



Deliverable 1.3:
Risk Management Plan

30/09/2026



Co-funded by
the European Union



1. Executive Summary.....	7
2. Introduction	8
2.1 Purpose of the Deliverable	8
2.2 Structure of the Document	8
3. Risk Management Framework	10
3.1 Introduction	10
3.2 Risk Management Plan	10
3.3 Risk Governance and Responsibilities.....	11
3.4 Quality Assurance and Quality Control.....	12
4. Risk Analysis and Assessment Methodology	14
4.1 Methodological Approach	14
4.2 Likelihood and Impact/Severity Criteria	15
4.3 Risk Level Classification	16
4.4 Risk Identification Procedure	16
4.5 Escalation and Identification Procedure	17
4.6 Risk Log Format.....	17
4.7 Risk Monitoring, Review and Updating Cycle	17
5. Comprehensive Project Risk Identification	20
6. Risk Mitigation and Response Strategies	24
6.1 Cross-Cutting Mitigation Measures.....	28
6.2 Early-Warning Indicators and Escalation Triggers	29
7. Conclusion.....	32
8. References.....	33

Risk Management Plan	
Identifier	Deliverable D1.3 – Risk Management Plan
Lead Beneficiary	UOWM
WP N°	WP1
WP Title	WP1 - Project Management and Coordination
Document Author(s)	Evangelos Saprikis – ES [UOWM];
Document Contributor(s)	Nikolaos Ploskas – NP [UOWM]; Georgios Nikolaou – GN [UOWM]; Chrysanthi Bonti – CB [UOWM]; Danai Antonaki – DA [iED]; Loic Lextraire – LL [EVAV]; Despoina Papadopoulou – DP [RDEWM]; Evangelia Triantafyllou – ET [RDEWM]; Edward Duca – ED [UOMA]; Claire Copperstone – CC [UOMA]; Gemma Cornau – GC [ACTIA]; Fabian Borg – FB [GLC]; Houda Taimourya – HT [IAV-CHA]; Mohamed Hachana – MH [UOMO]; Sawsen Ayadi – SA [INAT]; Salma Jallouli – SJ [INAT].
Document Reviewer(s)	Foteini Pavli – FP [UOMA]; Khadija Khouya – KK [IAV-CHA].
Contractual Due Date	30/09/2026 (M4)
Delivery Date to EC	30/09/2026
Type	R – Document, Report
Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Version	1.0
Status	Final

PROJECT INFORMATION	
Grant Agreement Number	2531
Project Full Title	Co-creating Living Labs to bring the Mediterranean Diet back to schools
Project Acronym	SchoolMedDiet
Funding Scheme	PRIMA
Start Date	June 2026
Duration	36 months
Project Coordinator	University of Western Macedonia (UOWM)-Greece
Project Website	https://schoolmeddiet.eu/

VERSION RECORD			
Version	Date	Author	Description of changes

V0.1	08/09/2026	ES [UOWM]	Document created
V0.2	18/09/2026	NP [UOWM]; GN [UOWM], CB [UOWM]; EK [UOWM]; FP [UOWM]; ID [UOWM]; DA [iED]; LL [EVAV]; DP [RDEWM]; ET [RDEWM]; ED [UOMA]; CC [UOMA]; GC [ACTIA]; FB [GLC]; KK [IAV-CHA]; HT [IAV-CHA]; MH [UOMO]; SA [INAT]; SJ [INAT]; FP [UOMA].	Updates and revision
V1.0	30/09/2026	ES [UOWM]	Final version

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Risk Likelihood and Impact/Severity matrix template	15
Table 4.2: Explanation of the Likelihood and Impact/Severity rating classification	15
Table 4.3: Risk monitoring and review cycle	18
Table 5.1: Technological Risks (T)	20
Table 5.2: Behavioral Risks (B).....	21
Table 5.3: Ethical and Legal Risks (E)	21
Table 5.4: Managerial Risks (M)	22
Table 6.1: Technological Mitigation.....	24
Table 6.2: Behavioral Mitigation	25
Table 6.3: Ethical/Legal Mitigation.....	25
Table 6.4: Managerial Mitigation	26
Table 6.5: Cross-cutting mitigation measures	28
Table 6.6: Early-warning signal areas	29

List of Abbreviations

ABBREVIATION	Explanation
ACTIA	– Association de Coordination Technique pour l'Industrie Agroalimentaire
AI	– Artificial Intelligence
B	– Behavioral
DMP	– Data Management Plan
E	– Ethical/Legal
EVAV	– EVAVEO SAS Ingénierie en Innovation
GDPR	– General Data Protection Regulation
GLC	– Gzira Local Council
IA	– Innovation Action
IAV-CHA	– Agronomic and Veterinary Institute Hassan II
ID	– Identity Document
IED	– Institute of Entrepreneurship Development
INAT	– University of Carthage, National Institute of Agronomy of Tunisia
IPR	– Intellectual Property Rights
KPI	– Key Performance Indicators
LL	– Living Lab
M	– Managerial
MoU	– Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	– Non-Governmental Organization
PRIMA	– Partnership for Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area
QA	– Quality Assurance
QC	– Quality Control
RDEWM	– Regional Directorate of Primary and Secondary Education of Western Macedonia
T	– Technological
TL	– Task Leader
TRL	– Technology Readiness Level
UI	– User Interface
UOMA	– University of Malta
UOMO	– University of Monastir
UOWM	– University of Western Macedonia
VR	– Virtual Reality
WP	– Work Package
WPL	– Work Package Leader

1. Executive Summary

This Risk Management Plan establishes the operational framework for identifying, assessing, mitigating, and monitoring risks throughout the 36-month SchoolMedDiet project. It also supports the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) processes required under Task 1.2, including internal review, deliverable quality checks, and external Advisory Board review of deliverables. To address the complexities of deploying AI and VR digital tools alongside public food procurement pilots across four national Living Labs, the consortium utilizes a streamlined 3×3 Likelihood–Impact/Severity matrix and a dynamic Risk Log. The baseline register identifies key vulnerabilities, particularly concerning the participation of minors, ethical data collection, AI-generated dietary guidance, continuity of consortium resources, national funding transfers, and post-project exploitation and uptake of the SchoolMedDiet Toolkit. By linking mitigation measures directly to Work Packages, milestones, and specific partner responsibilities, this plan ensures that risk and quality management remain integrated, continuous processes reviewed quarterly and consolidated semi-annually rather than static reporting exercises.

2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the Deliverable

This deliverable serves as a foundational component of Work Package 1 (Project Management & Coordination) under Task 1.2 (QA/QC and risk management). As a PRIMA-funded Innovation Action, SchoolMedDiet involves a multi-layered transnational collaboration across France, Greece, Malta, Morocco, and Tunisia. The ambition of transforming municipal public food procurement while engaging vulnerable student populations and deploying AI-enabled dietary guidance carries inherent technological, behavioral, ethical, and managerial complexities that must be anticipated. Consequently, the purpose of this document is to establish the procedural workflows necessary to proactively monitor, report, and escalate risks, while also defining proportionate procedures for assessing and assuring the quality of project outputs and deliverables. It provides the consortium with a standardized protocol and assigns explicit accountability to specific partners, supporting achievement of Key Performance Indicators.

2.2 Structure of the Document

To achieve the monitoring, quality assurance/control, and mitigation objectives outlined above, this document combines a practical framework with a project-specific assessment tailored to SchoolMedDiet. The remainder of the deliverable is structured as follows:

- **Section 3 (Risk Management Framework):** Introduces the overarching governance, the sequential five-stage risk management plan, and the QA/QC arrangements adopted by the consortium.
- **Section 4 (Risk Analysis and Assessment Methodology):** Provides the justification for selecting a qualitative 3x3 Likelihood and Impact/Severity Matrix over rigid quantitative engineering models and establishes the defined procedures for risk identification and escalation.
- **Section 5 (Comprehensive Project Risk Identification):** Presents the baseline list of anticipated risks, categorized into Technological, Behavioral, Ethical/Legal, and Managerial domains.

- **Section 6 (Risk Mitigation and Response Strategies):** Outlines concrete preventative actions and assigns specific partner responsibilities to ensure accountability across cross-cutting measures.
- **Section 7 (Conclusion):** Details the ongoing monitoring mechanisms, the handling of residual risks, the QA/QC feedback loop, and the advisory and quality-review role of the Project Advisory Board.

3. Risk Management Framework

3.1 Introduction

Risk management and continuous analysis are important requirements in complex, multi-actor research and innovation projects [1], particularly those funded under the PRIMA initiative which aims to bridge diverse socio-economic realities across the Mediterranean basin. During the 36-month lifetime of the SchoolMedDiet project, various types of risks ranging from localized delays in digital tool software development (WP4) to widespread low engagement from target student demographics (WP3), or municipal resistance to new food procurement paradigms (WP6) may emerge during project implementation.

The risk management process must be iterative and transparent. It is not a static document created at the first months and forgotten, but a living protocol. It includes the continuous identification of threats, an analytical and objective assessment of their severity and the harm they can inflict on project timelines and outputs, and the swift execution of the appropriate predefined response. For the risk management plan to be truly effective in the context of SchoolMedDiet, it must proactively reduce the possibility of such risks occurring (preventative action), while simultaneously minimizing any potential negative impact on the project's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) should the risk materialize (corrective action).

3.2 Risk Management Plan

The overarching plan adopted within the SchoolMedDiet project includes 5 sequential stages, designed to support the identification, assessment, response, monitoring and documentation of potential risks throughout project implementation:

1. **Risk Identification:** The detailed, ongoing documentation of possible risks that could affect the project. This is a continuous process driven from the bottom-up by local Living Lab (LL) coordinators and from the top-down by WP leaders. It involves environmental scanning, stakeholder feedback analysis, and regular review of technical progress.
2. **Risk Assessment and Prioritization:** Processing the identified risks and assessing their relative significance based on likelihood and impact. This generates structured risk

ratings to be used by the project's committees to prioritize responses, supporting more consistent and transparent prioritization.

3. **Risk Response Development:** Using the granular information generated during risk estimation to develop concrete, actionable strategies. This involves assigning specific partner responsibilities, defining fallback technological solutions, mapping adaptive policy frameworks, and allocating necessary contingency resources.
4. **Risk Monitoring and Control:** Maintaining and regularly updating the project Risk Log, monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of agreed mitigation measures, and reviewing changes in the likelihood, impact and status of identified risks. The Risk Log will be updated whenever a significant new risk emerges, or an existing risk materially changes. Operational risk checks are integrated into regular coordination meetings. The Risk Log is reviewed quarterly through WP-leader coordination, while a consolidated review is included at least every six months in the project progress cycle. QA/QC checks are integrated into the same management cycle so that emerging quality concerns can be recorded, assigned and addressed before they affect deliverables, milestones or project results.
5. **Risk Documentation:** Comprehensively archiving the objectives, information sources, baseline assumptions, executive decisions, and physical actions taken upon emerged risks. This ensures full auditability, transparency and compliance with applicable PRIMA, contractual and ethical requirements.

3.3 Risk Governance and Responsibilities

Effective risk management in SchoolMedDiet depends on a clear separation between risk identification, risk ownership, mitigation implementation, monitoring and consortium-level decision-making. The governance arrangements below translate the responsibilities described in WP1 and the proposal into an operational risk management structure. The approach is deliberately distributed: risks are identified as close as possible to the activity where they arise, while significant cross-WP risks are coordinated centrally by UOWM.

Project Coordinator/ WP1: UOWM maintains the overall risk-management and QA/QC framework, ensures that the Risk Log and quality-review records are maintained, coordinates

escalation, monitors cross-WP dependencies and ensures that risk- and quality-related actions remain consistent with the work plan, QA/QC procedures and reporting obligations.

WP Leaders and Task Leaders: WP leaders and, where applicable, Task Leaders are the first management level for assessing risks arising within their areas. They propose and coordinate mitigation measures with the responsible partners and report significant changes to the Project Coordinator.

Risk Owners/ Responsible Partners: The partner assigned to a risk is responsible for implementing the agreed mitigation measures, providing evidence of progress and alerting the relevant WP Leader when the likelihood, impact or status of the risk changes.

Consortium Level Management: The proposal foresees periodic review of the risk register and project progress. The Risk Log therefore serves as an input to WP-leader and consortium management discussions, particularly where risks affect more than one WP, a milestone, a deliverable, ethics compliance, budget or the achievement of a project KPI.

External Project Advisory Board: The Advisory Board provides independent, interdisciplinary advice on significant scientific, technological, ethical, educational, policy and quality-related matters. In accordance with the project's QA/QC approach, it reviews the quality and substantive coherence of relevant deliverables and provides documented approval/recommendations before finalization. Its role is advisory and does not replace formal consortium approval or operational ownership; nevertheless, Board observations, recommendations and approval status are recorded and considered in subsequent management and quality reviews.

General Assembly: Matters requiring consortium-level decisions, including substantial changes in implementation, resource allocation or responses to materialized high risks, are escalated to the General Assembly in accordance with the project's governance arrangements and Consortium Agreement.

3.4 Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Quality Assurance (QA) focuses on preventive measures that promote consistent and fit-for-purpose project outputs, while Quality Control (QC) focuses on checks performed on specific

outputs before their release. Under T1.2, each deliverable is subject to an internal quality review by the responsible WP/Task Leader and designated reviewer(s), covering completeness, consistency with the Grant Agreement and proposal, methodological/technical soundness, clarity, references, formatting, and compliance with applicable ethical, data-management and dissemination requirements. Identified comments and required corrections are documented and addressed before the deliverable is submitted for final approval.

The Project Advisory Board provides an independent quality-review layer for project deliverables, with particular attention to strategically significant and cross-cutting outputs. The Board reviews the quality and substantive coherence of the deliverable and records observations or recommendations before finalization. Its approval/recommendation does not replace the formal decision-making responsibilities of the consortium, Project Coordinator or General Assembly, as applicable, but provides an additional external quality gate. Evidence of internal review, revisions, and Advisory Board comments/approval is retained with the project documentation.

4. Risk Analysis and Assessment Methodology

4.1 Methodological Approach

To support consistent coordination across a diverse consortium spanning academic institutions, municipalities, tech SMEs, and NGOs, the SchoolMedDiet project relies on a streamlined, qualitative and semi-quantitative risk management approach, fully aligning with the protocols established in the Project Management Handbook (Deliverable 1.1). Moreover, it is consistent with the principles of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 31000:2018 guidelines [2], which emphasize that risk management should be customized, inclusive, and proportionate to the organization's context. Therefore, the core methodological framework utilizes a dynamic 3x3 Likelihood and Impact/Severity Matrix integrated into a centralized Risk Register. This ensures that all partners, regardless of their technical background, can consistently identify, escalate, and assess risks using a shared vocabulary and straightforward criteria.

This methodology provides several critical advantages:

1. **Shared Interdisciplinary Vocabulary:** A 3x3 matrix (Low, Medium, High) is universally understood. It allows a municipal policy officer in Malta, an AI developer in France, and a nutritionist in Tunisia to collaboratively assess a risk using a shared, intuitive framework without requiring specialized engineering training.
2. **Agility and Speed:** When a crisis emerges, the 3x3 matrix allows for rapid classification and immediate escalation. It prioritizes actionable dialogue over administrative calculation [3].
3. **Proportionality:** By categorizing risks into broad, clearly defined bands, the consortium can efficiently allocate resources only to threats that genuinely cross the threshold into "High" impact/likelihood territories, optimizing the project budget and management hours.

4.2 Likelihood and Impact/Severity Criteria

To accurately distinguish critical failures and objectively prioritize the identified risk nodes, all risks are evaluated on two primary dimensions, directly adopting the principles outlined in D1.1:

- **Likelihood (Low, Medium, High):** A pragmatic estimation of the probability of the risk occurring within the project's 36-month timeframe. This assessment relies on historical data from partners, previous Horizon/PRIMA project experiences, and the specific socio-political context of the participating Mediterranean countries.
- **Impact/Severity (Low, Medium, High):** An assessment of how severe the downstream effects of the risk would be on the project's goals, deliverables, stakeholders, or legal standing. A "High" impact denotes a scenario where a core objective (e.g., Living Lab deployment, AI app functionality, or GDPR compliance) is critically compromised.

The matrix is used as a decision-support mechanism rather than as a substitute for professional judgement. Where evidence is uncertain, the responsible WP Leader should document the assumptions behind the rating. Ratings may be revised whenever new evidence becomes available, a mitigation action changes the exposure, or a risk moves from a potential event to an actual issue.

Table 4.1: Risk Likelihood and Impact/Severity matrix template

Likelihood \ Impact	Low Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact
Low Likelihood	Low	Low	Medium
Medium Likelihood	Low	Medium	High
High Likelihood	Medium	High	High

Table 4.2: Explanation of the Likelihood and Impact/Severity rating classification

Rating	Likelihood interpretation	Impact/Severity interpretation
Low	The event is not expected to occur under normal project conditions, or relevant controls make occurrence relatively unlikely.	The event would have limited and recoverable consequences for activities, resources, outputs or stakeholder participation.
Medium	The event is plausible during the 36-month project and may	The event could cause material delay, reduced participation, rework, reduced quality or

Rating	Likelihood interpretation	Impact/Severity interpretation
	occur under identifiable conditions or dependencies.	measurable effects on a WP or KPI.
High	The event is reasonably expected or there are strong warning signs that it may occur without further action.	The event could critically compromise a core objective, milestone, deliverable, ethical/legal requirement, Living Lab, digital deployment or major policy/procurement activity.

4.3 Risk Level Classification

The resulting intersection of Impact and Likelihood dictates the overall Risk Level and triggers specific, proportional interventions:

- **High Risk (e.g., High Impact combined with High or Medium Likelihood):** Requires immediate mitigation planning coordinated by the Project Coordinator and relevant WP Leaders. Such risks are flagged for continuous monitoring and may require formal escalation to the General Assembly to authorize substantial strategic shifts or resource reallocations.
- **Medium Risk:** Requires proactive management and regular monitoring at the WP level. Mitigation strategies are drafted and executed by the Task Leaders, with the status reviewed during the quarterly WP-level risk review and consolidated, where relevant, in the six-monthly project progress cycle.
- **Low Risk:** Monitored routinely and logged for record-keeping. No immediate reallocation of resources is necessary.

4.4 Risk Identification Procedure

For the purposes of exact project monitoring and management, SchoolMedDiet project clearly distinguishes between risks, issues, and deviations, ensuring absolute consistency with D1.1. Mixing these concepts can lead to delayed responses; therefore, the following definitions strictly apply:

- **Risk:** A potential future event or circumstance that may negatively affect project implementation. Risks are anticipatory and require preventative mitigation.
- **Issue:** A problem or event that has already occurred (a realized risk) and requires immediate attention and corrective action.

- **Deviation:** A departure from the approved work plan, timeline, budget, or expected implementation of project activities.

4.5 Escalation and Identification Procedure

When a consortium member identifies a new or emerging risk, the following procedure applies:

1. The partner identifying the risk reports it to the relevant WPL (and TL, where applicable) and informs the Project Coordinator.
2. The relevant WP leader conducts an initial assessment, assigning Likelihood and Impact/Severity ratings in accordance with the D1.1, and officially updates the shared cloud-based Risk Log repository.
3. The newly logged risk becomes a mandatory agenda item for discussion during the next monthly meeting.
4. The relevant WPL and/or TL, together with the responsible partner(s) and in coordination with the Project Coordinator, agree on the appropriate mitigation measures.
5. If an identified risk materializes, it is immediately reclassified. It is no longer managed solely as a potential risk but is formally logged as an "Issue" requiring immediate, concrete corrective action. The responsible partner, together with the relevant TL/WPL, informs the Project Coordinator and implements the agreed corrective actions to stabilize the project workflow.

4.6 Risk Log Format

In accordance with D1.1, the dynamic Risk Log (hosted in the shared project repository) will strictly track the following fields to maintain a rigorous audit trail: Risk Description, Likelihood, Impact/Severity, Risk Level, WP(s) concerned, Responsible Partner/Risk Owner, Mitigation Measures, Status, Date Identified, Last Updated/Last Reviewed, Review Date and Action Date.

4.7 Risk Monitoring, Review and Updating Cycle

Risk monitoring is integrated into the project's normal management cycle rather than treated as a separate administrative exercise. The proposal states that the Risk Log will be updated quarterly during WP leader meetings and reviewed by the Steering Committee, while WP1 also provides every six months progress reporting. Accordingly, SchoolMedDiet adopts the

following complementary review cycle: risks are updated whenever a material change occurs; a structured quarterly review is performed by WP leaders; and a consolidated risk review is included every six months in the project progress cycle. High risks are monitored continuously between formal reviews.

Table 4.3: Risk monitoring and review cycle

Monitoring level	Minimum frequency / trigger	Main purpose	Evidence / output
Operational monitoring	Whenever a significant change occurs	Detect emerging risks, changes in exposure and materialized issues at activity level.	Risk Log update, action record, issue record where applicable
WP-level review	Quarterly	Review all active risks within each WP and identify cross-WP dependencies.	Updated WP risk entries and action status
Steering Committee review	Quarterly	Review the updated Risk Log, confirm prioritisation of high risks and agree escalation/corrective actions where needed.	Updated Risk log and list of actions
Consolidated project review	At least every six months	Review overall risk profile, major trends, mitigation effectiveness and resource implications.	Consolidated risk review / WP progress input
Advisory review	Yearly	Provide independent advice on significant scientific, technological, ethical, educational and policy risks.	Advisory Board observations and recommendations
Immediate escalation	Immediately after materialization of a high risk or significant ethical/legal event	Stabilize implementation and initiate corrective action.	Issue record, corrective-action plan and escalation decision

Risk status should be updated using a small set of consistent states: Open – risk identified and under active monitoring; Mitigating – mitigation actions are being implemented; Escalated – the risk requires management attention beyond the immediate WP; Materialized/Issue – the potential event has occurred and corrective action is required; Controlled – exposure has been

reduced and the risk remains under observation; Closed – the risk is no longer relevant or has been fully addressed. Closure should be justified in the Risk Log rather than inferred from inactivity.

5. Comprehensive Project Risk Identification

To ensure robust, evidence-based monitoring, the baseline risk list has been cross-checked against the approved proposal and complemented with operational risks identified during project initiation. The tables below explicitly distinguish between core risks already anticipated in the foundational proposal and additional operational risks identified during the project initiation phase. This distinction allows the consortium to track which threats were planned for structurally and which require newly adaptive responses.

Table 5.1: Technological Risks (T)

ID	WP	Risk Event	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Level	Origin
T01	WP4	Technical development delays or performance issues with AI and VR tools; unequal access to digital tools among disadvantaged schools' limits adoption.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal
T02	WP2, 5	Cross-country variation in educational systems and dietary environments limits the comparability of results and evaluation data across the four Living Labs.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal
T03	WP3, 5	Difficulty in collecting consistent, measurable impact data from schools (including potential inaccuracies or intentional misreporting in student self-reported dietary data).	Medium	High	High	Proposal
T04	WP4	AI Food Assistant or chatbot provides inaccurate, misleading, inappropriate, or insufficiently age- and context-sensitive dietary guidance to minors, potentially affecting wellbeing, trust, ethical compliance, or project credibility.	Medium	High	High	Project Initiation

Table 5.2: Behavioral Risks (B)

ID	WP	Risk Event	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Level	Origin
B01	WP3,4	Low adoption or engagement of digital tools by students or teachers due to digital fatigue after the initial novelty wears off.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal
B02	WP3	Overburdened educators may have limited capacity or willingness to integrate the SchoolMedDiet toolkit into their mandated teaching schedules.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Project Initiation
B03	WP3	Lower-than-expected participation and engagement from families, vulnerable populations, or underrepresented groups (e.g., rural youth, girls).	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal
B04	WP7	Low visibility or limited reach of project dissemination strategy and communication activities beyond academic circles.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal

Table 5.3: Ethical and Legal Risks (E)

ID	WP	Risk Event	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Level	Origin
E01	WP1, 2, 4, 5	Breach of stringent GDPR protocols or ethical/data privacy concerns regarding the dietary and personal health data of minors.	Low	High	Medium	Proposal
E02	WP1,3	Significant bureaucratic delays in securing formal ethical clearance and approval from national educational authorities to conduct research in state schools.	Medium	High	High	Project Initiation
E03	WP3	Inconsistent or invalid consent/assent procedures across countries, or parental withdrawal due to concerns or misunderstandings	Low	High	Medium	Proposal

		regarding data use, surveillance, or digital monitoring.				
E04	WP3,4	Privacy, consent and safeguarding risks linked to photo-based meal logging in the AI Food Assistant (e.g. images capturing other people, or inappropriate content).	Medium	High	High	Project Initiation

Table 5.4: Managerial Risks (M)

ID	WP	Risk Event	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Level	Origin
M01	WP1	Coordination issues within the geographically distributed consortium leading to project delays.	Low	Medium	Low	Proposal
M02	WP2,3	Significant delays in physically setting up the four national Living Labs due to administrative hurdles or local resistance from school boards.	Medium	High	High	Proposal
M03	WP6	Delays or failure in implementing green public procurement pilots due to rigidly locked existing catering contracts, regulatory constraints, or lack of municipal support.	Medium	High	High	Proposal
M04	WP1	Unexpected increases in equipment or technology costs affecting the planned procurement of digital/VR hardware.	Low	Medium	Low	Project Initiation
M05	WP3,6	Differing school meal policies and infrastructures limit uniform implementation across schools and countries.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal
M06	WP1	Delays in national funding transfers to PRIMA partners, or other national-level funding administration delays, affect partner cash flow and the timely	Medium	High	High	Project Initiation

		implementation of planned activities.				
M07	WP1–WP7	Withdrawal of a project partner or departure/unavailability of key project staff reduces capacity, delays activities, or creates gaps in critical expertise and responsibilities.	Low	High	Medium	Project Initiation
M08	WP7	Limited exploitation, institutional uptake, replication, or sustained use of the SchoolMedDiet Toolkit and other project results after the end of the project reduces the expected long-term impact and sustainability of results.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Project Initiation
M09	WP5, WP6	Limited policy uptake of SchoolMedDiet recommendations by municipal or national authorities.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Proposal

6. Risk Mitigation and Response Strategies

The mitigation strategies outlined below have been reviewed to ensure they reflect confirmed, agreed-upon project decisions and the baseline architectural methodologies established in the proposal. Overly prescriptive technical mandates have been removed, ensuring the focus remains on strategic, achievable mitigation leveraging the consortium's existing capabilities.

Table 6.1: Technological Mitigation

Risk ID	Detailed Mitigation Action Plan	Responsible Partner
T01 (Digital tools: development and access)	Development and testing of the AI Food Assistant and the VR experiences follow phased cycles on reference devices. All Living Labs use the headset model set by WP4, on which they run both online and offline, so schools with weak connectivity keep full access; any other model is used only once WP4 has validated it. Local teams receive technical onboarding and troubleshooting guidance before deployment.	EVAV, UOWM
T02 (Cross-country comparability)	Maintain a common methodological core, shared KPI definitions, common data-collection templates and a documented minimum dataset across all Living Labs. Local adaptations will be recorded through the national adaptation reports so that contextual differences are visible rather than treated as unexplained variation. Cross-country calibration and review will be undertaken before the main comparative analysis.	UOMA, UOWM, IAV-CHA, INAT
T03 (Impact data quality)	Use standardized and validated instruments, clear fieldwork instructions and training for local teams. Apply routine completeness and consistency checks, document missing or anomalous observations, and triangulate quantitative findings with interviews, focus groups, classroom observations and digital usage information where appropriate. The monitoring and evaluation framework will distinguish methodological limitations from genuine intervention effects.	IAV-CHA, UOWM, UOMO, INAT
T04 (AI dietary guidance)	Apply nutrition- and age-appropriate content validation before and during deployment; define clear content boundaries and escalation/feedback mechanisms; conduct systematic testing for factual, cultural and contextual errors; use expert review by nutrition/food-science partners; monitor user feedback and reported problematic outputs; and suspend or revise affected	EVAV, UOWM, IAV-CHA, INAT, UOMA, UOMO

	functionality when a material safety or appropriateness concern is identified. The chatbot should support educational guidance rather than replace professional medical or dietary advice.	
--	--	--

Table 6.2: Behavioral Mitigation

Risk ID	Detailed Mitigation Action Plan	Responsible Partner
B01 (Digital Fatigue)	Employ gamification, digital incentives, and structured youth ambassador roles to maintain long-term motivation. Sustain engagement with the AI-powered Food Assistant and its conversational chatbot through iterative content and interaction updates informed by user feedback, while maintaining culturally relevant Mediterranean Diet content. Only the data needed for the evaluation are collected. The DMP (D1.4) will set out each partner's role in the processing (controller or processor) and the procedure for notifying a personal data breach within the 72 hours set by the GDPR.	EVAV, IED
B02 (Educator Pushback)	Co-design the toolkit with teachers to ensure it integrates seamlessly into existing, mandated curricula rather than adding uncompensated extra hours. Provide comprehensive, tailored Teacher Training Packages and appoint local champions (teachers, principals) to build ongoing trust. Offer public recognition and certification to the teachers involved.	UOMA, RDEWM
B03 (Vulnerable Families)	Implement targeted outreach campaigns using culturally sensitive, accessible formats in local languages. Partner directly with trusted local NGOs and grassroots community leaders. Employ gender- and equity-sensitive facilitation strategies to ensure equitable participation.	UOMO, IAV-CHA
B04 (Dissemination)	IED will implement a robust, multilingual communication strategy from the project outset, tailoring messages specifically for diverse audiences (families, schools, policymakers). Leverage local multipliers and continuously monitor outreach metrics to adapt the strategy dynamically.	IED, ACTIA

Table 6.3: Ethical/Legal Mitigation

Risk ID	Detailed Mitigation Action Plan	Responsible Partner
E01 (GDPR/Data)	Ensure all personal data are appropriately anonymized or pseudonymized, encrypted and processed in accordance with the DMP and applicable GDPR	UOWM, EVAV

	requirements. Develop and rigorously adhere to a strict, FAIR-compliant Data Management Plan (DMP).	
E02 (Ethical clearance)	Map the national and institutional approval requirements before the start of school-based activities and maintain an approvals calendar linked to WP2/WP3 milestones. Initiate submissions early, track outstanding requirements and escalate delays through WP1. Where compatible with the approved implementation arrangements, identify contingency options in case administrative delays affect the availability of a selected school.	UOWM, UOMA, UOMO, RDEWM, GLC
E03 (Consent Procedures)	Ensure strict translation, localization, and review by the competent institutional/national ethics and data-protection structures, as applicable. Host highly transparent, plain-language sessions for parents before deployment, emphasizing clear, frictionless opt-out mechanics.	UOWM, national partners
E04 (Daily photos upload)	Apply data minimisation by design to photo-based meal logging. The final data flow, storage, retention, processing location and consent requirements will be defined and documented in D1.4 and validated before deployment. Where technically feasible, image processing should minimise retention of raw images and avoid unnecessary collection of identifying information	EVAV, UOWM, national LL partners

Table 6.4: Managerial Mitigation

Risk ID	Detailed Mitigation Action Plan	Responsible Partner
M01 (Coordination)	Maintain regular coordination meetings, clear WP-specific interfaces, shared project-management tools, action logs and decision records. Delays or unresolved dependencies will be raised by WP leaders to the Project Coordinator so that corrective action can be agreed before they affect dependent activities.	UOWM, all WP Leaders
M02 (Living Lab setup)	Engage school and education authorities early, formalize institutional commitment through agreements or MoUs, maintain a readiness checklist, and track administrative prerequisites before WP3 deployment. Moreover, inform parents and parents' associations early. Where compatible with the approved implementation arrangements, identify contingency options in case a selected school becomes unavailable.	GLC, UOMA, RDEWM, national partners
M03 (Procurement pilots)	Conduct early policy and procurement mapping, identify legal and contractual constraints, and engage municipalities, school authorities and relevant experts before pilot implementation. Where a full procurement	INAT, ACTIA, national partners

	change is not immediately feasible, use the flexible entry points and pilot approaches permitted by the applicable national framework, while documenting the constraints for the policy roadmap.	
M04 (Budget)	Implement strict semi-annual financial reporting protocols. All Living Labs use the headset model set by WP4; any other model is used only once WP4 has validated it. As manufacturers renew their ranges regularly, purchases are scheduled early enough for the model to remain available. Where a partner's procurement rules call for a technical specification instead of a brand name, WP4 provides one.	UOWM, EVAV, partners purchasing equipment
M05 (Different school meal systems)	Apply the shared methodological core with flexible local implementation. Record whether each school uses catering, an on-site kitchen, a restaurant, or has no meal provision, and adapt activities accordingly. National adaptation reports will document these contextual differences so that implementation and evaluation remain meaningful across sites.	UOMA, GLC, all national partners
M06 (National funding transfers)	Monitor national funding arrangements and cash-flow needs through WP1; request early notification of expected transfer delays; maintain updated partner financial forecasts; identify activities sensitive to delayed cash flow; and, where permitted by national rules and the Consortium Agreement, adjust sequencing or use available internal resources to avoid interruption of critical activities. Material delays should be escalated through WP1 and the General Assembly where they threaten milestones or deliverables.	UOWM, all partners
M07 (Partner/staff continuity)	Maintain documented role and responsibility assignments, shared access to key project records and critical know-how, and at least one identified backup for essential functions where feasible. Partners should notify WP1 promptly of anticipated withdrawal or prolonged unavailability of key staff. The Project Coordinator and relevant WP Leader should activate a replacement/reallocation plan and formally update responsibilities, timelines and the Risk Log.	UOWM, all WP Leaders, responsible partners
M08 (Toolkit exploitation and uptake)	Monitor exploitation and uptake indicators throughout WP7 rather than only at project end; maintain an exploitation roadmap and stakeholder pipeline; engage schools, municipalities, education authorities and other target users early; document barriers to adoption; strengthen dissemination and demonstration activities where uptake is weak; and define practical post-project ownership, licensing, maintenance and replication pathways for the Toolkit and digital outputs.	IED, UOWM, all WP Leaders

M09 (Limited policy uptake)	Early involvement of policymakers; co-development of policy briefs; alignment with national strategies and existing procurement/policy frameworks.	UOWM, all partners
-----------------------------	--	--------------------

6.1 Cross-Cutting Mitigation Measures

In addition to risk-specific measures, several controls apply across the SchoolMedDiet implementation chain. They are particularly important because the project links school-based participation, digital tools, evaluation data, procurement innovation and policy uptake. Cross-cutting controls reduce the possibility that a local problem in one activity becomes a systemic problem for another WP.

Table 6.5: Cross-cutting mitigation measures

Control area	Operational measure	Relevant WPs
Dependencies and milestone readiness	Track prerequisites for dependent activities, especially the transition from WP2 to WP3, from WP4 development to WP4 deployment, from WP3/WP4 implementation to WP5 evaluation, and from WP5 evidence to WP6 policy work.	WP1–WP7
Ethics and safeguarding	No data collection or school activity requiring prior approval should proceed until the relevant national/institutional requirements have been addressed. Consent, assent, safeguarding and withdrawal procedures should remain documented and reviewable.	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5
Data quality and comparability	Use common instruments and templates while documenting justified national adaptations. Maintain data dictionaries, collection guidance and contextual metadata sufficient for later cross-country interpretation.	WP2, WP3, WP5
Digital deployment readiness	Use staged testing, educator onboarding and troubleshooting guidance. Deployment decisions should consider school infrastructure and device availability.	WP3, WP4
Stakeholder continuity	Maintain local champions and institutional contacts, document engagement activities and use feedback from students, families, educators and municipalities to adjust implementation.	WP2, WP3, WP6, WP7

Control area	Operational measure	Relevant WPs
Policy and procurement readiness	Map applicable procurement and policy constraints before pilots, maintain dialogue with public authorities and document both successful mechanisms and barriers for the final roadmap.	WP5, WP6, WP7
Knowledge and IPR management	Maintain clear ownership and licensing records, distinguish open outputs from protected results, and ensure that exploitation decisions remain consistent with the Consortium Agreement and project objectives.	WP1, WP7

6.2 Early-Warning Indicators and Escalation Triggers

The following indicators do not replace the 3x3 risk rating; they provide practical warning signals for reviewing whether a rating should change. They are directly linked to the proposal's milestones, work-package sequencing and performance expectations.

Table 6.6: Early-warning signal areas

Area	Early-warning signal	Recommended management response
Living Labs	School agreement, readiness documentation or stakeholder mobilization is not progressing as required for the M15 operational milestone.	Escalate within WP2/WP3; review administrative blockers and, where feasible, activate an alternative school option.
Ethics / approvals	Required ethics or educational approvals remain unresolved close to the planned start of participant-facing activities.	Escalate to WP1 and the relevant national lead; do not commence the affected data collection/activity until requirements are satisfied.
AI / VR	Prototype testing identifies repeated functionality, usability, localization or infrastructure problems that threaten planned deployment.	Review development priorities, apply phased testing and fallback, and revise deployment sequencing if necessary.
Participation	Student, teacher or family participation is substantially below the level required by the agreed implementation plan or KPI framework.	Review barriers with local stakeholders, strengthen targeted engagement and document any contextual causes.

Area	Early-warning signal	Recommended management response
Evaluation data	Low completeness, inconsistent coding, unusual response patterns or other data-quality concerns appear during collection.	Run data-quality checks, retrain local teams where needed and document methodological limitations before comparative analysis.
Procurement	Municipal, legal or contractual constraints prevent the planned procurement pilot from progressing.	Escalate to WP6/ACTIA/INAT, reassess the feasible pilot entry point and document constraints for policy recommendations.
Policy uptake	Stakeholder dialogues show limited institutional interest or unclear pathways for adoption.	Increase early policy engagement, refine the evidence-to-policy format and identify the institutional conditions required for uptake.
Dissemination	Outreach indicators remain below the communication strategy's targets or key audiences are not being reached.	Review channel performance, adapt multilingual content and use local multipliers and stakeholder networks.
AI dietary guidance	Testing, expert review, user feedback or monitoring identifies inaccurate, misleading, culturally inappropriate or otherwise unsuitable dietary guidance, particularly for minors.	Immediately review the affected content/functionality with EVAV and the nutrition/academic partners; restrict or suspend problematic guidance where necessary; document the incident, corrective action and residual risk; and reassess the T04 rating.
Funding / partner continuity	A national funding transfer is delayed, a partner signals financial difficulty or withdrawal, or a key staff member becomes unavailable for a critical activity.	Escalate to WP1; assess the effect on cash flow, milestones and responsibilities; activate the relevant contingency/reallocation plan and update the Risk Log.
Exploitation / uptake	Toolkit downloads/accesses, stakeholder commitments, institutional adoption pathways or other exploitation indicators remain materially below the expected trajectory.	Review the exploitation roadmap with IED and WP leaders; identify barriers by stakeholder group; intensify targeted demonstrations and engagement; and document revised uptake actions and post-project sustainability measures.

7. Conclusion

Through the diligent application of the 3x3 Likelihood and Impact/Severity matrix and the targeted, proposal-aligned mitigation strategies outlined in Section 6, the consortium maintains a structured and proactive and structured stance on risk. The project management team ensures that SchoolMedDiet maintains a structured and adaptive approach to risk management, responsive to ground-level socio-technical realities, and fully prepared to adapt to operational challenges without disrupting core objectives.

Moreover, as described in the proposal under T1.2, the Advisory Board of the project is expected to examine the quality of its deliverables, contribute to the identification of quality-related risks and advise the consortium on implementation and dissemination strategies. Its annual interaction with the project provides an additional review layer that is particularly valuable for risks that cross disciplinary or national boundaries.

The Board's contribution, as an independent external body, is advisory rather than operational. The Project Coordinator, WP Leaders, Task Leaders and responsible partners retain responsibility for day-to-day risk identification, mitigation and monitoring. Board observations and recommendations should nevertheless be documented, assigned to the appropriate management level and considered during subsequent risk reviews. Where a recommendation has implications for the work plan, resources, ethics, data protection, technical deployment or policy activities, the relevant WP Leader should record the follow-up action in the project management documentation.

8. References

- [1] Groso, A., Ouedraogo, A., & Meyer, T. (2012). Risk analysis in research environment. *Journal of Risk Research*, 15(2), 187-208.
- [2] International Organization for Standardization. (2018). *ISO 31000:2018 Risk management — Guidelines*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- [3] Conforto, E. C., Salum, F., Amaral, D. C., da Silva, S. L., & de Almeida, L. F. M. (2014). Can agile project management be adopted by non-software organizations? *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 21-34.



Connect with us

Meet our team



GREEK MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS AND SPORT
REGIONAL DIRECTORATE OF PRIMARY
AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
OF WESTERN MACEDONIA



Co-funded by
the European Union



Funded by the PRIMA Foundation (co-funded by the European Union and the Participating States). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the PRIMA Foundation. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.