Ref. Ares(2024)4476070 - 20/06/2024



Data driven implementation of hybrid nature-based solutions for preventing and managing diffuse pollution from urban water runoff

D7.2 Risk Breakdown Report

November 2022

Sara García Argüelles (UC) Irune Indacoechea (UC) Jorge Rodriguez (UC) Daniel Castro (UC)





D7.2 Risk Breakdown Report	
Work Package	WP7
Deliverable lead	UC
Author(s)	Sara García Argüelles (UC), Irune Indacoechea (UC), Jorge Rodriguez (UC), Daniel Castro (UC) Contributors: All partners
Contact	info@d4runoff.eu
Grant Agreement number	101060638
Start date of the project / Duration	1 September 2022 / 42 months
Type of deliverable (R, DEM, DEC, other)	R
Dissemination level (PU, SEN)	PU
Project website	www.d4runoff.eu

Document	Document history			
Version	Date	Detailed updates		
0.1	14.11.2022	UC send it VCS for internal revision as project coordinators		
0.2	21.11.2022	VCS send it to UC for final review		
1.0	28.11.2022	UC send final version to deliver		
2.0	31.05.2024	The new version incorporates the changes requested by the project manager during the first monitoring period, mainly the removal of duplicated risks, the inclusion of new technical risks associated with Work Package 2, as well as the expansion of the high-risk mitigation measures (Tables 1, 3, 4 & 5 Pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18), the clarification of the difference between unforeseen and foreseen risks and finally the prevalence of the participant portal Risk Matrix as more updated Risk evolution (Page 17).		





R=Document, report; DEM=Demonstrator, pilot, prototype; DEC=website, patent fillings, videos, etc.; OTHER=other
 PU=Public, SEN=Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the GA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101060638.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

The work described in this document has been conducted within the D4RUNOFF project. This document reflects only the D4RUNOFF Consortium views, and the European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

This document and its content are the property of the D4RUNOFF Consortium. All rights relevant to this document are determined by the applicable laws. Access to this document does not grant any right or license on the document or its contents. This document or its contents are not to be used or treated in any manner inconsistent with the rights or interests of the D4RUNOFF Consortium or the Partners detriment and are not to be disclosed externally without prior written consent from the D4RUNOFF Partners.

Each D4RUNOFF Partner may use this document in conformity with the D4RUNOFF Consortium Grant Agreement provisions.





Executive Summary

This deliverable constitutes the guide document for managing the risks associated with the D4RUNOFF project. The document describes the foreseen risks, the chain of responsibility in risk management and the times and protocols for the required actions. A protocol is defined in the event of the appearance of unforeseen risks and also, the access to the live document that constitutes the true risk matrix of the project, is facilitated.





Table of Contents

1		INT	ROD	UCTION	6
	1.	1	Pur	pose of the document	6
		1.1.	1	Scope of the document	6
		1	.1.1.1	Structure of the document	7
	1.:	2	lder	tification of general risks for D4RUNOFF	7
2		Ris	k ma	nagement & responsibilities at project level	8
	2.	1	Risł	management process	
3		Ris	k Ma	trix: foreseen risk identified in the description of the action	
	3.	1	Risł	assessment	
	3.	2	Fore	eseen risk list and proposed mitigation measurement	11
	3.	3	Risł	matrix as a living document	17
4		Res	pon	sibilities in risk management process	17
	4.	1	Res	ponsibilities on task level general approach	17
	4.	2	Res	ponsibilities on work package level general approach	19
	4.	3	Res	ponsibilities on project level general approach	19
		4.3.	1	PC responsibilities at project level	19
		4.3.	2	RDM responsibilities at project level	19
5		Ris	k ma	nagement on the project level for an unforeseen risk	20
6		Ris	k mo	nitoring timeline and updates	20
7		Cor	nclus	ions	20
8		Pro	ject	partners	21
9		Acr	onyr	ns	21

List of Tables

Table 1. Foreseen & Unforeseen Risks	7
Table 2 Risk Assessment Matrix to weigh risk level or category	10
Table 3 Foreseen risks and mitigation measures	11
Table 4 Unforeseen risks and mitigation measures.	15
Table 5 Critical risks, tasks and Risk Owners	18
Table 5 Project partners	21
Table 6 Acronyms	21

List of Figures

Figure 1 Risk management process	9
Figure 2 Snapshot of D4RUNOFF Risk Matrix (in the internal share point)	22
Figure 3 Snapshot of D4RUNOFF Risk Matrix (in the participant portal)	23





1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the document

This deliverable sets up routines for D4RUNOFF project risk management which are needed to guarantee successful outcomes of the project.

The main aim of the active management of risks is to monitor their development and to be ready for needed actions. Risk may be associated with the scientific level of the work, implementation risks connected to the ability to implement what has been foreseen, exploitation and/or dissemination risks and managerial risk connected to internal accomplishment of work.

Risk at several levels may threaten D4RUNOFF. The objective of this deliverable is to describe the risk management procedure for the project. The different steps of the review procedure are described and review responsibilities are defined. That is, it describes how risks will be identified and assessed, what tools and techniques can be used, the evaluation scales and tolerances and the relevant roles and responsibilities. The main aim of the active management of risks is to monitor their development and to be ready for needed actions.

This document defines the risk monitoring and escalation process as well as the structure of the Risk Register, which is used to document and communicate the risks and their response actions.

The purpose of this Risk Breakdown Report is:

- To outline the risk approach and process to be used for the project.
- To identify the roles and responsibilities related to risk management.
- To specify the methodology, standards, tools and techniques used to support risk management.

1.1.1 Scope of the document

The initial Risk Breakdown Report describes the factors that have been recognised as posing a potential risk for the implementation of D4RUNOFF activities. This plan also defines the estimated impact of the risk and the means of mitigation.

The risk management plan identifies the risks specific to operational organisation, defines the mitigation, adaptation and contingency measures as well as actions to be taken. The monitoring plan of the risks is based on good communications between the different actors and timely reporting of potential risks.

Risk management brings visibility to risks and accountability as to how they are handled and ensures that project risks are proactively dealt with and regularly monitored and controlled. The main objectives of project risk management are:

- Project risks are identified, assessed and reported throughout the project.
- All major risks are reported to the Steering Committee.
- Risk response strategies are in line with stakeholders' risk appetite and approved risk level thresholds.
- All risks are monitored and under control.
- Risk response actions are implemented effectively.



DIGK



1.1.1.1 Structure of the document

The structure of this report consists of a general overview on the risk management of the D4RUNOFF project as a whole. A successful outcome of the project depends on efficient management and continuous surveillance of risks.

The focus of the risk management process in D4RUNOFF will be the identification and management of the true risks (both foreseen and unforeseen) and their root causes. The aim will always be to lower the risk to a manageable level.

1.2 Identification of general risks for D4RUNOFF

For the D4RUNOFF project, risk factors and risk probabilities of the work plan will be analysed periodically, once a month by the Steering Committee (SC) and twice a year during the General Assembly (GA). The PC supported by the UC in their role of Risk and Data Manager (RDM), in close cooperation with the WP & Task Leaders, will monitor the identified risks by applying risk management procedures (systematic understanding of relevant risks, an assessment of their relative priority and a rigorous approach for monitoring and controlling). The process seeks to maximize the chances of achieving the objectives. Also, this may ensure that the partners are aware of, and could contribute to find solutions for the identified risks.

Every task Leader will manage, monitor and supervise the risks associated to their tasks. Depending on the impact, the WP leaders, the Steering Committee and the RDM will be the final management part if risks require to make decisions. The potential risks (who are related to the WPs and linked to the tasks most likely to manifest the risk) have been identified and represented in a table (see Table 1). This table will be updated after the reports from WP Leaders in the WP meetings, if required. This will ensure that the risks are identified and the contingencies that are developed as soon as possible. In addition, the identified risk table will be incorporated into the overall project reporting on the EC portal for every Reporting Period (RP).

Table 1 gather the identified risks. These risks are clustered in the following categories:

- **Consortium Management Related risks**: Include operational (Effective and efficient use of the resources), and financial (Budget and cost aspects and reliability of reporting) risks-
- Technical: Interfaces, performance, feasibility of reporting.
- **Dissemination & Communication, IPR & Exploitation risks:** Related with project impacts.

NUMBER	FORESEEN RISK			
	Consortium Management Related Risks			
1	Partners show weak commitment or leave the consortium			
2	Delay in preparation deliverable			
3	International travel restrictions			
	Technical risk			
4	The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined target, suspect and non-target screening of CECs is not able to detect a great variety of PMOCs			
5	Low representativeness of stormwater samples for instance with respect to peak flows			

Table 1. Foreseen & Unforeseen Risks





6	Poor retention of Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the Nature-based Solutions
7	Low sensitivity of sensors for CECs and metals
8	High interference of wastewater (i.e. runoff water) on the sensors signals
9	Incorrect integration of the different criteria considered in the MCDA for Hybrid solutions
10	Fail in the stakeholder engagement
11	Identifying closed communications protocols that make harder data access
12	Not enough data to perform properly the simulations
13	Difficulty in collecting raw/treated water samples from the implemented NBS, due to the unpredictability of rainfall events
14	Failures in the validation of the MCDA for hybrid solution in the case studies
	Dissemination & Communication, IPR & Exploitation Risk
15	Lack of participation in the serious games
16	Low interest on project outputs by targeted stakeholders & policy makers
17	Low dissemination impact
18	Low engagement of actors
RISK NUMBER	UNFORESEEN RISK
U1	Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and NTS workflows
U2	SERS detection of triazines and 6PPD-Quinone as well as Raman detection of microplastics using a chip fails
U3	Loss of analyte concentration by non-specific adsorption in the monitoring system
U4	Communication with AI platform (WP4) fails
U5	BIM could not be applicable to the parametrization process in this moment
U6	System broken during transport or use
U7	Personnel in leave (sick, parental, change of job)

The risks have been already associated to the WP and also to the tasks, therefore, the task members involved will monitor the risks that can already be foreseen and the tasks in which each risk could potentially materialize. WPs & tasks related to the risk are shown in Table 3.

During each monthly meeting, the work package leaders will review the updated Risk Matrix table (see section 2.3) with the RDM, highlighting critical risks, new risks and their respective mitigation strategies.

2 Risk management & responsibilities at project level

As part of the overall management plan for the project, this document describes the Risk Breakdown Report. It identifies conditions that may put the project at risk and provides guidance for managing these. It also provides methods and establishes roles and responsibilities of all participants in the risk management process.

2.1 Risk management process

The project risk management process defines the activities to identify, assess, prioritise, manage, and control risks that may affect the execution of the project and the achievement of its objectives.





The proposed process, applicable for all D4FUNOFF activities (management, research, development, etc.), is presented below (Figure 1).



Figure 1 Risk management process

Main stages of Risk Monitoring are:

- **RISK IDENTIFICATION**: The purpose is to facilitate the identification and documentation of risks that can impact the project objectives. Risks are continuously identified throughout the project life cycle and all the consortium partners are responsible for that, nevertheless (see section 3.2) task leaders are the first step in the identification process.
- RISK ASSESSMENT: The purpose is to assess the likelihood and impact of the identified risks in terms of their influence to the project objectives. This assessment is necessary before any risk response planning can be done. As shown in Table 2 Risk Assessment Matrix to weigh risk level or category, risks are assessed based on their likelihood of occurrence and the severity in project objectives. The product of their likelihood and severity defines the Risk Level which is then used as a reference for their prioritization and risk response development. This risk assessment will be performed by the Risk Owner designated at this step, supported by PC and RDM and is included in each "Risk Matrix" prepared during the project execution.
- RISK RESPONSE DEVELOPMENT: At proposal stage, Risk Owners had defined some mitigation responses to the foreseen risk. In the case of unforeseen risk, the Risk Owner, the PC and the RDM, are in charge of the selection of the risk response strategy based on the results of the risk assessment (risk level), the type of risk, on the effects on the overall project objectives (e.g. schedule and costs), as well as on the cost of the strategy and its benefits (cost/benefit analysis).
- **RISK MONITORING AND CONTROL**: The purpose is to monitor and control the implementation of the risk response activities while continuously monitoring the project environment for new risks or changes in the risks already identified. As defined in section 4, responsible are defined according risk level impact.
- RISK REPORTING: During the project, several tools will be used in order to follow the defined risks and include new identified risks: Risk register (RISK MATRIX), Intermediate activity progress internal reports, different progress reports and the Funding and Tender in each Reporting Period.

Certain, regular communications between the TL, the WP leaders, the Steering Committee and the RDM, are of utmost importance for anticipating the risks throughout the project life (see section 4). Besides, the involvement of the Consortium partners is needed for the identification of new potential risks.

3 Risk Matrix: foreseen risk identified in the description of the action

3.1 Risk assessment

In order to classify the risk level or category of the risk, a risk assessment matrix is proposed (Table 2) to understand the relationship between "likelihood" and "severity". Thanks to this criteria, D4RUNOFF Consortium could set up a scale to distinguish and focus on the critical





risks, which are mandatory according to the "Standard Application Form (HE RIA, IA) from Horizon Europe programme version 5.0 8 September 2022". Nevertheless, any obvious and manifested risk will be evaluated and monitored, in order to accomplish all the D4RUNOFF objectives, outcomes and deliverables.

Risk is evaluated in terms of probability of occurrence and consequence if the risk takes shape and the importance of a risk is typically calculated as the product of the probability and the consequence. In Table 2 this relationship is showed.

		LIKELIHOOD		
		Low	Medium	high
SEVERITY	r	2	4	6
Low	2	4	8	12
Medium	4	8	16	24
High	6	12	24	36

COLOR	R RISK LEVEL / CATEGORY	
From Oto 8	Low	
From 12 to 16	Moderate	
From 24 to 36	High	

The risk shall be categorized by severity according to the following indications:

- Low severity: Inefficiency or time delays can occur. The risk is insignificant and can be managed with routine procedures.
- **Medium severity**: The risk is significant, medium impact of a risk is considered to have major impact on cost, schedule or quality. The risk is still manageable with additional controls or mitigations.
- **High severity**: In case of occurrence of such a risk in the worst case the entire project could fail.

The following levels of impact of occurring risks on the project <u>D4RUNOFF</u> have been defined. Depending on the identified level of the likelihood of a risk, measures should be taken <u>consequently</u>:

- <u>Low Risk Level:</u> Despite the foreseen impact is low for the project outcomes, the Task Leaders shall follow established procedures according to quality assurance on deliverables. Task Leaders shall report to the WP Leaders during Work Package meetings. The final step of escalation for decision making is to the Work Package Leaders.
- <u>Medium Risk Level</u>: Once risks occur, WP Leaders shall report to the project coordinator in the monthly Project meetings and to the Risk and Data Manger (RDM) during General Assembly meetings. The final step of escalation for decision-making is to the Project Coordinator.
- <u>High Risk Level</u>: Once such risks occur, work package leaders shall report to project coordinator and RDM as soon as possible. The Risk is severe and requires immediate attention and action.

To sum up, the expected consequences or level of impact of the risk, according to its category is summarised below:

- Low Risk Level
- Medium Risk
 Level
- High Risk Level

CONSEQUENCE: Easily recoverable

- CONSEQUENCE: Significant impact on cost, schedule or quality
- CONSEQUENCE: Threatens the objectives of the project





From D4RUNOFF perspective, all kind of risk (low, medium & high) are relevant and the consortium must monitor them and provide the best and the quick mitigation measure, nevertheless if the risk level is high, it requires immediate attention and action and emergency meetings can be proposed in order to start mitigation actions as soon as possible.

3.2 Foreseen risk list and proposed mitigation measurement

Risk Breakdown Report will be monitored continuously throughout the project by Work Package and Task Leaders. Risk Breakdown Report will be updated once a month by the Steering Committee (SC) and yearly to General Assembly (GA), as stated in section 1.2.

For the risks that have been identified, measures that reduce the risk have been also identified and planned. Several risks will remain threats throughout the project, which is unavoidable. The main aim of the active management of risks is to monitor their development and to be prepared for response actions.

Table 3, presents a set of foreseen risks and proposed mitigation measures identified at proposal level, as Table 4 presents a list of unforeseen risks identified at grant agreement level, at the kick-off meeting and also during this first project period. The list of unforeseen risks is continuously updated in accordance with section 3.3 and section 6. High level risks are highlighted in red and an extension of the contingency plan has been developed for these risks.

RISK NUMB.			TASKs	RISK LEVEL	PROPOSED RISK-MITIGATION MEASURE
	Consor	tium	Manag	ement F	Related Risks
1	Partners show weak commitment or leave the consortium (L, H)	all	all		Partner replacement: an external partner will be proposed.
2	Delay in preparation deliverable (M, M)	all	all		Regular follow-up within WPs and consortium meeting; workload adjustment.
3	International travel restrictions (M, L)	all			Online meetings and events
			Techn	ical risk	
4	The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined target, suspect and non-target screening of CECs is not able to detect a great variety of PMOCs (M, H)		T1.2, T1.3, T1.4		Shift of attention to alternative analytical protocols such as SFC-HRMS better suited for very polar compound.
	EXPANSION OF THE C	ON.	TINGEN	CY PLA	N FOR RISK 4:

Table 3 Foreseen risks and mitigation measures.





	 Prevention: Particular attention to the issue during development of HRMS analytical protocols (task 1.1), including method validation that will enable early assessment of the ability of the LC-HRMS method to detect relevant groups of PMOCs. Test of alternative methods (ST1.1.2) will give thorough assessment of the possibilities and limitations of alternative instruments and platforms. Samples will be stored to enable later re-analysis. Monitoring and correction: Ongoing monitoring of the performance of LC-HRMS method. If the LC-HRMS method is found to provide inadequate coverage of
	PMOCs, implementation of alternative methods from ST1.1.2 will be considered.
	- Compensation: If necessary, the impact of the risk will be compensated by implementing alternative analytical protocol during task 1.3 and re-analysing stored samples.
5	Low representativeness1T1.1, T1.2,24 - HDevelopment of a common sampling strategy (T 1.3.1)of stormwater samplesT1.2, T1.3T1.3for instance with respectT1.3to peak flows (M, H)
	EXPANSION OF THE CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR RISK 5:
	 Prevention: Test of preliminary sampling strategy during task 1.1, including estimation of stormwater variability and uncertainty introduced through sampling, which will enable early assessment of sample representativeness and ensure development of a suitable sampling strategy. Monitoring and correction: Ongoing monitoring of results will provide early indication of issues with sample representativeness. If necessary, the sampling strategy will be revised to increase representativeness during task 1.3.
	- Compensation: The impacts of the risk are difficult to compensate post- sampling. Therefore, particular attention is needed to validate sampling strategy before the main sampling campaign (task 1.3). If necessary, additional samples will be collected.
6	Poorretentionof5 ContaminantsT5.6I2 - MIn the WP5, if the performance of the NBS is poor, the application of the MCDA will produce as a result the need of including more NBS and/or other systems in the proposed treatment trains (theoretical proposal) until that the needed retentions will be achieved.
7	Low sensitivity of 2 T2.3, 24 - H Pre-concentration steps will be re- sensors for CECs and metals (M, H) 24 - H Pre-concentration steps will be re- designed to process higher volume of water to attain the system LoD/LoQ.
	EXPANSION OF THE CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR RISK 7:
	The contingency plan will depend on the source of the low sensitivity:
	- Not identification/discrimination or low SERS signal of Triazines and 6PPD- Quinone by selected COF/AuNPs substrate: 1. Tuning functionalization on COF pore surfaces enhance their affinity for selected CECs pre- or post-synthetically (possible change in vibration spectra); 2. Design of new structure as SERS substrate with higher enhancing performance (e.g., explore new strategies of COF growth to modify





	the pore orientation with respect to Au surface, taking surface selection rules into
	consideration).
	- Insufficient Raman signal for small microplastics: 1. Modification of the Raman system: a) Explore the reduction of spot size, also working distance, to reduce background and improve the spatial resolution (e.g. integrating Aspheric Lens into the Raman probe); b) modify the slit of the Raman spectrometer.
	- Spectral overlap between peaks associated with the vibrational changes of the COF upon interaction with CECs as well as spectral overlap between peaks associated with the matrix components and the characteristic peaks of plastics (medium): 1. Expand the spectral region of study; 2. Modification of slit of the Raman spectrometer to improve the spectral sensitivity; 3. Explore different Al-models to improve the data analysis (e.g. better algorithm to remove background peaks).
	- Low electrochemical signal for metal detection: Change sample processing and increase the concentration of the metals in the buffer.
8	High interference ofT2.3,24 - HClean-up steps will be reinforced towastewater (i.e. runoff water) on the sensors signal (M, H)T2.3,24 - HClean-up steps will be reinforced towastewater (i.e. runoff water) on the sensors signal (M, H)T2.3,24 - HClean-up steps will be reinforced towastewater (i.e. runoff water) on the sensors signal (M, H)T2.3,24 - HClean-up steps will be reinforced to
	EXPANSION OF THE CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR RISK 8:
	Specific interferents identified in the wastewaters from WP5 (analysed in WP2), which will allow deciding in the better strategy to reduce matrix interference:
	1. Clean-up steps will be reinforced to remove organic and particulate matter: a) Explore the modification of filtration module by including extra membranes/mesh with higher porous size; b) Explore the integration of gravitational sedimentation device to reduce the presence of particulate matter (i.e. suspended sediments) in the case of CECs (triazines and 6PPD-Quinone) and metals).
	2. Sample processing could be changed to allow the dilution of the matrix (for metal detection).
	3. In the case of microplastic, modification of the tubing lengths and flow rate will be explored to enhance the size separation due to the shear-enhanced dispersion of particulate matter subjected to a steady laminar flow.
9	Incorrect integration of 3 T 3.3 24 -H The number of criteria can be easily changed during the methodology design, learning how to do it in-process for future applications.
	EXPANSION OF THE CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR RISK 9:
	Before - Prevention: During the task 3.2, the selection of the criteria will be checked also from the point of view of the needed conditions for the correct integration in the decision-making process.
	- During - Measurement and correction: If the needed conditions change or are not feasible, the criteria will be combined and considered in different ways, looking for the best possible integration.





	during the task 3.4, taking criteria.	g adv	vantage	e of the	impact of this risk will be compensated GIS to look for different combinations o
10	Fail in the stakeholder engagement (M, L) 4	/6 T	74.1 76.3 76.5	8 – L	Definition of an engagement strategy including dialogue with main targe actors and develop an additional list c stakeholders to contact.
11	Identifying closed4 communications protocols that make harder data access (L, H)	T	ſ4.2	12 - M	Development of open communication APIs for specific suppliers. Selecting other equivalent device with open communication protocols.
12	Not enough data to5 perform properly the simulations (M, H)	Т	ſ5.4	24 - H	Close collaboration with demo site leaders to define the data structur needed along all the development a leverage readily available datasets.
	EXPANSION OF THE CO	DNT	INGEN	CY PLA	N FOR RISK 12:
	 proposed for development During - Measure gathering and calculation developed in such a way packages (WP1, WP2 and data will be accessible to project. After - Compensation be adapted to achieve the data available at each determine 	nt in t men n enq / as d W perfe tion: e ob emo- the a	the pro- tit and c gine mo to allov P3) and orm diff if need jectives -site. In amount	ject will correctio odules of w hostin d extern erent sin led, the s of the addition of avail	
13	Difficulty in collecting5 raw/treated water samples from the implemented NBS, due to the unpredictability of rainfall events (L, M).		⊺5.1, ⊺5.3	8 - L	It will be possible to implemer automatic sampling methods o raw/treated waters guided by events refining the sampling methods followin the first occurred events.
14	Failures in the validation5 of the MCDA for hybrid solution in the case studies (M, M)		5.5		The lessons learnt will be applied t improve it and try to validate the new version in the replication sites.
45					PR & Exploitation Risk
15	Lack of participation in6 the serious games (L, M)	T	6.3	8 - L	Local engagement actions ar coordinated in a dedicated task an there is a budget provision with prize to boost participation throug challenges.
16	Low interest on project6	Т	6.2,	8 - L	End users have been included in the





					ensure that the outputs are in line with existing needs.
17	Low dissemination impact (M, M)	6	T6.2, T6.5	16 - M	Periodical monitoring of dissemination indicators and fast implementation of corrective actions
18	Low engagement of actors (L, M)	6	T6.3	8 - L	Each of the responsible partners has significant experience working with the water pollution sector, and will build on their existing initiatives and strong local networks to identify and recruit actors for the co-design. The robust methods for recruitment, will ensure sufficient actors are engaged. Where there proves to be local difficulties in recruiting, in the first instance, this will be overcome through assistance and advice from other partners. However, in the event recruitment challenges cannot be overcome, the targets of other partners will be increased (with appropriate reallocation of budget as required). This will ensure that the overall number remains sufficient.

Table 4 Unforeseen risks and mitigation measures.

RISK NUMB.	IDENTIFIED RISK (level of likelihood/Severity: low, medium, high).	WP	TASKs	RISK LEVEL	PROPOSED RISK-MITIGATION MEASURE
			Tec	hnical ri	sk
U1	Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and NTS workflows (M, H)		T1.1, T1.2	24 - H	Implementation of SoA workflows on well- established Suspect lists of CECs'.
	EXPANSION OF TI	HE C	ONTING	ENCY P	LAN FOR RISK U1:
		ble fo	or upscali	ng and I	ssessed during task 1.1 to ensure that high-throughput applications. Samples will
	suspect screening	and N	NTS work	flows. If	ng monitoring of the performance of the necessary, workflows will be adjusted to blished workflows for relevant CECs.
					c can be compensated by implementing plicable for re-analysis of stored samples.





		•	T O O	40.11	
U2	SERS detection of triazines and 6PPD-Quinone as well as Raman detection of microplastics using a chip fails (M, M)		T2.3, T2.4	16-M	1. Interactive process for the readjustment of the chip designs; 2. Modification of the Raman system: a) Explore the reduction of spot size, also working distance, to reduce background and improve the spatial resolution (e.g. integrating Aspheric Lens into the Raman probe); b) modify the slit of the Raman spectrometer.
U3	Loss of analyte concentration by non-specific adsorption in the monitoring system (H, H)		T2.3, T2.4	24-H	Localization of the component/step/module that is provoking the poor performance. Then, the mitigation plan will be according to the component/step/module: a) Non-specific adsorption reduction by coating the sample preparation module with polymers such as polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) or hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose (HPMC); b) Integrate an adsorption cartridge involving COF in the sample preparation module to reduce the time of the analytes into the system; c) Explore alternative to enhance the sensitivity of the sensor taking in account the loss of non- specific adsorption: i) Modification of Raman system to improve spatial resolution (change slit or/and reduce spot size of the Raman probe) to improve limit of detection and limit of quantification of the SERS-based and Raman-based sensors; d) Modification of the operational strategy (e.g. time of sample collection, sample injection time for each sensor, the reservoir, etc), which would lead to a better design and operational guidelines for the specific type of runoff water.
U4	with AI platform (WP4) fails (M, M)		T2.4, 2.5		The prototype will be placed in a cabinet adequate to environmental conditions and with safe locker. When possible, the cabinet will be placed in a closed housing close to the sample collection point. External pieces will be minimized and add- ons like solar panels will be avoided when possible (when access to the power network is granted).
U5	BIM could not be applicable to the parametrization process in this moment (M, L)		T3.2	8-L	BIM is not needed for GIS implementation and consequently, the parametrization could be done in an easier alternative way.
U6	System broken during transport or use(L/H)		T5.3	12-M	Insurance for shipping.





	Cons	sortium N	lanageme	ent Related Risks
U7	Personnel in leaveal (sick, parental, change of job) (M, M)	ll all	16-M	If possible, new position released (at least 3-4 months delay).

3.3 Risk matrix as a living document

During the project, main internal tool to follow the defined risks and include new identified risks is the Risk Matrix as Living Document. This constitutes a Risk Register that will contain the risk identifier, risk name and short description, the category and owner, as well as strategies, actions and timing to facilitate the monitoring and control during the project.

This active "Risk Matrix" is uploaded as a living document in an internal SharePoint in the following domain: <u>D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX AS LIVING DOCUMENT</u>. It contains the following tabs, (a) Foreseen risk registers, (b) Unforeseen risk register, (c) a file for each risk, to be completed with extra information. A snapshot is showed in Annexe A.

The content of this internal control matrix will be periodically uploaded into the SyGMa ("System for Grant Management") application of the Participant Portal in the "Critical risks" section. For the correct management of risks and in case of doubt, the information in SyGMa will be taken as the most updated and reliable. A snapshot is showed in Annexe B.

These active documents will guarantee a proper evaluation of the risk occurrence and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation responses and will be updated once a month by the Steering Committee (SC) and yearly to General Assembly (GA), unless the project consortium unmasks some high-level risk. In such as case, the consortium response must to be quick and effective, therefore new meetings and actions could be stablished to deal with. Risk management updates will be incorporate to the Risk Matrix in the course of and ordinary or exceptional meetings.

4 Responsibilities in risk management process

4.1 Responsibilities on task level general approach

The assessment of risks is an integral part of the project management. Each **Task Leader** TL is responsible to <u>identify</u> possible risks and mention them to the responsible WP Leaders in the monthly WP meeting. If the manifested Risk Level is High, TL will communicate the situation to the WP leader (email, phone call or TELCO) within 5 days for an emergency meeting. Due to the task leaders have enough expertise and experience to detect the manifestation of risks that endanger their work and the whole project, they are the first control level in risk management and the risk owners. "Risk owner" is defined as the individual responsible for observing each potential risk related to their tasks and also executing a risk response (together with the PC or the RDM) if a risk event takes place. Risk ownership is a key part of the mitigation plan; it guarantees the implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures.

As mentioned above, in order to carry out a proper monitoring, in form and time, all task leaders have been asked about the relationship between tasks and identified WP's risk. To sum up,





below there is a list of the D4RUNOFF risk owners, its associated risk numbers (see Table 3 & Table 4 for the whole RISK MATRIX) and tasks according to the partners 'criteria (Table 5).

RISK	RELATED TASKS	RISK OWNER
NUMBER		
1	ALL	VCS
2	ALL	VCS
3	ALL	VCS
4	T1.2, T1.3, T1.4	UCPH
	(WP1)	00111
5	T1.1, T1.2, T1.3	UCPH
	(WP1)	
6	T5.6	VCS
	(WP5)	
7	T2.3, T2.4, T2.5	INL
	(WP2)	
8	T2.3, T2.4, T2.5, T5.3, T5.4	INL
	(WP2 & WP5)	
9	T3.3	UC
	(WP3)	
10	T4.1, T6.3, T6.5	3OC
	(WP4 & WP6)	
11	T4.2	ITG
10	(WP4)	ITO
12	T5.4	ITG
13	(WP5) T5.1, T5.3	UCPH (T5.1) & INL (T5.3)
15	(WP5)	$0CPH(15.1) \otimes INL(15.5)$
14	T5.5	UC
14	(WP5)	88
15	T6.1, T6.3	30C
	(WP6)	000
16	T6.2, T6.3, T6.5	30C
	(WP6)	
17	T6.2, T6.5	30C
	(WP6)	
18	T6.3	30C
	(WP6)	
U1	T1.1, T1.2.	UCPH
	(WP1)	
U2	T2.3, T2.4	INL
	(WP2)	15.11
U3	T2.3, T2.4	INL
114	(WP2)	18.11
U4	Task 2.4 and 2.5	INL
U5	(WP2) T3.2	UC
05	(WP3)	
U6	T5.3	INL
00	(WP5)	IINL
U7	ALL	VCS
01		v 00

Table 5 Critical risks, tasks and Risk Owners





4.2 Responsibilities on work package level general approach

WP Leaders assume responsibility for the control of the risks related to the tasks, deliverables and results related to their WP. Task leaders will inform them monthly about the state of the foreseen risk and the evolution of the mitigation measures. While, WP Leaders will share this data monthly with the Steering Committee during the recurring meetings.

As defined in section 2.1, according to the risk level, WP Leaders duties are:

• If the **Risk Level is Low**, the Work Package Leaders are the <u>final step of</u> <u>escalation for decision making</u>. They have to register the incidence in the "Living Document" in the shared folder (<u>D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX AS LIVING</u> <u>DOCUMENT</u>) in (a) Foreseen risk register or (b) Unforeseen risk register and in SyGMa.

• If the **Risk Level is Medium or High**, their main role is <u>communicators</u>. In the case of a manifested Medium level Risk, they must report to the PC in the monthly Project meetings and to the RDM during General Assembly meetings. If the manifested risk is high, work package leaders shall report urgently to project coordinator and RDM within 5 days.

4.3 Responsibilities on project level general approach.

At project level, D4RUNOFF has set up 2 figures of responsibility, the **PC** and the **RDM**.

4.3.1 PC responsibilities at project level

PC as member of the Steering Committee, must to fix a time to review risk management evolution in every monthly meeting of the Steering Committee. According to the Risk Level, PC's duties are the following:

- If the **Risk Level is Medium**, PC is the <u>final step of escalation for decision making</u>. They have to register the incidence in the "Living Document" in the shared folder (<u>D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX AS LIVING DOCUMENT</u>) in (a) Foreseen risk register or (b) Unforeseen risk register and in SyGMa.
- If the <u>Risk Level is High</u>, the PC will contact to the RDM urgently within 5 days to stablish exceptional meetings to a proper and successful mitigation response.

4.3.2 RDM responsibilities at project level

In order to support PC in the management of this three-and-a-half-year project, D4RUNOFF consortium has include the figure of **RDM**. **RDM** brings visibility to risks and accountability as to how they are handled and ensures that project risks are proactively dealt with and regularly monitored and controlled. RDM is not part of the Steering committee but of the GA. Therefore, the responsibility of the RDM in project risk management is as follows:

 If the Risk level of manifested risk is Low or Medium, or in any ordinary situation, the PC will inform RDM twice a year, during the GA. RDM must review and control the evolution of foreseen and unforeseen risks and to take actions, if is required. These actions could include, among others: Confirm with the work package leaders the correct





evolution of the mitigation measures, stress the control of high-level risks or correct errors. Comments or notes will be including in the Risk Matrix. and internal technical progress reports.

If the Risk Level is High, the PC will contact to the RDM and both will establish an urgent meeting with the involved partners. The RDM have to register the incidence in the "Living Document" in the shared folder (<u>D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX AS LIVING DOCUMENT</u>) in (a) Foreseen risk register or (b) Unforeseen risk register and in SyGMa.

5 Risk management on the project level for an unforeseen risk

During the execution of the project it is possible that some other unforeseen risks may arise suddenly. The procedure in these cases is as follows:

- A partner detects how an unforeseen risk manifests itself.
- Partner must communicate this fact to the TL or/and the WP leader within 5 days in order to classify the risk and define a mitigation measure. If the Risk Level is High, they have to involve PC and RDM within other 5 days.

6 Risk monitoring timeline and updates

The initial Risk Breakdown Report have been delivered at M3 as a framework for the Consortium and the responsible partners in the risk management. The *Risk Matrix* is a living document ready to be used to all partners involved in the risk management along with the project duration.

Risk matrix updates will be showed to the Commission in the different Progress reports in the corresponding Periodic Reports in M18, M30 & M42.

7 Conclusions

To sum up, this Risk Management Breakdown report has defined the methodology and already identified the basic risks at overall project as well as work package and task level. TL identified in table 4 are Risk Owners of foreseen risk. They are the main control actor in the risk management. Once a risk is detected, WP, PC and RDM will act to control and mitigate the risk, considering the Risk Level. The risk will be discussed monthly with the steering committee and twice a year during the GA meeting.

The document defines the responsibilities towards the risks within the Consortium. Moreover, the anticipated risks that the project could be confronted to are presented and the corresponding mitigation measures are proposed. After assessing the risk exposure level for each identified risk, it can be concluded that no critical risk was found.





8 Project partners

Table 6 Project partners

NO.	Name	Short name	Туре	Country
1	VCS (Coordinator)	VCS	LE	DK
2	Municipality Odense (Affiliated)	MDS	PB	DK
3	Aqualia	AQU	LE	ES
4	Hidrotec (Affiliated)	HDR	SME	ES
5	Instituto Tecnológico de Galicia	ITG	RTD	ES
6	Laboratorio Iberico Internacional de Nanotecnología	INL	RTD	PT
7	Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland	GEU	RTD	DK
8	University of Copenhagen	UCPH	RTD	DK
9	University of Cantabria	UC	RTD	ES
10	Three o clock	30C	SME	FR
11	Ingegnerie Toscane	ITS	LE	IT
12	Mitiga	MTG	SME	ES
13	Klink	KLK	SME	IT

9 Acronyms

Table 7 Acronyms

Acronym	Name
CA	Consortium Agreement
RDM	Risk and Data Manager
EC	European Commission
GA	General Assembly
PC	Project Coordinator
RP	Reporting Period
SC	Steering Committee
TL	Task Leaders
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader





ANNEX A SNAPSHOT OF D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX (IN THE INTERNAL SHARE POINT)

	DESCRIPTION OF THE RISK	DIA TOANI 44	TASK	LIKELIHOOD	ATIA3432	CATEGORT	RISK OWNER	WE WHOLVERD 1356 LIKELINGOD STREAMED AND STREAMED FOR AND FOROSTORIS MISSIONIS MISSION	RE (RHH) RHH -STARTING DATE FOLL
Per	Partnerrihau weak commitment or leave the constrium	•	•	•	,	2	VOS (Cear4.)	Partnar raplacement: an external partner will be prepared.	prepared.
Dela	Dolay in proporation deliverable	•	•		•	*	VCS (Ceard.)	Payular fallbur vy within VIPs and convertions maarhing, varklaad adjurtmant.	uting
1	International travel rootrictions	•	•		~		VCS (Ceard.)	Online meeting and events	
								TECHNICAL RISK	
	П	AP INTOLYCE	TASK	LIKELIHOOD	SEFERITE	CATEGORT	RISK OWNER	WE INFOLVE 145K, LUKLINGO STRENT CATGORT RISK OWHER BAIL OF REPORTING RISK MANAGER PROPOSED RISK-HITIGATION HEASURE (RMH) RMH-STARTING BAIL FOLLOW UP BAIL ETE	RE (RMM) RMM -STARTING DATE FOLLO
111	The LC-MBMS analytical presentation of the combined target, runport and nan-targets crooning alf CECs is nat able ta detect a great variety alf PMOCs (MJM)	-	12/13/14	·	•	2	HIGH	Shift of atransfian to alternative andreita from andre	calruch w
n te	Leu representativeneur af starmwater sampler far instance vith researts assochteur.	•	012103		,	2	нарл	Devolopment of a common rangiling reader (113.1)	0.0
Pass	Peersoontian al Centemineeux el Emerging Centern in the Network av el Selviseux		2	-		¥	SOA	In Adds. 1995.; of Ads. performance on Adds. 1995. 5: pear, (Ad- approximate Ads. 1995; Address and Ads. 2014; Address and Ads. Address and Ref. and Ads. 2014; Address and Address and Address and Address and Address and Address and Address Advectory and Address and Addr	, the he model respond Atha moded
- Per	Leuronaitivity of remain for CECr	ing.	23124125			*	ы	Pro-cencentrationary utility or re-designed in proceeding of the process higher values at unter the attractive flag.	racour higher
High	High interference of watewater on the zervarzignal	275	1995			*	HL	Cla www.maya.clash.clash.clash.cc.ad warana warani cal waran official warani cala warani cala da uku waran fram MPF (canadora da MPF).	nic material from WPS
de la	Incerte stinte-gratian af the different criteria cancidered in the MODA for Myterid valutions	•	2		,	2	9	 The remains or all criteries can be samily changed during the matheming that the remains and the remain of the remains the samily changed during the force opposite values. 	ing the cost far
2	Fail is the stake halfer engagement	476	4116.316.5	-	2	•	300	Definition of no conservation servery. Including distruction that the conservation of including the service much request servers a conservation of the conservation o	distances with.
44	Heantifitying clared communications protocols that make harder date access	•	9	~	-	¥	110	Ouvelegement of source communications of the specific regularization which we device units as an communication problement.	weithe Napon
Net	Nat enaugh dot a ta perform property the rimulations		3	-	3	:	116	Clave cell between which do not not a second to the second of the dote proverse accord of the equal to the second in the second second accord accord readily received and other accord.	fine the date seraes
2	Peer retention of CECs by the implemented HESs	•	18	•	•	¥	vos	The devolgence and My Schriffold Schridt Schrift Schredin auf Mediden (, The Schrift Andre Schrift Sch	af a dynamic
Difficu	Difficulty in calle cting raufter each duster ampler fram the implemented NBS, due ta the unpredictability af rainfall events	•	\$1453	~		•	UOPH(5.1) & INL (5.3	اد الله اعتماد محمد محمد معادد معادات محمد محمد معادد معادات معاده محمد معادد معاده مد ها د معادد جماد ما محمد و ما دهاد محمد و ما دهاد محمد و ما دهاد معاده معاده معاده معاده معاده معاده معاده محمد معادله معاد و المالي محمد و محمد محمد محمد محمد محمد محمد مح	nq mathede The sempling
24	f eiluras in the validation of the MODA for hybrid relation in the ear extraitor.	*	3	-	•	*	9	The learner learner will be applied to improve it on try to well dots the new version in the replication riter.	derytes
3	Limited variety of PMOO's detected by LO-HBMS		12113114	-	•	*	Habh	Shift to allure and you and you for the form (e.e. SFO-HRHS) better very saler compand.	C-HRMS)
2	Lau reprezentatioenezz af ztarm waterz emplez	-	CIVENU	-		2	HION	Duvelepmant of a commany muglicy frog to the first order of a consistent for pollivition morboard before that full condyrided program.	d cessains
33	Limited Scalability of Supect Screening and MTS untifieur	-	1012	•		:	наоп	haytam varatism al Sañ uaridhau an uult-urahidhud Sanyaa libu al OCCA'.	61-6
Syrt	System braken during transpart ar we	*	3	~	•	a	W	lacura ace for Alippine.	
PII I	Bill could not be applicable to the perametrization process in this mamont	•	*		~		8	BING watersound for All Simplementations and enconversions Use per emarking values could be done in on environ efformative vary.	ne equently. hernetive

Figure 2 Snapshot of D4RUNOFF Risk Matrix (in the internal share point)





ANNEX B SNAPSHOT OF D4RUNOFF RISK MATRIX (IN THE PARTICIPANT PORTAL)

Grant Management Project Continuous Report Project Content Report Project Continuous		ropa.eu/research/participants/grants-app/repor	ting/DLV-	101060638							
Grant Management Option Opt										'n	007qvjj (EXT
HUBBRICHAL GL- 2021 - ZEBOROLLUTION-D1 Suffmary Intervention Intervention Activities Activitie					Projec	t Continuous R	eport				Юнои
HORIZON-CLG-2021-ZEROPOLIUTION-01	60638		Re	searchers D	eliverables Milestones	Critical Risks	Publication	ns Results	Disseminat Co	ommunic Stan	dards
Et HORIZON-CLA-2021 - ZEROPOLLUTION-011 Image:	LIOPE		y inv	e project					activities A	ctivities	
he end of each period beneficiaries should give the state of play of every risk identified in Annex 1 and if necessary give new mitigation measures. He end of each period beneficiaries should give the state of play of every risk identified in Annex 1 and if necessary give new mitigation measures. State of the Play State of the Play </td <td></td> <td>. 🔶 🛛</td>											. 🔶 🛛
he end of each period beneficiaries should give the state of play of every risk identified in Annex 1 and if necessary give new mitigation measures. He end of each period beneficiaries should give the state of play of every risk identified in Annex 1 and if necessary give new mitigation measures. State of the Play State of the Play </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\checkmark</td> <td></td> <td>\sim</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>V</td>				\checkmark		\sim	1				V
Anter restrictions (M,L). 1 2, 2, 3 Partner replacement; an external partner will be restrictions (M,L). 1 2, 2, 3 Partner replacement; an external partner will b Image: Comments of a common sampling strategy (T 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined 1 1 Yes No X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Yes No X 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined 1 1 Shate of the Play No X X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Devicement of a common sampling strategy (T Yes X 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined 1 1 Shate of the Play No X X 1 Yes No X X X X X X 2 Delay in preparation deliverable (M,M,L). 1, 2, 3 Online meetings and events. X X X 3 International travel restrictions (M,L). 1, 2, 3 Online meetings and events. X X X X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T <											
Non-miniperintentation restriction for the integration restrictions (M,L). A term of each period beneficiaries should give the state of play of every risk identified in Annex 1 and if necessary give new mitigation measures. State of the Play State of the			-	_		_	_			_	
resear Risks resear Risks State of the Risk identified in Annex 1. The risk information is read-only and it is provided as a reference for the state of play information. State of the Play Note of the P	ical I	mplementation Risks and Mitigation	Actions	5							8
escen Risks following table lists the risks identified in Annex 1. The risk information is read-only and it is provided as a reference for the state of play information. k Description Work Need Comments Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play											
following table lists the risks identified in Annex 1. The risk information is read-only and it is provided as a reference for the state of play information.			e of play	of every risk i	dentified in Annex 1 and if n	ecessary give n	iew mitigatio	on measures.			
k Description Work Package No(s) Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play Period State of the Play Did you apply materialise? State of the Play Did you apply Did you app	esee	n Risks									
Arr Description Work Package No(s) Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play Period State of the Play Did you apply materialise? State of the Play Did you apply Did y	follov	ving table lists the risks identified in Annex 1. The	risk infor	mation is rea	d-only and it is provided as a	reference for	the state of	play information.			
o Period Did you apply risk mitigation measures? Did you apply measures? Did you ap				i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i							
1 Yes Yes Image: State of the Play State of		Description	Package		Kisk mitigation measures	State	Period	Did you apply risk mitigation	Did your risk	Comments	Actions
2 Delay in preparation deliverable (M,M). 1, 2, 3 Regular follow-up within WPs and consortium m 2 Delay in preparation deliverable (M,M). 1, 2, 3 Regular follow-up within WPs and consortium m 3 International travel restrictions (M,L). 1, 2, 3 Online meetings and events. 1 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t 1 Shift of attention to alternative analytical protoc 1 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T 1 6 Description Work Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play Period State of the Play Did you apply measures? State	1	Partners show weak commitment or leave the c	1, 2, 3	Partner rep	lacement: an external partn	er will b					D.
2 Delay in preparation deliverable (M,M). 1, 2, 3 Regular follow-up within WPs and consortium m 1 Yes No N											
1 Yes No X 3 International travel restrictions (M,L). 1, 2, 3 Online meetings and events. I 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t 1 Shift of attention to alternative analytical protocol 1 Yes No X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T I Yes No X Toreseen Risks K * Description Work Peckage No(S) Risk Mitigation Measures No(S) State of the Play Did you risk Mitigation measures? State of the Play Did you risk Materialise? State of the Play Did you risk Materialise? Action Package Mode So and							1	Yes	Yes	E)	×
3 International travel restrictions (M,L). 1, 2, 3 Online meetings and events. I Yes No X 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t 1 Shift of attention to alternative analytical protocol 1 Yes No X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T I Yes No X foreseen Risks State of the Play Description Work Risk Mitigation Measures No(s) State of the Play Did you apply Did you prisk Mitigation measures? State of the Play Did you risk Mitigation measures? State of the Play Did you risk Mitigation measures? Action Comments J1 08 Apr 2024 Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and 1 Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est	2	Delay in preparation deliverable (M_M)	1, 2, 3	Regular foll	ow-up within WPs and consc	rtium m	1	Yes	Yes	٩	
3 Interinational daver resolutions (m,t). 1 Yes No X 4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t 1 Shift of attention to alternative analytical protocol 1 Yes No X 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T Image: Shift of the Play integration integratintegratintegration integratintegration integratintegra	2	Delay in preparation deliverable (M,M).	1, 2, 3 	Regular foll	ow-up within WPs and conso	rtium m					G
4 The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t 1 Shift of attention to alternative analytical protocol 1 Yes No Image: Comparison of a common sampling strategy (Tmage: Common sampling strategy (Tmage: Comparison of a common sampling strategy (Tmage: Common sampli				-		rtium m					×
1 Yes No No No No 5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T Image: Common sampling strategy (T				-		rtium m					×
5 Low representativeness of stormwater samples 1 Development of a common sampling strategy (T 1 Yes No Image: Common sampling strategy (T 1 Yes No Image: Common sampling strategy (T		International travel restrictions (M,L).	 1, 2, 3 	0	nline meetings and events.		1	Yes	No		Li X
Image: Notice of the Play Risk wave and the Risk wave and t	3	International travel restrictions (M,L).	 1, 2, 3 	0	nline meetings and events.		1	Yes Yes	No	Đ	x x x
foreseen Risks Intersection Risks k Date the Risk was Risk was 2024 Description Work Package No(s) Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play Period State of the Play risk mitigation measures? State of the Play Did you apply Did you risk materialise? State of the Play Did you risk materialise? Action Ull 08 Apr 2024 Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and 2024 1 Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est	3	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte	nline meetings and events, ention to alternative analyti	cal prote	1	Yes Yes	No	Đ	x x x x
k Date the Risk was added Date the Package Description Work Package No(s) Risk Mitigation Measures State of the Play Period State of the Play State of the Play Did you apply Did you risk materialise? State of the Play Did you risk materialise? Action U1 08 Apr 2024 Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and 2024 1 Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est	3	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte	nline meetings and events, ention to alternative analyti	cal prote	1	Yes Yes Yes	No	8	x x x x x x
k Date the risk was added Date the risk was added Date the risk was added Date the risk was hols Date of the Play Period State of the Play priving the risk witigation measures? State of the Play Did your risk meteralise? State of the Play meteralise? State of the Play Did your risk meteralise? State of	3	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte	nline meetings and events, ention to alternative analyti	cal prote	1	Yes Yes Yes	No	8	x x x x x x
Package No(s) Package No(s) Period Did you apply risk mitigation measures? Did you risk materialise? Comments 08 Apr 2024 Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and 2024 1 Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est	3 4 5	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte	nline meetings and events, ention to alternative analyti	cal prote	1	Yes Yes Yes	No	8	x x x x x
added No(s) risk mitigation measures? materialise? U1 08 Apr 2024 Limited Scalability of Suspect Screening and 2024 1 Implementation of SoA workflows on well-est	3 4 5	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte	nline meetings and events, ention to alternative analyti	cal prote	1	Yes Yes Yes	No	2	x x x x x x x
2024 climited statebility of suspect screening and 1 implementation of sus worknows on wett-est	3 4 5 fores	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples een Risks Date the Description	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte Developme Work	nline meetings and events. ention to alternative analyti nt of a common sampling str	cal prote ategy (T	1 1 1 1 State of the	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No Play State of the Pl	C C C S State of the Pk	x x x x x
2024	3 4 5 fores	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples een Risk was Date the Risk was Description Risk was Description	 1, 2, 3 1	O Shift of atte Developme Work Package	nline meetings and events. ention to alternative analyti nt of a common sampling str	cal prote ategy (T	1 1 1 1 State of the	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes State of the prisk mitigat	No No No No Play: State of the P Did your risk materialise:	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	x x x x x
Yes No to the test of test	3 4 5 fores	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples een Risks Date the Risk was added 08 Apr Limited Scalability of Suspect Screet	 1, 2, 3 1 1	O Shift of att Developme Work Package No(s)	nline meetings and events. ention to alternative analyti nt of a common sampling str Risk Mitigation Measu	cal prote ategy (T	1 1 1 State of the Period	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes State of the prisk mitigat	No No No No Play: State of the P Did your risk materialise:	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	iforeseen Ris ay Actions
1 Yes N Validate	3 4 5 fores	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples een Risks Date the Risk was added 08 Apr Limited Scalability of Suspect Screet	 1, 2, 3 1 1	O Shift of att Developme Work Package No(s)	nline meetings and events. ention to alternative analyti nt of a common sampling str Risk Mitigation Measu	cal prote ategy (T	1 1 1 State of the Period	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes State of the Did you ap risk mitagenerative State of the state	No No No No Play: State of the P Did your risk materialise:	average Add Un average by average Add Un average by average Add Un by average Add U	storeseen Rfs ay Actions
	3 4 5 fores	International travel restrictions (M,L). The LC-HRMS analytical protocol for combined t Low representativeness of stormwater samples een Risks Date the Risk was added 08 Apr Limited Scalability of Suspect Screet	 1, 2, 3 1 1	O Shift of att Developme Work Package No(s)	nline meetings and events. ention to alternative analyti nt of a common sampling str Risk Mitigation Measu	cal prote ategy (T	1 1 1 State of the Period	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes State of the prisk mitigat	No No No No Play: State of the P Did your risk materialise:	average Add Un average by average Add Un average by average Add Un by average Add U	storeseen Rfs ay Actions

Figure 3 Snapshot of D4RUNOFF Risk Matrix (in the participant portal)