



D2.2 – Risk management plan



Project Title	A network of excellence for distributed, trustworthy, efficient and scalable AI at the Edge
Project Acronym	dAIEDGE
Grant Agreement No	101120726
Topic	HORIZON-CL4-2022-HUMAN-02-02
Start Date of Project	September 1 st , 2023
Duration of Project	36 Months

Name of the Deliverable	Risk management plan
Number of the Deliverable	D2.2
Related WP Number and Name	WP2 - Project Management and Coordination
Related Task Number and Name	T2.3 - Data management, quality control and risk monitoring
Deliverable Dissemination Level	PU – Public
Deliverable Due Date	29.02.2024
Deliverable Submission Date	29.02.2024
Task Leader/Main Author	DFKI
Contributing Partners	
Reviewer(s)	DFKI

Keywords

Risk management, risk log, mitigation measures

Revisions

Version	Submission date	Comments	Author
v0.1	22.02.2024	Initial version	DFKI
v0.2	28.02.2024	Internal review	DFKI
v1.0	29.02.2024	Coordinator review	DFKI

Disclaimer

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Acronyms and definitions

Acronym	Meaning
AI	Artificial Intelligence
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

This deliverable outlines the risk management strategies aimed at minimizing risks throughout the duration of the dAIEDGE project and offers guidance on addressing new risks as they arise. It also describes the scoring mechanism used to assign categories to identified risks. Also, the responsibilities of the project partners are described to ensure timely risk documentation and handling. Furthermore, it delineates the responsibilities of project partners to ensure the timely documentation and management of risks.

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction6
- 2. Risk and mitigation planning6
- 3. Documenting the occurrence of risks.....10
- 4. Risk logs11

1. Introduction

This deliverable presents the risk management to ensure that risks are minimised during the lifetime of the dAIEDGE project and to provide guidance for necessary actions upon appearance of new risks. The document also includes a general overview of the scoring mechanism used to categorise risk and determine mitigating actions.

During the project, the risks will be monitored continuously, as in due course their occurrence likelihood and/ or impact severity might change. Consortium members intend to use this information to identify the risks and take all the necessary actions to eliminate and minimise their impact.

We start with identifying events or problems that could jeopardise the project's success. Two kinds of risks must be discovered and evaluated: identified risks and unforeseen risks. Identified risks are defined as the issues the project team have already identified, can monitor, control or influence, while on the other hand, unforeseen risks are defined as issues beyond the project team's control that might arise due to unforeseeable events. Concerning the unforeseen risks, the dAIEDGE consortium plans to use a risk logging tool, where any risks that were either considered initially or not will be addressed through this mechanism using proposed tackling strategies.

2. Risk and mitigation planning

Each partner will be involved in the efficient and smooth project implementation and will cooperate, perform, and fulfil, promptly and on time, all its obligations under the grant agreement as well as the consortium agreement. In addition, it is expected that each partner will undertake to notify promptly any vital information, fact, problem or delay likely to affect the project. Each partner shall promptly provide all information reasonably required by a consortium body or the coordinator to carry out its tasks. Finally, each partner shall take reasonable measures to ensure the accuracy and the quality of any information, deliverables, or materials it supplies to the other partners.

At the proposal submission stage, the consortium identified the risks as indicated below in Table 1.

Table 1: Critical risks identified in the proposal and Grant Agreement

Description of risk	Work package(s) involved	Proposed risk-mitigation measures
Limited engagement or interaction with other pillars of the European AI Lighthouse	WP1	Most dAIEDGE partners are already active in related projects and networking associations. Dedicated communication means will be put in place (technical and organisational)
Missing or insufficient expertise for delivery of roadmaps and scientific agenda	WP3	The consortium has been carefully assembled to bring together leading organisations with multidisciplinary skills. Input for road mapping

		and agenda will be collected by dedicated questionnaires, which will be distributed to other members of the NoE beyond the consortium.
Incompatibility between different modules, integration risks	WP4	Development of a framework federation tool in WP4, based on existing assets from previous EU projects. Integration sprints, “agile” development, feedback to architecture design after unit tests
Insufficient technological readiness of the additional components	WP5, WP6	We foresee to have two iterations for the development of technical and scientific advances, allowing to generate a Minimum Viable Product already at month 16. Demonstrator implementation will feed back issues to improve and correct errors for the final version
Limitation to a few pilots/use-cases	WP5, WP6	In order to go beyond the three pilots of the project, we will work on community building and business development in WP8, which will raise interest outside of the consortium. Open calls will help pursuing additional use-cases and technical developments.
Low number of proposals submitted to open calls	WP8	Submissions reception, periodic checking. Analysing impacts of the dissemination activities and defining new ones based on the analysis’ results.
Low quality of the third party projects submitted	WP8	Only proposals reaching the desired quality level will be selected. The non-compromised funds will be added to the next open call or will be invested in providing additional support to awarded third party projects, if there are no additional open calls.
Lack of involvement of stakeholders for dissemination and exploitation objectives	WP7, WP8	Continuous monitoring of exploitation and dissemination activities. A first draft of the dissemination plan will be delivered early to help partners. Creation of dedicated tools (virtual incubator, incentive models) for reaching the critical mass for exploitation

In order to analyse the risk and their occurrence probability, we introduce two indicators for each risk:

- Likelihood level (how likely it is that the risk occurs during the project)
- Severity (how severe is the impact of the risk if it occurs during the project)

Each of these two indicators will be assessed by the project partners on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

In order to assess the risk, these two factors will be multiplied, leading to a scale between 1 and 25. This leads to a risk assessment matrix as follows.

Table 2: Risk assessment matrix and risk degree

		SEVERITY (B)				
LIKELIHOOD (A)		1	2	3	4	5
1		LOW 1	LOW 2	LOW 3	MEDIUM 4	MEDIUM 5
2		LOW 2	MEDIUM 4	MEDIUM 6	HIGH 8	HIGH 10
3		LOW 3	MEDIUM 6	HIGH 9	HIGH 12	HIGH 15
4		MEDIUM 4	HIGH 8	HIGH 12	HIGH 16	EXTREME 20
5		MEDIUM 5	HIGH 10	HIGH 15	EXTREME 20	EXTREME 25

Based on this analysis tool, the project consortium has completed Table 1 with the two indicators and the risk degree, to use it as a basis for the continuous risk assessment.

Table 3: Update list of critical risks from the proposal

Nr	Description of risk	Likelihood	Severity	Risk degree	WPs	Proposed risk-mitigation measures
R1	Limited engagement or interaction with other pillars of the European AI Lighthouse	2	4	4	WP1	Most dAIEDGE partners are already active in related projects and networking associations. Dedicated communication means will be put in place (technical and organisational)
R2	Missing or insufficient expertise for delivery of roadmaps and scientific agenda	1	5	5	WP3	The consortium has been carefully assembled to bring together leading organisations with multidisciplinary skills. Input for road mapping and agenda will be collected by dedicated questionnaires, which will be distributed to other members of the NoE beyond the consortium.
R3	Incompatibility between different modules, integration risks	2	3	6	WP4	Development of a framework federation tool in WP4, based on existing assets from previous EU projects. Integration sprints, “agile” development, feedback to architecture design after unit tests
R4	Insufficient technological readiness of the additional components	3	2	6	WP5, WP6	We foresee to have two iterations for the development of technical and scientific advances, allowing to generate a Minimum Viable Product already at month 16. Demonstrator implementation will feed back issues to improve and correct errors for the final version
R5	Limitation to a few pilots/use-cases	1	3	3	WP5, WP6	In order to go beyond the three pilots of the project, we will work on community building and business development in WP8, which will raise interest outside of the consortium. Open calls will help pursuing additional use-cases and technical developments.

R6	Low number of proposals submitted to open calls	2	3	6	WP8	Submissions reception, periodic checking. Analysing impacts of the dissemination activities and defining new ones based on the analysis' results.
R7	Low quality of the third party projects submitted	2	4	8	WP8	Only proposals reaching the desired quality level will be selected. The non-compromised funds will be added to the next open call or will be invested in providing additional support to awarded third party projects, if there are no additional open calls.
R8	Lack of involvement of stakeholders for dissemination and exploitation objectives	1	4	4	WP7, WP8	Continuous monitoring of exploitation and dissemination activities. A first draft of the dissemination plan will be delivered early to help partners. Creation of dedicated tools (virtual incubator, incentive models) for reaching the critical mass for exploitation

During the project, several risks might appear that were unforeseen at the time of the project's start. To handle any unexpected events, the consortium will follow specific steps as shown below to identify and manage them properly and in due time:

1. Inputs on potential emerging risks are collected by WP leaders, partners to the coordinator.
2. Coordinating team seeks mitigation measures.
3. If no solution is available by the coordination team, the issue is discussed, as soon as possible, with the coordinator and the affected WP's leaders to find possible solutions.
4. In the unlikely event of an unforeseen risk, the coordinator, along with the partners, briefs the project officer about the current situation, identifies the risk and its consequence, and applies the mitigation strategy that dAIEDGE teams will follow.
5. The affected WP team execute the decided measures and ensures the follow-up of the issue's resolution to the rest partners.
6. The coordinating team documents all steps and implemented measures in the risk logging tool.

3. Documenting the occurrence of risks

In order to verify the occurrence of risks, each WP leader will verify for each reporting period if the identified risks that affects their WP has occurred and what was the taken mitigation measure. To this aim, the WP leaders will fill in a risk occurrence log table containing the following information.

Monitoring Period	Risks are continuously monitored per reporting period; this is also the method for reporting on risks to the European Commission via the EU portal.
Risk identifier	R#
Description of the risk	Extensive description of the risk and its consequences to the project activities
Did the risk occur?	Yes No Partially
Likelihood level to happen	1-5, according to the Risk Assessment Matrix
Impact level of the risk	1-5, according to the Risk Assessment Matrix
Was the decided mitigation measure applied?	Yes No
WPs or Tasks affected	List of the WPs and tasks affected by the risk
Additional mitigation measures comments	List of the mitigation measures adopted for the risk. Also, mention the identified steps for the measures' implementation
Decisions by {date of decision}	Measures implementation is realised by the decisions of the coordinating team, the WP leaders in support with the coordinator
Current status of the risk	Open Closed
Is there any need for further seek for documentation/help for the current risk?	References to any available communication and/or documentation/help that are in accordance with the mutually accepted decisions

4. Risk logs

The consortium will generate updated Risk Log documents every 6 months, starting at month M06 (deliverable D2.4), then at month M12 (deliverable D2.6), M18 (deliverable D2.7), M24 (deliverable D2.8), and M30 (deliverable D2.9).



daiedge.eu