



D7.5

Update 1 Project Risk Management Plan

Date

31.03.2025

Author: Gordana Čveljo

Organisation: Johanniter-Unfall-Hilfe e.V.

D7.5 Update 1 Project Risk Management Plan

Grant Agreement	101121356
UKRI numbers	10062626
Call identifier	HORIZON-CL3-2022-DRS-01
Project full name	AGnostic risk management for high Impact Low probability Events
Due Date	March 2025 (M18)
Submission date	01.04.2025
Project start and end	01.10.2023 - 30.09.2027
Deliverable Lead	Johanniter-Unfall-Hilfe e.V. (JUH)
Authors	Gordana Čveljo

Abstract

This Deliverable presents an update of the Risk Management Plan for the AGILE Project.

Keywords

Risk Management Plan, Risk Assessment, Risk Management Strategy, Mitigation Measure, Risk Monitoring

Document revision history

Issue	Date	Comment	Author
V1.0	27.03.2025	Update draft	Gordana Čveljo
V2.0	28.03.2025	Review Risk Register	Andreas Seipelt
V3.0	31.03.2025	Final version	Gordana Čveljo/Manoj Kumar

Acknowledgment

Project funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe under the grant agreement n°101121356 and the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) programme. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Nature of the deliverable

Deliverable types

R	document, report (excluding periodic and final reports)
DEM	demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs
DEC	websites, patent filings, press and media actions, videos, etc.
OTHER	software, technical diagrams, etc.

R

Dissemination level

PU	Public, fully open. e.g., website	✓
SEN	Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement	

Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
2. The Risk Management Approach	4
3. Risk Update	5
3.1 Newly Identified Risks	5
3.2 Adjustment of Risks.....	6
4. Risk Register	9
5. Current estimation and Outlook.....	19

List of tables

Table 1. Newly Identified risks	5
Table 2. Adjusted Risks	7
Table 3. Risk Registry	9

Abbreviations

AGILE	AGnostic risk management for high Impact Low probability Events
CMCC	Fondazione Centro Euro-Mediterraneo Sui Cambiamenti Climatici (TL)
COO	Project Coordinator – here JUH
Dx.x	Deliverable Dx.x
FS	Factor Social (WPL)
Impact	I
JUH	Johanniter-Unfall-Hilfe e.V. (COO and WPL)
PPI	Prepared International (WPL)
Probability	L
Risk Rating	RR
SAB	Security Advisory Board
SC	Steering Committee
TL	Task Leader
TUD	Technical University Delft (WPL)
UCL	University College London (WPL)
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader

1. Introduction

This Deliverable provides an update to the project's Risk Management Plan (D7.2) and offers an overview of the current status of risk monitoring in AGILE. It describes the status of known risks and reflects on newly identified risks and the implementation status of mitigation measures. It ends with a short forecast.

2. The Risk Management Approach

AGILE's risk management approach follows the cyclical process of identifying, assessing, mitigating, implementing and monitoring risks. This is fully described in the Risk Management Plan and briefly summarised here. Each risk is assigned a risk owner. Risks are assessed and monitored using a traffic light system based on the risk matrix. Risks and challenges are identified in work packages. To prevent a challenge from becoming a risk, a bilateral meeting between the WPL and the coordinator has been set up as part of the steps, in addition to the monthly SC: This ensures that the coordinator receives a fortnightly update and that challenges and risks are continuously monitored. This is an update in the approach to the Risk Management Plan.

3. Risk Update

The following chapter shows the newly identified risks and adjustments to known risks. In general, no major risk has occurred that jeopardized the project. The following will show the newly identified risks and risks with an adjusted risk assessment.

3.1 Newly Identified Risks

A year ago the Risk Management Plan was submitted with 27 identified risks. Since then AGILE has identified 5 more risks.

Table 1. Newly Identified risks

Risk ID	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigations Measure	Source Date of 1st report	WPs Involved	Risk Rating Probability (L) Impact (I) Risk Rating (RR)	Risk Owner	History
28	Low participation in the survey (HILP library). After 13 days the survey had 12 responses, out of 100 needed.	Activating networks within the consortium, frequent postings on LinkedIn, distributing flyer at On-Site events (HNPW, CP Forum, etc.), CMINE postings. TUD offering a workshop and FAQ on the survey. Prolonging the initial timeline.	15.05.2024	WP2, WP6, WP7	L:0 I:0 RR:0	TUD	The taken mitigation measures were successful, even more than 100 responses received. Afterwards a Lessons Learned workshop conducted. (12.06.2024) Concluded
29	Lack of feedback from case-study partner for scheduling the Tiers	From January 2025 on a WP4 monthly meeting started to discuss all open topics among partners and the time schedule. Bi-lateral feedback will be required if needed.		WP4	L:2 I:4 RR:8	JUH	

30	PDC leaving the project - no data for WP2 and no T1 ST	Continuous dialog with PDC. Data collection for WP2 ongoing and using other data sources		WP2, WP4, WP5	L:3 I:4 RR:12	TUD, JUH, PPI	Data collection already started. Tier1 is currently planned for June 2026. (March 2025)
31	US Databases not accessible anymore	Set up global data base, store and cache data wherever possible	21.03.2025 SC meeting, reported by TUD	WP2	L:4 I:3 RR:12	TUD	
32	Security issues of data needed for the stress test	Cross-check with SAB of all Tiers for sensitive data	Meeting UCL with Rotterdam (28.3.2025)	WP3, WP4	L:3 I:4 RR:12	FS. UCL, TUD, CMCC, JUH	

Risk 28 was a time-limited risk related to an activity in WP2. The mitigation measure (dissemination) was supported by all consortium partners, which led to the successful completion of the survey. As a result, the risk assessment has been reduced to zero.

3.2 Adjustment of Risks

Three risks were adjusted in their risk assessment.

Risk 7 and risk 21 were increased in their risk assessment from Moderate to High.

Risk 22 has been downgraded from High to Moderate in their assessment.

Table 2. Adjusted Risks

Risk ID	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigations Measure	Source Date of 1st report	WPs Involved	Risk Rating Probability (L) Impact (I) Risk Rating (RR)	Risk Owner	History
7	Lack of available data for stress test implementation	Detailed assessment of available data in WP3 and the development of suitable methodologies	Proposal Oct 2022	WP4	L:3 I:3 RR:9	FS, UCL, JUH	The Toolkit developed within WP3 envisions a "Tier 0" that serves as first preparation stage for the stress test implementation. This includes the System Description Tool to guide Case-study partners in describing the system that is to be tested and gather relevant data about it. This data can then serve as input for the stress tests and be revisited and updated as the implementation progresses (Jan 2025)
21	With the ongoing wave of nationalism and silo government management, the potential arises of new laws limiting or forbidding the cooperation and interaction of international organisations.	Engaging relevant national authorities to reinforce the importance of cooperation within an international challenging environment.	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:3 I:2 RR:4	JUH	Political changes in the US are currently not influencing partner PDC. (Jan. 2025) Change of risk assessment due to political situation in the US. Raised from RR4 to RR9 (March 2025)

22	Ethics Clearance process at UCL for UCL's activities require more time than anticipated. Could lead to delays of activities and/or deliverables.	Clarify timelines of Ethics Clearance timeline and take the worst case into account for activity planning. Communicate to the WPLs and COO for which of UCL's activities an Ethics Clearance is required. If critical delays are expected, discuss within the consortium whether the needed data can be collected via another methodology or by another partner.	07.02.2024 Gianluca Pescaroli	WP1, WP3, WP4	L:2 I:4 RR:8	UCL	No Deliverable delay due to ethic clearance (Jan 2025)
----	--	--	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-----	--

4. Risk Register

The Risk Register is an overview and lists all identified and potential risks, their mitigation strategies and risk assessment, with a brief history where available. All risks are stored in the Risk Register, which is accessible from the shared AGILE Workspace Sharepoint.

Table 3. Risk Registry

Risk ID	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigations Measure	Source Date of 1st report	WPs Involved	Risk Rating Probability (L) Impact (I) Risk Rating (RR)	Risk Owner	History
1	Withdrawal of a key partner from the consortium	Continuous dialogue and a strong feedback culture will be part of the foundation of the consortium, in order to early identify any potential issues or conflicts that could result in the withdrawal of a partner. In the case of this happening, through the consortiums extensive network a new partner will be identified, proposed and approved by the consortium or if possible, other consortium partners will take over the tasks and allocated budget.	Proposal Oct 2022	All	L:2 I:2 RR:4	JUH	Risk was rated as moderate in the Grant. Within the first 6 months of AGILE it will be assess as low due to experience of good collaboration. (March 2024)

2	WP's time allocation was not enough; potential delay of activities and deliveries	Thorough Project Management tools will be set in place to track the performance of the project vs. the original plan in order to have an early identification of deviations and possible corrective actions. This performance vs. plan will be a metric closely followed and communicated in all virtual or onsite meetings in order to ensure awareness of the entire consortium.	Proposal Oct 2022	All	L:3 I:3 RR:9	Responsible WPL or TL	In the monthly meeting of the Steering Committee the progress in the current WPs is presented and discussed to identify deviations and possible impacts on related Tasks or WPs. WP1 was extended due to unexpected valuable insights. This was defined in the 1st amendment. Stress-test implementation is delayed. For a structured planning meetings were implemented (WP3/4 bi-weekly meeting and monthly WP4 meeting). (Jan.2025) The project timeline is not at risk. (March 2025)
3	SELP issues	WP7 will monitor and proactively address these issues and will establish a SELP advisory committee with representatives of Partners and external experts.	Proposal Oct 2022	All	L:3 I:2 RR:6	JUH	AGILE established two focal points for Ethics issues and a Security Advisory Board (SAB) for security issues. (March 2024)
4	Stakeholders start to reject contact with the project due to multiple partner / channel exposure.	WP6 entails a detailed communication and dissemination plan that aims at having relevant and engaging content to the right audience. This aims to reduce duplication of efforts whilst in parallel feedback will always be positively received and acted upon in order to update the content or frequency of the activities.	Proposal Oct 2022	All	L:3 I:3 RR:9	ARTTIC	The Impact Strategy (D6.1) will present detailed communication and dissemination plans and guidelines.

5	Implementation of the stress test in Ukraine	Close communication with Ukraine partner to assess viability of the stress test while ensuring proper briefing and training of project staff to implement the stress test.	Proposal Oct 2022	WP4	L:4 I:3 RR:12	JUH, PIMEE	Due to the ongoing war a forecast of possibility of having a physical ST in the Ukraine is almost impossible. (March 2024) Tier1 planned between November 2025 and April 2026. PIMEE would prefer onsite stress-tests for their partners. Decision will be made according to the political situation. (Jan 2025)
6	Incomplete or inaccurate budget allocation	Project management best practices will be incorporated to track the budget performance against the plan. Close monitoring will allow early identification of deviations from the plan and corrective actions will be agreed upon the identified gaps.	Proposal Oct 2022	All	L:3 I:3 RR:9	Beneficiaries	All beneficiaries will be asked to provide an interim financial reporting to the Coordinator covering M1-M6. Supported by the Project Management Office, a budget simulation will be created to assess the current status of budget spending. Interim financial reporting will be requested regularly within reporting periods. (March 2024)
7	Lack of available data for stress test implementation	Detailed assessment of available data in WP3 and the development of suitable methodologies	Proposal Oct 2022	WP4	L:3 I:3 RR:9	FS, UCL, JUH	The Toolkit developed within WP3 envisions a "Tier 0" that serves as first preparation stage for the stress test implementation. This includes the System Description Tool to guide Case-study partners in describing the system that is to be tested and gather relevant data about it. This data can then serve as input for the stress tests and be revisited and updated as the implementation progresses (Jan 2025)

8	Lack of competent participants of Tier 1 stress-tests.	Within WP3, the required participants should be described in detail to support the case study hosts in identifying the relevant participants for their stress tests. The participants will be screened thoroughly to reduce the probability of having participants not suitable for the tests.	Proposal Oct 2022	WP4	L:2 I:3 RR:6	FS, Case-study partner	Within WP3, a Toolkit - including a list with examples of important types of stakeholders and a Stakeholder Mapping Tool - was developed and shared with the Case-study partners in order to aid the identification and mapping of relevant stakeholders for participation in the tests, for each case study (Jan 2025) The stress-test haven't start yet, no screening was applied yet (March 2025)
9	Delays in the feedback or approval from the case study authorities, generating delay in the following activities.	The relevant authorities will be continuously engaged in order to effectively communicate the project needs in terms of feedback quality and time frame expectations. Any deviation from the plan should be early identified and incorporated as a corrective action.	Proposal Oct 2022	WP5	L:2 I:3 RR:6	Case study partner, PPI	
10	The challenge in designing the approach for capacity building is that countries have various backgrounds and levels of maturation of preparedness and response systems.	The capacity development approach will focus on generally accepted tools and methods for capacity development and at the same time allow for tailoring. What is required is a modular capacity development approach that uses standards that can be tailored to specific contexts.	Proposal Oct 2022	WP5, WP4	L:3 I:3 RR:9	PPI, FS, JUH	

11	Possible withdrawal of individual states from Community civil protection procedures (e.g. through anti-European political swings) reduces efficient cross-sectoral, cross-disciplines, cross-border coordination of the disaster risk management cycle	Dissemination of project results beyond the European Civil Protection Mechanism, also in external border regions of the European Union. This can be done both top-down (politically, e.g.), but also bottom up (e.g., via the developed training concept)	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	WP3, WP4	L:1 I:1 RR:1	ARTTIC, JUH, PPI	
12	Possible political tensions between neighbouring countries reduce efficient cross-border coordination of the disaster risk management cycle	Dissemination of project results beyond the European Civil Protection Mechanism, also in external border regions of the European Union. This can be done both top-down (politically, e.g.), but also bottom up (e.g., via the developed training concept)	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	WP3, WP4	L:2 I:2 RR:4	ARTTIC, JUH, PPI	
13	Inflation risk may make important investment into risk reduction or risk mitigation measures unaffordable.	The project methodology and results support decision makers from international to the local level to efficiently use existing resources to close security gaps (common point of failures) in civil protection systems.	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:1 I:1 RR:1	JUH	

14	Current events in world affairs (e.g., the war in Ukraine/Russia, war in Israel/Gaza) (still) tie up many resources. Preparing for even more critical situations at the same time can be overwhelming.	Communicate the importance of preparing to HILP scenarios and be supportive in their implementation.	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:3 I:2 RR:6	JUH, ARTTIC	
15	Private critical infrastructure providers may put profit ahead of safety and security, thereby neglecting mitigation measures.	Policy makers can be made aware of security gaps in critical infrastructure through the project methodology and then exert political pressure on the private sector to improve cross-disciplinary coordination along the disaster management cycle.	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:1 I:3 RR:3	JUH	
16	Crisis fatigue among the population and thereby caused resignation.	Direct target-group-oriented addressing of the population and politics	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:4 I:1 RR:4	JUH	
17	Population relies entirely on the government's preparedness measures and, as a result, does not take any self-provisioning measures	Direct target-group-oriented addressing of the population and politics	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:1 I:3 RR:3	JUH	

18	Increasing polarisation and radicalisation of communities, undermining compliance, hampering the effectiveness of crisis response, or even adding social unrest and riots.	Simple and valid rationale for preparedness recommendations made to all risk-exposed actors	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:3 I:2 RR:6	JUH	
19	Increasing technological complexity and highly dynamic evolution of infrastructures, information technologies and scientific methods, making the results outdated.	- low-threshold information provision -continuous monitoring of the technological and methodological developments for rapid integration into the project -use of various communication channels for dissemination of project results	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	WP2, WP3, WP5, WP6	L:2 I:2 RR:4	JUH	
20	Information oversupply from information and entertainment industry may reduce range of project results	- low-threshold information provision -continuous monitoring of the technological and methodological developments for rapid integration into the project -use of various communication channels for dissemination of project results	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	WP2, WP3, WP5, WP7	L:2 I:2 RR:4	JUH	

21	With the ongoing wave of nationalism and silo government management, the potential arises of new laws limiting or forbidding the cooperation and interaction of international organisations.	Engaging relevant national authorities to reinforce the importance of cooperation within an international challenging environment.	KOM (PPI) Oct 2023	All	L:3 I:2 RR:4	JUH	Political changes in the US are currently not influencing partner PDC. (Jan. 2025) Change of risk assessment due to political situation in the US. Raised from RR4 to RR9 (March 2025)
22	Ethics Clearance process at UCL for UCL's activities require more time than anticipated. Could lead to delays of activities and/or deliverables.	Clarify timelines of Ethics Clearance timeline and take the worst case into account for activity planning. Communicate to the WPLs and COO for which of UCL's activities an Ethics Clearance is required. If critical delays are expected, discuss within the consortium whether the needed data can be collected via another methodology or by another partner.	07.02.2024 Gianluca Pescaroli	WP1, WP3, WP4	L:2 I:4 RR:8	UCL	No Deliverable delay due to ethic clearance (Jan 2025)

23	Restrictions to data sharing e.g. historical data, data about critical infrastructure delaying or hampering the activities of partners that are not the owner of the data	WPL/Task Leader of the affected activity elaborate with the requested partner if data sharing agreements can solve the issue and enter into such an agreement	16.02.2024 Reported by TUD during SC	WP2, WP1	L:3 I:4 RR:12	TUD	Sharing historical data turned out to be problematic when they were requested by TUD because PDC is not the owner of the data. TUD and PDC set up a meeting to solve the issue. (March 2024) Continuous dialogue and feedback culture with PDC. For parts that are not covered under the Grant Agreement, initiated data collection on TUD side. Doing cross validation wherever needed (October 2024)
24	Unexpectedly high amount of literature/data to be reviewed for planned activities (e.g. for characterization of HILP). Potential delay in progress	Alignment among the partners with sharing literature/data for review. Proactively asking partners for support.	16.02.2024 Reported by TUD during SC	WP2, WP2	L:3 I:4 RR:12	UCL, TUD, FS, CMCC	
25	Data loss due to computer virus, cyber-attack, destruction of physical data storage	Individual business/university antivirus software, firewall and security processes, cloud back-up for physically stored data		All	L:3 I:3 RR:9	JUH, ARTTIC	
26	Unethical participant conduct	Individual business/university ethics guidance and project-internal ethics guidelines to be developed for AGILE		All	L:2 I:4 RR:8	JUH, Ethics Focal Points	
27	Loss of key participant (e.g. injury, illness, job role change, death)	depending on individual case; if possible: comprehensive hand-over within the organisation/university		All	L:2 I:4 RR:8	All	

28	Low participation in the survey (HILP library). After 13 days the survey had 12 responses, out of 100 needed.	Activating networks within the consortium, frequent postings on LinkedIn, distributing flyer at On-Site events (HNPW, CP Forum, etc.), CMINE postings. TUD offering a workshop and FAQ on the survey. Prolonging the initial timeline.	15.05.2024	WP2, WP6, WP7	L:0 I:0 RR:0	TUD	The taken mitigation measures were successful, even more than 100 responses received. Afterwards a Lessons Learned workshop conducted. (12.06.2024) Concluded
29	Lack of feedback from case-study partner for scheduling the Tiers	From January 2025 on a WP4 monthly meeting started to discuss all open topics among partners and the time schedule. Bi-lateral feedback will be required if needed.		WP4	L:2 I:4 RR:8	JUH	
30	PDC leaving the project - no data for WP2 and no T1 ST	Continuous dialog with PDC. Data collection for WP2 ongoing and using other data sources		WP2, WP4, WP5	L:3 I:4 RR:12	TUD, JUH, PPI	Data collection already started. Tier1 planned for currently planned for June 2026. (March 2025)
31	US Databases not accessible anymore	Set up global data base, store and cache data wherever possible	21.03.2025 SC meeting, reported by TUD	WP2	L:4 I:3 RR:12	TUD	
32	Security issues of data needed for the stress test	Cross-check with SAB of all Tiers for sensitive data	Meeting UCL with Rotterdam (28.3.2025)	WP3, WP4	L:3 I:4 RR:12	FS. UCL, TUD, CMCC, JUH	

5. Current estimation and Outlook

To date, no risks for AGILE have fully materialised that required escalation. Work Package 2 (Risk ID 23) with the data issue has been actively addressed. It might lead to deviations in budgets distribution but this will be seen within the next months, which doesn't present project risk.

The stress-test implementation will start in June 2025 and the preparation have started. This means that AGILE will engage more with external stakeholders in the future. This naturally involves some risk and will therefore be closely monitored and, if necessary, counteracted in accordance with the information provided. Overall, the risk situation for AGILE is considered to be manageable.