

Appendix C - Risk File

NR.	Risk	Causes	Effects
1	New measuring stations appear to be more susceptible to interference than expected	1. Parts have a (too) low 'mean time between failure' (MTBF) or the entire system has not been properly tested in conjunction 2. Measuring stations do not meet the required quality resulting from the functional requirements. 3. Asphalt situation in the Netherlands (ZOAB) differs compared to references. 4. Visible cabling from measuring stations with a risk of vandalism	1. Measuring stations are regularly out of use 2. Measuring stations require more maintenance from Contractor2 party 3. Measuring stations must be replaced again
2	After the award of the tender, the chosen solution cannot provide sufficient functionality.	1. The contractor has made promises during the award with regard to the delivery of required functionality that cannot be fulfilled; 2. RWS does not have full control over the monitoring station (for example: administrator rights, API access, remote management by B&O party, software updates, insight into how the software works).	1. Control and setting of the measuring station is not optimal 2. Management (remote) of the measuring station is not optimal 3. Collaboration with the RWS data platform is not optimal 4. Measuring stations are working insufficiently to support the anti-icing process.
3	The brainpower of the market with regard to the supply of a sustainable product/service combination is insufficiently questioned in the new contract.	1. Unseen perverse incentives in pricing model; margins are achieved on the technical components and not on the achievement of long-term objectives; 2. Insufficient validation in selection criteria with regard to required craftsmanship; 3. Insufficient validation in award criteria with regard to the way in which craftsmanship is specified (attitude and behaviour).	1. Insufficient quality for the long term (short lifetime products and End of Life components are not replaced); 2. Image damage RWS towards partners; 3. Additional costs due to new investments to continue to meet the requirements; 4. Life cycle management is not implemented in the intended way.
4	The necessary collaboration between RWS and contractors based on craftsmanship (contract 1 and 2) is poor.	1. The management processes with regard to the RWIS are insufficiently described in contract 1; 2. Great physical distance from supplier makes intensive collaboration difficult.	The contractor is insufficiently informed about what is going on at RWS to come up with suitable innovative solutions
5	Delivery of spare parts is difficult, End of Life of parts occurs too quickly/often.	1. Insufficient parts in stock 2. Long delivery times (from e.g. China) 3. Technological development is fast.	1. Emergency facilities are necessary to keep measuring stations operational; 2. Measuring stations stay "offline" longer