



PIISA

Piloting Innovative Insurance
Solutions for Adaptation

D5.8 Project Risk and Ethics Guide – Version 2

Author: Eeva Kuntsi-Reunanen, Hilppa Gregow, Kaisa Juhanko,
Anna Luomaranta



Funded by
the European Union

Disclaimer

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European union or the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Document information

Grant Agreement	n°101112841
Project Title	Piloting Innovative Insurance Solutions for Adaptation
Project Acronym	PIISA
Project Coordinator	Hilppa Gregow, Finnish Meteorological Institute
Project Duration	1 June 2023 – 31 May 2026 (36 months)
Related Work Package	WP5 Project Management
Deliverable Title	Project Risk and Ethics Guide – Version 2
Related Task(s)	Task 5.3 and task 5.4
Lead Organisation	Finnish Meteorological Institute
Contributing Partner(s)	
Authors	Eeva Kuntsi-Reunanen, Hilppa Gregow, Kaisa Juhanko, Anna Luomaranta
Due Date	19 Jun 2025
Submission Date	16 Jun 2025
Dissemination level	Public

History

Date	Version	Submitted by	Reviewed by	Comments
30 Sep 2023	1	FMI	Axa Climate: Ariane Kaploun & Jack Setton VU: Peter Robinson	Internal review with comments
29 Nov 2024	2	FMI	Axa Climate: Ariane Kaploun VU: Georges Farina BSC: Ángel Muñoz	Internal review with comments
12 Jun 2025	2	FMI	Tyrsky: Kati Berninger VU: Geroges Farina CAS: Lisette Klok LGI: George Lamah	Revised version after mid-term review with internal review with comments

Table of contents

1	Introduction	7
2	Risk management approach	7
3	Risk register	8
4	Ethics management approach	11

List of tables

Table 1: Risk register	7
------------------------------	---

Executive Summary

PIISA project partners operate in an area of uncertainty that comes along with developing and improving observations for piloting innovative insurance solutions for adaptation to deliver scientific findings. By doing so they take chances, which results in risks playing a role in a significant part of the project.

The purpose of the risk and ethics management plan is to establish the framework in which the project team identifies risks and develops strategies to mitigate or avoid those risks. Similarly, ethical issues related to the project implementation are identified and monitored. Risk and ethics management will occur across all project levels and the project partners will adopt a uniform and systematic approach to identify and evaluate risk and ethics; define and plan proactive and efficient actions for risk reduction; start, perform and control planned mitigation activities; document the progress of risk and ethics management activities and evaluate results to implement corrections where needed.

Towards the status report for mid-term of the project, the Project Management team (WP5) identified and compiled the various risks in the Risk Register. To ensure that monitoring is continuous throughout the life of the project, the Risk Register will be updated by the Project Risk Manager and discussed with the consortium at least on half yearly. Similarly, the ethics related issues will be monitored throughout the project on a regular basis. The project administration and the coordinator, with data manager and project manager have been and will be involved in developing the risk monitoring process and updating the Risk Register at the ECAS system.

Keywords

Risk management, risk mitigation, risk register, ethics management, ethical issues, human rights, gender equality

Abbreviations and acronyms

Acronym	Description
EC	European Commission
RR	Risk register
SG	Steering Group
WP	Work Package

1 Introduction

PIISA project partners operate in an area of uncertainty that comes along with developing and improving observations for piloting innovative insurance solutions for adaptation to deliver scientific findings. By doing so they take chances, which results in risk playing a role in a significant part of the project.

The purpose of the risk and ethics management plan is to establish the framework in which the project team will identify risks and ethics and develop strategies to mitigate or avoid those risks and adhere ethics.

2 Risk management approach

Risk management will occur across all project levels, and we will adopt a uniform and systematic approach to:

- i. continuously identify and evaluate risk.
- ii. define and plan proactive and efficient actions for risk reduction.
- iii. start, perform and control planned mitigation activities.
- iv. document the progress of risk management activities and evaluate results to implement corrections, if needed.

The approach we have taken to manage risks for the PIISA project includes a methodical iterative process by which the project team identified and scored the various risks listing them into a Risk Register (RR). This register will be accessible to all partners through MS Teams. The RR will be revisited on a regular basis to allow early identification of risks, and then minimize their likelihood of realization. In Table 1 the project's identified critical risks to implementation are shown with the potential to impact project objectives.

The list of risks has been developed by the Project Risk Manager and the Project Management (WP5) team. For each identified risk topic an identification number has been assigned, a description of the risk is included, the work packages (WP) which could be influenced are listed, and risk mitigation measures have been proposed.

Key to risk monitoring is ensuring that it is continuous throughout the life of the project. The RR will be thus updated by the Project Risk Manager and discussed with the WP5 regularly. As more risks are identified, they will be qualified and the Project Risk Manager together with the WP5 will develop avoidance and mitigation strategies. This established approach will provide sufficient time to decide and act upon agreed mitigation measures. Continuously revisiting the RR during the project will allow us to manage the risk life cycle, identify potential risk without delay, and apply immediate countermeasures.

Should the identified risk occur, implementation of mitigation measures will be decided by the Consortium through the Steering Group and WP5 (EB). For the effective management of PIISA, the following bodies have been established.

Related to the request for revision of deliverable submission as risks need to be addressed better - more specifically, the risks related to the stakeholder's engagement and upscaling of the results within the loop framework - were elaborated in the following way:

- 1) It was discovered that it can be difficult to find or identify stakeholders for interviews (in loop 2) in countries other than the interviewer's own country. Stakeholders are also sometimes hesitating in giving an interview in English, because it is not their mother language.
- 2) Stakeholders are busy and cannot participate in live or online events. Same complexity with the webinars: people register and do not show up. To handle and solve this matter, the consortium will do intensive marketing and provide recordings of the webinars.
- 3) Pilots may be inactive in reaching out for stakeholders. They work with their closest collaboration partners, but the broader target groups may not be reached. The consortium must make also an effort to figure out who they work with.
- 4) Another issue might be that the consortium cannot attract its target groups. To handle and solve this matter, the consortium tries to create interesting content and attends the events where to reach them.
- 5) The question also arises what to measure: a few key people from a specific target group may be enough to collect information, especially if they have a gatekeeper role, they can also help disseminate our results.
- 6) In terms of upscaling: In this stage of the project, it is not known if experiences from feeding into another area will create something new as the pilots have not yet reported how they are using the end of the loop surveys. This should be solved at the later stage of the project.
- 7) In addition to risks related to stakeholder engagement and upscaling within the loop framework, several risks can be anticipated should the project output move in that direction, such as:
 - i. variability in stakeholder engagement when transitioning from local pilots to broader contexts.
 - ii. potential misalignment between the loop framework and existing governance or institutional structures in new regions.
 - iii. operational and resource-related constraints that may limit scalability.

All of these will be considered and monitored in the latter part of the project. It was also noted that several pilots and WPs also encountered that no risks arose from stakeholder engagements.

The consortium has intense co-operation with many other partners such as Climate Kit and Nature. Most of the activities are listed in the KPI's which are monitored under the Data Management Plan. However, all activities are not included in the deliverables as they contain nonpublic information.

3 Risk register

The Project Risk Manager will maintain the RR in order to track risks, WP interdependencies and associated mitigation strategies. The RR for the project is a log of all identified risks, their probability and impact to the project, the WPs involved, mitigation strategies, and when the risk

is expected to occur. The RR includes also horizontal interdependencies between WPs that might affect the delivery of the expected results.

The Risk Register (June 2025) is shown in table 1.



Risk/ level of likelihood	WP	Proposed risk-mitigation measures	check date
Consortium Risks			
1. Partners leaving the consortium (Low)	ALL	In case of partner exit, workload will be redistributed to the remaining partners according to their expertise to ensure the continuation. The mitigation of such risk will be the responsibility of the project coordinator.	14.3.2024 28.11.2024 4.6.2025
2. External partner for the pilots leaving the consortium.	ALL	In case of external pilot partner exit, the mitigation measures will be identified by internal pilot partner (and by other consortium members) to identify alternative options and other replacement partners, if needed. The anticipation of such risk will be the responsibility of the pilot coordinator.	14.3.2024 28.11.2024 4.6.2024
3. Partners conflicting during the project development (Low)	ALL	The members of the consortium have already collaborated in the past. When necessary, the management team will take actions to ensure that appropriate communication channels are established among partners. The mitigation of such risk will be the responsibility of the coordinator.	20.9.2024 4.6.2025
Management Risks			
4. Delays in milestones achievement and project objectives. (Low)	ALL	Coordinator and WP leaders will keep track of the project deadlines. In case of delay, a meeting will be held with involved partner(s) to establish the causes and adopt measures to prevent future delays.	16.10.2024 5.6.2025
5. Delays in project deliverables (Medium)	ALL	WP leaders will be monitoring the working flow to identify possible delays in the deliverable submission. The Executive Board will prepare a backup solution and reallocation of resources and workload.	16.10.2024 5.6.2025
6. Information and data not accessible or shared effectively (Low)	ALL	The Data Manager monitors information and data exchange continuously. The project has partners with direct access to the type of data and services to be used. They will secure and speed up access to the required data. In case of urgency, a specific taskforce will be activated involving the most adequate partners.	20.11.2024 4.6.2025
7. Budget allocation revision or redistribution (Low).	WP5	According to necessity, workload redistribution or partner departure, the coordinator will propose a budget redistribution to be approved by the GA	15.11.2024 5.6.2025
Technical Risks			
8. Delays and difficulties in the interactive activities due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic (Low)	ALL	Workshops will be planned hybrid or online event. Engagement activities will be aligned to the prevention measures, planned in advance, to ensure that delays in the work plan are kept to the minimum. The Management team (WP5) have solid experience of organising online workshops, seminars, webinars and meetings.	15.3.2024 4.6.2025

9. Heterogeneity in the WP input/output data (Low)	ALL	The project structure aims at minimizing the dependency of outputs. Communication between tasks leaders will ensure effective dataflow.	16.10.2024 4.6.2025
10. The outputs of PIISA with the scalability potential are not well understood as the pilots are very different (High)	WP2 WP3	PIISA dedicates time to solve technical issues well in advance. Using wide network for sharing ideas and guidance this could partly be overcome by the pilot forms in which a similar conceptual framing may be adopted.	on-progress 5.6.2025
11. Gaps in and conflicts between the identified or needed data (Medium)	ALL	Identification of other datasets which can replace the missing data. If the change of data is leading to a different perimeter than initially described in the Grant Agreement, this topic will be brought to an extraordinary General Assembly then discuss with Project officer to ensure the consistency with the overall objective of PIISA project.	20.11.2024 28.11.2024 5.6.2025
Communication, Dissemination and Exploitation Risks			
12. Stakeholders or local partners are not interested in or willing to participate in pilots (Low)	WP3 WP4	The project will establish close connection with the key stakeholders and local partners. They will be given different options to participate.	on-progress 5.6.2025
13. The project outcomes will not meet the expectations (Low)	ALL	The EC project officer will be regularly invited to take part in meetings of the project, thus securing the EC being permanently informed while the feedback from the EC is duly taken into consideration. In case of need a specific taskforce will be activated.	21.5.2024 11.3.2025
14. Risk of confidentiality (Low)	ALL	Marketing and communicating as actively as possible to distribute the outcomes and impacts of the PIISA project widely	20.11.2024 5.6.2025
15. Lack of internal communication and information sharing between work packages and partners (Low)	ALL	Meetings between WP leaders on regulatory basis to share information for better understanding of others' tasks to foster effective workload between partners. (In Paris GA (15.11.2024) it was decided to have an open EB meeting for the whole consortium every two months to enhance the internal communication	new risk created on 9.2.2024 15.11.2024 6.2.2025

Table 1: PIISA's risk register.

4 Ethics management approach

The ethics management approach is to establish the framework in which the project team identifies ethical issues and develops strategies to mitigate or avoid potential matters. Ethics

management assessment is fully compliant with the EU legal and ethical frameworks as shaped to date, so as:

- i. to ensure a scientific and operational alignment with the EU values and human rights sets retrospectively,
- ii. to identify and mitigate activities with gender imbalance and wider socio-technical concerns, if any, and
- iii. to document the progress of ethics management activities and evaluate results to implement corrections, if needed.

The ethical issues related to the PIISA project will be revisited on regular basis to allow early identification of ethical matters and then minimize their likelihood of realization. Similarly, gender equality issues will be carefully and objectively monitored to avoid any deviation from the EC goals. Each WP and task leader will ensure PIISA meets these requirements.

In terms of the ethics related to the surveys conducted and data collected with respect to developing the pilots based on users' needs, the ethics have been elaborated in the following way:

- 1) It was discovered that because there are only a few stakeholders willing to be interviewed regarding the pilots, it was not an option to balance gender equality.
- 2) There is a need to be careful when categorizing humans as "Europeans" when surveys have been conducted only in a limited number of countries.
- 3) The survey elaborated in WP3 followed the GDPR regulations. In the case of the survey was conducted with households (pilot 1), the survey was validated by the ethics committee of Vrije Universiteit and included the standard measures (informed consent forms, anonymization of respondents, storage in a safe hard drive of the survey data). Similar measures were also considered with stakeholders.
- 4) Other questionnaires were sent internally among consortium partners and targeted internal consultations exclusively to PIISA WP3 pilot leads to collect structured input.
- 5) However, consortium's gender dimension is managed equally as the consortium has several females in leadership positions such as consortium coordinator and WP leaders.