



ROSIE

D9.2: Risk Management Plan v1.0

Author: Rosemarie Bernabe

Editor: Søren Holm

Project title: Responsible Open Science in Europe

Project acronym: ROSIE

Grant Agreement no.: 101006430

Lead contractor for this deliverable: University of Oslo



Project Number:	101006430
Project Acronym:	ROSIE
Project Title:	Responsible Open Science in Europe
Title of Deliverable:	Risk Management Plan
Work Package:	WP 9
Due date according to contract:	31.08.21
Editor(s):	
Contributor(s):	Rosemarie Bernabe
Reviewer(s):	Søren Holm
Approved by	Søren Holm

	ROLE	NAME	Short Name	Country
1.	Coordinator	University of Oslo	UiO	Norway
2.	Partner	Austrian Agency for Research Integrity	OeAWI	Austria
3.	Partner	European Citizen Science Association	ECSA	Germany
4.	Partner	European Network of Research Ethics Committees	EUREC	Germany
5.	Partner	Federation of Finnish Learned Societies	TSV	Finland
6.	Partner	High Council for the Evaluation of Research and Higher Education	Hceres	France
7.	Partner	National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and Environment	INRAe	France
8.	Partner	National Technical University of Athens	NTUA	Greece
9.	Partner	Universidade Católica Portuguesa	UCP	Portugal
10.	Partner	University of Latvia	UL	Latvia
11.	Partner	University of Tartu	UT	Estonia
12.	Partner	University of Southeastern Norway	USN	Norway



Table of contents

1	ROSiE management structure and procedures	4
2	Risk management procedures	7
2.1	Risk identification	7
2.2	Addressing and mitigating risks	8



1 ROSiE management structure and procedures

Note that this is the first version of the RMP Management Plan (RMP) of ROSiE. The RMP will be updated when necessary.

Risks are probabilities of harm or unwanted consequences. The management of risks is integral to ROSiE's management structure, which functions as follows.

1.1 Management structure of ROSiE

The basic purpose of project management is to ensure the proper level of co-ordination and cooperation amongst the project consortium members and timely reporting to the European Commission project officer. Additionally, project management has the following responsibilities: project administration, project organization, management of the scientific progress of the project, co-ordination with other EC-funded projects and other interested parties, and coordinating effective dissemination of the project results. The partners involved have agreed on developing an effective and decentralized management structure based on delegated responsibilities. ROSiE's project management system will provide full transparency and control of the entire project in terms of time, resources and cost tracking.

Project operation will involve the following roles or groups: (a) General Assembly (GA), (b) Executive Board (EB), (c) Work Package Leaders (WPLs), (d) Task Leaders and (e) External Advisory Board (EAB). The mandate and the scope of these roles and groups are described below.

The decision-making authority has been divided between the General Assembly and the Executive Board to ensure open and fair decision-making, while allowing for agile project management and time-efficient monitoring of the progress. The Executive Board will assist the Coordinator and the Executive Board in order to reduce the administrative workload of work package leaders, as they are also key scientists in the project.

ROSiE operates in a field with strong regulations regarding ethics. The project will observe all regulations. Nevertheless, ethical questions outside regulations may arise. In such cases, the opinion of a professional outside the project team is invaluable. Therefore, a member of the EAB with the relevant expertise will be appointed Ethics Advisor.

The General Assembly (GA)

Role: The GA is the supreme decision-making body of ROSiE and is responsible for the major strategic and scientific decisions. The GA has one representative from each of the project partners. It is chaired by the Coordinator. The GA will monitor the status regarding the scientific progress, costs, quality, and communication and compare the current and planned status. The GA will convene at the annual project meeting, to revise and update the plans for these aspects

for the upcoming year. Further, the GA will monitor the knowledge gained, the list of stakeholders, and the project risks. If needed, updates will be made and actions will be taken regarding these issues. In particular, the GA will be responsible for the issues listed below.

- Review the scientific progress and costs incurred so far
- Re-distribute tasks and/or budget within the consortium, if necessary
- Decide whether requests for contract amendments are to be made, if necessary
- Adopt a scientific work plan for the upcoming year
- Review the dissemination and communication activities so far, compare to the plan and adopt a dissemination/communication plan for the upcoming year
- Review the quality of the work and results so far, applying the quality management plan
- Review the project risks and adopt of an updated risk response plan based on the project so far and identification of potentially emerging new risks
- Review the data and knowledge gained so far and decide actions according to the data, innovation and IP/knowledge management plans on e.g. data storage and exploitation of results
- Resolve conflicts related to the project activities, if these can't be resolved at a lower level
- Decide on changes in the Consortium Agreement, if necessary

Meetings: The GA will convene physically at the beginning of the project and then, once a year. Notice of the upcoming meeting will be given 30 calendar days prior to the meeting and the agenda will be distributed 21 days prior to the meeting.

Voting rights and quorum in the GA: The GA may not make valid decisions unless 2/3 of the members are present (quorum). If the quorum is not reached, the chairperson shall arrange another meeting within 15 calendar days. Each member of the GA has one vote. Decisions will be made by simple majority. In the case of a tie poll, the Coordinator has two votes.

The Executive Board (EB)

Role: The EB consists of the Coordinator, the co-coordinator, and the WP leaders. The coordinator is the chair of the EB. The EB oversees the day-to-day management of ROSiE's project activities, in particular:

- Track and monitor progress of the WP activities
- Monitor potential deviations from the work plans and reporting them to the GA, summoning the GA for making decisions if necessary



- Prepare material to be presented and discussed at the GA
- Manage scientific, dissemination/communication activities in line with the yearly plans adopted by the GA
- Managing the data and IP/knowledge gained in the project, the innovation, quality and risks according to their respective management plans
- Initiating mitigating actions in line with the risk response plan
- Ensuring sufficient communication between the WPs to obtain seamless interfaces between them
- Facilitate resolution of conflicts

Meetings: The EB will meet every 6 months, meaning one intermediate meeting between each GA. Frequent communication is important to ensure that the WPs are well aligned at their interfaces and that inputs and outputs arrive in time, and it is particularly important at the beginning of the project. If necessary, the CPI can call additional EB virtual meetings.

Decision-making: The EB has the authority to make decisions and choices on the daily activities in ROSIE to ensure that the yearly plans for science, dissemination and communication are fulfilled. Further, the EB has the authority to initiate actions needed to execute the knowledge, quality and risk management plans.

The coordinator, co-coordinator, and the support team:

The coordinator is the link between the project partners and the European Commission. He will be responsible for the proper performance of the tasks as described in the Grant Agreement and the Consortium Agreement. In particular, the coordinator will be responsible for:

- Providing any document or information required by the EC
- Timely Submission of deliverables and periodic and final reports to the EC
- Managing the payments to the members of the Consortium
- Summoning, organizing, and chairing the EB meetings
- Organize the yearly GA meetings and summoning the GA, Executive Board and External Advisory Board
- Ensuring that the governing documents and other important project internal information is available on the project Sharepoint

The support team will support in administrative and financial tasks, respectively.

The Work Package Leaders (WPLs)



Role: The WPLs are responsible for the daily progress of the WP activities. The WPLs manage the work within the WP assigned to them in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the yearly plans adopted by the GA. The WPLs will in particular:

- Take actions to ensure satisfactory progress of the WP activities
- Initiate meetings within the WP when needed
- Initiate meetings between WPs when needed
- Participate in the EB

The External Advisory Board (EAB)

Role: The EAB will be present at the presentation of the main results obtained so far in ROSiE during the GA Meetings. The EAB will provide input to the scientific, dissemination/ communication and risk response plans for the upcoming year, as well as comment on the project quality. It may add specific metrics for the project quality to the quality management plan.

The EAB will give advice on strategic decisions to be made within the project.

2 Risk management procedures

2.1 Risk identification

Some risks were already identified in the proposal stage. These are the following:

Description of Risk
Coordinator leaves UiO or becomes unable to continue in role for other reasons
The Stakeholder Forum doesn't work smoothly enough to deliver WPs dependent on other WPs proper delivery of milestones and deliverables
Partners leaving the consortium

However, some risks were not identifiable at the proposal writing-stage. After six months of operation, these risks were identified as follows:

Description of Risk
Travel restrictions due to the pandemic
Delays in deliverables and milestones

The coordinator and the co-coordinator are actively monitoring risks to the project, though all ROSiE partners may identify risks and bring this to the attention of the coordinator. Risks may also be brought to the attention of the EB during its bimonthly meeting.

2.2 Addressing and mitigating risks

The following risk-mitigation measures will be observed for the risks identified during the preparation of the proposal:

Description of Risk	Proposed Risk-Mitigation Measures
Coordinator leaves UiO or becomes unable to continue in role for other reasons	The coordinating institution will appoint a replacement with experience of managing large research projects from among its senior staff
The Stakeholder Forum doesn't work smoothly enough to deliver	The format of the Stakeholder Forum will be reconfigured in collaboration with the relevant ROSiE partners
WPs dependent on other WPs proper delivery of milestones and deliverables	The EB and/or GA will take appropriate action to ensure that tasks (and budgets) are reallocated between partners to ensure proper delivery of WP milestones and deliverables
Partners leaving the consortium	In the unfortunate situation of one partner leaving the consortium for any reason, then the GA, the EB and eventually the coordinator will see that the work left by the leaving partner is performed by another partner, preferably already in the consortium, and that the Consortium Agreement and the budget are revised accordingly.

The following measures will be observed for the newly identified risks:

Description of Risk	Proposed Risk-Mitigation Measures
Travel restrictions due to the pandemic	Instead of a face-to-face General Assembly, the consortium had a Zoom meeting. While pandemic measures are in effect, Zoom meetings will be the default and would take the place of planned face-to-face meetings.
Delays in deliverables and milestones	Delays in deliverables and milestones are discussed in the Executive Board including measures to address the delay and the proposed new deadline.

The procedures for mitigating risks will depend on the nature and severity of the risks. Generally, identified risks will be brought to the EB for discussion of resolution. The EB may be summoned by the coordinator earlier to tackle risks, if necessary. If no resolution is reached at the EB, the coordinator ask for the opinion of the EAB and/or convene the GA. In case of discrepancy on opinions on risk mitigation measures, the decision of the GA will be the prevailing course of action for risk mitigation.

