



## LIFE HELP PROJECT

*New approach for managing Holistic Environmental governance Practices*

LIFE 22-SAP-ENV-GOV 101113783



### Deliverable D1.2 - RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN AND RISK REGISTER

Due date of deliverable: 31/08/2023

Actual submission date: 20/10/2023

DELIVERABLES RESPONSIBILE	
Name Member Consortium:	Comune di Rimini
Contact person:	Alberto Dellavalle
Personnel contributing:	Elena Favi, Roberta Musiani

CONTRIBUTING PARTNERS	
Name Member Consortium:	Vie en.ro.se. Ingegneria
Contact person:	Raffaella Bellomini
Personnel contributing:	Chiara Bartalucci, Riccardo Fusi

Document status			
Rev.	Changes description	Responsible	Date Approval
1	First release created and circulated	Comune di Rimini	17/09/2023
2	Final version approved by partners	Comune di Rimini	20/10/2023



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
2. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN .....	3
3. RISK REGISTER .....	4



## 1. INTRODUCTION

A detailed constraints and risk identification, analysis, mitigation and contingency planning was initially performed during the project's drafting phase.

Additionally, the current Risk management plan has been initially drafted at M2 by the Municipality of Rimini in collaboration with Vie.en.ro.se. Ingegneria with the aim to define the project's approach to risk management and detail how risk management efforts will be conducted throughout the project, specifying roles and responsibilities, methods and tools to be used. In the Risk management plan, necessary actions to be performed before the negative impact occurs, as well as actions to tackle possible risks and constraints both to minimise the impact and the likelihood of occurrence, are analysed.

Concurrently with the Risk management plan, a Risk register was drafted still at M2 by the Municipality of Rimini in collaboration with Vie.en.ro.se. Ingegneria. This document is the basis for the entire risk management process and will be constantly updated with information as the risk management processes are completed. At the beginning, the risk register will include a list of risks, potential risk owners, potential risk responses. Risks and constraints will be characterised by the degree of likelihood to occur and of their impact on the project and monitored as the project progresses. As the project progresses, the validity and compatibility of this information (impacts of risks/constraints on time, cost, resources, and quality) will be periodically reviewed. In fact, some risks may have been missed, new risks/constraints may have emerged.

Both the Risk management plan and the Risk register will be updated on a trimestral basis.

## 2. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

In the LIFE HELP project, management risk is mitigated by the mutual experiences of partners, who have already been involved (in some cases also together) in several EU funded projects or who have otherwise collaborated on other occasions, allowing facilitated flexibility and dialogue between the partners.

Project Management will be conducted to coordinate the technical efforts and outputs of the partners. Technical activities being held in all WPs will be monitored with each WP and task leader. The aim is to comply with technical milestones, expected outputs and project objectives. Within this task, internal reviews of the project's outputs (e.g., deliverables and reports), as well as the coordination between the related WPs and activities, will be ensured. Unforeseen delays and difficulties of various kinds could be encountered during the project implementation, due to the great number and to the different typologies of the planned activities (formal and administrative issues, technical difficulties, socioeconomic environment).

Risks related to management issues will be handled by an impeccable timing of the management and a constant work of the PM and the CO-PM together with the Project Management Team (PMT) consisting of one member for each partner, chaired by the Project Manager (PM), which is the ultimate decision-making Consortium Body. The management representatives will have the authority to make decisions on behalf of their respective organisations also in terms of settlement of problems/risks and will meet at least in digital mode whenever it is necessary.



Constant monitoring so as to anticipate any problems related to risks analysis will be carried out in WP1 and if any impact on project results is identified, actions will be put in place to implement the most appropriate response.

Eventually, risks and constraints will be reviewed at project closure, to verify if the conditions set have been met and analyse the effectiveness of any corrective actions. It will be kept track of how project risks/constraints have been managed (WP1), including it in the lessons learned, part of the final report.

The project executive board, consisting of one representative from each WP, will also be responsible for informing the Project Management Team if any issues are encountered in the progress of the technical activity or any risk of delay/problem in implementation.

The financial monitoring team will monitor the progress of expenditures and carry out the proper collection, verification and periodic filing of financial documentation. Also based on communications from the dream partners, any mismatches or need for reasonable budget variances will be evaluated.

### 3. RISK REGISTER

In the following table, main identified risks are listed, described, linked to one/more than one Work Packages, and connected to proposed risk mitigation measures.

With respect to the similar table prepared for the project submission, two columns have been added in order to allow to periodically report the occurrence of one or more risks and of applied mitigation measures.

In particular, in the column “Risk occurrence (date and explanation)” the date of occurrence of a specific risk will be reported, together with a brief description and in the column “Mitigation measure adopted” the strategy put in place to mitigate the risk will be described.

In addition, more rows could be added to include additional risks not envisaged in the project preparatory phase.

Risk No	Description	Work package No	Proposed risk-mitigation measures	Risk occurrence (date and explanation)	Mitigation measure adopted
1	<p>Management risk. Project Manager or WP Leader changes.</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: medium;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP1	<p>The management risk is considered limited by the mutual experiences of partners, already being involved together in several EU funded projects.</p> <p>Sufficient project documents in place, assigning deputies and sharing responsibilities on critical milestones and deliverables limits this risk</p>		
2	<p>Policy - Possible changes in the municipality priority policies opposing or hinder the smooth running and development of the whole project; this might generally have a major impact on such projects</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: high;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP1-WP7	<p>The policy makers will be the same for the duration of the project, because next municipal elections will be in June 2026, therefore the current political leadership of the Municipality will remain in office until the end of the project, ensuring its continuity</p>		
3	<p>Lack of support from internal stakeholders (Team for change and decision makers) for achieving the originally planned goals</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: high;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p>	WP1-WP7	<p>The Project Monitoring Team will continuously verify that the Team for change and the decision makers are involved in a stable and continuous manner.</p> <p>Team building and training mechanisms are foreseen throughout the project to keep attention and motivation high</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>likelihood: low;</li> <li>impact: low.</li> </ul>		<p>If there is a lack of interest, the Executive Body will be involved, making direct contact with people and, if necessary, guaranteeing adequate substitutions</p> <p>In the case of decision makers, the risk is further limited by the fact that the achievement of environmental goals is directly linked to personal performance evaluation</p>		
4	<p>Lack of support from internal stakeholders (Policy makers) for achieving the originally planned goals</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>likelihood: medium;</li> <li>impact: high;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>likelihood: low;</li> <li>impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP1-WP7	<p>The Project Monitoring Team will continuously verify that the Environmental HUB is involved in a stable and continuous manner. The great prominence that will be given to the project and the achievement of the objectives also among the citizens will discourage policy makers from having an uninvolved attitude. Moreover, for policy makers, the pursuit of the goals of the 2030 Agenda will be a personal driver for their political careers</p>		
5	<p>Service supplying delays / non-compliance are possible</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>likelihood: medium;</li> <li>impact: medium;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>likelihood: low;</li> <li>impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP3 WP4 WP6	<p>This risk mainly concerns the transfer of data to the SensorNet platform, which could be delayed both for technical reasons (Utilities operators / municipal offices are delayed in supplying data) and for bureaucratic reasons related to the signing of the protocol between Lepida and CCCB. To mitigate this risk, preparatory activities were</p>		

			<p>initiated during a series of meetings, the offices responsible for providing the data identified, and contacts between the top management of Lepida (the Region's in-house company) and the municipality already made.</p> <p>In general, very detailed SOW (Statement of work), source selection criteria and bid documents.</p> <p>Apart from the service for data integration in the SensorNet platform, external services are not crucial activities within the project</p>		
6	<p>Workload / costs significantly different than estimated in the proposal</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: medium/high;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP1-WP7	<p>Realistic estimation and re planning of the deliverables. Reallocation of resources</p>		
7	<p>Failure in validating the WA<sup>2</sup>NNA-BEST index by the EMAS Committee due to possible delays in appointing new Committee members after the term of office of the present Committee foreseen at the beginning of 2026.</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: medium;</li> </ul>	WP7	<p>Having foreseen the validation activity one year before the closure of the project will guarantee us to have the validation carried out in any case before the end of the project</p>		

	after risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>				
8	Lack of interest from other municipalities for replicating the approach / the WA <sup>2</sup> NNA-BEST index Before risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: medium/high;</li> </ul> after risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP7	Apart from the 5 cities that have already shown interest, as soon as the index is validated, all the cities where partners have direct contacts will be directly contacted (Vienrose is part of the Eurocities network and in contact with the signatory cities of the GCA). Should no other city be interested in replication for reasons related to shortage of human resources, Vienrose is already willing to test the index free of charge on the data of a volunteer city		
9	Failure to engage the significant and previously identified external stakeholders and potentially interested groups Before risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: medium;</li> <li>● impact: medium/high;</li> </ul> after risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP2, WP3, WP5, WP6, WP7	Strong and timely identification and analysis of stakeholders and interested groups and proper planification of dissemination actions		
10	Poor visibility of the impacts and benefits of the project Before risk-mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: medium;</li> </ul> after risk-mitigation:	WP7	Proactive, timely and planned communication actions throughout the duration of the project		



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>				
11	<p>Difficulties and delays in data collection for baseline updating</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: medium;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP2	Establishment of preliminary contacts and letters of support to the project from the various involved entities		
12	<p>Formal delays / failure in the acquisition of voluntary tools</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: medium/high;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP5	Establishment of adequate timelapses; provision for internal (unofficial) audits preceding certification visits		
13	<p>Difficulties in implementing bottom-up interventions</p> <p>Before risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: medium;</li> </ul> <p>after risk-mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likelihood: low;</li> <li>● impact: low.</li> </ul>	WP6	Provide adequate targeted information and rely on the experience of APSR		