

About this document

Deliverable lead beneficiary: Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology Spain SL (RMIT)

Dissemination Level: PU (Public)

Date of publication: 10 December 2019

Authors:

Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology Spain SL (RMIT): Ferne Edwards, Nevelina Pachova, Jago Dodson

Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin (UBER): Ina Säumel, Suhana Reddy, Thomas Wachtel

Contributors: (in alphabetical order)

Ajuntament de Sant Feliu de Llobregat (Santfeliu de LL): Raquel Gil Eiroa, Sergio Torres Giménez

Association Tunisienne de Developpement Durable: La Recherche en Action (REACT): Latifa

Bousselmi, Lamia Bouziri

Commune de Carthage (Carthage): Karim Malki

Departmental Government of Montevideo- Urban Development– Public Spaces and Buildings

Division: Mariela Pacheco

Facultad de Agronomía, e IMM (Jardín Botánico): Stella Faroppa

Gemeente Rotterdam (Rotterdam): Katelien van den Berge, Mohamed el Massoudi

University of Hertfordshire: Susan Parham

Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation (Letchworth GCHF): David Ames

Obcina Sempeter-Vrtojba (SEMPETER): Nina Fiorelli, Blanka Šuler

Oslo Kommune (Oslo): Cecilie Bergmann, Stephanie Degenhardt,

Ministerio de Educacion y Cultura (Montevideo MEC): Claudia Romano, Maria Noel

Hernández Graciela Morelli, Any Paz

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Wohnen (Berlin): Sören Bott, Inken Schmütz

Unidad de Resiliencia y Planificación de la IMM: Gabriella Feola, Soledad Mantero

Ville de Lomé (LOMÉ): Aridja Frank, Degbe Praise

Other contributors: Komla Anovo, Romy Ortiz

Quality assurance:

Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin (UBER): Chiara Bearzotti

For any comments please contact: edicitnet-coordinator@eurtd.com

The document reflects only the views of the authors and the Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and the European Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information that the document contains.

Table of Contents

Summary	4
Introduction	4
Methodology	4
Outcomes	5
Risk register at city level	5
Aggregated risk management matrix insights	5
Lessons learnt and recommendations	6
Top-five aggregated risks	6
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>GLOSSARY</u>	<u>9</u>

Summary

Risk management is crucial for ensuring sustainable outcomes of the EdiCitNet project. To minimise negative interferences, WP1 Urban Governance and Network Infrastructure team asked all EdiCitNet City Team coordinators to list the major risks in the categories (political, social, economic, environmental, organisational risk) that each City Team faces to achieve its goals and indicate the likely probability and impact of the identified risk (high, medium or low), and propose possible measures for preventing the risk or mitigating the expected impacts. All results were aggregated in a table and some mitigation strategies were drafted. City-based risk management matrices were shared among all cities and partners to encourage shared learning and mutual support with anticipating and solving problems. Managing risks and updating the risk management matrices on a regular basis was included as a responsibility in the Terms of Reference for each local EdiCitNet city team.

Introduction

Risk is any unexpected event (positive or negative) that can affect your project and jeopardise the achievement of its goals. This can include any relevant factors for the project such as people, processes, technology, and resources. Project risks are risks that have a potential effect on at least one project objective. No project is ever without risk and risk assessments, such as this one, employ a process to identify, assess and manage risks to minimize their impact on the project¹.

This report describes the first draft of a city specific aggregate risk matrix based on perceived potential and actual risks for each participating city and contributes to a whole-of-project risk analysis for the EdiCitNet project. It forms the basis of an ongoing, dynamic document which identifies, prepares and shares risk management strategies amongst cities and Consortium partners across the lifetime of the project.

Methodology

This aggregate risk matrix has developed through the following processes:

1. A co-design workshop in Andernach (May 2019), to identify and discuss unexpected risks and challenges for Edible City Solutions (ECS) in the City Teams (*world café format*), including possible strategies to address them. Based on Deliverable D8.3 “Risk Management Plan”², several risks were proposed as an example to the City Team Coordinators. This was done via a pre-designed list (as part of the Institutional Context Summary Sheet) aimed at assessing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, but also with the aim to rank the pre-selected risks.

¹ Project Management Institute, Inc. (2008) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*, 4th ed. NewtownSquare, PA: Project Management Institute, Inc., 273.

² All public deliverables are available in the EdiCitNet community in Zenodo: <https://zenodo.org/communities/edicitnet>

2. The Institutional Context Summary Sheets (Deliverable D1.4) were sent to all City Team coordinators. The City Team coordinators were asked to list the major political, social, economic, environmental and organisational risks that each City Team could face to achieve its goals, to indicate the likely probability and impact of the identified risk (high, medium or low), and to propose possible measures for preventing the risk or for mitigating the expected impacts. Examples were given in the form (see critical evaluation of applied methodology in the outcome section).
3. The City Team coordinators were encouraged to complete this table with the participation of members of their City Team. Some conversations were held with City Team representatives, when possible to further elaborate on their understandings of risks. However, this was often not possible due to time constraints. This initial city-level risk assessment indicated some risk management strategies and proposed responsibilities towards developing tangible, effective risk management systems and processes. However, the responsibilities have to be assigned in multi-lateral evaluation meetings in a holistic follow-up. This is usually not a top-down decision, but a lateral approach elaborated through participation of all relevant stakeholders in the development of the best strategies, thus sharing responsibilities. As all risks are identified and monitored at a global project level, the project management structure is carrying the responsibility. As far as the urban governance and network infrastructure are concerned, the responsibility is shared between WP1 and WP8, as stated in deliverable D8.3.
4. Indicators for key risks were then drafted. The indicators aim to give a numerical value that can be measured to reveal increasing or decreasing risk.

Outcomes

Risk register at city level

To begin the risk management process, examples of possible risks were suggested for cities to adapt and add to from their specific contexts. Each City Team coordinator assessed the pre-selected risks. This list draw attention to very specific and narrow portfolio of risks. This influencing methodology gives indeed an overview on the ranking of specific risks which were proposed but it lacks a holistic approach to a risk management exercise. However, the ranking of similar risk is done by assigning them probability and impact numbers and a comparison can be drawn across the cities to show who encounters similar problems. This can provide a base for future knowledge sharing activities.

Aggregated risk management matrix insights

The aggregated risk management matrix pools the cities' risks into one table. The team in WP1 recommends that these risk assessments are performed at least annually. For the cities, this activity can be implemented together with the annual revision of the Terms of References (Deliverable D1.2).

Each city's risk register and the linked aggregate risk matrix are dynamic documents to be uploaded to the virtual project space of each city so all stakeholders can regularly check

theirs' and others' degree of risks and possible tools to manage them. This process has to be accompanied closely by the teams in the WP8 Coordination and Management. As the whole-of-project risk management system develops over the 60 months of the project, we see new insights of risk minimisation and management being shared across both the cities and the work packages as the project develops.

Lessons learnt and recommendations

As this is the first version of a comprehensive aggregated risk matrix produced by the teams in the EdiCitNet project, we have learnt a number of lessons in the process, and these can be taken into consideration for future development of the project activities:

- In the future, more types of risks could be potentially added to the provided examples. To develop data received from this first round, we suggest in the next round that cities both respond to identified risks and revisit and update the matrix by adding risk factors that might be specific to their situation or that might have emerged due to changes in the project needs and context since the previous review. The matrix should also be updated with the deletion of risks which have been eliminated. Over time, this could then build both a comparable and extensive framework.
- Some risks fall into multiple categories, requiring a peer-review process to add clarifications and to remove duplications.
- We recommend that each city reviews other cities' risks as this could encourage cities to provide more detailed responses while supporting knowledge sharing across the project.
- We suggest that more attention is placed on gathering data from the Follower Cities in the upcoming months.
- The monitoring of the risks should be performed in WP8 Coordination and Management, together with the updates of the Del. 8.3 to be submitted with the periodic reports to the European Commission.

Top-five aggregated risks

H = high risk, corresponding to a score of 3 points. M = medium risk, corresponding to a score of 2 points. L = low risk, corresponding to a score of 1 point.

Highest to lowest risks	Numerical aggregate	Aggregate city risk level H=3, M=2, L=1	Category	Cities	City risk factors	Indicators	Responsible
1	23	H (3X3) + M (5X2) + L (4X1)	Political	Oslo (H), Carthage (H), Lome (H), Montevideo (H) + Sempeter (M), Lome (M), Letchworth (M), Berlin (M), Andernach (M) + Rotterdam (L), Ajuntament de Sant Feliu de Llobregat (L)	Change of government	Frequency of elections per annum	City Team Coordinator, EdiCitNet Coordinator, Municipal administration

2	23	H (7X3) + M (1X2)	Economic	Lome (H), Sempeter (H), Carthage (H), Berlin (H), Ajuntament de Sant Feliu de Llobregat (H), Andernach (H), Rotterdam (H), Montevideo (H) + Letchworth (M)	High dependence on public financing to ensure the continuity of ECS	Number of diverse economic sources of income to support ECS	EdiCitNet Coordination team, City Team Coordinator, WP6, Municipality (including green department), SMEs, external associations
3	14	H (3X3) + M (2X2) + L (1X1)	Organisational	Lome (H), Andernach (H), Sempeter (H) + Ajuntament de Sant Feliu de Llobregat (M), Letchworth (M), Montevideo (M) + Carthage (L)	Coordination difficulties due to working schedules and lack of time	Diversity of communication strategies both within City Teams and across the project	City Team Coordinator
4	10	H (2X3) + M (2X2)	Political	Rotterdam (H) + Berlin (M), Lome (M), Andernach (M)	Politics loose interest in ECS over time	No. of strategies for citizen involvement to influence ECS policy	City Team Coordinator, Municipal administration, WP1
5	10	H (2X3) + M (2X2)	Social	Letchworth (H), Carthage (H) + Sempeter (M)	Limited interest on behalf of marginal groups to engage in ECS (particularly those in deprived areas and lower incomes)	Number of different pathways for marginalised groups to engage in ECS activities	City Team Coordinator, Research partners in EdiCitNet City Team, WP1, across Consortium

For Montevideo: The classification provided above reflects the situation on 02/12/2019. After the national elections at the end of November 2019, there will be a change of government as of 01/03/2020. Nevertheless, the technical teams will continue working on the project. Moreover, there will be held municipal elections in May 2020, which may result in a change of priorities in the Agenda of the City of Montevideo.

Conclusion

This report provides a first draft of a city specific aggregated risk matrix based on perceived potential and actual risks for each participating city. This deliverable contributes to a whole-of-project risk analysis for the EdiCitNet project and thus constitutes the basis for an ongoing, dynamic process for identifying, preparing and sharing risk management strategies among the cities and the Consortium partners during the lifetime of the project. This document serves as a first basis on which to identify, assess, manage and monitor risks across the project.

According to the feedback of the City Teams, a holistic risk management exercise has to be implemented as soon as possible.

The present document is highlighting the top 5 risks of a longer risk matrix. The full version of the list of the outcomes of the aggregate risk matrix is a confidential document accessible to the partners only. Some of the City Teams had expressed their concern in disclosing in a public deliverable the full list of risks, thus it was decided to remove from this final report the full version of the matrix, for preserving the confidentiality of the data, and to include just the five top level risks.

The full version of the aggregated risk matrix is uploaded to the EdiCitNet online platform for allowing future modifications and for sharing the knowledge for risk management among the cities participating in the EdiCitNet project.

At the project level, risks are monitored in WP8, on the basis of the feedback provided by the Work Package Leads to the Executive Board. Risks are later compiled and reported by the Coordinator to the European Commission together with the periodic reports.

Glossary

Abbreviation	Description
D	Deliverable
FRC	Front Runner City
FC	Follower City
WP	Work Package
ECS	Edible City Solution
SFLL	Ajuntament de Sant Feliu de Llobregat
ICSS	Institutional Context summary sheet (D1.4)

About the EdiCitNet project

EdiCitNet is demonstrating innovative nature-based solutions (NBS). Edible City Solutions (ECS) are going one step further: We include the whole chain of urban food production, distribution and utilisation for inclusive urban regeneration and address societal challenges such as mass urbanisation, social inequality and climate change and resource protection in cities.





Thank you!



Twitter: @edicitnet



Insta: edicitnet



edicitnet-coordinator@eurtd.com



EdiCitNet has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 776665



Reports in #openaccess #OA in Zenodo
<https://zenodo.org/communities/edicitnet/>