





Project DEOS-UD Disruptive Earth Observation Sensing for Urban Developement

Deliverable 3 Procurement, Quality, Risks and Communication Management

Authors:

Calderón Rosario, Borja Nachett, Hamza De Benedicto Barba, Maria Pérez Sánchez. David Escartín Vivancos, Guillermo Pla Olea, Laura Fontanes Molina, Pol Pons Daza, Marina Ramón Costa, Fernando Franch I Ruiz, Sergi González García, Sílvia Sellart Combalia, Ana Maria Herrando Moraira, Albert Serra Moncunill, Josep Maria Lopezbarrena Arenas, Santiago Urbano González, Eva María

National Contact Point: Pérez Llera, Luís Manuel

Group: G3-220310-PM-P2018 **Delivery date:** 14-05-2018



Contents

| Lis | st of | Tables | iii |
|-----|--------------------|---|-------------|
| Lis | st of l | Figures | iv |
| 1 | Plan 1.1 1.2 | procurement management Make or Buy decisions | 1 1 3 |
| 2 | Qua | lity management plan | 4 |
| | 2.1 | Quality Assurance Approach | 4 |
| | 2.2 | Quality Control Approach | 4 |
| | | 2.2.1 Documentation quality plan | 4 |
| | | 2.2.2 Technical quality plan | 5 |
| | | 2.2.3 Software quality plan | 5 |
| | 2.3 | Quality Improvement Approach | 6 |
| | 2.4 | Quality Roles and Responsibilities | 7 |
| 3 | Risk | management plan | 9 |
| | 3.1 | Definitions of Probability | 9 |
| | 3.2 | Definitions of impacts by objective | 9 |
| | 3.3 | Probability and impact matrix | 11 |
| | 3.4 | Risk rating | 12 |
| | 3.5 | Risk identification and assessment | 13 |
| | 3.6 | Risk data sheet | 20 |
| 4 | Plan | communication management | 36 |
| | 4.1 | Participants roles and responsabilities | 36 |
| | 4.2 | Communication process | 40 |
| | | 4.2.1 Informal | 40 |
| | | 4.2.2 Formal | 40 |
| | | 4.2.2.1 Status Meetings | 40 |
| | | 4.2.2.2 Status Reports | 41 |
| | | 4.2.3 External Communication | 41 |
| | | 4.2.3.1 General public | 41 |

HIRO R - i

CONTENTS



| | 4.2.3.2 | Aerospace sector | | | | | | | | | 42 |
|-----|---------------|-------------------|--------|---|------|--|--|--|------|--|--------|
| 4.3 | Communication | management plan r | matrix | < | | | | | | | 42 |

HIRO R - ii



List of Tables

| 2.4.1 | List of quality roles and responsibilities |
|--------|---|
| 3.1.1 | Definitions of probability |
| 3.2.1 | Scope/Quality impacts |
| 3.2.2 | Schedule imapcts |
| 3.2.3 | Cost impacts |
| 3.5.1 | Risk identification and assessment |
| 3.5.2 | Risk identification and assessment |
| 3.5.3 | Risk identification and assessment |
| 3.5.4 | Revised risk identification and assessment |
| 3.6.1 | Risk 1 data sheet |
| 3.6.2 | Risk 2 data sheet |
| 3.6.3 | Risk 3 data sheet |
| 3.6.4 | Risk 4 data sheet |
| 3.6.5 | Risk 5 data sheet |
| 3.6.6 | Risk 6 data sheet |
| 3.6.7 | Risk 7 data sheet |
| 3.6.8 | Risk 8 data sheet |
| 3.6.9 | Risk 9 data sheet |
| 3.6.10 | Risk 10 data sheet |
| 3.6.11 | Risk 11 data sheet |
| 3.6.12 | Risk 12 data sheet |
| 3.6.13 | Risk 13 data sheet |
| 3.6.14 | Risk 14 data sheet |
| 3.6.15 | Risk 15 data sheet |
| 3.6.16 | Risk 16 data sheet |
| 4.1.1 | Roles and responsibilities |
| 431 | Revised risk identification and assessment 44 |

HIRO R - iii



List of Figures

| 3.3.1 | Probability and Impact Matrix | 12 |
|-------|-------------------------------|----|
| 3.3.2 | Probability and Impact Matrix | 12 |

HIRO R - iv



1 | Plan procurement management

On the following sections, procurement decisions will be exposed, determining whether to acquire outside support, and if so, what to acquire, how to acquire it, how much is needed, and when to acquire it.

1.1 Make or Buy decisions

| WBS ID | Work Package Name | Reasons for BUY | Cost estimate | Type of contract | Possible risks | List of suppliers | Special considerations or constraints |
|-----------|--|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| 5.1.1. | Manufacturing of payload sensors | Create sensors with the designed parameters, using high performance industry standards. | c € | FFP (Firm Fixed Price contract) | Delay in delivering the products Faulty products | SUPLIERS FOR SENSORS | Products must satisfy design parameters Maximum due date $16/04/21$ |
| 5.1.2 | Manufacturing of modular system | Use sensor interface specific outsource facilities for manufacturing the modular system | c € | FFP (Firm Fixed Price contract) | Delay in delivery Specifications not met. | SUPPLIWES FOR INTERFACE | Product must satisfy design parameters Maximum due date 16/04/21 |
| 5.6. | Quality of the product | Outside of the project entity must do quality tests | c € | FFP (Firm Fixed Price contract) | Quality standards of the products not met. | QUALITY agency | Due date of quality study is fixed on 21/01/22 |
| 7.2.1. | Web site development | Quick launch the project professional website. | cost€ | FFP (Fixed Price Contract) | Late delivery Not meeting communiation plan specifications | Due date before 21/01/22 | |





1.2 Statement Of Work

For each procurement option

Detailed description of the procurement item; • Requirements to be met by the procurement item; • Type of contract to be used; • Setting the scheduled dates in each contract for the contract deliverables (milestones) and coordinating with the schedule project development; • Any constraints and assumptions that could affect planned procurements; • Identifying requirements for performance bonds or insurance contracts to mitigate some forms of project risk; • Establishing the form and format to be used for the procurement/contract statements of work; • Identifying prequalified sellers, if any, to be used; and • Procurement metrics to be used to manage contracts and evaluate sellers.

5.1.1. Manufacturing of payload sensors

Requirements Build sensors described by the 4.2.1.0. Payloads final design, related to the Earth Observation project. Seller can manufacture one part of the required items, but budget will be adjusted accordingly.

Type of contract A Firm Fixed Price contract is stipulated because, for this tasks there are clear requirements and determined deadlines. Also, budget have been assigned and a final product version it is clearly decided.

Scheduled date To be delivered no later than 16/04/2021. Starts after the 4.2.1.0. Payloads final design delivery and is part of the 5.0. Prototype manufacturing milestone.

Constraints Manufactured sensors should met all 4.2.1.0. Payloads final design constraints without exception.

Risk control actions description

Form and format description

Prequalified sellers description

Procurement metrics description



2 | Quality management plan

TEXTO

2.1 Quality Assurance Approach

TEXTO

2.2 Quality Control Approach

The quality control plan of the project is divided in three main areas:

- Documentation quality plan
- Technical quality plan
- Software quality plan

2.2.1 Documentation quality plan

All the documentation of the project has to follow a strict quality plan in order to ensure that no information is lost. This plan refers to the deliverables but also to the internal documents of the company. The processes that have to be followed are:

- 1. Definition of the document
 - Define the type of document and its content as well as the standards that it has to follow.
 - Define the responsible of the document, the team that is going to work in it and the team that is going to verify it.



- Define the deadline of the document as well as any milestone that may be related to it.
- 2. Redaction of the document: While the document is in progress there may be some periodic quality controls to ensure that the quality plan is met.
- 3. Review and approval: Once the document is finished, it is delivered to the quality department. They have to verify that the documentation follows the quality standards defined by the company.

2.2.2 Technical quality plan

Since the project consists in the design and construction of the prototype, it is necessary to ensure that the product of the project meets all the quality requirements. To do so, before beginning with the design, a quality plan has to be defined. Once the plan is finished and the design phase starts, there are some procedures that will have to be done regularly:

- Check that the design fulfils the requirements of the project.
- Check for possible incompatibilities between the payload and the modular system.
- Review that the milestones are met in the given deadlines.

Finally, when the design is over and the prototype is constructed, a validation must be done in order to check that it fulfils all the requirements of the project as well as to verify that it complies the quality plan. This validation process has to follow the standards given by the industry.

2.2.3 Software quality plan

The project not only consists of a prototype that should be constructed, but it also has a software that has to be verified. In order to do so, before stating with the coding, a software quality plan has to be defined. According to this document, some standards have to be followed in the making of the interaction platform, such as coding and comment standards, to ensure a correct flow of information between the people who work on it as well as to avoid possible errors. During the design phase, some procedures will be done regularly:

- Check that the standards are being followed.
- Avoid possible incompatibilities between the interaction platform and the payload or modular system.



• Review the latest modifications before making them definitive.

Once an error is detected, it has to be immediately reported to the responsible of the software development. Then, an engineer will be assigned to solve it, and he/she will report it once the problem is solved.

Finally, once the interaction platform is operative, a validation has to be performed in order to ensure that it fulfils all the requirements of the project as well as to verify it complies the software quality plan. This validation process has to follow the standards given by the industry.

2.3 Quality Improvement Approach

Quality improvement (QI) is a formal analysis of practice performance and efforts done in order to improve the performance of the project with the main objective of increasing its efficiency. The information shown here about QI models and tools has been extracted from [?] and [?]. A proper QI process requires of some basics to success. These basics are the following ones:

- Establish a culture of quality in the project: Creation of QI teams, QI meetings and QI goals.
- Determine and prioritize potential areas of improvement: Define, according to the acceptance criteria of the project, the main areas of improvement.
- Collect and analyse data: Determine the type of data to be collect and analyse it properly according to the project objectives.
- Communication of results: Quality improvements should be transparent to the stakeholders in order to keep them satisfy.

In this project the six-sigma working philosophy will be implemented in order to improve quality. The objective of this philosophy is to adjust the existing processes in order to improve the quality and minimizing variability by reducing defects and irregularities. The model related with six-sigma philosophy that will be used is DMAIC. This model includes the following steps:

- Define: Set the objective of the problem or the existent defect. In this project this definition will be done according to the acceptance criteria. The improvement of the quality plan is one of the objectives that will need to be taken into account.
- Measurement: Measures are needed in order to have values for the problem or defect. In this project the measurements according to the effectiveness of the quality plan are:



- Number of iterations of a document to be approved.
- Stakeholders satisfaction
- Time needed to approve a document.
- Number of defects detected by the quality department
- Analyse: Figure out the causes of the problem or defect and propose solutions.
- Improve: Implement the solution approved.
- Control: Control the implementation of the improvement, assure continuity and success.

2.4 Quality Roles and Responsibilities

| Role | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|--|
| Project Manager | Final responsible for the quality of the project. |
| | Schedules meetings with the Quality Department in order to discuss the quality aspects of the project. |
| | Establishes the quality plan of the project. |
| Project Manager Secretary | Helps the Project Manager in the tasks that he/she delegates. |
| Quality Manager | Main quality responsible of the project. |
| | Fixes the quality guidelines that all documents are required to fulfill. |
| | Reviews all the deliverables to make sure they fulfill the required quality. |
| Quality Manager Assessor | Helps the Quality Manager in the tasks that he/she delegates. |



| Role | Responsibilities | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Technical Manager | Coordinates the work done by the engineers and technicians. | | | |
| | Reviews the technical aspects of the deliverables before approving them. | | | |
| | Makes sure the technical procedures have been correctly. | | | |
| | Provides assistance to the engineers and technicians in order to fulfill the quality requirements. | | | |
| Engineers and technicians | Make sure that the technical aspects of the project follow the quality standards. | | | |

Table 2.4.1: List of quality roles and responsibilities



3 Risk management plan

3.1 Definitions of Probability

Two parameters are commonly used in order to model risk: the probability that something might happen and the impact it would have if it did happen. Therefore, to evaluate the probability of the potential risk to occur it is crucial to define and quantify it properly.

A scale of 1% to 100% will be used for Probability, which is linearly divided in five sections represented in the table below. In fact, the 1% is associated with the minimum probability meaning it is very rare it occurs and the maximum 100% means a risk is unavoidable.

| Probability | Description | Probability Score |
|-------------|---|-------------------|
| Very High | Means it is a fact because it is very likely to occur | (81-100)% |
| High | Likely to occur | (61-80)% |
| Medium | May occur about half of the time | (41-60)% |
| Low | Unlikely to occur | (21-40)% |
| Very Low | Very unlikely to occur | (1-20)% |

Table 3.1.1: Definitions of probability

3.2 Definitions of impacts by objective

To evaluate the impact into the overall project if a certain risk did happen, a numerical estimate it is provided to quantify the effects of the risks in terms of Scope and Quality, Schedule and Cost. Those three categories are scaled from 1 to 5 in a linear way in order to quantify the



impact, where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum. Moreover, each effect is defined qualitatively depending on its category and its impact.

| Scope/Quality Impact | Description | Scope Impact Score |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|
| Very High | Be unable to achieve the desired objectives. The project end item is effectively useless. | 5 |
| High | Scope and quality reduction hardly acceptable. The impact makes that the project item quality is below the desired objectives and under the acceptance criteria. | 4 |
| Medium | The risk produces moderate impact in the project and the results. Major areas of the scope are affected and quality is reduced but still above the acceptance criteria. | 3 |
| Low | It produces a low impact. Minor areas of the scope are affected and quality is lightly reduced affecting very demanding applications. | 2 |
| Very Low | It produces and insignificant impact in the project. Scope and quality decrease barely noticeable. | 1 |

Table 3.2.1: Scope/Quality impacts

| Schedule Impact | Description | Schedule Impact Score |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Very High | Very significant delay in the schedule, increasing the milestone duration more than a 20%. | 5 |
| High | Significant delay in the schedule, increasing the milestone duration between a 10% and 20%. | 4 |
| Medium | Moderate delay in the schedule, increasing the milestone duration between a 5% and 10%. | 3 |



| Schedule Impact | Description | Schedule Impact Score |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Low | Slightly significant delay in the schedule, increasing the milestone duration less than 5%. | 2 |
| Very Low | Insignificant delay and time increase. | 1 |

Table 3.2.2: Schedule imapcts

| Cost Impact | Description | Cost Impact Score |
|-------------|--|-------------------|
| Very High | Several impact on the project cost, increasing the cost about more than 30%. | 5 |
| High | Important impact on the project cost, increasing the cost about 15% to 30% . | 4 |
| Medium | Moderate impact on the project cost, increasing the cost about 10% to 15% . | 3 |
| Low | Reduced impact on the project cost, increasing the cost about less than 10 | |
| Very Low | Insignificant impact on the project cost. | 1 |

Table 3.2.3: Cost impacts

3.3 Probability and impact matrix

Beyond the definitions of probability and impact, a further quantitative analysis of risk is required. Every risk is assigned a rate based on the probability and impact scores. This evaluation of risks is the way in which they are classified by their importance: the higher the risk rating, the higher their priority for attention. To manage ratings in a more organized manner, the probability and impact matrix is defined. This matrix specifies combinations of probability and impact that lead to rating the risks as very low, low, moderate, high or extreme. The following table shows the risk rating legend used for the elaboration of this project risk matrix:



| Risk Rating | Score | Colour |
|---------------|---------|--------|
| Extreme Risk | [4 - 5] | |
| High Risk | [3 - 4) | |
| Moderate Risk | [2 - 3) | |
| Low Risk | [1 - 2) | |
| Very Low Risk | [0 - 1) | |

Figure 3.3.1: Risk Rating Legend

| | | | Probability | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 25 | | Very Low/.2 | Very High/1 | | | | | | | | |
| | Very High/5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | |
| ಕ | High/4 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 4 | | | | | |
| Impact | Medium/3 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 3 | | | | | |
| 드 | Low/2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2 | | | | | |
| | Very Low/1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1 | | | | | |

Figure 3.3.2: Probability and Impact Matrix

Depending on the risk score, the response and priority assigned to a risk will change. For example, risks that are in the red area of the matrix (high probability and high impact) may require priority action and aggressive response strategies while risks in the light green area may not require proactive management action beyond being considered as a warning. Throughout the project risks may vary so, using this matrix, risks will be reconsidered, changing their rating if necessary.

3.4 Risk rating

As already mentioned, risk rate is determined through probability and impact scores. In fact, it is the result of multiplying both scores. Hence, to identify a risk's position in the matrix, first it is necessary to assess probability and impact score as explained in sections 3.1 and 3.2. The previously defined matrix, represents impact as an overall score but in our case, different impact scores have been defined depending on the project objective that is threatened (scope, schedule, or cost). Hence, to determine the general impact grade the following equation is defined:

$$I_{general} = \sum_{i} (W_i \cdot I_i)$$

where:

• "i" represents the different types of impact (scope, schedule, cost)



- ullet Wi represents the importance or weight (from 0 to 1) of each of the impact types and it is satisfied that Wscope + Wschedule + Wcost = 1
- Ii represents the impact score of each of the types (from 0 to 5)

Consequently, the overall impact will have a value of (0-5] calculated doing a balance between each type of impact importance. Regarding the weights defined for this project, it has been decided that cost is the most important, followed by scope and finally, the schedule. Hence, the values assigned are the ones shown below:

$$W_{scope} = 0.3$$

$$W_{schedule} = 0.2$$

$$W_{cost} = 0.5$$

Once the general impact is calculated, the risk rating is defined as: Risk Rating=Probability Score·Impact Score

3.5 Risk identification and assessment

In this section as risk identification and assessment is provided by taking into account the defined data of the previous sections. Here it is also provided the information about the revised-risks.

The factors that have been used in the identification process are: enterprise environmental factors, organizational process assets, the project scope statement and the project management plan.

It is worth to mention that after analyzing these points, risks have been classified in two main groups: External risks, which are risks the project team cannot control and therefor no response nor action can be defined, and Internal risks, which can be detected in advance and be addressed properly.



HIRO

R - 14

HIRO

| D:-I- ID | Diala Chahamant | Due beskiller | Impact | | | | D |
|------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|------|----------|----------------------------|
| Risk ID | Risk Statement | Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Response |
| Identifier | Description of the risk | Likelihood | | | | Probab. | Description of the |
| | event or circumstance | of | | | | x Impact | planned response |
| | | occurrence | | | | | strategy to the risk event |
| R.1 | Deliverable delays | Medium | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1.6 | Mitigation: Dedicate |
| | | | | | | | more resources than |
| | | | | | | | expected. |
| R.2 | Inaccurate cost forecast | High | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2.6 | Transfer: Consider new |
| | | | | | | | funding sources and |
| | | | | | | | revise the financial |
| | | | | | | | management plan. |
| R.3 | Lack of communication | High | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2.6 | Avoidance: Periodical |
| | | | | | | | meetings and use of |
| | | | | | | | collaborative software. |
| R.4 | Lack of technology | Low | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0.7 | Avoidance: Guarantee |
| | improvement | | | | | | the development with |
| | | | | | | | thorough search of the |
| | | | | | | | actual technology. |
| R.5 | Lack of access to project | Very Low | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | Avoidance: A previous |
| | needed information | | | | | | accurate research is |
| | | | | | | | needed before the |
| | | | | | | | development of the |
| | | | | | | | project. |
| R.6 | Low team motivation | Medium | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1.4 | Acceptance: Personal |
| | | | | | | | control and team |
| | | | | | | | building projects. |



Table 3.5.1: Risk identification and assessment

HIRO

| D:-I- ID | Diel. Chahamanh | Door by a ballion | Impact | | | | D |
|------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|--|
| Risk ID | Risk Statement | Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Response |
| Identifier | Description of the risk event or circumstance | Likelihood of occurrence | | | | Probab. x Impact | Description of the planned response strategy to the risk event |
| R.7 | Unsuccessfully quality control | Low | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1.0 | Mitigation: Improve or increase the quality controls. |
| R.8 | Conflicts between members | High | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1.9 | Acceptance: Personal conflicts resolution meetings. |
| R.9 | Infeasible design | Low | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1.4 | Transfer: Periodical reviews with experts and managers. |
| R.10 | Technologies components with security vulnerabilities | High | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2.1 | Transfer: Check for possible security problems during development through specialized companies. |
| R.11 | Organization issues | Very High | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.2 | Transfer: Ask for help from an external company specialized in project management. |
| R.12 | Stakeholder desertion | Low | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1.2 | Acceptance: Try to transfer the responsibilities to another stakeholder or contract a new one. |



Table 3.5.2: Risk identification and assessment

| Diala ID | Risk Statement | Duahahilit. | Impact | | | 6 | Dononos | |
|------------|---|------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|---|--|
| Risk ID | Risk Statement | Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Response | |
| Identifier | Description of the risk event or circumstance | Likelihood of | | | | Probab. × Impact | Description of the planned response | |
| | | occurrence | | | | | strategy to the risk event | |
| R.13 | Competitors appearance | Very Low | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0.7 | Acceptance: Improvement of the quality/price ratio of the service. | |
| R.14 | Delay in external deliverables | Medium | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1.4 | Acceptance: Control the delivery schedules and change provider if necessary. | |
| R.15 | Economical market issues | Low | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1.1 | Acceptance: Control cost evolution due to external changes throughout the project. | |
| R.16 | Components or row material quality | Low | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1.2 | Mitigation: Have exhaustive and regular quality controls to avoid problems in components in the final test. | |

Table 3.5.3: Risk identification and assessment



| Risk ID | Revised Probability | Revised Impact Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Revised Score | Owner | Action |
|------------|---|------------------------------|----------|------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Identifier | Likelihood after the response strategy | | | | Revised probability x Impact | Person who will manage the risk | Actions to be taken to address the risk |
| | | | | | | | |

Table 3.5.4: Revised risk identification and assessment





3.6 Risk data sheet

| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | Risk Description: | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| R.1 | Deliverables dela | ys: The deli | verables o | could not b | e completed a | t the | | | | |
| | time of their corresponding deadlines, leading to an increase of costs | | | | | | | | | |
| | and a delay of all the schedule of the project. | | | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of th | ne circumstai | nces or d | rivers that | are the source | of the | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | | |
| Duohahilitu | Impact | | | Score | Basmanasa | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | | | |
| Medium | 1 | 4 | 3 | Probab. | Mitigation: [| Dedicate | | | | |
| | | | | X | more resourc | es than | | | | |
| | | | | Impact | expected. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | L | | | Owner | Actions | | | | |
| Revised Probability | Revised Impact Scope/Quality | | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | | | |
| | | | Cost 2 | - | Owner Project | Actions Increase | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | | - | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | | - | Project | Increase | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | | - | Project | Increase planning | | | | |

Description of the risk that arise out of the response strategies taken to address the risk

Residual Risks:

Description of the remaining risk after response strategies

| Contongonou Plani | Contengency Funds: |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Contengency Plan: | Funds needed to protect |
| | the budged from |
| | overrun |
| | Contengency Time: |
| | Time needed to protect |
| | the schedule from |
| | overrun |

Comments:

Any other information on the risk, the status of the risk, or response strategies.

Table 3.6.1: Risk 1 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|----------------|------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| R.2 | Inaccurate cost f | forecast: The | e financia | l prediction | ns could be wro | ong or | | | |
| | different issues n | nay occur in | creasing | the total co | st of the proje | ect. | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | |
| D., . b . b :11:4 | Impact See Beenenses | | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | | |
| High | 3 | 2 | 4 | Probab. | Transfer: Co | nsider new | | | |
| | | | | X | funding sour | ces and | | | |
| | | | | Impact | revise the fin | ancial | | | |
| | | | | | management | plan. | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | <u> </u> | I | Revised | _ | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | | |
| Medium | 2 | 2 | 2 | | Project | High control | | | |
| | | | | | Manager | of the costs | | | |
| | | | | | and | and reduce | | | |
| | | | | | Financial | unnecessary | | | |
| | | | | | Manager | expenses | | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | ı | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | | |
| risk | | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | | | |
| c . | DI | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | | | |
| Contengenc | y Plan: | | | | Funds needed | d to protect | | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | to protect | | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | • | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | l | | | | |

Table 3.6.2: Risk 2 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | n: | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| R.3 | Lack of commur | nication: The | absence | e of a prope | r communicati | on | | | |
| | method or chani | method or channel might affect the quality of the product, the | | | | | | | |
| | fulfilment of the deadlines or a good coordination between members | | | | | | | | |
| | and departments. | | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of th | ne circumstai | nces or d | Irivers that | are the source | of the | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | |
| | Impact | | | _ | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | | |
| High | 3 | 4 | 3 | Probab. | Avoidance: F | Periodical | | | |
| | | | | × | meetings and | l use of | | | |
| | | | | Impact | collaborative | | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | | Revised | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | | |
| Low | 1 | 2 | 1 | | Project | Compulsory | | | |
| | | | | | manager | courses will | | | |
| | | | | | and | be carried | | | |
| | | | | | secretary | out to teach | | | |
| | | | | | | everybody | | | |
| | | | | | | to use | | | |
| | | | | | | collaborative | | | |
| | | | | | | software. | | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | se strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | | |
| risk | | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | | | | | |
| Ct | DI | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | | | |
| Contengenc | cy Pian: | | | | Funds needed | d to protect | | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | to protect | | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | from | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | • | | | | |

Table 3.6.3: Risk 3 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | n: | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| R.4 | Lack of technolo | gy improven | nent: The | e main goa | of the projec | t is to | | |
| | innovate but it o | ould happen | that the | company | did not find th | ne way to | | |
| | improve enough | the different | technolo | ogies. | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of th | ne circumsta | nces or d | rivers that | are the source | of the | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Impact | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | |
| Low | 3 | 2 | 1 | Probab. | Avoidance: | Guarantee | | |
| | | | | x | the developr | nent with | | |
| | | | | Impact | thorough sea | arch of the | | |
| | | | | | actual techn | ology. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | | Revised | Owner | Actions | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | |
| Very low | 2 | 1 | 1 | | Project | Take the | | |
| | | | | | Manager | necessary | | |
| | | | | | | measured to | | |
| | | | | | | achieve to | | |
| | | | | | | desired level | | |
| | | | | | | of | | |
| | | | | | | innovation | | |
| | | | | | | including | | |
| | | | | | | redesign | | |
| | | | | | | and propose | | |
| | | | | | | alternatives. | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to add | ress the | | |
| risk | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | | |
| Contonno | n. Dlanı | | | | Contengen | cy Funds: | | |
| Contengenc | zy Pian: | | | | Funds neede | d to protect | | |
| | | | | | the budged | from | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| | | | | | Contengen | cy Time: | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | to protect | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | from | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Any other in | formation on the | risk, the stat | us of the | risk or res | sponse strateg | ies | | |

Table 3.6.4: Risk 4 data sheet

Comments:



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | n: | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| R.5 | Lack of access to project needed information: Discovering new | | | | | | | | |
| | technologies implies working with leading-edge science. It could occur | | | | | | | | |
| | that the team does not have access to the last improvements or patents. | | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | |
| 0.0000 | Impact | | | _ | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Score Res | | Responses | Responses | | | | |
| Very low | 2 | 2 | 2 | Probab. | Avoidance: A | nrevious | | | |
| Very low | | | | X | accurate rese | • | | | |
| | | | | | needed befor | | | | |
| | | | | Impact | | | | | |
| | | | | | development | or the | | | |
| D | . | | | D • • | project. | Ι | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | | 1 - | Revised | Owner | Actions | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | | | | | |
| Very low | 1 | 1 | 2 | | The | Contact | | | |
| | | | | | manager of | with | | | |
| | | | | | the | scientific | | | |
| | | | | | corresponding | g and | | | |
| | | | | | department | technologica | | | |
| | | | | | | centres | | | |
| | | | | | | must be | | | |
| | | | | | | established | | | |
| | | | | | | so as to get | | | |
| | | | | | | the | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | necessary information | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | for the | | | |
| | | | | | | complete | | | |
| | | | | | | development | | | |
| | | | | | | of the | | | |
| | | | | | | project | | | |
| Secondary I Description or risk | Risks: of the risk that ar | ise out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | | |
| | of the remaining r | isk after rest | onse stra | itegies | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | -6 | Contengenc | y Funds: | | | |
| Contengend | cy Plan: | | | | Funds needed | - | | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | • | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | . • | | | |
| HIRO | | | R - 23 | | Contengenc | v Time: | | | |
| | | ' | | | Time needed | | | | |
| | | | | | | • | | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | irom | | | |

overrun



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--|--|
| R.6 | Low team motiv | ation: The t | eam cou | ld lose moti | vation, which | would | | |
| | lead the project to take more time and costs to be completed. | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| D 1 1 1111 | Impact | | | _ | _ | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | |
| Medium | 3 | 5 | 1 | Probab. | Acceptance: | Personal | | |
| | | | | X | control and t | eam | | |
| | | | | Impact | building proje | ects. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | <u> </u> | ı | Revised | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | |
| Low | 2 | 3 | 1 | | Human | Be aware of | | |
| | | | | | Resources | possible | | |
| | | | | | Manager | staff | | |
| | | | | | | reduction | | |
| | | | | | | and | | |
| | | | | | | contract | | |
| | | | | | | more people | | |
| | | | | | | if it is | | |
| | | | | | | necessary. | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| - | of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | |
| risk | | | · | · · | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | | |
| | | | | _ | Contengenc | y Funds: | | |
| Contengenc | cy Plan: | | | | Funds needed | to protect | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | = | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | • | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |

Table 3.6.6: Risk 6 data sheet

Any other information on the risk, the status of the risk, or response strategies.



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | n: | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| R.7 | Unsuccessfully q | | l: The a | uality of so | me component | . product | | |
| | or deliverable ma | , | • | , | • | • | | |
| | acceptance crite | • | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| 5 1 1 | Impact | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | |
| Low | 4 | 2 | 2 | Probab. | Mitigation: I | mprove or | | |
| | | | | X | increase the | quality | | |
| | | | | Impact | controls. | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | • | Revised | Owner | Actions | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | |
| Low | 2 | 1 | 2 | | Quality | Plan a | | |
| | | | | | Manager | quality | | |
| | | | | | | schedule for | | |
| | | | | | | each | | |
| | | | | | | component | | |
| | | | | | | and increase | | |
| | | | | | | the human | | |
| | | | | | | resources if | | |
| | | | | | | it is needed. | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | |
| risk | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | | |
| Contengenc | v Plan: | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | | |
| Contengene | y i idii. | | | | Funds needed | d to protect | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | • | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | from | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Any other in | formation on the | risk, the stat | us of the | risk, or res | sponse strategi | es. | | |

Table 3.6.7: Risk 7 data sheet

Comments:



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description | n: | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| R.8 | Conflicts between members: There could be a disagreement over the | | | | | | |
| | project issues between executive members. | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | |
| Duahahilia. | Impact | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | |
| High | 2 | 4 | 2 | Probab. | Acceptance: | Personal | |
| | | | | х | conflicts reso | lution | |
| | | | | Impact | meetings. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | | Revised | Owner Actions | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | |
| Medium | 1 | 2 | 2 | | Project | Actions | |
| | | | | | Manager | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | |
| risk | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | |
| Contengenc | sy Dlani | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | |
| Contengent | y Fian. | | | | Funds needed to protect | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | |
| | | | | | overrun | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | |
| | | | | | Time needed | to protect | |
| | | | | | the schedule | from | |
| | | | | | i | | |

Any other information on the risk, the status of the risk, or response strategies.

Table 3.6.8: Risk 8 data sheet

overrun



| | Risk Description: | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|----------|--------------|---|--|--|
| R.9 | Infeasible design | : The design | could to | urn out to b | e excessively o | costly or | |
| | not possible to b | e built. | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | |
| D 1 1 1111 | Impact | | | | _ | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | |
| Low | 2 | 4 | 4 | Probab. | Transfer: Periodical | | |
| | | | | x | reviews with experts | experts and | |
| | | | | Impact | managers. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | <u> </u> | ı | Revised | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | |
| Very Iow | 1 | 1 | 4 | | Engine | ACtions | |
| | | | | | Department | | |
| | | | | | Manager | | |
| Secondary I | | | | | | | |
| risk Residual Ri s | | | | | taken to addr | ess the | |
| risk Residual Ri s | | | | | | | |
| risk Residual Ri s | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | |
| risk Residual Ris Description of | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengenc Funds needed | y Funds: d to protect | |
| risk Residual Ris Description of | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengence Funds needed the budged f | y Funds: d to protect | |
| risk Residual Ri s Description o | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengence Funds needed the budged for | y Funds: d to protect rom | |
| risk Residual Ris Description of | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengence Funds needed the budged for | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: | |
| risk Residual Ris Description of | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengence Funds needed the budged for overrun Contengence Time needed | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: to protect | |
| risk Residual Ris Description of | sks: of the remaining r | | | | Contengence Funds needed the budged for | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: to protect | |

Table 3.6.9: Risk 9 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|------------------|------------|--|
| R.10 | Technologies con | mponents wi | th securi | ty vulnerabi | lities: Security | | |
| | vulnerabilities are unwanted in high-tech projects if some government is | | | | | | |
| | interested in using the technology. | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | |
| Probability | Impact | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | |
| High | 4 | 3 | 2 | Probab. | Transfer: Ch | eck for | |
| | | | | Х | possible secu | rity | |
| | | | | Impact | problems dur | ing | |
| | | | | | development | through | |
| | | | | | specialized co | ompanies. | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | | Revised | Owner | Actions | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | |
| Low | 2 | 1 | 1 | | ?? | Action | |
| | | | | | Manager | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | |
| risk | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | |
| Contengenc | v Plan: | | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | |
| Contengene | y i iaii. | | | | Funds needed | to protect | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | |
| | | | | | overrun | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | | |
| | | | | | Contengene | y Time: | |
| | | | | | Time needed | - | |
| | | | | | _ | to protect | |

Table 3.6.10: Risk 10 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---------|---------|--|---|--|
| R.11 | Organization Issues: The project could be not well organized in terms of | | | | | | |
| | timing, activities, etc. and the schedule may be always changing. | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | |
| Drobability | Impact | | | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | |
| Very High | 3 | 4 | 3 | Probab. | Transfer: Ask for help | for help | |
| | | | | X | from an exte | rnal | |
| | | | | Impact | company spe | cialized in | |
| | | | | | project mana | gement. | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | | | Revised | 0 | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | |
| | | | | | | | |
| ? | ? | ? | ? | | ?? | Action | |
| | | ? | ? | | ?? Manager | Action | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri | Risks: of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | | Manager | | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri | Risks: of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr | ess the | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri Description or | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr | ess the y Funds: | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr Contengenc Funds needed | ess the y Funds: If to protect | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri Description or | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr | ess the y Funds: | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri Description or | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr Contengenc Funds needed the budged fi | ess the y Funds: If to protect | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri Description or | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Manager taken to addr Contengenc Funds needed the budged for | ess the y Funds: If to protect from y Time: | |
| Secondary Description or risk Residual Ri Description of | Risks: of the risk that ari sks: of the remaining ri | se out of the | respons | | Contengence Funds needed the budged for overrun Contengence | ess the y Funds: If to protect rom y Time: to protect | |

Table 3.6.11: Risk 11 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Descriptio | n: | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|----------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| R.12 | Stakeholder dese | ertion: The a | bandonn | nent of a st | akeholder coul | d occur | | |
| | for several reasons, leaving the project without its contribution. | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| Donale a la illiana | Impact | | | 6 | D | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | | | |
| Low | 2 | 4 | 2 | Probab. | Acceptance: | Try to | | |
| | | | | x | transfer the | | | |
| | | | | Impact | responsibilitie | es to | | |
| | | | | | another stake | eholder or | | |
| | | | | | contract a ne | ew one. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | | 1 | Revised | 0 | A - 1 | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | |
| Very low | 1 | 2 | 2 | | Project | An in-depth | | |
| | | | | | Manager | research of | | |
| | | | | | | alternatives | | |
| | | | | | | to the | | |
| | | | | | | current | | |
| | | | | | | members | | |
| | | | | | | would allow | | |
| | | | | | | fast | | |
| | | | | | | solutions. | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| - | of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | se strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | |
| risk | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | |
| | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | | | | |
| - | | - 1 | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | | |
| Contengenc | cy Plan: | | | | Funds needed | • | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | · · | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | - | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | • | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | <u> </u> | | | |

Table 3.6.12: Risk 12 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Descriptio | n: | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|
| R.13 | Competitors appearance: The emergence of other companies that could | | | | | | | |
| | offer the same product. This could modify the benefits of our company. | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of th | ne circumsta | nces or d | lrivers that | are the source | of the | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Impact | | | Score | Responses | | | |
| Frobability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | | | | |
| Very low | 4 | 1 | 4 | Probab. | Acceptance: | | | |
| | | | | x | Improvement | of the | | |
| | | | | Impact | quality/price | ratio of the | | |
| | | | | | service. | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | | | Revised | Owner | Actions | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | ACLIONS | | |
| ? | ? | ? | ? | | ?? | Action | | |
| | | | | | Manager | | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the risk that ari | se out of the | respons | se strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | |
| risk | | | | | | C33 LIIC | | |
| D :1 1 D: | | | | | | C33 the | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | C33 the | | |
| | sks: of the remaining ri | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | Contengenc | | | |
| | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | Contengenc Funds needed | y Funds: | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | y Funds: | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | oonse stra | ategies | Funds needed | y Funds: | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | Funds needed the budged f | y Funds: d to protect rom | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | oonse stra | ategies | Funds needed the budged for | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | Funds needed the budged for overrun | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: to protect | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | oonse stra | ategies | Funds needed the budged for overrun Contengence Time needed | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: to protect | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | oonse stra | ategies | Funds needed the budged for overrun Contengence Time needed the schedule | y Funds: d to protect rom y Time: to protect | | |

Table 3.6.13: Risk 13 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| R.14 | Delay in external deliverables: If the products that the company orders do not arrive at the predicted time all the processes can experience a | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | delay, incrementing costs. | | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of th | ne circumsta | nces or d | Irivers that | are the source | of the | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Impact | | | Score | Responses | | | | |
| 1 Tobability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | | | | | |
| Medium | 2 | 4 | 2 | Probab. | Acceptance: | Control the | | | |
| | | | | X | delivery sche | dules and | | | |
| | | | | Impact | change provi | der if | | | |
| | | | | | necessary. | | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | | | Revised | Owner | Actions | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | O TOTAL | | | | |
| Very low | 2 | 2 | 2 | | Sales | Ask for | | | |
| | | | | | Department | materials to | | | |
| | | | | | Manager | arrive before | | | |
| | | | | | | the delivery | | | |
| | | | | | | final | | | |
| | | | | | | deadline | | | |
| | | | | | | and have | | | |
| | | | | | | them in | | | |
| | | | | | | stock. | | | |
| Secondary I | Diaka | | | | | Stock. | | | |
| - | | 50 011+ of +b | rocnono | a stratagio | · + alcan + a addr | occ the | | | |
| risk | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | se strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | | |
| | -1 | | | | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | | ial, aftar raam | | -+: | | | | | |
| Description | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse str | ategies | Contengenc | v Eunder | | | |
| Contengend | y Plan: | | | | Funds needed | - | | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | - | | | |
| | | | | | | rom | | | |
| | | | | | Overrun | Timas | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | - | | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | to protect | | | |
| | | | | | | £ | | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | from | | | |

Table 3.6.14: Risk 14 data sheet

Any other information on the risk, the status of the risk, or response strategies.



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------|-------------|----------------|--|-------------|--|--|
| R.15 | Economical market issues: During the period of time that the project is | | | | | | | |
| | executed, there could be large-scale economic crisis. | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | |
| D 1 1 1111 | Impact | | | C | D | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Responses | xesponses | | |
| Low | 2 | 1 | 4 | Probab. | Acceptance: | Control | | |
| | | | | x | cost evolution | n due to | | |
| | | | | Impact | external chan | iges | | |
| | | | | | throughout t | he project. | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t | I | Revised | | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | |
| Medium | 2 | 2 | 2 | | Sales | Use the | | |
| | | | | | Department | contingency | | |
| | | | | | Manager | budget to | | |
| | | | | | | afford the | | |
| | | | | | | unexpected | | |
| | | | | | | overrun. | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | | | | | | |
| - | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | se strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | |
| risk | or the risk that are | se out or the | . 105poile | o otrategree | taken to addi | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks. | | | | | | | |
| | of the remaining r | isk after resn | onse str | ategies | | | | |
| Description | or the remaining i | isk ditter resp | 701130 3111 | атебісэ | Contengenc | v Funds: | | |
| Contengend | y Plan: | | | | Contengency Funds: Funds needed to protect | | | |
| | | | | | the budged fi | • | | |
| | | | | | | TOTT | | |
| | | | | | overrun | T: | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | - | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | • | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | irom | | |
| <u> </u> | | | | | overrun. | | | |
| Comments: | | | <i>.</i> . | | _ | | | |
| Any other in | formation on the | risk, the stat | us of the | e risk, or res | sponse strategi | es. | | |

Table 3.6.15: Risk 15 data sheet



| Risk-ID: | Risk Description: | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| R.16 | Components or row material quality: The ordered equipment or | | | | | | | | |
| | materials could not be in good condition, delaying processes and | | | | | | | | |
| | increasing costs. | | | | | | | | |
| Status: | Risk Cause: | | | | | | | | |
| Open or | Description of the circumstances or drivers that are the source of the | | | | | | | | |
| Closed | risk | | | | | | | | |
| Probability | Impact | | | Score | Responses | | | | |
| riobability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Кезропаса | | | | |
| Low | 4 | 2 | 3 | Probab. | Mitigation: F | Have | | | |
| | | | | X | exhaustive ar | nd regular | | | |
| | | | | Impact | quality contro | ols to avoid | | | |
| | | | | | problems in o | components | | | |
| | | | | | in the final to | est. | | | |
| Revised | Revised Impact | t . | | Revised | 0 | 0 -4: | | | |
| Probability | Scope/Quality | Schedule | Cost | Score | Owner | Actions | | | |
| Medium | 3 | 1 | 2 | | Software | Plan a | | | |
| | | | | | Engineering | quality | | | |
| | | | | | Manager | schedule for | | | |
| | | | | | | each | | | |
| | | | | | | component | | | |
| | | | | | | and increase | | | |
| | | | | | | the human | | | |
| | | | | | | resources if | | | |
| | | | | | | it is needed. | | | |
| Secondary I | Risks: | | l | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | |
| - | of the risk that ari | se out of the | e respons | e strategies | taken to addr | ess the | | | |
| risk | | | • | J | | | | | |
| Residual Ris | sks: | | | | | | | | |
| Description of | of the remaining r | isk after resp | onse stra | ategies | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | · | | | Contengenc | y Funds: | | | |
| Contengence | y Plan: | | | | Funds needed to protect | | | | |
| | | | | | the budged f | rom | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| | | | | | Contengenc | y Time: | | | |
| | | | | | Time needed | | | | |
| | | | | | the schedule | - | | | |
| | | | | | overrun | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | L | | | | |

Table 3.6.16: Risk 16 data sheet

Any other information on the risk, the status of the risk, or response strategies.



communication

4 | Plan management

This section stands for an accurate description of the communication management inside the DEOS-UD Project, as communication is one of the keys to a successful development of any project. In the first insight, the different roles and responsibilities will be described as well as the different relations between people, teams and committees inside DEOS-UD. Along with the detailed roles and responsibilities of teams and committees, every member's specific task inside them will be mentioned. Secondly, the different communication procedures will be carefully detailed to provide the maximum information possible in order to allow a correct development of meetings and communications between people and departments, thus increasing the overall project efficiency. The section will end with a communication management plan matrix, which will summarize all the previously descripted procedures by mapping all the communication requirements of the project.

4.1 Participants roles and responsabilities

As previously stated, this section will provide the reader with the roles and responsibilities of the different DEOS-UD staff in terms of the Communication Plan. In this section, different committees and teams will also be described.

Steering Committee

The steering committee will provide DEOS-UD with solutions to problems along with strategic command in order to ensure a correct and efficient development of the project. As this team's role is of extreme importance when it comes to the project's success, a careful selection of its representatives must be performed. The steering committee will be composed of the members with key roles in DEOS-UD project; these members are listed in the following table, extracted from the first project charter.



| Role | Resource Name | Organization | Responsibilities |
|---|---|------------------------|---|
| Project Sponsor | Luís Manuel Pérez Llera | European Commission | Supervise the project. |
| Project Manager | Pol Fontanes Molina | HIRO | Manage the project. |
| Project Secretary | Sílvia González García | HIRO | Administrate the internal documents and information of the group. |
| Financial Manager | Santiago Lopezbarrena Arenas | HIRO | Estimate and control the costs of the project. |
| Stakeholders & Procurement Manager | Eva María Urbano González | HIRO | Identify the stakeholders of the project and manage and control their engagement. Plan, conduct and control the procurements of the project. |
| Scope & Time Manager | Marina Pons Daza | HIRO | Define and control the scope and deadlines of the project. |
| Risk Manager | Borja Calderón Rosario | HIRO | Identify and manage the possible risks of the project. |
| Quality Manager | Guillermo Escartín Vivancos | HIRO | Control that the quality requirements of the project are met. |
| Technical Managers | David Pérez Sánchez, Hamza Nachett, Laura Pla Olea | HIRO | Analyse and control the technical aspects of the project. |
| Marketing & Communications Managers | Albert Herrando Moraira, María De Benedicto Barba | HIRO | Promote the project and its final product. Search for possible customers. Ensure communication between the different members of the group. |

Table 4.1.1: Roles and responsibilities

As described, the team will not only work as a steering committee but also as an advisory committee, for this reason it will be composed by multiple consortium members that will act as advisors in diverse fields. The key roles developed by the steering committee are detailed below.

• Take and implement management decisions that affect a significant part of the



stakeholders.

- Take action in important schedule delays as well as cost overruns by modifying resources assigned to departments, staff planning, or anything necessary to redirect situations that endanger a correct development of the project.
- Offer leadership, guidance and support to problems that smaller groups have not been able to solve by themselves.
- Enhance communication skills along with communications procedures in order to avoid communication-related problems.

Project Manager

DEOS-UD Project manager, Pol Fontanes Molina, is the person in charge of assuring that every aspect of the project is functioning as planned. He is ought to detect, communicate and correct any deviations (schedule variances, cost overruns and scope changes) from the original plans. The decisions taken by the PM, will be communicated directly to the steering committee, members of which will communicate to the rest of the staff.

Advisory committee

Participants in the advisory committee are detailed here.

- Research and Development assessors:
 - Matthew Perren (Airbus Defence and Space GmbH)
 - Ismael López (Deimos Space)
- Legal and Business Assessor
 - Oliver Heinrich (BHO Legal)
- Application collaborators
 - Jean François Rapp (ICUBE-SERTIT)
 - Vessela Samoungi (ReSAC)
- Development and Application collaborator
 - Steven Krekels (VITO nv)

The function of this committee will be that of providing tailored assistance in anything related with the project in order to solve issues and avoid risks during DEOS-UD development. Given



the importance of this group itself, its participants will meet with the steering group regularly to ensure a correct use and implementation of their know-hoy inside DEOS-UD.

Business Project Team

This team will be directed by Santiago Lopezbarrena Arenas, the financial manager, and is in charge of assuring an economical resources correct management by providing careful tracing in the use of the budget along with a proper staff training in means of economical performance. This team is also ought to communicate the project manager with the latest information on earned value management parameters in order for the latter to know at what point exactly the development of the project is found.

Technical Project Team

The Technical Project Team, conducted by its three leaders David Pérez Sánchez, Hamza Nachett and Laura Pla Olea, will be in charge of analysing and controlling every single technical aspect of the project. The team itself must assure that everything done during DEOS-UD project development meets the requirements of the contract by successfully following all de documentation and activities received from the overall project staff, including contractors and subcontractors as well. As part of its essential activities, the Technical Project Team is expected to resolve and to give advice in any inconveniences or issues that may appear during the course of the project. The Technical Project Team's leaders will be part of the Steering group and will report regularly to the project manager on topics that concern the technical progresses of DEOS-UD project, by having gathered all the information related to this subject from the different departments developing such activities.

Oversight

For the sake of a reliable accomplishment of the project's goals along with a recognized meeting of the contract's specifications, an oversight agency will actively work with DEOS-UD mostly when different milestones are achieved and a certification in the results is needed. The company auditing DEOS-UD results will be Bureau Veritas and its specific responsibilities are detailed here.

- Auditing a correct implementation of the different requirements of the contract regarding privacy policies with data management.
- Auditing a correct implementation of the different requirements of the contract regarding privacy policies with data management.
- Auditing a correct implementation of the different requirements of the contract regarding privacy policies with data management.



Given that an auditory is an external agency, it has not been included the advisory team; yet its collaboration inside the project is key to a successful accomplishment of the project's goals.

4.2 Communication process

This section approaches the way in which the information is transmitted. In order to communicate efficiently it is important to bear in mind who are we addressing to. The communication process can be divided into three main categories: informal communications, formal communications, and external communications.

4.2.1 Informal

Informal communications consist of e-mail, conversations, or phone calls and serve to supplement and enhance formal communications. Due to the varied types and ad-hoc nature of informal communications, they are not discussed in this plan.

4.2.2 Formal

The DEOS-UD Project will engage in various types of formal communication. The general types and their purpose are described below as "Status Meetings" and "Status Reports".

4.2.2.1 Status Meetings

There are five basic types of status meetings for the DEOS-UD Project:

- Status meetings internal to the DEOS-UD business team to discuss assignments, activities, and to share information
- Status meetings and reports between the DEOS-UD business team, and the technical project team
- Advisory Committee meetings with the project stakeholders, and project manager to review progress, risks, and issues
- Status meetings and reports between the DEOS-UD project manager and the steering committee
- Status meetings and reports to stakeholders, such as oversight agencies



4.2.2.2 Status Reports

A variety of status reports will be produced during the project. The status reports will be produced on regular intervals to provide stakeholders project information on the status and progress of the DEOS-UD project. At a minimum the reports will contain:

- Project status on major activities
- Project schedule
- Budget and cost tracking
- Status of issues and risks
- Health status
- Status of action items, if applicable.
- Future or planned activities

The intent of the status reports is to inform stakeholders of the project's progress and keep them actively involved in the project. The information provided will contain enough detail to allow stakeholders to make informed decisions and maintain oversight of the project.

4.2.3 External Communication

Although internal communication is very important for the proper development of the project, we must not forget that external communication is also crucial in a project of this magnitude. Having a good dissemination plan involves explaining how the outcomes of the project will be shared with stakeholders, relevant institutions, organisations, and individuals.

In order to achieve the proposed objectives in terms of external communication, the process of dissemination will be focused in two different ways depending on whether we want to reach the general public or aerospace sector.

4.2.3.1 General public

It is important to find an adequate channel to reach the less specialized public in the aeroespace field. In order to achieve the maximum diffusion of the project in this sector, the following resources will be used.



- Social Networking. Social networks are the best way to reach the widest possible audience. Posting regularly is also crucial to keep people interested in the project.
 Some of the platforms that will be used during the project development are: Twitter,
 Facebook and Instagram. There will be at least one update a week in order to keep people informed of the progress of the project.
- Website. A project website is one of the most versatile dissemiation tools and will help reaching people unfamiliar with social networks. It can contain information intended to different profiles. As in the previous case, it has to be kept updated.

4.2.3.2 Aerospace sector

PONER CUANTOS VAMOS HA HACER O ALGÚN EJEMPLO?

- Trade shows. Trade shows, fairs and exhibitions are a great way to get in close contact
 with people from other regions and countries that we would ordinarily never be face to
 face with. They are also helpfull in terms of finding new prospects, nurture current client
 relationships and stay up to date on the latest industry developments.
- Conferences. National and international conferences will help sharing the achievements of the project with specialists of the field.
- Journal Articles. To promote project ideas and results in scientific research.

4.3 Communication management plan matrix

Aquí hay que poner las tablas de este apartado



| Communication Type | Objective of Communication | Medium | Frequency | Audience | Owner | Deliverable | Format |
|---|--|----------------|-----------|--|----------------------|---|---|
| Kickoff Meeting | Introduce the project team and the project. Review project objectives and management approach. | - Face to Face | Once | - Project Sponsor - Project Team - Stakeholders | Project Manager | - Agenda - Meeting Minutes | Soft copy archived on SharePoint site and project website |
| Internal Business Status Meetings | Discuss assignments, activities and sharing information | Face to Face | Weekly | Business Team | Financial Manager | Agenda, Meeting Minutes | Soft copy archived on SharePoint site and project website |
| Technical and Business Status Meetings and Reports | Discuss assignments, activities, sharing information and reporting the project status | Face to Face | Weekly | Project Manager, Business Team, Technical Team, Project Secretary | Project Manager | Agenda, Meeting Minutes, Status Reports | Soft copy archived on SharePoint site and project website |
| Advisory Committe Meetings | Review progress, risks and issues | Face to Face | Monthly | Adivsory Committee, Project Stakeholders, Project Manager, Project Secretary | Project Manager | Agenda, Meeting Minutes | Soft copy archived on SharePoint site and project website |
| Steering Committee Status Meetings | Enhance communication and coordination of the project | Face to Face | Monthly | Steering Committee, Project Manager, | Project Manager | Agenda, Meeting Minutes | Soft copy archived on SharePoint site and project |





HIRO

R - 44