



SHERPA

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

Deliverable No. 6.2

Risk register

V 5.0

**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
WP/Task Related	WP6 Project management
Delivery Date	31st August 2018
Dissemination Level	Public
Lead Partner	DMU
Contributors	Mutual Shoots, Lucy Peel NEN, Thamar Zijlstra EUREC, Renate Klar
Reviewers	Bernd Stahl
Abstract	This deliverable explains how the SHERPA project ensures that any potential risks are identified from the outset of the project. It outlines the critical risks for implementation as well as the proposed risk mitigation measures. One risk has already materialised (in M2) where a consortium partner has been removed from the project, and therefore the proposed risk mitigation measures are now in place.
Key Words	Risks, mitigation

Revision History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Reviewer(s)	Notes
0.1	02/07/2018	Nitika Bhalla	ALL	First Draft / Review etc. Circulation: Consortium/ Partners' Names
0.2	12/07/2018	Lucy Peel	Nitika Bhalla	Additional details regarding 1.1.2 Risk Mitigation Measures.
0.3	16/07/2018	Thamar Zijlstra	Nitika Bhalla	Additional details regarding 1.1 Critical risks for implementation.
0.4	17/07/2018	Renate Klar	Nitika Bhalla and Bernd Stahl	Additional details regarding 1.1 Critical risks for implementation.
0.5	08/08/2018	Nitika Bhalla	Bernd Stahl	Second draft/Review

Table of Contents

1 Executive summary	3
2 Methodology	4
3 Critical risks for implementation	4
1.2.1 Identified risk - Removal of a consortium partner	7
1.2.2 Risk mitigation measures	8
4 Progress	8

1 Executive summary

This deliverable explains how the SHERPA project ensures that any potential risks are identified from the outset of the project. It outlines the critical risks for implementation as well as the proposed risk mitigation measures.

One risk has already materialised (in M2) where a consortium partner has been removed from the project, and therefore the proposed risk mitigation measures are now in place.

Key risks covered include; Brexit, the shortage of stakeholders and internal project delays.

2 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 the risks were categorised into three sections; 'Implementation risks', 'dissemination and exploitation risks', and 'management risks'. This process was carried out by the project consortium by reviewing SHERPA's vision, scope and deliverables in as full detail as possible. This level of project planning ensures partners can; show an awareness of threats and identify any associated risks. Therefore it was important to produce a type of risk register (ie the 'Critical risks for implementation') along with risk mitigation measures in case a particular risk arises .

Specifically, the project activities as a whole were discussed, as well as individual work packages and tasks. In particular, the top three most important risks identified were; Brexit, the shortage of stakeholders and internal project delays.

The table below was then constructed under the following headings; Description of risk, Affected WPs, Risk Level (high, medium, low) and proposed risk mitigation measures. Taking each heading in turn, the 'description of risk' contained the identified risk eg. Brexit, the 'Affected WPs' states which work packages this risk will have an impact on eg. All, the 'risk level' measures whether the risk is categorised as low, medium or high (the risk of Brexit is deemed as high). Finally the 'proposed risk mitigation measures' contains what is proposed as a means of mitigating this risk if it materialises. In the case of Brexit then the consortium has agreed that the coordination duties will be taken over by another (non UK based) partner.

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

3 Critical risks for implementation

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

Description of risk	Affected WPs	Risk level	Proposed risk mitigation measures
Implementation risks			
Brexit	All	High	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).
Shortage of stakeholders to comment on scenarios in Task 1.2, 2.4	WP1, WP2	Medium	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.
Inability to find stakeholders for the case studies, or stakeholders pull out of participation in the case study in Task 1.1	WP1	Medium	This has already happened with two case studies - UT's Facebook case study and Trilateral's energy case study. Mitigation efforts include each partner identifying alternative stakeholders, and if there is an inability to find any, contact NEN to assist with their stakeholder contacts. Additional backup case studies are being developed to ensure that difficulties in one particular case study do not affect the overall task.
Low participation	WP3 Task 3. 4 - standardisation	Low	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 - standardisation	Low	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	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	Low	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.
Dissemination and exploitation risks			
Lack of interest from project stakeholders, and challenge to compile a sufficiently large and representative list.	WP2, 5	Low/medium	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 sufficiently large contact list for partners to succeed in this and other tasks. 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.
Management risks			
Delays in meeting milestones and deliverable delivery	WP6	Low	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.
One or more partners is unable to produce work of sufficient quality in a timely manner.	All	High	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. This risk has now been deemed as high, as it has already materialised in the form of non-performance of a partner in M2 of the project.

1.2.1 Identified risk - Removal of a consortium partner

One consortium partner (Dries Depoorter) has been removed from the project in M2 primarily due to; a lack of response when attempts were made to contact the partner, failure to attend the project kick off meeting (as well as online project meetings) and failure to sign the Grant Agreement. In light of this, the project consortium agreed that the style of working was not compatible with the requirements of an EU project. Therefore a decision was made that Dries Depoorter will be now be withdrawn from the project as of immediate effect from 8th June 2018.

1.2.2 Risk mitigation measures

The next steps have now been put in place to find an alternative partner which can fulfil the requirements as set out in the proposal and Grant Agreement (ie producing artistic representations of AI in society). The plan has been set out to invite artists to submit a proposal for the artistic representation of ethics and human rights implications of Smart Information Systems. The selected artist will be given a budget of 52,400 EUR (+25% indirect costs) to work in a medium of their choice. Proposals may include photography, sculpture, theatrical works, video representations of theater, interactive installations, exhibitions and digital media including mobile applications.

The timeline for adding the selected beneficiary is as follows;

APPROXIMATE TIMELINE:

Request for Proposals	6 th July 2018
Submission Deadline	30 th July 2018 at 17:00 CET
Notification of Shortlisted Artists	10 th August 2018
Notification of Selected Artist	31 st August 2018

Requests for proposals were sent out on the 6th July 2018 to a range of 13 upcoming and established artists and collectives from across Europe, working in a variety of mediums and formats. All the artists or collectives have been identified by existing SHERPA members to be focussing their creative work upon the influence and role of technology in society.

A good response has been received from the initial request for proposals and it is anticipated that an artist or collective will be recruited to SHERPA by the 31st August 2018.

4 Progress

As of the 7th August 2018, the consortium have shortlisted and agreed on a new partner to replace Dries Depoorter and steps are now under way to organise a meeting with the new partner to discuss work going forward.

As a consortium, we have agreed that the risk register will be progressively reviewed and updated, and this will be added as a standard agenda item for our physical GA meetings.

