



IcARUS

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO URBAN SECURITY

www.icarus-innovation.eu

info@icarus-innovation.eu

D 7.2

Risk Management and Quality Assurance Plan



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 882749

D 7.2

Risk Management and Quality Assurance Plan

DELIVERABLE TYPE

Report

MONTH AND DATE OF DELIVERY

Month 5, 29 January 2021

WORK PACKAGE

WP 7

LEADER

Efus

DISSEMINATION LEVEL

Public

AUTHORS

Sarah Diemu-Trémolières

Programme
H2020

Contract Number
882749

Duration
48 Months

Start
September
2020

Peer Reviews

NAME	ORGANISATION
Carla Napolano	Efus
Julia Rettig	Efus
Pilar de la Torre	Efus

Revision History

VERSION	DATE	REVIEWER	MODIFICATIONS
01	12/01/2020	-	1 st version
02	20/01/2021	Carla Napolano (Efus)	Revision
03	29/01/2020	-	Final version

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf.

Index of Contents

1. Executive Summary	5
2. Project Overview	5
3. Work packages and tasks responsibilities.....	6
3.1 Work packages and tasks	6
3.2 Responsibilities of the coordinator	9
3.3 Responsibilities of WP leaders	10
3.4 Responsibilities of task Leaders	10
4. Quality control and assurance	11
4.1 Principles	11
4.1.1 First quality control principle	11
4.1.2 Second quality control principle	11
4.2 Monitoring of the implementation of the project	11
4.3 Production of deliverables	11
4.3.1 Responsibilities.....	11
4.3.2 Deliverable production plan.....	12
4.3.3 Drafting process	12
4.3.4 Peer-review	12
4.3.5 Final review	12
5. Management of risks.....	23
5.1 Risk Management Plan.....	23
The coordinator is responsible for establishing a Risk Management plan	23
5.2 Risk Monitoring and Mitigation.....	24
6. Conclusion	30

Index of Tables

Table 1- WPs and tasks.....	10
Table 2-Production of IcARUS deliverables.....	23
Table 3-Risk monitoring and mitigation.....	30

1. Executive Summary

This deliverable aims at establishing a consistent set of internal working procedures, processes and best practice guidelines and set quality standards for the project outcomes (Quality Assurance Plan). It also aims to identify and anticipate risks that may arise in the implementation of the project as well as specify risk management procedures and responsibilities (Risk Management Plan).

2. Project Overview

The IcARUS project (Innovative AppRoaches to Urban Security), is coordinated by Efus, with a consortium of 17 partners.

IcARUS aims to learn from past experiences in urban security policies. The project's main objective is to rethink and adapt existing tools and methods to help local security actors anticipate and better respond to security challenges in the context of:

- A decline of citizens' trust in institutions, local elected officials and other security and prevention actors;
- Drastic budgetary cuts and various contemporary crises that affect local and national authorities;
- The development of smart cities, which implies the effective inclusion of technological innovations in crime prevention.

The project will review and reassess past and present urban security policies to provide technologically and socially innovative tools adaptable to specific local contexts.

IcARUS will focus on four areas that have been identified by local and regional authorities as their main security challenges:

- Preventing juvenile delinquency
- Preventing radicalisation leading to violent extremism
- Designing and managing safe public spaces
- Preventing and reducing trafficking and organised crime

These will also be examined in the light of 4 cross-thematic issues: governance and diversification of actors, technological change, gender approaches and internationalisation and cross border issues.

The project will develop custom made solutions to security challenges which will incorporate social and technological innovations. Local and regional authorities will be involved in all stages of the project.


The tools will be designed through a constant process of testing, evaluation and adaptation by local authorities. This process will ensure that they are effective and meet the collective needs of citizens.

3. Work packages and tasks responsibilities

3.1 Work packages and tasks

The coordination of each work package (WP), is ensured by one partner, referred to as the “WP leader”. All WPs are also divided into tasks, which are managed by a “task leader”. **Responsibilities for each WP and each task are detailed in the DOA and summarised in the table below.**

	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP1	Innovation methodology adoption	EUR
TASK 1.1	Definition of a common methodology on design thinking	EUR
TASK 1.2	Development of design thinking guidelines that support integration of DT approach in IcARUS	Efus
TASK 1.3	Adoption and familiarisation with DT technology	KEMEA
TASK 1.4	Accelerator model for the exploitation	EUR



	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP2	Review and cross-analysis of urban security	UNIVLEEDS
TASK 2.1	State of the art	UNIVLEEDS
TASK 2.2	Collection of best practices, tools and institutional barriers to prevent and tackle urban security issues	Efus
TASK 2.3	Critical review of 'what works' and needs assessment	Eurocircle
TASK 2.4	Roadmap for the improvement and definition of tools	UNIVLEEDS



○	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP3	Toolkit development using social and technological innovation	USAL
TASK 3.1	Local workshops with civil society to create a cross-priority analysis	Efus
TASK 3.2	Defining, prototyping, and adapting tools according to the social innovation approach	USAL
TASK 3.3	Defining, prototyping, and adapting tools according to the technological innovation approach	IDIAP
TASK 3.4	Development of indicators that measure the feasibility, desirability and viability of the developed tools	EUR
TASK 3.5	Local workshops consultation with civil society to validate and adapt the defined tools	EC
TASK 3.6	Workshop consultation with Expert Advisory Board, Consultative Committee of Cities, EFUS and LEAs	Efus
TASK 3.7	Synergies between social and technological innovation tools	EUR
TASK 3.8	Compilation of the toolkit	USAL

O	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP4	Toolkit demonstration and implementation	Efus
TASK 4.1	Definition of plan to integrate the toolkit into one of the policy lines of the local security plan	Efus
TASK 4.2	Training for the local partners who will be involved in the demonstration	Efus
TASK 4.3	Demonstration tools for a strategic approach to urban security	Partner cities
TASK 4.4	Learning expeditions	Efus
TASK 4.5	Elaboration of guidelines to better implement the toolkit for a strategic approach to urban security	Efus
TASK 4.6	Elaboration of training procedures for end users	Eurocircle
TASK 4.7	Evaluation of the toolkit	EUR



O	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP5	Communication and dissemination	LOBA
TASK 5.1	Dissemination and Communication Strategy and Data Management Plan	LOBA
TASK 5.2	Dissemination and Communication Material	LOBA
TASK 5.3	Dissemination and Communications Actions	LOBA
TASK 5.4	Exploitation and knowledge transfer	LOBA

O	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP6	Ethical, Legal & Privacy Aspects	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.1	Design and legal adjustment of IcARUS	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.2	Implementation of adapted codes of good practices to each partner of the consortium	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.3	Detection of new ethical challenges and evaluation of the social acceptability of IcARUS	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.4	Ethical risk assessment and monitoring on main tasks of IcARUS	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.5	Structural implementation and monitoring of a Privacy-by-Design model	Plus Ethics
TASK 6.6	Compliance with personal data collection and processing	Plus Ethics
O	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP7	Project coordination	Efus
TASK 7.1	General coordination	Efus
TASK 7.2	Financial management and reporting	Efus
TASK 7.3	Quality assurance and Risk management	Efus
TASK 7.4	Creation and management of an Expert Advisory Board	Efus
TASK 7.5	Establishment and management of a Consultative Committee of Cities	Efus
TASK 7.6	Scientific and technical management support	Efus



	WP AND TASKS	LEADER
WP8	Ethics requirements	Efus

Table 1-WPs and tasks

3.2 Responsibilities of the coordinator

The coordinator has the following responsibilities:

- Monitoring the overall implementation of all WPs and project's activities
- Ensuring the smooth implementation of the work programme
- Ensuring that project's objectives are met to the highest standards
- Ensuring that all necessary resources are available for the implementation of the project
- Ensuring that all deliverables are submitted in due time on the participant portal
- Ensuring the dissemination of public deliverables, once they are approved by the EC, in coordination with WP5 leader (LOBA).

3.3 Responsibilities of WP leaders

WP leaders have the following responsibilities:

- Coordinating the implementation of their WP
- Monitoring the implementation of and the coordination of the different tasks of their WP
- Ensuring that all deliverables are delivered in due time

3.4 Responsibilities of task Leaders

Tasks leaders have the following responsibilities:

- Monitoring the implementation of their respective tasks
- Coordination the production of the deliverables they are responsible for, in coordination with contributors

In addition, the coordinator and WP leaders must be in regular communications to ensure the smooth implementation of the work plan as well that necessary steps are taken to settle any issues or challenges that may emerge. WP leaders must also work closely with task leaders to ensure that their WP meet the objectives of the project.

4. Quality control and assurance

The aim of a Quality Control Plan is to establish and maintain high standards of technical and professional quality with regard to the objectives set for the project as well as ensure the continuous improvement of project's outcomes.

4.1 Principles

There are two main principles guiding the Quality control and assurance process of the IcARUS project.

4.1.1 First quality control principle

The first principle relates to ensuring that project activities and results comply with project's objectives. Indeed, the Quality control plan will permit the close monitoring of the implementation of project's activities and the delivery of best results.

4.1.2 Second quality control principle

The second principle relates to ensuring that project's activities and results meet the requirements the end users, through all stages of the project. Indeed, the Quality Control plan will aim at ensuring that the tools developed in the context of the project, meet the needs of local stakeholders and citizens within the project as well as beyond.

4.2 Monitoring of the implementation of the project

The Coordinator will be monitoring closely the implementation of all project's activities and ensure that all necessary technical and financial resources are available. As described in the GA and the Project Management Guide, there will be regular coordination meetings with project partners to review the implementation of the project and address any issues that may arise. In addition, the Coordinator will carefully monitor the implementation of the project through the interim and periodic financial and narrative reports produced by project's partners.

4.3 Production of deliverables

4.3.1 Responsibilities

Beneficiaries have the following responsibilities:

- Task leaders will be responsible for ensuring that deliverables are produced in a timely manner, with high quality standards and that they meet the objectives set out in the GA. To this end, they will be responsible for elaborating a plan and coordinating the drafting of the deliverable in cooperation with pre-identified contributors and peer-reviewers.
- The coordinator will be responsible for the final review of the deliverable as well as its submission on the participant portal. Should partners face any challenges or difficulties arise in the process, the coordinator is also responsible for assisting task leaders and partners in finding solutions for the smooth production of the deliverable.

4.3.2 Deliverable production plan

Task leaders must ensure the timely production of high-quality deliverables. To this end, they will establish an outline detailing their plan for the production of each deliverable, 4 or 6 weeks, depending on the nature of the deliverable, before the submission deadline, that they will share with pre-identified contributors as well as identified peer-reviewers. This plan will include the following information:

- A timeline for the production of the deliverable
- Involved partners
- Peer reviewers
- Proposed outline of the deliverable

4.3.3 Drafting process

The task leader will produce a first draft of the deliverable that will then be shared with all contributors to their task, as defined in the GA. After receiving their input, task leaders will draft an updated version of the deliverable that will then be sent to pre-identified peer-reviewers.

4.3.4 Peer-review

To ensure that the project's objectives are met and that its results fit end users' needs, deliverables will be reviewed by selected partners and more particularly by the partner cities, tentatively, 3 weeks before the submission deadline. In addition, the project's Expert Advisory Board and the Consultative Committee, will conduct reviews of some deliverables, thus providing external expertise and practitioner's knowledge.

To facilitate the process, task leaders will develop a series of questions for peer-reviewers.

4.3.5 Final review

The deliverable will be sent to the coordinator (Efus), tentatively, 2 weeks before the submission deadline, who will do a final review. Efus will check the conformity of the deliverables to the description action, project's objectives, the quality of the content as well as the correct application of established templates and logos. Efus will then submit the approved deliverable to the European Commission via the Participant Portal. The coordinator will also ensure that relevant public deliverables are published on the project's website and disseminated to a wider audience.

The process and responsibilities for the production of each deliverable are summarised in the table below:

WORK PACKAGES

WP1 . INNOVATION METHODOLOGY ADOPTION

LEADER

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY

D 1.1

Methodology for the adoption of DT in urban security & crime prevention initiatives

Submission date

M3

Leader

Erasmus
University

Contributors

USAL, Makesense, Efus, IDIAP,
all other partners

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 1.2

Guidelines to the DT implementation in IcARUS task

Submission date

M5

Leader

Erasmus
University

Contributors

USAL, Makesense, Efus,
IDIAP, Plus Ethics,
KEMEA, LEEDS

Design/infographics

LOBA

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 1.3

Result from cross training task

Submission date

M7

Leader

KEMEA

Contributors

Eurocircle, EUR, Makesense,
Efus

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 1.4

Exploitation of tools developed/improved in the framework of the project

Submission date

M24

Leader

Erasmus
University

Contributors

Makesense, EC, Efus, IDIAP,
KEMEA, Stuttgart, Rotterdam,
CML, Nice, PLTO, RMP

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Consultative
Committee of
Cities (CCC)

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

WORK PACKAGES

WP2 . REVIEW AND CROSS-ANALYSIS OF URBAN SECURITY

LEADER

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

D 2.1

Report describing the state of the art and cross analysis of the priority areas

Submission date

M15

Leader

University of Leeds

Contributors

Panteion, FHS, USAL, KEMEA, CML, Rotterdam, PLTO, Nice, Stuttgart, IDIAP, Efus, RMP

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Expert Advisory Board (EAB)

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 2.2

Report describing the inventory of practices, tools and lessons learnt

Submission date

M15

Leader

Efus

Contributors

Panteion, UNIVLEEDS, FHS, USAL, EUR, KEMEA, CML, Rotterdam, Stuttgart, Plus Ethics, IDIAP, EC, Nice, PLTO, Makesense, RMP

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

EAB and CCC

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 2.3

Report describing the results from the workshops for assessing requirements

Submission date

M18

Leader

Eurocircle

Contributors

Efus, EUR, Panteion, USAL, UNIVLEEDS, FHS, IDIAP, Nice, Stuttgart, PLTO, CML, Makesense, KEMEA, Loba, Plus Ethics, Rotterdam, RMP

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

EAB and CCC

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 2.4

Roadmap of tools that need to be improved and the parameters to be taken into account for defining the tools

Submission date

M18

Leader

University of Leeds

Contributors

Efus, KEMEA, FHS

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

All WP leaders and Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

WORK PACKAGES

WP3 . TOOLKIT DEVELOPMENT USING SOCIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

LEADER

UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD

D 3.1

Report of the results of the cross analysis exercise

Submission date

M23

Leader

Efus

Contributors

Makesense, USAL, IDIAP, Nice, Rotterdam, Stuttgart, PLTO, CML, EC, UNIVLEEDS, RMP, EUR

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

CCC

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 3.2

Report of the guidelines to the creation of synergies between social and technological innovative tools

Submission date

M24

Leader

Erasmus University

Contributors

USAL, IDIAP, FHS, EC, KEMEA, Makesense, Efus, LEEDS, EUR, Panteion

Design/infographics

LOBA

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

CCC and EAB

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 3.3

Report of workshop consultation with Advisory Board, cities, consultative committee, LEAs

Submission date

M31

Leader

KEMEA

Contributors

Efus, USAL, IDIAP

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Partner cities, CCC and EAB

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 3.4

Report of local workshops consultations with previously involved civil society

Submission date

M32

Leader

Eurocircle

Contributors

USAL, IDIAP, Efus, Makesense

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 3.5 Report of the indicators and roadmap to test them		Submission date M33	Leader Erasmus University
Contributors Efus, FHS, Panteion, LEEDS, KEMEA, USAL		Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline CCC and Partner cities	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 3.6 Tools defined according to the social innovation approach		Submission date M33	Leader USAL
Contributors Makesense, Efus, FHS, LEEDS, Panteion, KEMEA	Design/infographics LOBA	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline CCC and Partner cities	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 3.7 Tools defined according to the technical innovation approach		Submission date M33	Leader IDIAP
Contributors Efus, PLTO, FHS, Panteion, LEEDS, Eurocircle, KEMEA		Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Cities, CCC and Plus Ethics	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 3.8 Toolkit for an improved and innovative strategic approach to urban security		Submission date M34	Leader USAL
Contributors IDIAP, LEEDS, Efus, FHS, EUR, Panteion, EC, Makesense, KEMEA	Design/infographics LOBA	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Cities, CCC and Plus Ethics	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus

WORK PACKAGES

WP4 . TOOLKIT DEMONSTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

LEADER

EFUS

D 4.1

Work plan from LEAs to implement tools for each of the 4 priority areas

Submission date

M33

Leader

Efus

Contributors

Stuttgart, Rotterdam, Nice, Turin, Lisboa, Riga, USAL, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion, IDIAP

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

EAB, CCC and Plus Ethics

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.2

Report from training sessions meant to support the creation of the guidelines

Submission date

M36

Leader

Efus

Contributors

IDIAP, USAL, Plus Ethics, KEMEA, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.3

Report of the demonstration in each of the cities

Submission date

M42

Leader

All partner cities

Contributors

Efus, USAL, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

EAB

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.4

Reports (recommendations) gathered from the learning expedition in each of the cities

Submission date

M43

Leader

Efus

Contributors

USAL, LEEDS, Panteion, FHS

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

CCC and EAB

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.5

Training procedure methodology addressed to local security practitioners from the cities

Submission date

M46

Leader

Eurocircle

Contributors

Efus, USAL, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion, Plus Ethics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

CCC and Partner cities

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.6

Guidelines on how to better implement the toolkit

Submission date

M48

Leader

USAL

Contributors

Efus, USAL, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion, IDIAP, Makesense, Plus Ethics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Partner cities and CCC

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

D 4.7

Evaluation of the toolkit

Submission date

M48

Leader

Erasmus University

Contributors

Efus, USAL, LEEDS, FHS, Panteion, Makesense, Plus Ethics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

EAB

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Efus

WORK PACKAGES

**WP5 . COMMUNICATION AND
DISSEMINATION**

LEADER

LOBA

D 5.1

Visual Identity

Submission date

M2

Leader

LOBA

Contributors

LOBA

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 5.2

**Strategic Dissemination and
Communication plan V.1**

Submission date

M3

Leader

LOBA

Contributors

LOBA and Efus

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

All partners

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 5.3

**Creation of the project's webpage
and social networks**

Submission date

M4

Leader

LOBA

Contributors

LOBA and Efus

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 5.4

**Strategic Dissemination and
Communication plan V.2**

Submission date

M25

Leader

LOBA

Contributors

LOBA and Efus

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

All partners

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 5.5

**Communications and Dissemination
Report 1**

Submission date

M25

Leader

LOBA

Contributors

LOBA and Efus

Review - 3 weeks before
submission deadline

All partners

Final review - 2 weeks before
submission deadline

Efus

D 5.6 Electronic newsletters	Submission date M48	Leader LOBA
Contributors LOBA and Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Efus	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 5.7 Dissemination toolkit	Submission date M48	Leader LOBA
Contributors LOBA and Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Efus	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 5.8 Communications and Dissemination Report 2	Submission date M48	Leader LOBA
Contributors LOBA and Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline All partners	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 5.9 Management of IPR, Exploitation, Commercialization plans, including roadmap, USPs	Submission date M48	Leader LOBA
Contributors LOBA and Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline All partners	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus

WORK PACKAGES

**WP6 . ETHICAL, LEGAL AND
PRIVACY ASPECTS**

LEADER

PLUS ETHICS

D 6.1

Legal adjustment report of IcARUS to the relevant international and national regulations

Submission date

M12

Leader

Plus Ethics

Contributors

Design/infographics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Plus Ethics

Plus Ethics

Cities

Efus

D 6.2

Publication of the code of ethics and good scientific practices in IcARUS

Submission date

M18

Leader

Plus Ethics

Contributors

Design/infographics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Plus Ethics

Plus Ethics

DPO of each partner institution

Efus

D 6.3

Report on new ethical challenges and social acceptability of IcARUS

Submission date

M48

Leader

Plus Ethics

Contributors

Design/infographics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Plus Ethics

Plus Ethics

Cities

Efus

D 6.4

Evaluation report of the main general and specific ethical risks of IcARUS

Submission date

M48

Leader

Plus Ethics

Contributors

Design/infographics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Plus Ethics

Plus Ethics

DPO of each partner institution

Efus

D 6.5

Ethical, legal and privacy monitoring of IcARUS

Submission date

M48

Leader

Plus Ethics

Contributors

Design/infographics

Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline

Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline

Plus Ethics

Plus Ethics

DPO of each partner institution

Efus

D 6.6		Submission date	Leader
Monitoring on compliance with personal data collection and processing		M48	Plus Ethics
Contributors	Design/infographics	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline
Plus Ethics	Plus Ethics	DPO of each partner institution	Efus

WORK PACKAGES

WP7 . PROJECT COORDINATION

LEADER

EFUS

D 7.1		Submission date	Leader
Project Management Guide		M3	Efus
Contributors	Design/infographics	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline
Efus	LOBA	Efus	Efus

D 7.2		Submission date	Leader
Risk Management and Quality Assurance Plan		M5	Efus
Contributors	Design/infographics	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline
Efus and all partners	LOBA	Efus	Efus

D 7.3		Submission date	Leader
Management and coordination plan for the EAB and CCC		M6	Efus
Contributors	Design/infographics	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline
Efus		WP leaders	Efus

D 7.4		Submission date	Leader
Coordination meeting minutes		M48	Efus
Contributors		Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline
Efus		All partners	Efus

WORK PACKAGES		LEADER
WP8 . ETHICS REQUIREMENT		EFUS
D 8.1 H-Requirement No. 1	Submission date M6	Leader Efus
Contributors Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Plus Ethics	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 8.2 H-Requirement No. 2	Submission date M12	Leader Efus
Contributors Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Plus Ethics	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus
D 8.3 H-Requirement No. 3	Submission date M6	Leader Efus
Contributors Efus	Review - 3 weeks before submission deadline Plus Ethics	Final review - 2 weeks before submission deadline Efus

Table 2-Production of IcARUS deliverables

5. Management of risks

5.1 Risk Management Plan

The coordinator, with the support of project partners is responsible for establishing a Risk Management plan. The aim of this Plan is to identify, at an early stage, any possible risks that may arise in the implementation of the project and find solutions in due time. This Plan specifies risk management procedures and responsibilities.

The Risk Management Plan (RMP) is defined according to the following elements:

- risk identification, that aims to identify risks of any nature that may arise in the context of the project
- risk analysis, that evaluates the likelihood of each risk and its potential impact on the project;

- contingency actions, that aims to identify the measures and the processes which should be undertaken to manage risks. Contingency actions define who is responsible for the risk and the scope of the contingency action;

The accuracy of identified risks will be reviewed every six months, by the coordinator and WP leaders, and the plan will be improved and completed accordingly.

5.2 Risk Monitoring and Mitigation

There are four primary elements involved with risk monitoring activities:

- systematically track the status of risks previously identified
- identify, document, and assess any new risks that emerge
- effectively manage the risk reserve
- capture lessons learned for future risk identification and assessment efforts.

The project coordinator, WP leaders and task leaders must constantly monitor the evolution of the risks that may emerge during the course of the project. To this end, the coordinator and project partners have identified risks related to the implementation of their WPs and tasks as well as proposed specific actions/measures to mitigate them. **These are presented in the table below**, which includes:

- a description of each identified risk, an indication of the WPs in which this risk may arise
- a measure of the risk assessment (likelihood and impact)
- a description of the proposed mitigation response
- information on the partner who is responsible for taking action to mitigate the identified risk

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
1	The preclusion to hold on-site and in-person meetings due to Covid 19 restrictions for the first year of the project inhibits partners' identification with the project and capacity to collaborate successfully.	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7		
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Hold additional virtual meetings and endeavour to render them more interactive, to facilitate the co-production process. Entertain additional communication channels with partners, such as the Efus Network platform.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
2	Consortium partners do not all have the same level of information on the implementation of project's activities and therefore do not contribute efficiently to the project.	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Efus will ensure through the organisation of coordination meetings every 3 and 6 months as well as project management body meetings that regular communications is kept within the consortium. Moreover, Efus will organise bilateral meetings to ensure that all partners are on the same page and have the same level of information. In addition to that, communication between all partners will be facilitated by the internal Efus network platform that allows to share and discuss working documents and ideas.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus, EUR, University of Salford, University of Leeds		
3	WPs work separately and project's objectives are not met.	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Efus will facilitate regular communications among project partners to ensure that all WPs work together. In addition, Erasmus will play a central role in ensuring that the DT methodology is homogeneously applied in all WPs.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus and EUR		
4	Some partners may not have a full understanding of the rules of the Grant Agreement, of eligible costs as well as of, the documentation they need to provide for the periodic reporting, which might result in mismanagement of funding	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Hold additional virtual meetings and endeavour to render them more interactive, to facilitate the co-production process. Entertain additional communication channels with partners, such as the Efus Network platform.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
5	Due to the health situation related to Covid 19 in 2020 and 2021, partners underspend the pre-funding payment that they have received. Therefore, there might be a discrepancy between the pre-funding payment and the costs that will be declared during the first reporting period.	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps The interim (every 3 month) and periodic financial reporting will enable the coordinator to closely monitor each partner's budget spending. The coordinator will reajust and reallocate budget, in case some partners are underspending their budget.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		
6	Partners are not able to complete the financial reporting due to staff change, or organisational issues.	WP 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Coordinator will keep constant contact with partners, and ask partners to provide the required documentation to complete the financial reporting.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		
7	Data to complete the state of the art and the survey on existing tech tools might not be available for a specific priority, and certain countries. Data might not be updated or collected yet or under data protection law. Details of specific tools might not be public due to legal property reasons.	WP 2	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Use of existing reports from Eurocircle, European observatory, European research council, FRA, etc. Benchmark on other projects and use of synergies to facilitate data collection. Efus will make sure that partners cities share all relevant and available information.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
8	Insufficient amount of time to conduct the cross analysis. Academic partners do not have enough time to produce the state of the art and the collection of practices.	WP 2	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Start WP2 activities earlier and more particularly task 2.1 and 2.2. Furthermore, (virtual) regular WP2 meetings will be held and tools to facilitate communications and interaction will be developed.		This mitigation step has already been taken. It has been decided during the project's Kick-Off-Meeting to start WP2 activities earlier. This has also been approved by the PO.		
		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		
9	Difficulty to identify and adapt existing tools which meet the following criteria: comply with the needs of the cities, technically innovative, cost efficient, compliant with ethical and legal requirements.	WP 3	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Reinforce and define tools built on (1) open source tools and common platforms and (2) tools that use FAT principles (fairness, accountability, transparency)		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions University of Salford		
10	Participation of initially identified civil society stakeholders is not sustained throughout the project.	WP 3	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps The six partner cities will be supported by Efus and other partners in the process of identifying and recruiting relevant civil society actors. One component of the Design Thinking methodology training will be dedicated to equip local authorities with the required skills to engage and work with civil society actors. The actors' involvement over the duration of the project will be a determining condition to participate and a respective consent form will be created. Efus will make sure that the relevant stakeholders are represented and participate in the different workshops and demonstrations.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
11	Failure of the implementation of the tools: innovative tools are not adapted to local challenges and needs.	WP 4	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>

Proposed risk-mitigation steps

Already at the beginning of the selection of tools and practices, local stakeholders will be involved in the identification of local challenges as well as the detection of unmet needs of the citizens. These findings will inform the subsequent project stages as they determine the tools and practices that respond to these local challenges and unmet needs. Both the collection of practices and the design of innovative tools will be co-produced, reviewed and validated by experts and local stakeholders representing a variety of institutions and professions through the course of several consultation workshops. This constant process of review, adaptation and validation will also ensure the compliance of the tools with local requirements and needs.

Partner(s) in charge of taking actions

Efus

12	Absence of feedback on the evaluation of the tools at the end of the project.	WP 4	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
----	---	------	--	--

Proposed risk-mitigation steps

Constant monitoring will be conducted in the course of the project. The implementation of a continuous process of review, adaptation and validation through the applied Design Thinking methodology will ensure the collection of constant feedback from partners within and beyond the consortium.

Partner(s) in charge of taking actions

Efus

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
13	Low visibility and dissemination of the toolkit and the project outcomes and results.	WP 4	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps All project partners will use their network to promote project's activities and results. The Consultative Committee of Cities will also be an important channel the dissemination of the project's activities and results. Finally, involving local authorities' communication departments of local authorities may also help disseminating project's results.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus and LOBA		
14	Substantial changes in ethics and privacy standards related to project activities.	WP 6	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Updating of regulatory standards and constant monitoring of activities that may contain particularly sensitive elements. In the event that an activity has already been completed, ethical and privacy compliance will be reassessed in D6.4 based on the new standards in order to validate the <u>outcome</u> .		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Plus Ethics		
15	Low external validity of the empirical ethical study (T6.3) due to small sample size.	WP 6	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps A two-fold strategy is envisaged to address this risk: 1) involve end-users more intensively in the online recruitment of participants, and, only if necessary, 2) use quantitative analytical benchmarking techniques of sample weighting to correct for biases in data collection.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Plus Ethics		

RISK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	WP NUMBER	LIKELIHOOD ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)	IMPACT ON A SCALE FROM 1 (low) - 5 (high)
16	Difficulties in coordinating a diverse consortium with different backgrounds, priorities, countries, working in different sectors, and speaking different languages as well as using English as a common language.	WP 7	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps Efus can rely on a multicultural team of programme managers who exhibit strong diplomatic and intercultural skills. In addition, a budget has been allocated to some partners to cover the translation of relevant documents if necessary.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		
17	Changes in project consortium (e.g. partner withdrawal)	WP 7	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Proposed risk-mitigation steps In the Consortium Agreement a clause is included according to which the partners in case of withdrawal, agree to suggest substitutes with equivalent (or higher) qualifications and experience upon their withdrawal announcement.		Partner(s) in charge of taking actions Efus		

Table 3-Risk monitoring and mitigation

6. Conclusion

This deliverable presents both a Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) and a Risk Management Plan (RMP) for the IcARUS project. The QAP aims to ensure the quality of project's outputs as well as that project's results meet the requirements of partner cities, while the RMP aims to identify and anticipate potential risks before they arise and ensure that proper action and mitigation steps are taken.



CONSORTIUM



European Forum for Urban Security (Efus)



FH Salzburg
Fachhochschule Salzburg
(FHS) Salzburg University of Applied Sciences



Plus Ethics



Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR)



Laboratory of Urban Criminology / Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (Panteion)



University of Salford



University of Leeds



Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart Municipality of Stuttgart



Riga Municipal Police (RMP)



City of Rotterdam



City of Nice



Lisbon Municipal Police / Lisbon Municipality (LMP/CML)



Local Police of Turin (PLTO)



makesense



Eurocircle



Idiap Research Institute



KEMEA



LOBA

