



DECISIVE

A DECentralized management Scheme for Innovative Valorization of urban biowastE

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 689229.

Deliverable D1.2 Project Risks Register Template: version 2

Deliverable Information

Dissemination : Public

Nature : Report

Contractual Delivery Date : 30/11/2016

Actual Delivery Date ver. 1 : 30/11/2016

Actual Delivery Date ver. 2 : 11/06/2018..

Scientific coordinator: Dr. A.Trémier
IRSTEA Rennes, France
e-mail : anne.tremier@irstea.fr

Document Information

Project	: DECISIVE
Filename	: DECISIVE_WP1_D01.02_Project Risks Register template_S2.docx
Last saved on	: 10/06/2018 08:22 by Jacques BERTRAND

Authorship and Review

	Name (Organisation)	Approval Date
Written by	J.Bertrand (PSUtec)	
For review by	A.Trémier (IRSTEA)	V1 29/11/2016
		V2 08/06/2018

Release Details

Release	Date	Comments
V1 Draft 01	15/11/2016	First draft
V1 Release 01	29/11/2016	First release after approval by Coordinator
V1 Submitted	30/11/2016	Submitted to the Commission
V2 Release 01	08/06/2018	First release for approval by Coordinator
V2 Submitted	11/06/2018	Submitted to the Commission

Distribution List

- On the project Portal
- On the DECISIVE Intranet (<http://decisive.psutec.com/>)

Table of Contents

1.	Executive summary	4
2.	Risks Management.....	4
2.1.	Process	4
2.2.	Responsibilities	5
3.	Register structure	5
3.1.	Risks attributes	5
3.2.	Score calculation.....	6
4.	Annex 1: Decisive Risks Register: status as 16/11/2016.....	7

1. Executive summary

Risks management is an essential component of the quality management of any project, and especially of projects involving research activities.

In the following text, risk is defined as an event adverse to project objectives and Risk Management is the process of identifying, analysing and responding to project risks.

The purpose of a risk register is to record details of all risks that have been identified, together with their analysis and plans for how those risks are to be treated. The risk register is an important component of the overall risk management framework. It is used to maintain the register of project risks over the lifetime of the project.

The Risks Register is a simple worksheet with one row for each risk and one column for each attribute.

The up to date version of the Risks Register is available on the Decisive intranet (<http://decisive.psutec.com>) at Main menu/Documents repository/Reference documents.

This deliverable contains the template of the Risks Register of the Decisive project with its initial content as developed at the start of the project (Annex 1).

2. Risks Management

2.1. Process

The risks management process includes the following activities:

1. **Risk Identification**
2. **Risk Description:** Its objective is to display the identified risks in a structured format.
3. **Risk Estimation:** It provides values for probability of a risk and impact in case of risk occurrence. The combination of both estimates produces a global score for the risk.
4. **Risk Evaluation:** Preparing for responding to risks. The risk estimation is compared against risk criteria to analyse whether the risk is accepted or requires any treatment.
5. **Risk Reporting:** There are different requirements on reporting depending on the level inside (internal reporting) or outside (external reporting) the Consortium.
6. **Decision Making:** A decision is made about whether and how to respond to a risk.
7. **Risk Treatment:** Selection and implementation of treatments against risks.
8. **Monitoring:** Loop back via modifications to the previous steps. It is the loop of improvement and update.

As soon as a risk is identified/raised, it must be recorded here. It's important to assign responsibilities to actively manage this document. It must remain a living document that is kept right up to date, ensuring that risks are actively managed. For this, the Project Office has been appointed by the General Assembly as Risks Supervisor.

Once a risk has been raised, it will never be deleted but indicated as "closed" if it is no longer relevant or has been resolved. When a risk happens, it can be closed and become an issue to be registered in the Change Register.

The Register should provide an audit trail of ALL risks raised throughout the lifecycle of the project. The Risk Register will be presented and updated at each General Assembly meeting.

An important attribute recorded in the risk register is the 'owner' of each risk - the person who owns responsibility for actions relating to that risk. The action plans and status reports may be very detailed, and thus quite unsuitable to be included in a table of this sort. One way to handle this issue is to use the table cells as entries of URLs or hyperlinks where the full documents can be found. This makes navigation of the risk register quick and efficient.

Access to the risk register must be controlled to maintain its integrity and confidentiality. Some items recorded in the register may be very sensitive and thus not for wide publication.

2.2. Responsibilities

- The Risks Supervisor is the owner of the updating process; the Project Office has been appointed by the General Assembly as Risks Supervisor.
- The WP Leaders are the owners of the content

3. Register structure

The current document introduces the structure of content as it is at the start of the project. It is assumed that the content and the format of the Risks Register could be improved during the life of the project, according to the evolution of the needs.

3.1. Risks attributes

Field Name	Field Description
ID	A unique incremental number
Owner	The name of the person responsible for ensuring the risk is mitigated or eliminated. In Decisive it will usually be the Leader of the concerned WP.
Entry Date	The date at which the risk was recorded
Risk Description	A description of the risk that needs addressing. This field could contain a hyperlink to a document providing more details.
Task	WP(s)/Task(s) affected by the risk
Probability	The probability of the risk occurring, one of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost Certain • Likely • Moderate • Unlikely • Rare
Impact	The impact if the risk does occur, one of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insignificant • Minor • Moderate • Major • Catastrophic
Score	A score calculated on the combined risk probability and risk Impact. The colour of the cell indicates at a glance its level of criticality; see table below
Response type	The type of response employed to mitigate or eliminate the risk, one of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention • Reduction • Transference • Contingency • Acceptance
Risk Response Description	A more detailed description of the approach taken to mitigate or eliminate the risk.
Assignment	The person assigned to mitigate or eliminate the risk
Due date	The date by which the risk should be mitigated or eliminated according to the response type
Status	The risk status which can be open or closed. The risk can only be closed once the risk is mitigated or eliminated, one of:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open • Closed
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.2. Score calculation

The values are arbitrary fixed, based on statistical experience.

Probability	Impact				
	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Almost Certain	16	17	23	24	25
Likely	9	14	15	21	22
Moderate	3	8	13	19	20
Unlikely	2	6	7	12	18
Rare	1	4	5	10	11

Legend	Criticality
Extreme	Extreme risk. Immediate action required
High	High risk; senior management attention needed
Medium	Moderate risk; management responsibility must be specific
Low	Low risk. Manage by routine procedures

4. Annex 1: Decisive Risks Register: status as 16/11/2016

DECISIVE

Project Risk Register

Situation as at: 16/11/2016

No.	Owner	Date Raised	Risk Description	Task	Probability	Impact	Score /25	Risk Response	Risk Response Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
1			Lack of responsiveness of the partners to respect quality procedures	WP1					Analysis on the basis of planning performance indicators and finding solutions with each partner			Open
2			Infringement of IPR between Partners	All WPs					Robust management of the CA			Open
3			Lack of resources available to complete the objectives by 1 Partner	All WPs					Robust project progress tracking			Open
4			Data availability; Input/output (biowaste flows, conversion factors, and output products) and technology data received from the related WPs	WP3, WP4, WP6					Scenario and sensitivity analysis to identify the most critical steps of the value chain			Open
5			European wide representativeness of the concept model	All WPs					Identify country representatives from eastern Europe			Open
6			Multitude of different European situations demands to many model chains	WP3					Simplifications and selections of most relevant scenarios			Open
7			Low citizen participation in the new collection system with food waste shredder	WP3					Organisation of information campaigns			Open
8			Low performance of the kitchen waste shredder	WP3					Optimisation of process specifications			Open
9			Low efficiency of biogas production in 100 l prototype	WP4					Optimisation of process management conditions (residence time, waste load)			Open
10			Low efficiency in transferring of burning chamber and Stirling head	WP4					Optimization of the Stirling head configuration and the gas flow inside the chamber			Open
11			Digestate is not a good substrate to obtain the targeted bioproducts by SSF	WP4					Other urban wastes can be used: organic fraction of municipal solid wastes, pruning and gardening wastes, farm wastes.			Open
12			Reduction of the SSF process efficiency when scale-up is performed	WP4					Modification and optimizations of the process conditions during scale-up			Open
13			Biopesticides amendments from SSF are not efficient	WP4					Focus on other products from SSF process			Open
14			The decision support tool does not work properly	WP5					In order to avoid this risk, the tool will be tested in the demonstration sites before it's launched.			Open
15			No demonstration site in Catalonia is available	WP6, WP7					At the beginning of the project ARC will start conversations with possible candidates in order to get a pre-agreement for their participation in the project			Open
16			Stakeholders opposition to the demonstration	WP6, WP7					Reinforced communication and incentives			Open
17			Low quality of the collected biowaste	WP6, WP7					Organisation of information campaigns and Training session on waste sorting			Open
18			Delay in the achievement of a performant and steady state running of the decentralised valorisation demonstration sites	WP6, WP7					Optimisation of process management conditions and modification of specifications Realisation of only one characterization campaign after demonstration implementation			Open
19			Reduced data access due to commercial sensitivity	WP7					Establish detailed description of required data and source early in the project			Open