

Risk Management Plan

1. Purpose

This Risk Management Plan establishes a structured approach to identifying, assessing, and managing risks that may impact the successful delivery of the Training Centre for Sustainable and Green Economy Manufacturing (SAGE-M). It aligns with ARC requirements and supports effective governance, compliance, and operational decision-making.

2. Scope

This plan applies to all Centre activities. It includes Governance, Financial, Research Delivery, Partnership, Compliance, and Operational risks.

3. Risk Assessment Framework

Risks assessed by Likelihood (Rare to Almost Certain) and Consequence (Insignificant to Major) using the following risk matrix.

	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major
almost certain	medium	high	high	extreme
likely	low	medium	high	high
possible	low	medium	medium	high
unlikely	low	low	medium	medium
rare	low	low	low	medium

4. Risk Treatment

Strategies:

- Accept**
 The risk is acknowledged and tolerated without further action, with ongoing monitoring to ensure it remains within acceptable limits.
- Reduce (Mitigate)**
 Actions are implemented to lower the likelihood and/or impact of the risk to an acceptable level.
- Avoid**
 The activity causing the risk is changed or stopped to eliminate the risk entirely.
- Share (Transfer)**
 The risk is partially transferred to another party (e.g. partner, contractor, insurer), while retaining oversight.

- **Escalate**
The risk is elevated to higher governance (e.g. Director or Executive) due to its significance or cross-cutting impact.

5. Governance

- Director oversees strategic risks.
- Business Manager manages operational risks.
- Executive Committee provides oversight.

6. Process

- **Identify**
Risks and issues are identified through planning, stakeholder input, and ongoing program activities.
- **Assess**
Each risk is evaluated based on its likelihood and potential impact using the defined risk matrix.
- **Assign**
A responsible owner is allocated to each risk to ensure accountability for management and mitigation.
- **Mitigate**
Appropriate treatment strategies are implemented to reduce, avoid, share, or accept the risk.
- **Monitor**
Risks are regularly reviewed to track status, effectiveness of controls, and any changes in risk level.
- **Escalate**
Risks exceeding thresholds or requiring higher-level decisions are escalated to the appropriate governance body.

7. Monitoring

Quarterly review. Linked to KPIs and reporting.

8. Continuous Improvement

This is a living document updated regularly.

Appendix 1: Risk Register

Copied from sheet, full register maintained [here](#).

Risk #	Risk Description						Mitigation Strategy			Residual Risk
	Cause	Impact	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Rating	Treatment Strategy	Owner	Residual Likelihood	Residual Consequence	
1	Delayed commencement due to agreement execution delays		Possible	Major	High	Reduce	Business Manager	Engage Research Office and legal teams early; run parallel review of agreements; weekly establishment tracker.		Medium
	Prolonged negotiations with participants	Delay to project start, research activity and spending						Unlikely	Moderate	
2	Inability to recruit high-quality HDR candidates within timeframe		Likely	Major	High	Reduce	Director / Executive	Advertise early and widely; use CI networks; consider interim support from existing group members.		Medium
	Limited applicant pool or timing delays	Delay to research delivery and training cohort formation						Possible	Moderate	

3	Partner organisation withdraws from the Centre or a project		Possible	Major	High	Reduce	Maintain active engagement; diversify partner base; develop replacement partner pipeline where feasible.		Medium
	Commercial priorities change or organisational restructure	Loss of expertise, cash/in-kind support and potential project disruption					Director	Unlikely	
4	Project under-delivers against partner or Centre expectations		Possible	Major	High	Reduce	Use milestones, advisory oversight and transparent project reviews; adjust scope early if needed.		Medium
	Research scope proves harder than expected or misaligned	KPI shortfalls, reputational damage and reduced partner confidence					Theme Leader / CI	Possible	
5	HDR researcher withdraws before project completion		Possible	Moderate	Medium	Reduce	Use rigorous selection; provide support and mentoring; plan replacement or task reallocation if needed.		Medium
	Personal, academic or employment factors	Loss of capacity and project delay					Supervisors	Unlikely	
6	Supervisor becomes unavailable		Unlikely	Moderate	Medium	Reduce	Maintain at least two academic supervisors; document progress and responsibilities.		Low

	Leave, turnover or other competing commitments	Disruption to project continuity and student support					Director	Rare	Moderate	
7	Travel restrictions affect collaboration or placements		Unlikely	Moderate	Medium	Reduce		Use remote collaboration; prioritise domestic alternatives; adjust placement timing where required.		Low
	External disruption to domestic or international travel	Reduced collaboration and delays to planned exchanges					Business Manager	Rare	Minor	
8	Failure to meet ARC reporting deadlines or evidence requirements		Possible	Major	High	Reduce		Establish reporting calendar; assign owners; collect KPI and financial data quarterly.		Medium
	Weak data collection processes or delayed inputs	Compliance breach and potential funding consequences					Business Manager	Unlikely	Moderate	
9	Partner cash contribution shortfall or late payment		Possible	Major	High	Reduce		Track invoices and receipts quarterly; escalate late payments quickly; identify contingency options.		Medium
	Partner default or cashflow timing issues	Pressure on delivery and possible non-compliance					Finance / BM	Unlikely	Major	

10	Budget shortfall due to underestimated research costs		Possible	Moderate	Medium	Reduce	Reforecast quarterly; educate researchers on costs; seek co-funding or reprioritise spend.		Medium
	Higher-than-expected consumables, staffing or equipment costs	Scope reduction or need for alternative funding					Finance / Executive	Unlikely	
11	Conflict of interest not properly disclosed or managed		Unlikely	Major	Medium	Reduce	Maintain COI policy, annual declarations and escalation pathway for new conflicts.		Low
	Insufficient awareness or process failures	Breach of ARC requirements and governance risk					Director	Rare	
12	Intellectual property dispute between stakeholders		Likely	Moderate	High	Reduce	Set clear IP terms in agreements; involve legal/OGC early; document project-specific arrangements.		Medium
	Unclear expectations or disagreement on ownership/publication	Delay to publication, commercialisation or partner relationships					Director / Legal	Possible	
13	Ethics, data management or open access requirements are not met		Unlikely	Major	Medium	Reduce	Maintain ethics and data management plans; review obligations at project start and reporting cycle.		Low

	Incomplete planning or poor compliance follow-through	Delays, reporting problems or compliance breach					BM / Researchers	Rare	Moderate	
14	Critical equipment unavailable due to maintenance or access constraints		Possible	Moderate	Medium	Reduce		Identify alternate equipment or site; plan bookings early; maintain service support.		Low
	Breakdown, servicing or booking conflicts	Project delays and missed milestones					Project CI	Unlikely	Minor	
15	Failure to achieve Centre KPIs		Possible	Major	High	Reduce		Set realistic KPI pathways; review progress quarterly; intervene early where projects are off-track.		Medium
	Targets not embedded in project and reporting processes	Negative ARC review and reputational impact					Director / Executive	Possible	Moderate	
16	Affiliate HDRs (students not enrolled with the Centre but who take advantage of Centre activities, supervision, and infrastructure) use ARC funds or conflate ARC performance metrics		Possible	Major	High	Reduce		Create information about role of Centre vs affiliate HDRs and make supervisors aware; intervene early if incorrect behaviour is identified.		Medium
	Personnel don't understand the different positions of Centre vs affiliate HDRs	Incorrect allocation of funding, compliance breach					Project CI	Possible	Minor	

17	Partner expectations mismatched with research progress.		Possible	Major	High	Reduce	Regular brief reports instigated by HDRs and postdocs, regular face-to-face meetings, good communication between CI and PI on project, ensure that PO has several "champions" supporting the project, clear expectations for project expressed in Project Agreement and revisited over life of project.		Medium
	Partners and CIs have differing expectations and research delays can occur for a number of reasons.	Project delays and poor supervision of students.					Project CI / Project PI	Unlikely	