

## Critical implementation risks and mitigation actions

### Foreseen Risks

<b>Foreseen risks</b> <i>The table shows the risks already listed in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement (read-only).</i>			
<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Work Package No(s)</b>	<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>
1	Progress starting too late and the project resulting in poor delivery and project outcome (Likelihood: low, Impact: high)	WP1	Previous work has been done during the preparation of the Project. General management procedures have been designed to detect any deviation from the initial plan and an experienced and robust management team will lead the project. The kick-off meeting has been carefully designed to coherently launch all the simultaneous activities.
2	Deliverables or official notifications to HADEA submitted late (Likelihood: low, Impact: low)	WP1	The coordinator will keep abreast of the ongoing work, promote mutual sharing of updates within the consortium and provide guidance to the consortium members in order to avoid delays. Responsibilities and procedures will be clearly defined and implemented by partners under the coordinator's, WP leaders', task leaders' supervision. The coordinator will also check the status of any deliverable to be sent to HaDEA 15 days before the deadline. Any delay will be communicated and justified beforehand, indicating the actual date of submission.
3	Financial deviations/ Budget issues that do not allow for activities to be carried out (Likelihood: medium, Impact: medium)	WP1	The budget has been carefully designed, discussed and agreed with all partners. A financial manager will lead the evaluation and monitoring of the use of resources and its justification by all partners.
4	WP members do not deliver inputs to other WPs in time (Likelihood: high, Impact: low)	WP3,WP4,WP2,WP1	Coordination and constant monitoring carried out by WP1 will help prevent this issue. Attention will also be paid to building a strong relationship and trust among project members. This can be reached, for example, by means of face-to-face meetings that will take place during the project.
5	Holidays, personal issues, COVID-19 pandemic or any other health issues that cause some	WP3,WP4,WP2,WP1	WP members make sure that they have a person in their team who can cover, at least partly, their participation

<b>Foreseen risks</b>			
<i>The table shows the risks already listed in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement (read-only).</i>			
<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Work Package No(s)</b>	<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>
	WP members to be missing for a certain period of time (Likelihood: low, Impact: low)		in the project. WP leaders and task leaders create back-up contact lists for having replacements in place.
6	Reports and deliverables do not meet required standards of written English and/or presentation, data visualization, clarity (Likelihood: low, Impact: low)	WP3,WP4,WP2,WP1	Presence of an independent quality reviewer that is external to the core team and who has extensive professional experience in drafting reports for the EC and national authorities is sought; Strong collaboration with WP2 needs to be held
7	Problems with (sub)contracting due to delays in (public) procurement (Likelihood: medium, Impact: high)	WP4	Preparing conditional (public) procurement and/or framework contracts
8	Difficulty in setting up meetings, mainly due to unavailability of all relevant parties in any given time (Likelihood: low, Impact: low)	WP3,WP4,WP2,WP1	WP team members will make all efforts to adjust other commitments and ensure the presence
9	Losing leadership over outsourced activities (Likelihood: low, Impact: high)	WP4	Communication will be crucial to deliver outputs of the desired quality within the desired timeframe. High-quality handover of partial tasks and monitoring must be carried out, in order to avoid losing quality and timeliness.
10	A key expert unexpectedly leaves the team (Likelihood: medium, Impact: medium)	WP3,WP4,WP2,WP1	Project managers create possible back-up lists of experts in their within their Competent Authorities/ Affiliated Entities, so that another expert can be promptly involved if needed until a new person is hired.
11	Stakeholder fatigue, lack of incentive with engaging with the consortium or providing feedback. (Likelihood: high, Impact: high)	WP4	The CA and AE will ensure that communication with stakeholders is efficient and respects the stakeholders time and effort. As such web-based tools will be used to enable engagement at times most convenient, and incentives such as acknowledgment of contributions will be considered were necessary.

## Unforeseen Risks

Unforeseen risks			
Risk No	Description	Work Package No(s)	Proposed Mitigation Measures
U 1	Implementation of the cross-border Patient Summary microservice on the new platform is part of a broader transition to a microservices platform and is therefore highly dependent on other microservices that are in the process of being rolled out in the live environment. If significant obstacles arise in the prerequisite work or if changes in national priorities cause a shift in the work schedule, this could hinder meeting the planned deadline for launching the new Patient Summary microservice. (Likelihood: Medium, Impact: Medium)	WP4	The work on the prerequisite microservices for the Patient Summary implementation is already in progress and, according to plans, is scheduled to be completed before the deadline for the Patient Summary rollout. In addition, the same team responsible for implementing the new microservices platform is handling the rollout of the new Patient Summary service. This allows the team, within its capabilities, to manage priorities and the order of tasks to ensure that the project is completed on time.
U 2	National priorities may change and may not align with the goals of the current project. For example if priorities change and other projects from the Government are deemed more critical than the creation of the new data allergy standards, then it could lead to delays and cause a poor outcome. (Likelihood:Low, Impact: High)	WP4	MSAE will help steering political priorities to align with the current project.

## State of play

<b>State of play</b> <i>Continuous Reporting (Critical Risks screen) - Give the state of play of the risks that were identified in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement (and new risks that materialised during project implementation) and add new mitigation measures, if needed.</i>				
Risk No	Period	Did you apply risk mitigation measures?	Did your risk materialise?	Comments
1	1	Yes	Yes	Although some tasks began later than initially scheduled due to various factors, project managers proactively adjusted the timeline and resources to ensure the overall outcome would not be affected.
2	1	Yes	No	
3	1	Yes	No	Financial manager and project managers have monitored the use of resources and made adjustments if needed, meaning the overall budget has not exceeded and all activities so far have been carried out as planned.
4	1	Yes	No	Coordination and monitoring in WP1 has meant the risk has not realized.
5	1	Yes	Yes	Members have been missing for a certain amount of time due to holidays and health issues, however members have replacements and back-ups for critical tasks who could cover them. In situations where coverage was insufficient or not possible, the team utilized time buffers to ensure that any delays would not impact overall outcomes.
6	1	Yes	No	
7	1	Yes	No	
8	1	Yes	No	

<b>State of play</b> <i>Continuous Reporting (Critical Risks screen) - Give the state of play of the risks that were identified in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement (and new risks that materialised during project implementation) and add new mitigation measures, if needed.</i>				
<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Did you apply risk mitigation measures?</b>	<b>Did your risk materialise?</b>	<b>Comments</b>
9	1	Yes	No	
10	1	Yes	Yes	During the reporting period several key experts did leave the team. However suitable replacement experts had been identified and onboarded. As a result, there was no disruption in the implementation of project activities.
11	1	Yes	Yes	There has been some lack of incentive from stakeholders regarding the creation of new allergy related data exchange standards, however web-based tools (web questionnaires) have been used and MSAE has helped to communicate the need for the change to stakeholders. Stakeholders have been doubtful of the national impact, however thorough communication is expected to help mitigate these issues.
U1	1	Yes	No	
U2	1	Yes	No	