



S H E R P A

Shaping the ethical dimensions of smart information systems– a
European perspective (SHERPA)

Deliverable No. 6.2
Risk register (UPDATED)

20th September 2019

This project has received funding from the
European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme
Under Grant Agreement no. 786641



Document Control

Deliverable	D6.2 Risk register UPDATED
WP/Task Related	WP6 Project management
Delivery Date	Follow up deliverable as a result of P1 review
Dissemination Level	Public
Lead Partner	DMU
Contributors	All
Reviewers	Bernd Stahl
Abstract	This revised deliverable explains how the SHERPA project continues to ensure that risks are identified throughout the project. It outlines the critical risks for implementation as well as the proposed risk mitigation measures for some new risks which have been identified as a result of: the period 1 review and on-going activities from work packages and tasks.
Key Words	Risks, mitigation

Revision History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Reviewer(s)	Notes
0.1	31/08/2019	Bend Stahl and Nitika Bhalla	All	First submission
0.2	27/08/2019	Nitika Bhalla and Doris Schroeder	Bernd Stahl, Laurence Brooks, Tilimbe Jiya, Renate Klar	First revision post period 1 review
0.3	18/09/2019	Nitika Bhalla	Bernd Stahl	Final version for submission



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
List of tables	4
REVISION NOTES	4
List of acronyms/abbreviations	4
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	5
1. METHODOLOGY	6
2. CRITICAL RISKS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	6
3. PROGRESS	11



Executive Summary

As a result of the period 1 review and feedback, this deliverable has been reviewed and updated with new risks. This updated deliverable outlines the critical risks for implementation as well as the proposed risk mitigation measures.

Key risks covered include; gender and diversity balance of SHERPA stakeholder board, challenges in reaching stakeholders in certain fields, adapting academic work to a policy audience, challenges with budget amongst partners and advocacy.

Revision Notes

In response to the first periodic review the SHERPA consortium discussed and updated the risk register. The revised register is displayed in section 3. New risks that were added as a result of the review are shown in red font. Some of the initial risks that were specific to WP1 are no longer relevant and were retired.

In addition to this update of the risk register document, the consortium agreed to include the risk register as a standing item on the agenda of all physical GA meetings. These meetings will be used to review risks and mitigation strategies and update the register. The updated risk register will be included in future periodic reports.

List of tables

Table 1: List of acronyms/abbreviations

Table 2: Glossary of terms

Table 3: Critical risks for implementation

Table 4: Previous risks

List of acronyms/abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
PRINCE2	Projects in controlled environments
GA	General assembly (face to face consortium meetings)



GDPR	General data protection regulation
QA	Quality assurance
HLEG	High level expert group

Table 1: List of acronyms/abbreviations

Glossary of terms

Term	Explanation
Risk level	Threat event category – i.e. high, medium or low
Risk probability	The likelihood of the risk occurring
Risk mitigation measures	Steps taken to reduce the threat of the risk

Table 2: Glossary of terms



1. Methodology

In order to assess the likely impact of risks occurring during the lifetime of the project, we have used a qualitative PRINCE2 approach. This was done by proactively identifying risks before the initiation of the project, and now as the project is in its active phase new risks are being identified. This process was carried out by the project consortium by reviewing SHERPA’s vision, scope and deliverables in as full detail as possible. During the course of the project the risk register is reviewed at every physical GA meeting by the consortium. This allows consortium partners to discuss new risks which have arose as a result of on-going activities from work packages and tasks.

The table below has now been updated with **new risks** and their mitigation measures in place. The new risks are highlighted in red.

Please note: the remaining table containing the critical risks for implementation have been reviewed and agreed by the project consortium.

The current deliverable contains a snapshot of the risk register as agreed by the consortium during the preparation of the review response. An updated version, following discussions during the physical GA meetings, will be included in periodic reports.

2. Critical risks for implementation

Below are the potential risks identified during the lifetime of project SHERPA.

Description of risk	Affected WPs	Risk level	Risk probability (1 (low) to 5 (high))	Proposed risk mitigation measures
Lack of gender balance diversity within the stakeholder board and network	WP2	High	3	It is vital to achieve gender balance within the stakeholder board to ensure that the views of the board members is representative of society as a whole. Currently active recruitment of females experts is required. This will be achieved by; approaching existing female contacts, networking via conferences/events and reaching out to potential stakeholders using online methods that are GDPR compliant.
Challenges in	WP2	Medium	3	To ensure that the stakeholder board



reaching out to stakeholders in certain fields		/ High		is well represented and cover a broad range of expertise. The consortium will focus on contacting experts from particular areas of domain that are currently lacking within the stakeholder board. Recruitment will be similar to that described above, ie. approaching existing contacts, networking via conferences/events and reaching out to potential stakeholders using online methods that are compliant with GDPR.
Non-adherence to impact-related elements of previously agreed Quality Assurance Plan	All	High	3	Ascertaining via a short survey whether QA criteria are not well aligned with SHERPA expectations (June 2019), short video by QA Lead about problem (June 2019), alignment of QA problem with policy audience challenge and co-operation of QA lead with impact task force. Design of SHERPA brief format by QA lead (Aug 2019).
Partners run out of budget	All	High	1	Monitoring of budget will be carried out throughout the project to keep track of expenditure and resources.
SHERPA is 'slow' in communicating its findings	All	High	1	Constant engagement with HLEG and collaboration with SIENNA and PANELFIT will ensure that remains the project findings are dynamic and achieves impact.
Challenges in reaching out to policy makers during advocacy	All	High	3	Communication and dissemination is key, such as the artistic representation gives greater access to a more diverse audience including policy makers.
GDPR requirements for privacy notices and opt-in procedures could hinder recruitment of newsletter subscribers and use of	WP5	Medium	3	As of year 1 of the project, no issues have arisen regarding newsletter subscribers. Our stakeholder list currently has approx. 1000 contacts and is continuing to grow as more people join our network. However, a strategy to mitigate this risk will be developed by WP1, WP2



stakeholder contact list developed by WP2.				and WP5 together should the problem arise.
Inadequate policymakers mapping process and inadequate analysis of EU and national legislation process	WP5/All	High	4	Inadequate policymakers mapping might result in missed advocacy opportunities. To mitigate this risk, EBS will very carefully plan each advocacy initiative taking into account the political context in the EU (both at the EU and national level) and the targeted audience. In addition, EBS will conduct the ACT-ON model assessment to ensure that advocacy will be carried out in the most effective and informed way.
Inadequate ACT-ON model analysis	WP5/All	High	4	The ACT-ON model will serve as the main tool to gather contacts for advocacy purposes. An inadequate and incomplete list might slow down the advocacy efforts or shift advocacy resources in the wrong direction. The mitigation measures will include four reviews of the ACT-ON model tool to ensure that all partners agree with EBS' actions.
Lack of interest in attending the final SHERPA event	All	Medium	3	In October 2021, EBS will organise a final conference, bringing together all stakeholders interested in the SHERPA project findings and advocacy outcomes. One of the risks of organising a conference in Brussels is the number of other events occurring simultaneously that SHERPA will have to compete against. This may result in a low number of key policymakers present and thus lost engagement opportunities. The best way to mitigate this risk would be to keep stakeholders informed about the final conference during each advocacy meeting, as well as through communications and dissemination activities.



Internal risk – lack of consistency between communications, dissemination and advocacy efforts	All	Low	2	SHERPA has already mitigated this risk through a detailed DCEAP ensuring that each section of the plan complements others. Furthermore, project meetings and WP5 meetings work to maintain a line of communication between the communications, disseminations, and advocacy tasks. As advocacy goes hand-in-hand with communications and disseminations, EBS will stay in regular contact with SHERPA partners via WP5 calls to closely monitor the message delivery and to stay consistent and transparent.
Brexit	All	High	5	The SHERPA consortium contains four UK-based partners, including the coordinator. A hard Brexit that would cut off the UK from H2020 would therefore constitute a significant risk. This risk is mitigated by the UK government’s guarantee to continue funding all H2020 activities that were awarded prior to Brexit. However, Brexit might make it impossible for the coordinator to be UK- based. Should this be the case, coordination will be taken over by the University of Twente - Professor Philip Brey who is an experienced EU project coordinator (SATORI, SIENNA).
Low participation	WP3 Task 3.4 - standardisation	Medium	3	A key characteristic of standards is that they are developed by all parties concerned. It will be important to get stakeholders to actively participate in the defining of the scope and the development of the standard. A stakeholder analysis will be made based on the methodology of the Dutch standardisation institute and communication materials will be developed. Partners will make their best efforts to draw participation



				from their networks (including the network of CEN with many stakeholder groups).
No consensus possible	WP3 Task 3. 4 - standardi sation	Medium	3	The consortium views this as low risk, and will work hard to achieve consensus. This will be mitigated by additional discussions and meetings, if needed. Normally, a CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA) reserves time for two plenary meetings, but in the task, there will be time for an additional consultation (in person or online).
Lack of agreement on outcomes/ recommendations	WP4	Medium	3	The evaluation, validation and prioritisation work will include key stakeholders from the outset, and it is more likely that they will agree on the problem description and criteria for evaluation.
Poor response rate and other inherent difficulties - Delphi study	WP2	Medium	3	Partners involved in the Delphi study have successful experience of carrying out such exercises. The partners will carefully consider the subject selection and optimise the timeframe for completing the study, prior to its initiation. Additional precautions pertaining to low response rates, unintentionally guiding feedback, and surveying experts about their limited knowledge of the topic rather than soliciting their expert judgements will be built into the design and implementation of the study.
Lack of interest from project stakeholders, and challenge to compile a sufficiently large and representative list.	WP2, 5	Low/ Medium	3	WP2 focuses on stakeholder identification, analysis and consultation – three key elements of successful CSAs. Stakeholders will be involved in every step in our approach using a variety of means: interviews, focus groups, Delphi study, survey, meetings, workshops communication actions, Stakeholder Board. Compiling a contact list is tedious work, but the partners will need to redouble their efforts to develop a



				<p>sufficiently large contact list for partners to succeed in this and other tasks.</p> <p>It will be problematic to share personal details of stakeholders with all partners, especially due to GDPR. It is better for partners to contact stakeholders individually (unless they are on the stakeholder board). Stakeholders can decide for themselves if they wish to be in the database, they can have an option to opt in when signing up to the newsletter.</p>
Delays in meeting milestones and deliverable delivery	WP6	Medium	3	<p>The project coordination team will regularly monitor project activities and monthly virtual meetings, as well as periodic physical meetings, which will be used to identify potential problems early and discuss and agree potential avenues for remedial action. WP leaders will ensure all tasks progress per schedule and take corrective action (in consultation with the co-ordinator) if they encounter problems.</p>
One or more partners is unable to produce work of sufficient quality in a timely manner.	All	Low	1	<p>All current partners in the project have good track records in EC project work, and are a good fit for the work they will undertake in SHERPA. Nevertheless, the project will manage this risk by ensuring there is regular contact between the project co-ordinator and the partners. If this risk becomes serious, early remedial action will be taken, e.g., either to have another representative from the organisation assist in the production of the work or, in extreme cases, the work may be taken away from the partner and a new partner installed to take over (in agreement with the project coordinator and amendment to the grant agreement). In addition, the tested Quality Assurance System ensures timely suggestions for improvements of major deliverables.</p>



				<p>This risk has been deemed as high, as it did materialise in the form of non-performance of a partner in M2 of the project. However better engagement of partners will reduce the probability of this risk materialising again.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Table 3: Critical risks for implementation

Previous risks now resolved or redundant

Description of risk	Affected WPs	Risk level	Risk probability	Proposed risk mitigation measures
Shortage of stakeholders to comment on scenarios in Task 1.2, 2.4	WP1, WP2	Medium	1	It is not only a challenge to get a sufficiently large stakeholder list, but also a well-balanced list that represent all the different types of stakeholders adequately. Partners will need to contact stakeholders from different background and experiences. The extended contact list will need to be utilised to draw appropriate stakeholders to the scenario development process.
Shortage of stakeholders to comment on scenarios in Task 1.2, 2.4	WP1, WP2	Medium	1	It is not only a challenge to get a sufficiently large stakeholder list, but also a well-balanced list that represent all the different types of stakeholders adequately. Partners will need to contact stakeholders from different background and experiences. The extended contact list will need to be utilised to draw appropriate stakeholders to the scenario development process.

Table 4: Previous risks



3. Progress

The risk register will be continually reviewed by the project consortium and new risks are being highlighted as the project progresses. As a result this deliverable (D6.2 Risk register) will be revised at M24, M36 and M42.

