multiple projects/programmes need consolidated risk reporting.
- QCRA/QSRA runs are slowed by manual data preparation.
- Board/governance wants live visibility on exposure and mitigations.
- Risk register complexity makes manual reporting error-prone.

| Aspect | Excel | Battleground Live |
|---|---|---|
| **Data Currency** | Static – only as current as last manual update. Risk of using outdated inputs for QCRA or reports. | Live-linked data from all users; QCRA-ready at any time without manual consolidation. |
| **QCRA/QSRA Preparation** | Requires exporting data to specialist tools (e.g., @Risk, PRA) with high risk of version errors. | Directly supports QCRA/QSRA workflows with clean, structured data; no double-handling. |
| **Complex Reporting** | Manual collation and pivot tables; time-consuming and prone to formula errors. | Automated reporting and dashboards, with drill-down by owner, location, category, or any custom field. |
| **Portfolio Visibility** | No native roll-up; requires separate files and manual aggregation. | Instant portfolio view with aggregated risk exposure across multiple projects/programmes. |
| **Audit & Assurance** | Limited change history; difficult to evidence decision trails. | Full audit trail for each risk, including ownership, status changes, and mitigation progress. |
| **User Adoption** | Familiar to most users, but no guidance for non-risk specialists. | Guided workflows, configurable to match existing frameworks; minimal training required. |
| **Scalability** | Works for small/simple projects; breaks down under high volume or complexity. | Handles large programmes with thousands of risks without performance loss. |