



Project risk assessment

*WP6 – Management, Coordination and
Dissemination*

Deliverable 6.1

29th November 2023



Deliverable Title	Project risk assessment
Deliverable number	D6.1
Brief Description	Critical risks analysis of UPTAKE including the provision of measures to properly manage adverse situations along with the evolution of the project (risk management)
WP number	WP6
Lead Beneficiary	FONDAZIONE CMCC
Author(s)	Fabiana Gerardi, Soheil Shayegh, Mohamed Abdalla, Pete Smith, Agnieszka Boratyńska, Sabine Fuss
Deliverable Due Date	30/11/2023
Actual Delivery Date	29/11/2023
Nature of the Deliverable	R – Document, report
Dissemination Level	PU - Public
KeyWords	Critical risks, Mitigation measures, Risk management

Date	Ver.	Contributors	Pages





LIST OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	4
2. UPTAKE's risk assessment	5
3. Risks management strategy	7
3.1 Identification process	8
3.2 Monitoring and response	9
4 Critical risks and mitigation measures	11
5. Conclusions	15





1. Executive Summary

The goal of the Critical risks analysis of UPTAKE is to increase the project's success by identifying the potential adverse situations and providing the mitigation measures to properly manage them, along with the evolution of the project.

UPTAKE holds very ambitious goals: it aims at generating an open and interactive **CDR roadmap explorer** to investigate strategies that are resilient to risks of failure and disruption and minimize adverse impacts on society, the economy, and the environment, aiming for a just, inclusive, and sustainable transition. Therefore, it is essential to understand **potential risks and have an appropriate process to manage them.**

This deliverable contains the **details of the project risk assessment**, exploring, identifying, and handling all relevant risks related to the research and the strategic process to manage them.

KEYWORDS

Critical risks, Mitigation measures, Risk management





2. UPTAKE's risk assessment

The UPTAKE project aims to develop resilient **CDR strategies** based on strengthened scientific evidence on the social, technological, economic, and environmental characteristics of CDR technologies and their interplay. The scientific evidence will be collated into a **CDR knowledge inventory**, openly accessible to the science, policy, and business communities. Together with improved CDR modules in climate-energy models, a **CDR roadmap explorer** will be developed to help identify resilient and implementable **CDR portfolios that enable net-zero strategies**.

Given the project's ambitious goals, UPTAKE's risk assessment carefully examines what could cause harm or what the project faces during its lifespan.

Since the proposal stage, the Consortium **pre-identified potential risks** and **evaluated their probability** and severity (their impact) with a scale from insignificant impact (Low) to very likely impact (High). Furthermore, identifying and evaluating the probability and severity of potential project risks helps put **risk management** procedures in place and control risks by implementing **mitigation measures**.

On the one hand, the UPTAKE members identified potential **risks related to the project's general management** that could impact all WPs. On the other hand, due to the heterogeneous area of research, the Consortium identified potential risks that differ from WP to WP concerning the **specific area of research**.

The UPTAKE's potential risks can be grouped into the following areas:

- Management-related risks





These risks are associated with the ability to manage the project effectively, the coordination and liability of all Parties involved, the achievement of the objectives on time, and the overall performance of partners during implementation of the project.

- Research-related risks

These risks are related to research tasks that may prove harder to reach WP objectives (e.g., due to missing data, difficulties associated with stakeholder engagement, etc.).

A complete and detailed list of critical risks will follow in session 4.



3. Risks management strategy

According to the Grant Agreement (GA) WP6 defines the monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure the **integrity of the scientific activities** and deliverables of the project and to identify delays or problems with specific tasks sufficiently early so that correcting measures can be implemented. This includes the **provision of measures** to properly manage adverse situations along with the evolution of the project (risk management)¹.



The project's coordinator and the project's governance bodies² will be responsible for the project activities implementation, including **risk identification and mitigation measure** application as one of the related tasks.

¹ The UPTAKE Grant Agreement no. 101081521, Annex I DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION (PART A), Work Package 6

² The UPTAKE Consortium Agreement (session 6 – Governance) establishes the organizational structure of the Consortium as follows: The project steering committee (PSC) is composed of at least one representative from each Party and operates as the ultimate decision-making body of the Consortium; the Coordination Board (CB) composed by WP leaders and co-leaders, in charge of the operational management of the project; and the Advisory Board (AB) composed by external experts and stakeholders, supporting the project implementation and quality control.



3.1 Identification process

The UPTAKE's Coordination Board (CB), composed by WP leaders and Co-Leaders and chaired by the Project Coordinator, will be responsible for the project implementation, including **risk identification and mitigation** as an essential task. Given its **operational role** it is the executive body of the project, in charge of the execution of the workflow at WP level and the monitor of the effective and efficient implementation of the project.

The first identification of the project's risks took place during the proposal preparation, and during the negotiation phase, all risks identified were re-examined and updated during the GA preparation. This process will last during the **project's life cycle** and **will be iterative**.

Each partner in the project is responsible for **reporting potential risks** (and proposing remedial actions) to the CB by informing first their WP leader and the Project Coordinator in a timely fashion.

The CB, together with that partner, has the responsibility to **assess the risk**: identify and evaluate the type of risk considering the probability that the risk will materialize, and the associated impact on the project; and it has the responsibility to advice the Project steering Committee (PSC) on ways to arrange tasks to manage that risk (if any).

The CB will provide **strategic guidance** on how the problem should be addressed and the risk managed and **take actions and decisions where needed**. All risks that can be managed at this level should be addressed as soon as possible.

Significant risks will be reported to the Project Officer of the European Commission.





3.2 Monitoring and response

The mechanisms to **monitor and proactively respond to any project risks** are listed as follows:

1) scheduling regular project meetings during the project's life span. CMCC will organize these meetings: at least once a year, the PSC and the AB meetings (back-to-back with the project meetings), while the CB meetings will be organized bi-monthly during the project's life. Extraordinary meetings can be organized for all adverse situations or at any time upon specific request. Furthermore, before deliverables and milestones that are critical for the linkages between different WPs, specific meetings will take place. CMCC will convene additional remote meetings as needed to ensure the timely and efficient delivery of all projected-related outputs and research. WP leaders will organize online meetings for their respective WPs as needed.

2) the development of a knowledge and data management plan;

3) the integration of data quality assurance mechanisms.

All these measures will allow a **continuous process of monitoring** and updating throughout the lifetime of the project. A gender-balanced Advisory Board (AB) will also be appointed, aiming at regular participation of Advisory Board members in project meetings to





allow for **direct insights and feedback into project activities to improve the quality of the research outputs.**

Intermediate internal reports, including critical risk evaluation, will be prepared to anticipate possible problems.

With the risk register in place, monitoring and managing the identified risks will be performed directly with the technical work. The risk register will be **reviewed and updated constantly** with a frequency based on the severity of the risk.



4 Critical risks and mitigation measures

Table 01 shows the list of risks pre-identified during the project proposal development phase. Since the start of the project, no new risks have yet been identified. Nevertheless, the UPTAKE's CB consists of the project coordinator and the WP leaders and co-leaders are constantly monitoring the project progress to identify and analyse new risks and implement mitigation measures to manage their impact on the project's outcomes.

Table 01 – Critical risks & risk management strategy³

Risk number	Description	Work Package	Proposed mitigation measures
1	Continuation of the COVID19 pandemic's restrictions for the organization of stakeholder's and projects meeting in presence (Medium; Low)	All WPs	The partners have acquired an extensive experience in organizing events and online formats (e.g., webinars, workshops, consortium meetings, ...) during the last two years. This will avoid any delay or problems in implementing project meetings and events

³ Grant Agreement: 101081521 – UPTAKE – HORIZON-CL5-2022-D1-01-two-stage, List of critical risks table.

2	Delays within and between WPs tasks, milestones, and deliverables (Low; Medium)	All WPs	Continuous monitoring of the project implementation by the Project Consortium (PC) and PSC (Project Steering Committee). If some critical situations emerge, the PC will convene an extraordinary meeting of the PSC for immediate and corrective action
3	UK association with Horizon Europe will not be in force by the time of the signature of the grant agreement (High; Low)	All WPs	Extension of current short-term guarantee by UK government covering UK beneficiaries on funded Horizon Europe grants, as showed on 4 Feb 2022 by UK Science Minister. In the likely event of no UK association to Horizon Europe, UNIABDN and USTRATH will be financed from this UK guarantee fund and be included in the Consortium as Associated Partners. In an unlikely event where the UK guarantee fund is not available to them, the tasks allocated to UNIABDN partners will be re-allocated to IIASA, and tasks allocated to USTRATH will be reallocated to CMCC (partners sharing similar expertise)
4	Limited participation of stakeholders in CDR stakeholder forum (Low; Medium)	WP1	To ensure participation, all partners will leverage their strong networks within the four types of target groups (Research, Policy, Business, Civil Society) To reduce the stakeholders' fatigue all partners actively seek to connect the CDR stakeholder forum to other meetings, exploiting synergies with other projects and networks. REFORM and CMCC team members have an excellent track record of organising and promoting stakeholder engagement activities, as manifested in the organization of various high-level events like IAMC, IEW, ECEMP etc. To attract and maintain

			stakeholder participation, REFORM and CMCC will ensure that the information provided to them is relevant, targeted, regularly posted, and up to date.
5	Generation of CDR supply curves delayed because of multiple CDR options, multiple involved partners, and multiple methods (Medium; Medium)	WP2	A harmonised protocol for consistent database/typology/characterisation of CDR assessments and reporting will be developed and shared with all partners involved. MCC's expertise in developing protocols for CDR assessments (MCC is driving a community effort on systematic reviews of CDR technologies) will help keep the risk of having incomplete or incoherent information very low.
6	Full CDR integration in IAM frameworks has not been tested yet and might deem infeasible or impractical at the end. (Low; Low)	WP3	Continuous monitoring of the process will allow to adjust the development process and potentially scale back the integration to a degree which makes most sense to ensure correct model representation. Some models used have already developed CDR modules.
7	Social, political, equitable CDR implementability indicators/constraints are diverse and might be hard to quantify for modelling in WP5 (Medium; Low)	WP4	Besides quantitative indicators, a set of qualitative narratives will be proposed to facilitate the consistent incorporation of SSH findings into integrated assessment modelling frameworks
8	Several tasks in WP5 (T5.2-5.4) depend on the contributions of several partners - increasing the risks that one team cannot deliver in time (Medium; Medium)	WP5	For most topics, more than 1 team can provide the relevant data so that the risk of delivery failure is mitigated

9	Key project personnel (Coordinator or WP leaders) will become unavailable due to unexpected events (Low; Medium)	All WPs	All WP leaders including the project coordinator (CMCC) have included at least 2 senior and highly qualified people in the list of their personnel to conduct their tasks. In case of emergency, the second person in line will step up to guarantee the continuation of the project's activities without interruption.
10	Underperformance of partners (Low; Low)	All WPs	The partners are all experienced and reputable research entities. In case of underperformance of any partner, the project coordinator and the Coordination Board will hold a special meeting with that partner and will review the performance and quality of the performed work and will help the partner address the shortcomings.
11	Conflict between partners (Low; Low)	All WPs	Most of the partners have collaborated with each other on numerous projects in the past and have a continuous working relationship with a strong sense of understanding. In case of conflict, the project coordinator will mediate and resolve the issue. In case the conflict involves the coordinator, the PSC (Project Steering Committee) will get involved to resolve the problem.



5. Conclusions

This deliverable addresses **UPTAKE's project risk assessment** related to the main activities of its implementation, both management and research. It must relate to the actual work and require continuous monitoring.

At this project's stage, only a few risks have been pre-identified with a medium probability occurrence, while most risks are classified as Low. This helps to facilitate their management. The analysis for each risk on what may cause it, its triggers, or reasons for occurring, and the corresponding mitigation measures have been carefully elaborated, taking care of the **roles and responsibilities** of each partner.

The whole UPTAKE strategy will help **control and proactively monitor** any risk that may affect the project implementation during the project's lifespan, taking all necessary actions without impacting on the overall project.

