



LIFE17 GIE/IT/000562

ANCHOR Life

Advanced Noise Control strategies in HarbOuR

Risk Contingency Plan

Deliverable number *E1*

Dissemination level *Internal*

Delivery date *18/12/2018*

Status *Finalised*

Author(s) *Giuseppe Marsico, ISPRA*



LIFE Programme



This project is funded under the *LIFE* programme,
the EU's funding instrument for the environment and climate action.

Document Version Control

Version	Date	Change Made (and if appropriate reason for change)	Initials of Commentator(s) or Author(s)
00	10/12/2018	Final Version of Risk Contingency Plan	GM, ISPRA

Document Review

Reviewer	Institution	Date and result of the review
Simona Repetto	INGENIA	18/12/2018 – Fully accepted

Approved by (signature)	Date

Approved by at European Commission (signature)	Date



Content

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction.....	5
3. Constraints/Risks	5



1. Executive Summary

ANCHOR LIFE Risk Contingency Plan is devoted to handle the risks if they occur during the project is being carried out. This does not reduce the probability of the risk occurring but the impact should it occur.

The Plan identifies the risks the project may be affected and the related responses using contingent response strategies called "contingency plans".

2. Introduction

Assuming that ANCHOR LIFE partnership commitments are devoted to a strong cooperation and willing in accomplishing all the activities, carefully planned in order to guarantee a correct and fluid implementation of the project, nevertheless, we are aware of possible internal and external events that could strongly and negatively impacting on the implementation of the project, from different sides. It has to be underlined that no constrains are represented by the assessment perform related to EIA, SEA or the conservation of natural habitats as ANCHOR LIFE does not foresee the realization of infrastructures, plans or programmes strongly impacting on the environmental.

3. Constraints/Risks

Risks which may affect the development of the project are presented in decreasing order of importance, indicating for each the constrain (C) and the related contingency plan to mitigate them (CP):

- Difficulties in the carrying out the public tenders

C: Any problems can be represented by difficulties in carrying out the public tenders, especially those related to the communication activity that in the proposal were externalized. The difficulties are due to the National anticorruption regulations, recently in force in some EU States, not suitable for the timing of the project. The delay may occur will impact the carrying out of the related actions.

CP: The partners responsible for public tenders could internalize some of the activities they can carry out themselves, with a possible money saving saving. The financial resources saved could also be moved to other costs that may be insufficient for the needs of the project – i.e. travel costs.

- Difficulties in the involvement of stakeholders in the “Follower Platform”

C: Any problems can be represented by difficulties in reaching the different stakeholders, poor communication on the part of local communities and possible lack of interest and involvement in terms of low impact of the problem of reduction of acoustic levels in port context.

CP: In order to achieve the objectives of a participatory process is necessary to clarify at an early stage to stakeholders on the role that a collaboration network can play in the project tasks and carry on, in a parallel way, an effective advertising campaign on possible health damage of acoustic pollution. The fact that since the beginning of the project several stakeholders have already joined the steering committee



asking for associated partnership will be promoted in order to stimulate further stakeholders to be involved.

- Low participation in dissemination campaign

C: Low participation of stakeholder to dissemination events and campaigns, low use of the on-line available tools (website, blog, YouTube, Twitter etc.), weak communication and interactions with end-users and weak feedback from the stakeholders.

CP: Effective advertising of the event through the website, local media, social media and local institutions. Development of attractive website and social networks accounts. Use of tools to identify people interested in similar accounts (for instance Audience) and to schedule posts and messages when target audience is most likely to see them (for instance Tweetdeck, Hootsuite and Buffer) in order to maximise the possibility of appearing on social media followers' timelines. Direct involvement of stakeholders during workshops and events.

- Difficulties in decision making on governance policies due to multiple voices

C: Opinions from several actors within Steering Committees (composed by ANCHOR LIFE partnership + external Associated Partners from the "Follower platform") on decision making about noise control governance policies are surely an added value but we are aware that sometimes it could be difficult, in case of high number of participants, to converge to an agreement.

CP: Effective transfer of material and correct description of information could lead to a better focus on the discussion. The presence of a chairman leading each Steering Committee will ensure a conciliatory proceeding of debates and outputs.

- Difficulties with governance policies (Action B1).

C: The variety of characteristics of urban ports may create difficulties in defining common criteria within noise control governance policies. Some difficulties could be encountered in external Port Authorities not sharing the idea of port dues reduction towards private operators.

CP: Early and common definition of criteria for noise control governance policies. Great effort in the preliminary phase (Sub-action A1.1). A particular dedication will be addressed to the explanation of the importance of award systems in order to ensure a long-term positive impact and improvement of environment and their great success and implementation in many ports all over the world in other topics (such as air and water pollution, waste, etc.). Members of the Steering Committee and of the "Follower



platform” will share their expertise and their knowledge about their noise governance policies. Efficacious examples will be always shown in order to increase the awareness.

- Difficulties in designing and realization of the Smart Port Noise Monitoring System (Action B2)

C: The location of the sites where the monitoring system will be placed and its set-up may affect the outcomes of Action B2

CP: In Sub-action A1.1 the knowledge of CIRIAF on noise monitoring systems will be improved in order to select a system tailored for Patras situation during Action B2. MUPAT is conscious of noise environment of the area and will select the points where microphone will be installed accordingly. These operations will allow to have all the authorizations needed for microphones installation in time for the fulfilment of all B2 project activities.

- Difficulties in collection of data required for Action B3

C: MPA could have some difficulties in the collection of all data needed for noise mapping operations

CP: CIRIAF is conscious about the data required to perform a noise map. Data concerning the current noise situation and design of port expansion will be required by CIRIAF to MPA since the beginning of the project, using data formats agreed by the two partners (for instance using freeware software as QGIS). Moreover, if some lack of data happen, CIRIAF is conscious about the use of some standardized data and methods (some of them defined in the deliverables of NADIA project), that may be used to fulfil properly the noise mapping activities foreseen in action B.3, keeping calculation uncertainty low.

- Modification in the layout of Melilla port expansion (Action B.3)

C: An additional scenario of Melilla port expansion could be required during the project implementation

CP: The realization of up to three additional noise maps representing other expansion scenarios could be successfully managed since the highest time-consuming operation are represented by data collection and noise sources characterization. The time allocated for action B.3 is adequate to fulfil the goal of that activity.

- Changes in the work plan.

C: The present situation may change from the work plan description, so needing to be readapted.

CP: Revision of the work plan and elaboration of a new document.



- Need for unplanned meetings

C: It could be possible that, beside planned meetings listed in the work plan, further meetings will be needed in order to face problems arising within the project or to reinforce dissemination action related to noise issue (Action D1).

CP: Realization of on-line (web) meeting, insertion of intermediate technical meetings, if budget resources are available.

- Environmental risk

C: Adverse weather conditions

CP: Even protracted rainy events will not affect the fulfilment of project activities thanks to adequate time scheduling. In particular, measurement campaign in Melilla during Action B3 may be delayed without affecting the following activities. Monitoring system in Patras (Action B2) will function for more than one year so it will collect enough data to be analysed.

- Computer and software-related risks.

C: loss of data due to computer malfunctioning or damage

CP: Partners will take care of constantly backing up the system for avoiding dramatic losses of data. The backup will be kept safe.

In the figure below is shown, in general terms, the overall risk management process that will be followed.

Each of the risk management functions shown is discussed in the following paragraphs, along with specific procedures for executing them.