

RISKS MANAGEMENT PLAN



5. Risks Management Plan

5.1 SDM Approach to Risk Management

The prompt detection and effective management of risks is key in order to ensure the coordinated, timely, successful and synchronised implementation of the SESAR Deployment Programme. The present risk management plan builds on an “iterative approach” which will be implemented during the execution of the Programme, so as to ensure the most efficient and effective management of any event which might have a negative impact on the DP.

The Risk Management approach is composed by three phases, as illustrated below.

Risk Assessment

The first phase of the methodological approach is represented by the “Risk Assessment”, which is composed of three steps: Risk Identification, Risk Analysis, and Risk Evaluation. The objectives of this phase are to ensure the prompt identification of any event which might have a negative impact on the execution of the Deployment Programme, to perform in-depth analysis of the identified risks, and to evaluate effectively risks in terms of probability and impact.

Risk Identification

The identification and management of risks at “Deployment Programme level” is at the core of SDM activities. Risks at this level are defined as those events which might have **significantly negative impacts on the successful, synchronized and timely implementation of the Deployment Programme and the overall PCP**. In order to guarantee an efficient categorization of all risks, their identification is conducted at four different levels, i.e. **Project** (in the remits of the Project Managers), **Activity** (Activity Leaders), **Action** (Action Leaders), and **Deployment Programme** levels (SDM). Moreover, also external stakeholders (e.g. PMO), where applicable, can support the identification of risks at any level.

It is important to mention that the identification of risks at “Deployment Programme level” by SDM is a continuous activity performed during all the DP lifespan:

- During the **development of the DP**, SDM identifies risks at Programme Level, covering, for each risk, objectives affected, consequences / impacts, and mitigation actions;
- During the **Deployment Programme “Execution phase”**, risks at Programme level are identified by SDM taking into account the results of monitoring activities, the results of continuous interactions with Action, Activity and Project Managers, and the analysis of any external event which might have a negative impact on the successful implementation of the Programme.

Moreover, SDM will play a proactive role in the identification of risks, and each “discrepancy” (i.e. misalignment between planned and actual results in terms of implementation cost, time and delivery quality) will be analysed and managed in cooperation with IP, Activity and Action Leaders, in order to prevent the escalation to risk.

In addition, the risks identification at Project Level starts during the **Implementation Projects’ “Proposal phase”**. During this phase, Project Managers provide SDM with a list of the main risks / factors of uncertainty / major elements of complexity / externality which may affect the implementation of the Project by submitting their “IP Proposals” through the SESAR Tool for ATM Roll-out (STAR) tool.

Risk Analysis

During the **“Risk Analysis”** step, risks which have been previously identified are analysed in order to enable the subsequent evaluation step.

In particular, SDM, in cooperation with Action Leaders, Activity Leaders, Project Managers and external stakeholders (if needed), analyses the identified risks which might affect the coordinated, successful,

synchronized and timely implementation of the overall Deployment Programme, by allocating them to one of five well-defined categories: **Cost, Time, Performance, Interdependencies**, or **Quality**.

Such activity is performed by SDM through:

- Preliminary interaction with Action, Activity, Project;
- Organisation of internal meetings / workshops with the involvement of SDM professionals and, if needed, external professionals to finalise the analysis of the identified risk.

Risk Evaluation

The Risk evaluation step aims at assessing the risks which have been previously identified and analysed, in terms of:

- **Probability:** likelihood that a given adverse event can negatively impact on the coordinated, successful, timely and synchronized deployment of the Programme;
- **Impact:** level of severity through which adverse events impact the successful DP Implementation.

Both Probability and Impact are assessed by SDM through a qualitative evaluation, according to a five-level scale: a) Very low; b) Low; c) Medium; d) High; e) Very high.

The matrix below presents an overview of the possible categorisation of each risk after SDM evaluation. SDM aggregates the result of the probability / impact analysis in order to define the **risk level** within the following scale: a) High, b) Medium, c) Low d) No Risk.

		Impact of the Risk				
Risk		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Probability of the Risk	Very High			High Level Risk	High Level Risk	
	High	Low level Risk	Medium Level Risk			
	Medium			Medium Level Risk		
	Low	No Risk	Low level Risk		Medium Level Risk	High Level Risk
	Very Low		Low level Risk	Low level Risk	Medium Level Risk	Medium Level Risk

Fig. 20 – SESAR Deployment Manager Risk Matrix

It is worth noting that the impact evaluation takes the utmost account of the “**interdependencies**” among projects in the DP, both within the same Action and across different Actions.

In particular, the interdependencies among projects are detected since the earliest stages of the DP elaboration, thus enabling a prompt identification and evaluation of risks through:

- Experts judgement, which leverages on Project management and ATM expertise;
- Execution of “Scenario analysis” exercises, also performed (if needed) taking into account quantitative evaluation (in particular with for the assessment of risks within the “cost” category).

Risk Mitigation

The second phase of the methodological approach is represented by the “**Risk mitigation**”, which aims at ensuring the prompt identification and implementation of mitigation actions with regard to each risk which has been identified, analysed and evaluated.

On the basis of the results of the risk assessment step, SDM identifies the most suitable mitigation actions to be implemented which can lead to the resolution and closure of the risk. Specifically, for each risk, mitigation actions are defined by SDM in terms of **owner**, **activities** to be performed, and **timing** for implementation. In addition, SDM is in charge of the follow-up of the mitigation actions, which is defined in terms of **reporting frequency** and **content**.

Risk Monitoring

The third phase of the methodological approach aims at ensuring that risks and related mitigation actions are effectively monitored over time so as to verify their evolution. In order to enable the effective monitoring of identified risks, the following activities are performed by SDM:

1. Each risk is assigned to a specific SDM expert in order to continuously monitor the evolution of the risk, interact with the relevant stakeholders, and periodically report to SDM management with regards to the evolution of the risk and the degree of success of the mitigation actions;
2. The "risk register" within the STAR tool is continuously maintained, in order to provide updated information on risks' and mitigation actions' evolution anytime.

5.2 Risks and Mitigation Actions

In accordance to its **responsibility of "ensuring effective management of risks"**, as stated at Article 9 (d) of Reg. (EU) n. 409/2013, the SESAR Deployment Manager identified, assessed and evaluated all risks whose occurrence could **affect the implementation of the SESAR Deployment Programme** and of the Pilot Common Project.

Taking into account the principles underpinning the Single European Sky initiative and the need to directly involve in the Risk Management activities all interested parties, SDM has been liaising **directly with those stakeholders potentially affected by the DP-level risks**, as well as with the potential **candidates to undertake Mitigation Actions** to limit their impact.

In parallel, the SESAR Deployment Manager is working **closely with the SESAR Joint Undertaking** in order to ensure that the **risks listed in the Deployment Programme** are well-connected and **linked with the risks listed in the ATM Master Plan**, especially with regard to implementation-related issues. As a result of this process, the **following risks have been identified**:

1. Misalignment between DP and operational stakeholders' investment plans
2. PCP Implementation outside the framework of SESAR Deployment FPA
3. Failure to adequately achieve full military involvement
4. Failure to provide required standards and regulations on time
5. Failure to ensure global interoperability
6. Misalignment between CEF co-funding profile and readiness for implementation
7. Late definition / failure to establish SWIM Governance
8. Late implementation of AF6: Initial Trajectory Information Sharing
9. Late delivery of IOP SESAR Solutions
10. Late industrialisation decisions
11. Unaddressed cyber-security vulnerabilities
12. Misalignment in Full Operational Capability dates
13. Lack of adherence to SESAR Deployment Programme

In accordance with the proposed Risk Assessment Approach, the 13 identified risks have been assessed and consequently positioned on the **Deployment Programme Risk Evaluation Matrix** as reported within the picture below.

The following tables have been developed in order to **identify and present those risks with higher relevance to the successful and timely implementation of the Deployment Programme**

Risk		Impact of the Risk				
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Probability of the Risk	Very High					
	High			5		
	Medium			1 8 9 10 12	2 4 6 7 11	
	Low			3	13	
	Very Low					

Fig. 21 – SESAR Deployment Programme Risk Matrix (2017 Edition update)

and thus the full Pilot Common Project. The tables detailing the **13 DP-level risks** and the **associated Mitigation Actions** are structured in order to clearly show the following elements:

- the **title** of the Risk;
- the **objectives** which are **most likely to be impacted** by the identified Risk;
- the indication of their **potential impact on the PCP implementation**, as well as its probability of occurrence. Each element is scored, on the basis of a **qualitative assessment** performed by the SESAR Deployment Manager, in cooperation with other relevant SES bodies, helping to characterize each Risk on a three-level scale (High Level, Medium Level and Low Level);
- the envisaged **consequences / impacts** which might stem from the risk occurrence;
- the **Mitigation Actions** to be implemented (either by the SESAR Deployment Manager or by other stakeholders) in order to reduce the likelihood of the risk occurrence, or to mitigate its impacts.

SESAR Deployment Programme – Risks and associated Mitigation Actions

1	Misalignment between DP and operational stakeholders' investment plans	Medium Level Risk			
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation and release of associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	The gap analysis showed that there are families that are not implemented or just partially implemented in the PCP geographical scope. The impact of the late implementation of the Families identified as high relevance could lead to a potential delay of the overall PCP implementation. Furthermore, in some cases the deployment of pre-requisites is lagging behind, with potential impacts on the subsequent investment end dates. The analysis has been performed taking into consideration projects awarded through CEF Transport Calls, as well as other implementation initiatives not funded by INEA, potentially resulting in a postponement or cancellation by the operational stakeholders. When this situation occurs, the delivery of performance benefits would be delayed accordingly. Additionally, late or missed investment could also have a negative impact on other stakeholder categories, jeopardizing the achievement of full PCP objectives.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager ▪ Strong promotion of the Deployment Programme together with dedicated local face to face meetings between SDM and "concerned stakeholders" and/or group/platform of stakeholders (e.g. at airport level). Stress also at local level the need to close the gaps in the high readiness families as a priority; ▪ Strong promotion and information initiatives in order to emphasize the need to proceed with the deployment of pre-requisites and enablers for the Pilot Common Project; ▪ Preparation and distribution of information packages to the operational stakeholders to support/facilitate the submission of the IPs both at technical and financial/administrative level; ▪ Support/facilitate the submission of proposals through a dedicated and timely process (anticipated as much as feasible) on Indications of Interest; ▪ Facilitation of stronger partnership between the operational stakeholders in preparation for the upcoming CEF calls, both at local and European level; ▪ Request demonstration of local coordination with other relevant stakeholders by projects leaders prior to projects submission to CEF calls; ▪ Enhancement of the transversal approach and buy in among airspace users, airports and ANSPs; ▪ Synchronisation / coordination activity on identified projects by SDM, through all phases, from their preparation towards the submission to INEA until the project execution; ▪ Close correlation between requests for payment by the implementation projects to SDM and their effective transmission to INEA by SDM. ▪ Organize dedicated meetings and/or communication flows in order to ascertain why a project was not awarded and to check whether it can be successfully submitted within next CEF Calls. By other Stakeholders/Authorities DG MOVE to ensure that future calls take place in order to maintain a flow of Implementation Projects throughout CEF timeframe and to support full PCP implementation (including its pre-requisites).				

2 PCP Implementation outside the framework of SESAR Deployment FPA					High Level Risk
Objectives affected by the Risk	PCP Benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	Within its current mandate, SDM should prioritize its effort to monitor the progress of implementation only for those projects awarded through SESAR deployment FPA. Should a significant part of PCP be implemented outside SESAR deployment FPA and not properly monitored by SDM, this could lead to incomplete picture of PCP's implementation status and to an impact on overall performances analysis.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager To perform annually the monitoring exercise with stakeholders both inside and outside SESAR FPA, in order to keep track of all implementation initiatives related to PCP in EU. By other Stakeholders/Authorities EC to streamline the EU reporting processes in order to avoid any unnecessary duplication and potential inconsistencies.				

3 Failure to adequately achieve full military involvement					Medium Level Risk
Objectives affected by the Risk	Full and timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	The lack of adequate military involvement, both at European and local level, could lead to an insufficient buy in of the military community and to a "backlog" concerning the necessary investments in line with PCP and DP priorities.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager ▪ Maintain the strong communication channel between SDM and EDA in order to facilitate and accelerate dialogue with the military authorities (Cooperative Arrangement with EDA was signed on 29th June 2015); ▪ Continue to liaise with EDA to further facilitate local coordination between the local civil stakeholders (level 3) and the military authorities; ▪ Continue to support EDA in the promotion of the PCP and the DP amongst military authorities; ▪ Identify and highlight the areas where military projects can be expected in the context of CEF Transport Calls; ▪ Support implementing partners enabling the local civil/military coordination. By other Stakeholders ▪ EDA to continue with the promotion of the PCP amongst military authorities. ▪ Military authorities to submit Implementation Projects to CEF Transport Calls, according to the Deployment Programme.				

4 Failure to provide required standards and regulations on time				High Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Harmonized PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Medium
Consequences and Impacts	Some of the families necessary for the full PCP implementation are not ready yet for deployment as indicated by their planned completion date of V3-phase (Pre-Industrial Development & Integration of E-OCVM – European Operational Concept Validation Methodology) and/or not covered by appropriate standards (ESOs and EUROCAE responsibilities), specifications and dedicated means of compliance (EASA responsibility). This issue could lead to a non-harmonized deployment, a lack of interoperability, integration problems and consequently to the need of reinvestments at a later stage to upgrade the deployed solutions to the required standards. Ultimately, this could negatively impact the operational deployment and the delivery of the expected benefits.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager Continue to reinforce the synergies with: • SJU for the prioritization of the validation exercises and the Large Scale Demonstrations (SDM has signed the Cooperative Arrangement with SJU); • EASA, EUROCAE and European Standardization Organizations to align their work programmes with the deployment priorities, as identified in the European Standardisation Rolling Development Plan (RDP) (SDM has signed the Cooperative Arrangement with EUROCAE); • EASCG (European ATM Standards Coordination Group) bringing together all relevant organisations; • Manufacturing industry and operational stakeholders to seek their assistance in contributing to the timely development of the necessary standards and marketing of the necessary hardware and software; • ICAO for standards and recommended practices, to ensure their timely provision as well as the alignment of their content with the deployment priorities. By other Stakeholders/Authorities • Relevant stakeholders to refer to and use existing standards and regulatory material and/or updated material to the greatest extent to avoid new rulemaking and/or standardisation tasks. • EUROCAE members to adequately promote and provide resources to the working groups involved in the development of the required standards. • EC to promote stronger commitment by key players for timely delivery and necessary funding to bodies involved in critical development of standards and regulation to secure necessary resources. • Implementing stakeholders to report to SDM the identified issues experienced with standards and regulations, allowing the SDM to liaise with the relevant bodies.				

5	Failure to ensure global interoperability	Medium Level Risk			
Objectives affected by the Risk	Harmonized PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	High
Consequences and impacts	The consequences of the lack of global interoperability are the potential misalignment for avionics and/or processes between the different aviation world regions (e.g. between SESAR / NextGen, as the ATM modernisation programmes), potential misalignment between the different avionics vs. ground systems and amongst ground systems themselves. The potential impact could be: ▪ Civil and military Airspace users having to buy, certify, install, maintain, train and carry redundant systems; ▪ Increased costs and workload for civil and military airspace users, as well for airports and ANSPs; ▪ Additional costs due to misalignments could overshadow operational benefits and efficiencies. This risk is strongly linked to the Risk n. 4.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager SESAR Deployment Manager has appointed an International Relations Manager to handle this specific risk. SDM and SJU coordinate with FAA (NextGen and ATO) under the EU/US MoC on this specific topic to ensure adequate actions in securing requirements and timelines of major ATM operation & technical changes through alignment of Master Plan and Deployment Programme with NextGen Implementation Plan. With respect to ICAO activities on global harmonisation, SDM is working closely with the members of the ICAO working groups nominated by European States as required, under the political guidance of EC and in close cooperation with SJU, to ensure timely and content alignment with the European deployment priorities. Special focus is being given to European deployment alignment with ICAO GANP/ASBUs update activities. Furthermore, SDM is seeking assistance from the manufacturing industry (notably airborne equipment manufacturers) on the issue of global interoperability and alignment of industrialization and deployment roadmaps. By other Stakeholders SJU with SDM promoting SESAR requirements based on full life cycle view, towards FAA/NextGen and ICAO GANP/ASBU activities. Relevant stakeholders to adequately promote the SESAR deployment needs to the working groups involved on European and global level. EC to promote interoperable and synchronized mandates, with the US and globally. High priority to be given on Data Link Systems (both Air/Ground and Ground/Ground) and Surveillance systems implementation strategies.				

6 Misalignment between CEF co-funding profile and readiness for implementation				High Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	The outcome of the Deployment Programme gap analysis, clearly states the need for more Implementation Projects by operational stakeholders to achieve full PCP implementation. Therefore, significant investments are still required. In particular, some key families in the DP are not ready for implementation yet due to an insufficient level of maturity. The conjunction of both constraints could lead to a significant time gap in PCP implementation.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager • To continue the liaison with EC about the availability of grants to cover full PCP requirements. • To continue the cooperation with SJU in order to emphasize the critical impact that the lack of maturity of some functionalities has on the overall implementation of the PCP. • To carefully review the readiness of each family in the yearly update of the Planning View of the Deployment Programme. By other Stakeholders/Authorities Align co-funding profile (calls and available co-funding) to foreseeable evolution of families’ readiness for implementation, ensuring smooth implementation of PCP throughout the whole CEF period.				

7 Late definition / failure to establish SWIM governance				High Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely and harmonized PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	Implementation of SWIM-technology could be delayed significantly and/or SWIM interoperability could be substantially impaired due to a lack of SWIM-governance in place.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager Continue to support the activities related to the establishment of the SWIM Governance and all the relevant stakeholders. SDM established and chaired a dedicated SWIM Governance Focus Team, which drafted a SWIM Governance strategy detailing the Action Plan for its implementation. Execution of 3 actions in accordance with the Action Plan has been completed and forms the basis for a new SWIM Governance project. Airports, ANSPs, Airspace Users, Military Authorities and MET service providers have proposed a common project related to SWIM Governance for CEF Call 2016, which was kicked off in February 2017. By other Stakeholders Airports, ANSPs, Airspace Users, the Network Manager, Military Authorities and MET service providers to work together for the achievement of SWIM Governance definition.				

8 Late implementation of AF6: Initial Trajectory Information Sharing				Medium Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	DLS is an essential prerequisite for the business trajectory (Initial Trajectory Information Sharing) which is the backbone of the SESAR operational concept. Therefore, benefits from a considerable portion of SESAR solutions would be severely inhibited unless AF6 is fully implemented to achieve the required VDL Mode 2 network performance and capacity as well as the integration of the EPP into the ATM systems.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager - Monitoring the implementation of the DLS in line with the requirements of the "Data Link Services (DLS) Recovery Plan", which focuses on the implementation of the ELSA recommendations. - SDM to perform its role as DLS Implementation Project Manager in accordance with EC mandate. - Support operational stakeholders in the implementation of the "Data Link Services (DLS) Recovery Plan". - Cooperate with EASA, NM, EUROCAE and SJU in the definition of all the complementary activities needed for the full deployment of Datalink Services in support of the i4D trajectory. By other Stakeholders/Authorities - To adhere to the requirements laid down within the "Data Link Services (DLS) Recovery Plan" and follow SDM indications and consultation steps. - EASA, EUROCAE and NM to fulfil the mandates received by EC in full cooperation with SDM.				

9 Late delivery of IOP SESAR Solutions				Medium Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	The PCP regulation requires the provision of flight information exchanges through two different SWIM Technical Infrastructure (TI) profiles: - Yellow TI profile for Flight information exchanges which do not require real time performance; - Blue TI profile for the network intensive and real time exchanges of tactical Flight information data between ACCs and the Network Manager. The Blue profile is currently encountering some delays in its operational validation and consequently the update of ED 133 is being postponed until these validations are over. The initial IOP (iIOP) from SESAR 1 and some planned SESAR 2020 activities will serve as the basis for validating the PCP IOP standard which will be published in 2020 by EUROCAE as ED-133 Revision. The ED-133 update proposals will be provided by the SJU in the form of a deliverable. These deliverables will feed the work of EUROCAE WG-59 who will remain in charge of publishing a final ED-133 revision in 2020. This postponement implies a potential overall delay of AF5 and other related AFs with respect to PCP deadlines.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager - Continue the collaboration with SJU on the on-going IOP validation activities, to synchronise the IOP validation and deployment roadmaps; - Assess the industry's readiness for implementation By other Stakeholders SJU to continue the on-going activities to deliver a complete SESAR Solution in 2018, allowing a final ED-133 revision in 2020.				

10 Late industrialisation decisions				Medium Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	The industrialisation decision for developing the expected capabilities may not be made by the manufacturers if an adequate return on investment is not envisaged, even if the standards are available. This might be the case, in particular, for airborne functions where a mandate is not put in place.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager - Activate cooperative arrangements and/or other means of cooperation with the Manufacturing Industry, in order to align expectations and share a common view of the capabilities required for deployment; - Identify alternative funding and financing mechanisms to support this development.				

11 Unaddressed cyber-security vulnerabilities				High Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	Contrary to the traditional ATM systems, that used to work as a network of bespoke systems, the level of automation and interoperability within ATM, besides the usage of COTS systems and open standards, has increased. Moreover, the interactions between traditional actors and also with new ones have also grown. These changes and technological improvements may, however, introduce vulnerabilities into the systems in the form of cyber-security risks, which is even more significant with the introduction of internet based solutions. As even low impact incidents could erode trust in the system, the implementation roadmap must ensure that delivered solutions are secure as a whole, thanks to a secure integration into operational ATM systems (including legacy systems), contributing as a result to a resilient European ATM system.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager To identify in the DP those families which present a need of cybersecurity standards and regulations, together with the available cybersecurity standards and regulations. By other Stakeholders/Authorities - EC to ensure efforts on ATM cyber-security are coordinated, and assess policy options for strengthening cyber-security and resilience. - SJU to establish principles and processes for ensuring that cyber-security and resilience is included appropriately within the SESAR work programme.				

12 Misalignment in Full Operational Capability dates				Medium Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, associated benefits	Impact	Medium	Probability	Medium
Consequences and impacts	Dependencies between Families may cause misalignment between their Full Operational Capability target dates. For example, whilst some sub-functionalities in AF2 are supposed to be implemented by 2024, they are also a pre-requisite for another AF/Sub-AF to be deployed by 2021. This could entail a delay in the achievement of the PCP deadlines, as a consequence of the un-readiness of the predecessors.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager - Identify dependencies amongst Families which may cause misalignment between their FOC target dates. Inform applicants about the consequences and SDM proposed mitigation strategies; - Liaise with EC to present the results of the analysis and the possible impact on timely and full PCP deployment; - Support EC in the identification of inconsistencies during the PCP review process. By other Stakeholders/Authorities EC to launch the PCP review to solve inconsistencies.				

13 Lack of adherence to SESAR Deployment Programme				Medium Level Risk	
Objectives affected by the Risk	Timely PCP implementation, timely release of associated benefits	Impact	High	Probability	Low
Consequences and impacts	Lack of buy-in of Deployment Programme would negatively affect the level of engagement and involvement in the implementation of the Pilot Common Project and in the overall ATM modernization effort. Such low engagement could result in lower investments (or no investments), thus affecting the overall implementation of the PCP.				
Mitigation Actions	By SESAR Deployment Manager - Continue with the involvement and engagement of all operational stakeholders impacted by the PCP regulation through the Stakeholder Consultation Platform. - Continue taking into account the comments and suggestions formulated during consultation cycles by operational stakeholders.				