7th Framework Programme
ENV.2010.4.1.2-2
Integrating new data visualisation approaches of earth Systems into GEOSS development

Project Nr: 265178

QUAlity aware VIsualisation for the Global Earth Observation system of systems

Deliverable D1.2
Risk analysis and assessment report

Version 0.1.3

Due date of deliverable: 01/04/2011
Actual submission date: 7/06/2011

Document control page				
Title	D1.2 Risk analysis and assessment report			
Creator	IS_CREAF			
Editor	JM_CREAF			
Description				
Publisher	GeoViQua Consortium			
Contributors	GeoViQua Partners			
Type	Text			
Format	MS-Word			
Language	EN-GB			
Creation date	28/04/2011			
Version number	1.1.1			
Version date	7/06/2011			
Last modified by				
Rights	Copyright © 2011, GeoViQua Consortium			
Dissemination level		CO (confidential, only for members of the consortium)		
		PU (public)		
		PP (restricted to other programme participants)		
	X	RE (restricted to a group specified by the consortium)		
	When restricted, access granted to:			
Nature	X	R (report)		
		P (prototype)		
		D (demonstrator)		
		O (other)		
Review status	X	Draft	*Where applicable:*	
		WP leader accepted		Accepted by the PTB
		PMB quality controlled		Accepted by the PTB as public document
		Coordinator accepted		
Action requested		to be revised by all GeoViQua partners		
	X	for approval of the WP leader		
		for approval of the PMB		
	X	for approval of the Project Coordinator		
		for approval of the PTB		
Requested deadline				

Revision history			
Version	Date	Modified by	Comments
0.1	10-05-2011	IS_CREAF	Created the basic content of the deliverable
0.2	28-04-2011	JM_CREAF	Content modification
0.3	7-6-2011	IS_CREAF	Minor changes

Copyright © 2011, GeoViQua Consortium

The GeoViQua Consortium grants third parties the right to use and distribute all or parts of this document, provided that the GeoViQua project and the document are properly referenced.

THIS DOCUMENT IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS "AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT OWNER OR CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS DOCUMENT, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1

2. Identification of new risks 2

1. Introduction

A risk analysis was performed before starting the project identifying the key external factors and the assumptions made when assessing the project impacts.

Probability	Description	Countermeasure
Low	A key risk is that the specifications / standards and protocols that we develop will not be accepted by the relevant GEO committees, or by ISO or OGC. While we cannot be certain that our developments will be accepted, we are heavily engaged in most of the relevant bodies (and have these on our project advisory board) so we hope that we can manage this issue through dialogue.	To make our work available for comment with sufficient time for partners and external organisations to comment before the proposals are finalised. Where existing standards need to be extended or changed we will employ the relevant Change Request procedure. We will utilise existing and developing standards, for example we will implement the QA4EO recommendations in the GEO context, and will use relevant OGC and ISO standards throughout, extending these only where necessary. Our aim is to have a structuring effect while innovating, and providing usable tools to enable the uptake of the developments.
Low	There is a risk that the uptake of the GeoViQua outputs will be slow due to users not appreciating the benefits of access to quality information and visualisation, given the learning cost of using the system.	To consider usability of tools at all times, frequent and early user consultation and education, and stressing the value and importance of quality information when using any observational data. Where users are not interested in visualising quality information we can inform the potential users about the consequences of using the data with unacceptable (or unknown) quality; these can be legal, financial or increased operation costs. The pilot case studies will be used to illustrate the application of GeoViQua developments across a range of societal benefit areas, and this will further exemplify the benefits of our work, including showing users practically the ease with which the tools can be employed.
Low	The GeoViQua solutions might not integrate well with existing infrastructure.	To building both specifications / protocols *and* tools to support these, which integrate with existing GEO portals and implement increasingly used interoperable standards such OGC OWS, and KML based services will minimise the risk of integration problems. Again user consultation plays a significant role as well as frequent testing of GeoViQua developments against existing systems. The experience of S&T and 52N in providing working solutions in a range of Earth observation problem domains will be critical here.

2. Identification of new risks

Probability	Description	Countermeasure
Low	Collaboration with external programs and projects planned as dissemination activities can change their objectives in a way that no longer allows GeoViQua participation on them.	Reconsider a different approach to allow GeoViQua participation on these programs and projects or if this is not possible, find other equivalent activities to collaborate with.
Low	A collaboration with other external activities is possible but different time scales make collaboration difficult	Project Management Board analyzes modifying the time table to align with important external activities.
Moderate	Quality information is seen in a way that producers no longer want it in their websites or even in their product descriptions. For example, legal obligations derived from declaring an incorrect quality indicator can make QI publication too risky for producers.	In this case reinforce efforts on providing data provenance and lineage. Focus on the uncertainties of the QI as a way to avoid legal bounding.
Moderate	Changes in governance structure of GEO or workplan redefinition makes some project activities irrelevant. (The GEOLabel is a possible example).	Project Technical Board with EC interaction will decide to continue these activities or refocus them to a broader scope. Eventually the activity can be removed or replaced with another of equivalent effort.