

Risk Analysis and Management Plan



Introduction

This risk analysis and management plan (RAMP) is the outcome of the risk assessment conducted by the co-leading partners of WP 8 of SECRA, MIUN and MSU. The plan presents the identified risks for the SECRA consortium to not achieve the project objectives.

The RAMP has been reviewed by the project's steering committee and confirmed at the SECRA steering committee meeting on 10 June, 2021. The co-leading partners of work package 8 are responsible for the continuous update of the RAMP.

A risk analysis is an account about anything that may go wrong. From a project perspective this encompasses circumstance that could potentially severely curtail the project team's ability to achieve the project's objectives within the projected time and resources. To analyse the potential risks to the project, the risk analysis asks what the chances are that something with serious consequences will go wrong, and what the consequences are if this happens. In conceptual terms, we call this probability and consequences. The full risk analysis also provides mitigating measures to avoid the risks as well as management actions to deal with the consequences from an actually occurred scenario. With this full risk analysis, the project team can discuss and decide how key local team members, staff, and students may be informed to reduce concern and increase trust and confidence.

The structure of the document is as follows. First, we present the assumptions with its associated risks from the project proposal. Then we evaluate them and propose a set of mitigation and risk management measures. The latter are based on the concept that WP 8 has a robust consolidated work plan in place for the purpose of detecting disturbances in the work flow so that they may be managed.

Assumptions and risks

The table below presents (a) assumptions and risks related to the six project objectives, and (b) four risks related to the outcomes, outputs, and activities in the project. The table content is based on information in the project proposal.

Objective	Assumption	#	Risk
SECRA's first specific project objective is to trace, delimit, and map the lacunae in UEC collaborations broadly identified through (i) work preceding SECRA and (ii) the needs analysis conducted together with the partners in the Philippines, Thailand, and Sri Lanka. Bounding these lacunae will, inter alia, provide the foundation for the work conducted in the development WPs.	That the partner countries see the value of exploring the collaborations that already exist in their HEIs in relation to the institutional and societal context in which they take place; that they are willing to examine their strengths and weaknesses with a view to understanding how to improve them.	1a 1b 1c 1d	That the faculty members will not be willing to reveal their connections with the private sector. That the networks will be too narrowly depicted by the social network analysis. That there will be cultural and linguistic barriers. That we may miss the broader context in which these networks exist.
SECRA's second objective is to foster a better alignment between the interest of enterprises with the national public interest, especially in the field of disaster resilience.	That SECRA will ensure active participation in the workshops and policy dialogues	2a 2b	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate to the policy dialogues or other events. That the picture we get from each partner institution in the surveys and reports are not representative of the country.
SECRA's third objective is to create the prerequisites for, and establish a community of practice involving university and enterprise actors in the field of disaster resilience, both in physical and in virtual network terms.	The rationale behind this objective is the well-established assumption that disaster resilience and climate change adaptation require many different stakeholders and interests to come together to strive towards a common goal. This is particularly true when it comes to interdisciplinary thinking and stimulating creativity and innovations	3a 3b	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate in the networks and communities of practice. The decline of engagement and interest in the long run.
SECRA's fourth objective is to boost entrepreneurship and innovation in the selected HEIs by creating	We assume freedom given by the regulatory environment of the HEIs to build up mutually beneficial	4a	Lack of willingness of the participants to partner-up with the industry and vice-versa.

COLLABORATE FOR RESILIENCE

<p>opportunities for collaboration with enterprise actors; support the transition of ideas into practice, and support start-ups and scale-ups while making use of existing knowledge resources at these HEIs.</p>	<p>collaborations. The needs analysis has indicated support by faculty members for development and integration of entrepreneurial elements in the curriculum</p>	<p>4b Lack or decrease of the students' motivation to take part.</p>
<p>SECRA's fifth objective is to develop and launch a monitoring and assessment tool that can feed into evaluations of UEC collaborations in a broader effort of evidence-based policy in the program countries.</p>	<p>That there is a need for a model and a tool – as part of a development program for UEC – to monitor the systematic and progressive development of UEC on institutional level. The tool is aimed at supporting the academic staff as well as provide input to the successful implementation of the structure of UEC.</p>	<p>5a That the model is not applied on educational program level. 5b That the tool will suffer from technical issues. 5c That the institutional ownership of the model is not clear. 5d That different stakeholders (teachers, students, external entities) are not willing to buy in to the model over time.</p>
<p>SECRA's sixth objective is to foster appropriate, inclusive solutions for the promotion of gender equity and diversity.</p>	<p>That the partner countries already have a high level of gender parity.</p>	<p>6a Complacency, in the sense that partner countries score relatively high in the region when it comes to gender equity.</p>
<p>Risks related to the project's outcomes, outputs, and activities</p>		<p>7a Instances of political instability in a partner country such as riots, or another expression of unrest. 7b Lack of financial resources 7c Error in the estimation of the tasks' duration. 7d One or more partners do not comply with the work plan. 7e Weak communication with and dissemination to stakeholders.</p>

Risk evaluation

In this section we account for the evaluation of the probability of the identified risks happening and the potential consequences should they do so. Each risk is given a score indicating the level of probability and consequence. The scores are then multiplied to produce a risk value.

Score	Degree of probability	Consequence
1	Improbable	Insignificant
2	Low	Minor
3	Probable	Moderate
4	High	Major

#	Risk	Probability	Consequence	Risk value
1a	That the faculty members will not be willing to reveal their connections with the private sector.	1	3	3
1b	That the networks will be too narrowly depicted by the social network analysis.	2	3	6
1c	That there will be cultural and linguistic barriers.	1	2	2
1d	That we may miss the broader context in which these networks exist.	2	2	4
2a	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate to the policy dialogues or other events.	2	4	8
2b	That the picture we get from each partner institution in the surveys and reports are not representative of the country.	1	2	2
3a	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate in the networks and communities of practice.	2	4	8
3b	The decline of engagement and interest in the long run.	2	4	8
4a	Lack of willingness of the participants to partner-up with the industry and vice-versa.	1	1	1
4b	Lack or decrease of the students' motivation to take part.	1	4	4
5a	That the model is not applied on educational program level.	2	2	4
5b	That the tool will suffer from technical issues.	2	3	6
5c	That the institutional ownership of the model is not clear.	1	2	2
5d	That different stakeholders (teachers, students, external entities) are not willing to buy in to the model over time.	3	4	12
6a	Complacency, in the sense that partner countries score relatively high in the region when it comes to gender equity.	1	2	2
7a	Instances of political instability in a partner country such as	2	3	6

	riots, or another expression of unrest.			
7b	Lack of financial resources	2	2	4
7c	Error in the estimation of the tasks' duration.	2	3	6
7d	One or more partners do not comply with the work plan.	1	1	1
7e	Weak communication with and dissemination to stakeholders.	2	4	8

Risk matrix

The risk matrix below is a visual representation of the outcome of the risk evaluation. It shows the distribution of the identified risks according to its risk value. The colour codes indicate whether the risks are *acceptable* (green), no need to act; *tolerable* (yellow), action plan required; *intolerable* (red), action required urgently.

Consequence				
Probability	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major
High	4b			
Probable				5d
Low	1c, 2b, 5c, 6a	1d, 5a, 7b	1b, 5b, 7a, 7c	2a, 3a, 3b, 7e
Improbable	4a, 7d		1a	

Mitigation and management of risks

The last section of this RAMP lay out the course of action to mitigate the identified risks and plan for the management of occurred risks.

#	Risk value	Risk	How the risks will be mitigated	Management at occurrence
1a	3	That the faculty members will not be willing to reveal their connections with the private sector.	<p>SECRA will combat such risks through communications channels that were developed during earlier collaborations. What is more, SECRA includes academics who not only come from Asian countries (Sri Lanka) but also others who have extensive experience with this region.</p> <p>We conduct an up-to-date market analysis as well as an institutional analysis in each country to ensure we capture the entire picture. What is more, the participation of three HEIs per partner country will go a long way towards ensuring that our data will be representative of the partner country. Finally, a number of researchers and staff in the programme countries have a linguistic and cultural background from one of the partner countries (Sri Lanka) and researchers from all the programme countries have worked with a researcher from the partner countries in past projects. This will facilitate the overcoming of cultural and linguistic barriers and will ensure contextual understanding. The consortium will perform additional training preceding the interviews.</p>	Should we discover during data collection that there is a trend that faculty members are reluctant to reveal the connections with the private sector, we will regroup the team managing the questionnaire and we re-examine it. Perhaps we are asking the wrong questions. We will consult again with local actors as to why there is reluctance. We attempt the data collection with an updated questionnaire. If this does not work, we will try to shift to a different department at the same institution.
1b	6	That the networks will be too narrowly depicted by the social network analysis.	triangulation of data with quantitative and qualitative analyses in order to capture the holistic picture.	If we discover that the networks are too narrowly depicted in the SNA, we will place a greater emphasis on the qualitative interviews.
1c	2	That there will be cultural and linguistic barriers.	We have multiple partner institutions in the partner countries who can assist with this.	If we discover that there has been a misunderstanding, we will coordinate with the country lead to ensure we avoid something like this happening on another occasion.
1d	4	That we may miss the broader context in which these networks exist.	We are conducting literature reviews in all countries and our partners are experienced in the field.	We will repeat the data collection on a separate occasion, working closely with the country lead.

COLLABORATE FOR RESILIENCE

2a	8	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate to the policy dialogues or other events.	SECRA will mobilize the partner universities and the associated partner to attract stakeholders. We can do this through partners with contextual knowledge and wide networks as well as associated partners.	The key here would be to monitor the events to ensure wide participation. If we discover that there this is the case, we will change the way we invite our partners to these events. If for example, national level stakeholders do not attend the events, we will attempt to shift to the regional level.
2b	2	That the picture we get from each partner institution in the surveys and reports are not representative of the country.	SECRA will ensure a broad participation in the activities. We will do this through an effective project management plan and frequent management meetings, online and face-to-face, 9 in total, as well as regular follow up of the activity with the partner HEI. The participation of three HEIs per country goes a long way into giving a well- rounded picture of the partner country in general.	We will contextualize this, of course, but in the end, capacity building is at the level of the HEI.
3a	8	That the stakeholders outside the partners taking part in the project would not be willing to participate in the networks and communities of practice.	SECRA will mobilise the partner universities and the associated partner to attract stakeholders. We will do this through frequent meetings, face-to-face and online, and prompt and meaningful follow up of events	There are two ways to manage this risk if it materializes: (i) aggressively broaden the scope of the stakeholders, or (ii) narrow the scope of the networks and the community of practice.
3b	8	The decline of engagement and interest in the long run.	SECRA will counteract this by (a) a thorough training in network thinking, (b) practical guidance on how to sustain networks and communities of practice, and (c) promote a strong UEC component in the UEC Compass Model (WP5).	If we discover a decline of engagement, we will boost dissemination activities, with more press releases, items in local press, and engagement of our partners.
4a	1	Lack of willingness of the participants to partner-up with the industry and vice-versa.	We will mobilize both external actors and students through the networks of our partners as well as the associated partners. The HEI teachers have the ability to motivate the students to take part in these events, while the associated partners, which includes ministries, chambers of commerce, and private enterprises can provide internal incentives for staff to attend.	We will address this issue through steering committee meetings and increased integration of the WP work. We will activate activities to find out why partners are reluctant and try to address any concerns they might have.
4b	4	Lack or decrease of the students' motivation to take part.		This would probably be managed through more engaged promotion of the events. We will also re-consider the content of the events and survey the students in an attempt to find out why they are lack interest.
5a	4	That the model is not applied on educational program level.	SECRA includes a sensitization programme that ensures piloting of the tool and plans as well as an iterative development and application period to ensure a good contextual fit into all	The tool can be applied at a lower level and allow time to get more traction.

COLLABORATE FOR RESILIENCE

5b	6	That the tool will suffer from technical issues.	partner HEIs.	We will monitor is implementation through our country leads and partner contacts so that catch these issues early.
5c	2	That the institutional ownership of the model is not clear.		Monitoring and contact with our HEI contact persons should address the issue of institutional ownership. Listening to our partners' concerns will be crucial here.
5d	12	That different stakeholders (teachers, students, external entities) are not willing to buy in to the model over time.		Monitoring and contact with our HEI contact person would be an appropriate, if more involved, strategy here also. The workflow, ownership and technical interface might require adjustments.
6a	2	Complacency, in the sense that partner countries score relatively high in the region when it comes to gender equity.	Mobilize participants, especially through the women consortium members, which are numerous. This will be an ongoing item in the management meetings.	The country leads will be important here. We did not notice such signs during the needs analysis so a constant dialogue with the partners should contain this issue, should it occur.
7a	6	Instances of political instability in a partner country such as riots, or another expression of unrest.		SECRA will reschedule the event to one of the remaining partner countries.
7b	4	Lack of financial resources	Solvency of project partners has been assessed, ensuring their financial resources during the project execution. Almost all partners have already participated in national or EU projects, having a wide experience and history, which reduces this risk.	In this instance, we fall back into mechanisms outlined in the bilateral partnership agreements and in turn the grant agreement between the European Commission and MIUN.
7c	6	Error in the estimation of the tasks' duration.	Continuous assessing of the work to be performed will be done through the quality plan to detect possible problems and find suitable solutions. If required, the consortium will consider transferring some activities to another partner or bringing a new partner into the consortium, upon consultation with the EU Project Officer.	If a task takes more time, MIUN can offer support to the partner that needs it. Sometimes, however, tasks are simply delayed, as has been the case during the pandemic. In that case, we will strive to complete the task as timely as possible and provide an explanation as to why it has been delayed.
7d	1	One or more partners do not comply with the work plan.		In this case, we will provide support especially through the country coordinators who are experienced and familiar with the country context.
7e	8	Weak communication with and dissemination to	Communication is one strength of SECRA. All partners are involved in the task and have a strong network to enable reaching	Continuous monitoring is the strategy for this risk here as well. If we have notice that there has been a period when

COLLABORATE FOR RESILIENCE

		stakeholders.	the stakeholders targets. Contacts will be taken from the very beginning of the project (prior to KOM) to ensure that a proper communication plan will be implemented with no delay.	dissemination has been lacking, we will increase activities thereafter.
--	--	---------------	--	---

