D1.6: Risk Management Plan

WP1 – Project Management & Quality Assurance

Authors: Stergios Asteriou, George Karavias, George Voutsinos, Stylianos Sylignakis

Disclaimer

Any dissemination of results reflects only the author's view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Copyright message

Document Information

Grant Agreement Number	821964	Acronym	BEACON
Full Title	Boosting Agricultural Insurance based on Earth Observation		
Horizon 2020 Call	H2020-SPACE-2018		
Type of Action	IA		
Start Date	01/01/2019	Duration (in months)	37
EU Project Officer	Iulia SIMION		
Deliverable	D1.6: Risk Management Plan		
Work Package	WP1 – Project Management & Quality Assurance		
Date of Delivery	Contractual	M9	Actual	M9
Nature	R – Report	Dissemination Level	PU-Public
Lead Beneficiary	KARAVIAS		
Lead Author	Stergios Asteriou	Organisation	KARAVIAS
Other authors	George Karavias (KARAVIAS), George Voutsinos (KARAVIAS), Stylianos Sylignakis (KARAVIAS)		
Reviewer(s)	AGROAPPS		

Document History

Version	Issue Date	Stage	Changes	Contributor
1.0	15/09/2019	Draft	Send for review	KARAVIAS
2.0	24/09/2019	Draft	Review feedback	AGROAPPS
3.0	30/09/2019	Final	Final version	KARAVIAS

Table of Contents

BEACON

Abbreviations

Agricultural Insurance	AgI
Confidentiality Agreement	CA
Earth Observation	EO
European Union	EU
Key Performance Indicators	KPIs
Lighthouse Customers	LHC
Minimum Viable Product	MVP
Non-disclosure Agreements	NDA
Potential New Risks	PNR
Questions & Answers	Q&A
Risks faced	RF
Risk Management Plan	RMP
Risk Management Strategy	RMS
Risk Occurrence timeframe	ROT
Synthetic Aperture Radar	SAR
Work Package	WP

Executive summary

Risk is defined as an event or condition that has a probability of occurring, and could have either a positive or a negative effect on the project's objectives. A risk may have one or more causes and if it occurs, one or more impacts. Risk Management is the process of identifying, assessing, responding to, monitoring, and reporting risks. This Risk Management Plan (RMP) is developed to ensure levels of risk and uncertainty and defines how risks associated with the BEACON project have been identified, analysed and managed.

The aim of this deliverable is to provide to the partners a useful tool for managing and reducing the risks, identified before and during the project, to document risk mitigation strategies being pursued in response to the identified risks and their grading in terms of likelihood and seriousness and, finally, to identify the mitigation actions required for implementation of the plan.

This deliverable is the first Risk Management Plan developed during the BEACON project and it records the risks faced so far (M9) and the potential new ones that may occur until the second Risk Management Plan which will be implemented at M17.

The BEACON project Coordinator (KARAVIAS) has provided on time all the work package leaders and rest of the partners with a template along with instructions on how to fill it in.

The current deliverable is structured in the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Risk Management Strategy – Includes the strategy that will be followed during the project implementation

Chapter 2: Risk analysis and management – Includes the identified risks (faced and potential new ones)

Chapter 3: Conclusion – Includes that following steps

1. Risk Management Strategy

Project risk management is one of the more crucial elements for successfully delivering a project's defined scope on time and within the budget limitations. Through risk management, the project's partners better understand the level risks, minimize the likelihood of negative events and maximise the likelihood of positive events on the project's outcomes.

Strategy sets the foundation for a RMP and defines how risks are addressed and managed. Specifically:

a Risk Management Strategy (RMS) provides a structured and coherent approach to identifying, assessing and managing risks.

The Project Manager has the overall responsibility for collecting and managing the project's risks, whereas the project team considers the risk monitoring as the inseparable part of the project management process. The main purpose of the RMS is to incorporate monitoring of the identified risks and the potential new ones, making sure of the accurate reaction occurrence and reviewing their effectiveness, as well as monitoring the risk changes in all the project's stages.

RMS includes the following activities and steps:

- Assigning roles and responsibilities related to risk management activities;
- Establishing common risk categories for identified risks.
- Developing a risk matrix and assigning risk ratings to identify risks.

For the BEACON project, it is the Project Manager's responsibility to assist the project team with the risk identification, and to document the known, faced and potential risks in the RMP. Therefore, a template will be circulated to the partners every six months, in order for them to record any risk factor faced or potential new one per Work Package (WP). Based on the input, updates to the RMP will occur and risk management will be a topic of discussion during the regularly scheduled project meetings. Furthermore, the Project Manager will determine if any of the newly identified risks warrant further evaluation, and if so, imminent action will be undertaken.

BEACON's strategy will take into consideration:

- Project's risk management guidelines;
- Available resources;
- Preferred reporting and communication protocols as specified in the D1.1 Project Management Handbook;
- The project's objectives.

2. Risk analysis and management

Risk analysis is a phase of the BEACON project that enables the estimation and evaluation of all potential risks that may arise during its implementation. The project's risk analysis is an effective way of ensuring that the RMS used to monitor and control potential risks of the project are beneficial.

Risk analysis and management involves a series of steps to quantify the impact of uncertainty on the BEACON project. These steps are:

- ⊘ **Risk identification**
  Comprehensive identification and recording of risks is critical for the project's successful outcome. In order to manage risks effectively, the BEACON partners have to know what risks are faced with and document their characteristics. The risk identification phase should cover all risks, regardless of whether or not such risks are within the direct control of the project. The key benefit of this process is the successfully capturing of all project's risks, identifying as early as possible inaccuracies, inconsistencies and negative assumptions regarding the project.

- ⊘ **Risk Exposure**
  Risk Exposure is the value that is given to an identified risk based on the analysis of the probability and the impact of occurrence. The Risk Exposure should be continuously reevaluated and modified based on the project's phase and needs.

- ⊘ **Risk occurrence timeframe**
  Risk occurrence timeframe (ROT) is the timeframe in which the identified risks will have impact.

- ⊘ **Risk response plans**
  Risk response planning is the phase in which the project team develops response actions and alternative options to reduce project risks. This process enables the project team to decide ahead of time how they will address possible risk occurrences and how they will avoid, mitigate or accept project risks. The main purpose of the Risk response plans is to align risks with an appropriate response based on the severity of the risk along with feasible considerations.

2.1. BEACON Risk Analysis and management

2.1.1. Risk identification

Based on the following risk categories, the risks faced so far and the potential new ones are presented below.

Risk Category	Risks faced	Potential new risks
WP1 – Project Management & Quality assurance	RF1. Changes in the project team RF2. Delays in submission of project deliverables/ reports or requested input RF3. Lack of commitment from Lighthouse Customers (LHC) causing delays in deliverables RF4. Unavailability for monthly calls	PNR1. Financial issues with regards to resources and/ or overspending of budget.
WP2 – Structural AgI value chain collaboration and co-evolution of business models and services	RF5. Different needs of the insurance companies; some insurance companies have requirements that are incompatible with the others RF6. The end-users do not understand the potential and limitations of Earth Observation (EO) technology RF7. Lack of understanding of blockchain applications RF8. Failure to identify and clearly document the user requirements RF9. Users have difficulties in responding to the user requirements questionnaire RF10. Users concern about data protection RF11. Difficulties to elicit the requirements from the end-users, either due to the users did not understand the questions or they had difficulties to explain the requirements (e.g. in terms of completeness and accuracy) RF12. Inadequate minimum viable product definition – validation – learning process	PNR2. Failure to record how the identified user requirements have been addressed by the BEACON toolbox PNR3. No sufficient effort provided in order to explain the blockchain applications
WP3 – Servitisation of AgI Business: Creating value by adding EO	RF13. Failure on the integration of different components and fusion of different data types	PNR4. Claim-based Damage Assessment fails to provide timely results PNR5. Crop growth models fail to simulate real farming conditions

data products and services	RF14. Limitations in the acquisition and analysis of EO data, leave gaps in claim-based insurance product RF15. Transfer functions for biophysical parameters calculation are crop and region specific	PNR6. Short-term numerical weather prediction models fail to provide precise results for index-based insurance. PNR7. There is a risk of data unavailability due to service or mission interruption (Sentinels) or defective instruments. PNR8. Delay in the implementation of the BEACON services
WP4 – BEACON toolbox services & functions ecosystem: design and implementation	RF16. Possible workflow revision RF17. Products (triggers, thresholds) have not yet been defined RF18. Lack of understanding of how the blockchain technically works	PNR9. Possible technical failures that may occur during the integration of the platform and services PNR10. Possible technical failures that may occur during the integration/ communication between the platform and the blockchain PNR11. Delay in the implementation of the BEACON toolbox
WP5 – Creating Business Experience & BEACON Accreditation path		PNR12. Pilot implementation will not be properly planned PNR13. Favourable weather conditions, thus low number of calamities that may occur PNR14. Difficulties in defining the appropriate regions for setting pilots and collecting the required information PNR15. Damage data not adequate or descriptive enough for the validation of the Damage Assessment Calculator PNR16. Partners will not sufficiently understand the evaluation methodology, validation and demonstration plan to assist later in the diffusion plan PNR17. Define metrics to compare quality of BEACON in comparison to current alternatives PNR18. Bottlenecks and delays in the pilot operation cases
WP6 – BEACON Commercialisation Playbook and Growth Hacking	RF19. Poor interest of potential LHC RF20. Busy schedule of LHC during season and slow response of LHC related to their inputs for BEACON RF21. Concern about data sharing RF22. Difficulties in developing trust between the BEACON solution and LHC	PNR19. No willingness of insurers to integrate the BEACON toolbox with their existing systems PNR20. Business plan of low quality PNR21. No interest from new LHC or no information provided to the LHC with regards to BEACON

| WP7 – Dissemination, Communication and Diffusion of BEACON | RF23. Failure to engage into the Agricultural Insurance (AgI) enablers significant stakeholders and interest groups
RF24. Lack of commitment – Unclear role from AgI enablers for achieving the desired feedback
RF25. Delays in communication from connected organization – AgI enablers or other projects/ initiatives
RF26. Low motivation of partners to actively engage in communication activities
RF27. Inadequate reporting of partners for communication and dissemination activities | PNR22. Poor visibility of the impacts and benefits of the project's activities and tool
PNR23. Not able to promote the BEACON solution for the right audience
PNR24. Failure to meet some Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
PNR25. Unbalanced geographical communication in the partners' countries and the rest of European Union (EU)
PNR26. Inadequate engagement of target audiences
PNR27. Discontinuity and unbalanced effort by the partners |

2.1.2. Risk Exposure

The table below presents the probability and impact of occurrence for the potential new risks using the following approach:

Probability of risk Occurrence:

- High probability – (80% ≤ x ≤ 100%)
- Medium – high probability – (60% ≤ x < 80%)
- Medium – low probability – (30% ≤ x 60%)
- Low probability (0% < x < 30%)

Risk impact:

- High – Risk that has the potential to greatly impact project schedule or performance;
- Medium – Risk that has the potential to slightly impact project schedule or performance;
- Low – Risk that has relatively little impact on schedule or performance.

Probability of Occurrence					
		1= high	2= medium-high	3= medium-low	4= low
Risk impact	A= high	RF7 PNR5, PNR15	RF13, RF14, RF15 PNR4, PNR7	RF22 PNR1, PNR2, PNR3, PNR6, PNR8, PNR9, PNR11, PNR12	
	B= medium	RF6	RF8, RF9, RF11, RF18, RF20	RF16, RF21, RF23, RF24, RF25, RF26, RF27 PNR10, PNR13, PNR19, PNR26	PNR14, PNR16, PNR20, PNR21, PNR24
	C= low			PNR25	RF1, RF2, RF3, RF4, RF5, RF10, RF12, RF17, RF19 PNR17, PNR18, PNR22, PNR23, PNR27

The colours represent the urgency of risk response planning and determine reporting levels.

2.1.3. Risk occurrence timeframe

The risks are classified based on the following timeframe:

Timeframe	Description
Near	Now- until one month
Mid	Next 2-6 months
Far	> 6 months

2.1.4. Risk response Plans

For each risk (faced or potential one), a risk response plan has been provided aiming to eliminate the risk, lower the probability of risk occurrence and depict the impact of the risk on the project's objective.

FACED RISKS

Risk Event	Risk response
RF1. Changes in the project team	These challenges have been identified as soon as possible and the needed changes have been performed without minimizing the project's impact. New partners included have equivalent (or higher) qualifications and experience.
RF2. Delays in submission of project deliverables/ reports or requested input	In order to minimize the risk of delays, the consortium applies a strict project management procedure. If an indication of a possible delay arises, the respective WP leader and the coordinator discuss the implications. They work on the development of an adequate strategy to counteract and minimize the negative impact of the delay.
RF3. Lack of commitment from LHC causing delays in deliverables	Continuous iterations and communications with the LHC, providing also them with results and outcomes of the project activities.
RF4. Unavailability for monthly calls	From the early stages of the project, the consortium agreed on a specific date for the every-month call. If a partner is not available to join the call, then the Project Manager is informed and they can arrange another call or read the minutes.
RF5. Different needs of the insurance companies; some insurance companies have requirements that are incompatible with the others	Although, there was noticed variability in the user requirements collected from different AgI companies, there was also a common concept, which was defined. All the specific requirements were also recorded.
RF6. The end-users do not understand the potential and limitations of EO technology	Several direct communications were performed among the AgI companies involved in the project and the responsible team for the user requirements collection in order to thorough explain how the EO technology works and the potential of its application in the AgI context.
RF7. Lack of understanding of blockchain applications	The end-users received detailed explanation (through presentations) of the advantages of using blockchain technology for smart contracts in AgI.
RF8. Failure to identify and clearly document the user requirements	To minimize this risk, the user requirements analysis was conducted in 3 stages (iterations). In the first stage, the basic understanding of the requirements was outlined. In the second stage, more detailed feedback from the end-users resulted in the first consolidated version of the user requirements which was further discussed and agreed with the end-users to produce the final version.
RF9. Users have difficulties in responding to user requirements questionnaire	The end-users were provided with the support when responding to the questionnaire. Furthermore, during the direct calls with the end-users, a thorough interview was performed based on the questionnaires provided to clarify the uncertainties.

RF10. Users concern about data protection	BEACON pays special attention to security and respects the privacy and confidentiality of the users' personal data, as described in the D1.3 Data Management Plan.
RF11. Difficulties to elicit the requirements from the end-users, either due to the users did not understand the questions or they had difficulties to explain the requirements (e.g. in terms of completeness and accuracy)	A user requirements analysis methodology was designed in order to avoid this risk. Three iterations were performed to ensure that the end-users would be involved in this process and all the misunderstandings and ambiguities would be clarified so as the questions to be understandable for the them.
RF12. Inadequate Minimum Viable Product (MVP) definition – validation – learning process	A user requirements analysis was designed to estimate the priorities based on the users' business models. Close collaboration with several different AgI companies in the validation of MVP will ensure the process is adequate.
RF13. Failure on the integration of different components and fusion of different data types	AgroApps' operational system OCTOPUSH integrates ready-to-use geospatial and weather intelligence components, required for the index and claim-based services. OCTOPUSH has already been tested and proven technically and operationally mature to support the development of BEACON services.
RF14. Limitations in the acquisition and analysis of EO data, leave gaps in claim-based insurance product	Crop growth modelling has been employed to fill the gaps left by EO data. The results of the models quantify the possible reduction in the predicted crop yields. The consequences of high temperatures and droughts are reflected in the physiological procedures simulated by crop models at different crop growth stages. This is very important in cases where optical imagery change detection is hindered by prolonged cloud conditions.
RF15. Transfer functions for biophysical parameters calculation are crop and region specific	Data for the calibration and validation of the transfer functions per crop and region have been provided by the LHC of BEACON. A detailed methodology for the calibration and validation and the results has been provided.
RF16. Possibility of workflow revision	Technical meetings have been arranged in order to identify possible deviations from the desired workflow. During these meetings, possible modifications have been discussed and based on their severity they will be prioritized. Furthermore, in order to minimize such a risk, a reporting system has been available to the end-users to report possible issues (Trello).
RF17. Products (triggers, thresholds) have not yet been defined	A technical meeting was held between the AgI providers actively involved into the project and the technical team in order to start creating the products.
RF18. Lack of understanding of how the blockchain technically works	Several calls were held with the technical team in order to fully understand how the blockchain works and how it will be integrated with the BEACON platform.
RF19. Poor interest of potential LHC	Although the AgI sector is heavily traditional, both in terms of operations as well as in terms of innovation adoption, during

	the early months of the project the AgI companies were very open to attend and hear about BEACON activities and expected outcomes. Furthermore, to ease the communication and approach of AgI actors, the BEACON Business team applied a bifold approach, combining the circulation of communication material prior and after the person-to-person meetings.
RF20. Busy schedule of LHC during season and slow response of LHC related to their inputs for BEACON	Although all planned activities for the first semester have been successfully performed, mild alterations in the internally planning/calendar have been performed. The reasoning being the high workload of AgI personnel during this period, new contracts generation was undergoing, and a number of calamities caused a heavy workload for the AgI personnel. Future activities involving the LHC and new AgI members, shall take into consideration the timing and seasonality of their activities as well as include a time buffer in the activities' timeline.
RF21. Concern about the data sharing	AgI companies provided input, contains to an extent data of their and their client's interest. Since this input is very important for the development of BEACON solution, BEACON Business & Development team prepared and signed BEACON Confidentiality Agreement (CA) with AgI companies to secure all uncertainties regarding the data sharing.
RF22. Difficulties in developing trust between the BEACON solution and LHC	Nurturing good relationships among BEACON partners and LHC actors was a key aim and objective of BEACON. The team from day one placed significant effort to fully involve and commit AgI-LHC members to the cause by involving them in a co-development process approach, as well as to gather detail requirements from their side that will address their pain points. Those actions in parallel to CA and Non-disclosure Agreements (NDA), signed among the involved entities, lead to the successfully establishment of a fruitful and transparent environment of trust among the entities.
RF23. Failure to engage into the AgI enablers significant stakeholders and interest groups	Identification and selection of the BEACON AgI Enablers members was considered on the basis of the main concepts/sectors upon which BEACON is realized, i.e. Agricultural Insurance; Earth Observation/Remote sensing; Agricultural Risk Management/Weather Intelligence; Blockchain. Beyond the potential members identified at proposal stage, additional organizations and individuals were identified by the consortium partners, creating a pool of experts. Ice-breaking communications tailored to the sector/experience specifications of each selected member, aimed and succeeded to trigger the interest of AgI members

	to participate in to BEACON AB and analysis of stakeholder and interest groups.
RF24. Lack of commitment – Unclear role from AgI enablers for achieving the desired feedback	Pro-active, timely and dynamic communications followed by person-to-person teleconferences held, providing in detail the role; expectations and expected contributions by all selected AgI Enablers members. A detail plan of project activities and expected contribution (describing step by step activities, participation in project meetings; etc.) will be formulated and circulated.
RF25. Delays in communication from connected organization – AgI enablers or other projects/ initiatives	Active and continuous two-way communication; explicitly specifying the topics where contribution is expected; retain an open channel for incoming suggestions. A preliminary list of projects and initiatives has been created and communications to explore synergies will be planned.
RF26. Low motivation of partners to actively engage in communication activities	All partners are showing in practice their motivation and commitment in engaging actively in communication activities.
RF27. Inadequate reporting of partners for communication and dissemination activities	The BEACON approach and guidelines for partners' reporting communication and dissemination activities has been set to facilitate partners reporting. An easy to use online form for reporting has been created for an immediate reporting after each activity performed.

POTENTIAL NEW RISKS

Risk Event	Risk mitigation measure	ROT
PNR1. Financial issues with regards to resources and/ or overspending of budget.	A 6-month financial reporting procedure has been established in order to monitor the use of resources and confirm that the required commitment of the partners is in lines with the costs declared. Furthermore, constant communications and guidance between the Financial Manager and the partners are taken place to clarify issues and avoid deviations.	Far
PNR2. Failure to record how the identified user requirements have been addressed by the BEACON toolbox	Each of the user requirements will be related to the BEACON toolbox and services.	Mid
PNR3. No sufficient effort provided in order to explain the blockchain applications	In order for the users to better understand the blockchain application and how it works, a small document will be prepared describing the main aspects of the blockchain and the workflow that will be followed into BEACON. Furthermore, webinars will be organized with each pilot case to live	Near

	demonstrate the solution and how the blockchain is integrated into its workflow.	
PNR4. Claim-based Damage Assessment fails to provide timely results	Claim-based damage assessment is based on optical EO data analysis and processing. Reasons for delaying in providing data for the area of interest, could be cloud cover and cloud shadow in the collected images before and after an extreme event. The use of Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data for detection of water on the earth's surface is well documented and validated. SAR data processing for floods detection and their usefulness will be investigated in BEACON. The use of SAR data and their ability to detect plants defoliation, due to hail or extreme winds, will also be investigated.	Mid
PNR5. Crop growth models fail to simulate real farming conditions	Crop growth models will simulate the growing conditions and expected yield based on weather, soil and farming data. Seasonal weather predictions will feed the meteorological input requirements of the models. SoilGrids will provide the crop models with the required soil data. Farming conditions information will be provided by the Lighthouse Customers of BEACON, for pilot countries.	Mid
PNR6. Short-term numerical weather prediction models fail to provide precise results for index-based insurance	The weather product has been adjusted to the highest spatial resolution for pilot countries. AgroApps provides high precision and field specific weather forecasting for the index insurance scheme of pilot countries.	Mid
PNR7. There is a risk of data unavailability due to service or mission interruption (Sentinels) or defective instruments	due to service or mission interruption or defective instruments, in this case alternative EO data procurement will be suggested from other available missions. For the time being no mission interruption was announced. Sentinel products have an operational status, unless clearly mentioned.	Near
PNR8. Delay in the implementation of the BEACON services	In order to minimize the risk of delays, the Task's or WP leaders will be asked to prepare a detailed document describing the process they intend to follow. If any delay may occur, then they will be required to clearly state the cause of it. In consultation with partners, coordinator and project manager will draw up a mitigation plan including adapted timetable and required additional resources.	Mid
PNR9. Possible technical failures that may occur during the integration of the platform and services	The technical team is highly experienced software engineers and they are able to handle any technical failure the soonest. Furthermore, the project is	Mid

	planned to run in two development cycles that minimize the risk of overall technical failure, which could occur in the case of having a single technical at the end of the project.	
PNR10. Possible technical failures that may occur during the integration/ communication between the platform and the blockchain	The technical team is highly experienced software engineers and they are able to handle any technical failure the soonest. Furthermore, the project is planned to run in two development cycles that minimize the risk of overall technical failure, which could occur in the case of having a single technical at the end of the project.	Mid
PNR11. Delay in the implementation of the BEACON toolbox	In order to minimize the risk of delays, the Task's or WP leaders will be asked to prepare a detailed document describing the process they intend to follow. If any delay may occur, then they will be required to clearly state the cause of it. In consultation with partners, coordinator and project manager will draw up a mitigation plan including adapted timetable and required additional resources.	Mid
PNR12. Pilot plan will not be properly planned	A pilot plan will be developed from the early stages of the project. Furthermore, a pre-pilot phase will be included in order to better prepare and structure the pilot phase trying to eliminate any possible risk.	Mid
PNR13. Favourable weather conditions, thus low number of calamities that may occur	A pre-pilot phase will be included in order to have adequate time to test and validate the BEACON solution and capture as many cases as possible.	Mid
PNR14. Difficulties in defining the appropriate regions for setting pilots and collecting the required information	The technical team is highly experienced software engineers and they are able to handle any technical failure the soonest. Furthermore, the project is planned to run in two development cycles that minimize the risk of overall technical failure, which could occur in the case of having a single technical at the end of the project.	Mid
PNR15. Damage data not adequate or descriptive enough for the validation of the Damage Assessment Calculator	The technical team is highly experienced software engineers and they are able to handle any technical failure the soonest. Furthermore, the project is planned to run in two development cycles that minimize the risk of overall technical failure, which could occur in the case of having a single technical at the end of the project.	Near
PNR16. Partners will not sufficiently understand the evaluation methodology, validation and	Constant communication and group meetings will be taken place between the responsible task leader and the pilot partners to explain and clarify every aspect	Near

demonstration plan to assist later in the diffusion plan	of the evaluation methodology, validation and demonstration plan.	
PNR17. Define metrics to compare quality of BEACON in comparison to current alternatives	Constant communication and group meetings will be taken place between the responsible task leader and the pilot partners to collaboratively define the metrics, as well as explain and clarify any possible incomprehensiveness.	Mid
PNR18. Bottlenecks and delays in the pilot cases	The pilot plan will be based on the capacity of the participating AgI actors and sufficient measures and time will be allocated to address any identified bottlenecks. Moreover, the WP leader along with the Project Coordinator will monitor the progress and propose mitigating actions whenever delays or bottlenecks become apparent.	Far
PNR19. No willingness of insurers to integrate the BEACON toolbox with their existing systems	Develop a scalable solution that could be modified based on the insurers/ clients' needs.	Far
PNR20. Business plan of low quality	Proactive and frontloaded work, as well as desk research and support by the project leader and partners with experience in the field, will minimize the possibility of a low-quality business plan.	Mid
PNR21. No interest from new LHC or no information provided to the LHC with regards to BEACON progress	A "customer integration roadmap" should be created, from which newly interested LHC will be informed what to expect at each stage of the collaboration with BEACON.	Mid
PNR22. Poor visibility of the impacts and benefits of the project activities and tool	Pro-active, timely and planned communication actions throughout the duration of the project; delivering success stories based on actual pilots and Services validation examples	Far
PNR23. Not able to promote the BEACON solution for the right audience	A list of events that BEACON could participate will be created. All the partners will be in constant search of relevant events that they would attend in order to promote the BEACON solution.	Near
PNR24. Failure to meet some KPIs	A regular monitoring of communication KPIs will be performed and a monthly reporting will be shared internally to the consortium partners. If necessary specific and tailormade recommendations will be provided to each of the project partners so to strengthen and further extent their communication activity and reach the relevant KPIs or diminish the risk or not succeeding in reaching it.	Far
PNR25. Unbalanced geographical communication in the partners' countries and the rest of EU	The plan-do-check-act methodology will ensure that this unfavourable result will not arise. Targeted activities when planning and sophisticated analytics	Far

BEACON

	when checking the relevant performance will guarantee that the WP leader will have on time all the information needed in order to manage the risk.	
PNR26. Inadequate engagement of target audiences	A portfolio of engagement techniques is available in order to avoid this possibility. For instance, the available techniques are: online polls, surveys, webinars, person-to-person conversations (at conferences, workshops, etc.), social media interaction, telephone contacts, e-mail Q&A, as well as tools such as videos, infographics, imageries, quotes and teasers that strongly stimulate interest and responses.	Mid
PNR27. Discontinuity and unbalanced effort by the partners	To deal with the particular risk, regular reminders and personalized recommendations will be exercised in order to ensure continuous and consistent work according to the allocation of the relevant man-months.	Near

3. Conclusions

The deliverable covered all the aspects related to what could go wrong (risks), which risks are important to deal with and what strategies should be implemented to deal with those risks. Moreover, this RMP aims to be a proactive decision making that avoids problems before they arise and a collaboration mean among the partners for managing all the identified risks. Further analysis will be implemented and illustrated in the 2nd version of the RMP.