

Risikokatalog *Projektrisiken*

Wien, 2026

Impressum

Medieninhaber, Verleger und Herausgeber:
Austrian Development Agency
Wien, 2026. Stand: 30. September 2026

Copyright und Haftung:

Auszugsweiser Abdruck ist nur mit Quellenangabe gestattet, alle sonstigen Rechte sind ohne schriftliche Zustimmung des Medieninhabers unzulässig.

Es wird darauf verwiesen, dass alle Angaben in dieser Publikation trotz sorgfältiger Bearbeitung ohne Gewähr erfolgen und eine Haftung des Bundesministeriums und der Autorin / des Autors ausgeschlossen ist. Rechtausführungen stellen die unverbindliche Meinung der Autorin / des Autors dar und können der Rechtsprechung der unabhängigen Gerichte keinesfalls vorgreifen.

Rückmeldungen: Ihre Überlegungen zu vorliegender Publikation übermitteln Sie bitte an risk@ada.gv.at.

Risk Catalogue*

**This is a catalogue of the most common risks that can occur within a project or programme, and was developed for ADA staff as guidance and practical resource for project risk assessment.*

Applicants are also free to use this catalogue, consider the different risk categories and think through possible scenarios in order to systematically identify prevailing risks. However, ADA does not require applicants to document risks with the type/area and code according to this catalogue (which are purely used for internal purposes).

Please note that the risks contained in this catalogue are not exhaustive.

Type / Area and Code			Standard risk	Explanation	Examples
EXTERNAL RISKS					
Legal Framework	ER	01	Restrictive legislation impedes project	Legislation in project-relevant areas, including labor law, environmental legislation, etc.	e.g. New legislation in the partner country restricts NGO activity, rendering planned activities impossible, requiring adjustment of project logframe.
	ER	02	Changes in political situation impede project	Political situation pertains to everything from the overall political climate, composition of government (administration) to project co-workers in line ministry or national authority.	e.g. Change in political leadership / departure of key personnel in Ministries lead to shifting priorities or loss of institutional memory and inability to implement project as planned.

Political Framework / Uncertainties	ER	03	Violence threatens staff or project	Instable security situation poses risk to personal health, safety and security of staff working on the project, or to project infrastructure.	e.g. Violent incidents make it unsafe (or impossible) for staff to travel for the project; e.g. Vandalism of offices disrupt project.
Environment	ER	04	Natural events threaten staff or project	Natural events can pose a physical threat to project staff or assets, the ability to undertake project activities or to the effectiveness of those activities.	e.g. Pandemic, Risk of flood in or near the project location poses a threat to project assets and to freedom of movement for project staff and beneficiaries.
Economic Conditions	ER	05	Economic and developmental situation in-country impedes project	Economic situation refers to the overall economic stability in terms of prices, currency, employment etc.; Developmental situation refers to the populations livelihoods and income stability, employment etc.	e.g. Sudden economic downturn in the project location due to collapse in global commodity prices for major crops in the area lead to significant drop of income, which forces participants in training programme to drop out and pursue income-generating activities instead, in order to support their families.
Infrastructure in Project-Country	ER	06	Inadequate country infrastructure impedes project	Country Infrastructure includes the project country's internet / communication services, water or electricity supply, transport, health infrastructure, etc.	e.g. Failure of local internet or communication infrastructure leads to delays in project implementation or to unforeseen costs for additional travel.
Social / Cultural Norms	ER	07	Cultural conflicts impede project	Misunderstandings or behaviour due to language, social or religious norms lead to problems in implementing project as planned.	e.g. Stakeholders deny active participation in project decision-making due to misalignment of project objectives with cultural norms.

PROJECT RISKS					
Result Orientation	PR	08	Lengthy negotiations between multiple stakeholders impede project progress	Lengthy negotiations impede activity planning, approval and / or implementation.	e.g. Due to mistrust, different groups of stakeholders refuse to take part in steering group meetings, which paralyses project decision making.
Partner Country Orientation / Ownership	PR	09	Lack of stakeholder ownership weakens results and sustainability	Ownership / commitment from stakeholders can be impeded by other environmental factors.	e.g. Lack of active participation and follow-up by partner country institution weakens effectiveness and sustainability.
	PR	10	Failure of donor coordination reduces effectiveness	In multi-donor initiatives, good coordination is required to ensure alignment of objectives and interventions, and coherence of processes / standards / requirements.	e.g. Different donors insist on divergent monitoring and reporting requirements, which binds existing resources and leads to overly high transaction costs.
Transparency / Accountability	PR	11	Political influence on grant and contract awards	Exertion or appearance of political influence on project-related decisions could lead to reputational damage to the project.	e.g. Partner government minister strongly suggests use of a certain vendor for project procurement.
Project Personnel	PR	12	Difficulty to recruit and retain qualified project staff	Difficulty to secure the staff required for high-quality project delivery	e.g. Inability to find qualified staff in time could delay implementation, or in the case of sub-standard recruitment, impair the quality of deliver, lack of competitiveness of project positions advertised
	PR	13	Loss of critical knowledge	Any kind of loss of knowledge and information that are essential for the project to operate without impediment.	e.g. Failure to secure comprehensive documentation and transfer of knowledge prior to staff departure.

IT	PR	14	Failure to secure adequate and compatible IT systems, equipment & IT support	Inadequate project IT infrastructure and support negatively impact quality of project delivery.	e.g. Risk, that new IT-products and -systems cannot be integrated into the existing IT environment, more specifically that incompatible IT-systems are not interlinked resulting in wrong data, system failure, manual effort, additional costs, etc.
	PR	15	Technology failure prohibits / impedes operation	Failure of critical technology impedes ability to implement project as planned or monitor progress.	e.g. IT system breakdown
Environmental, Gender, Social Risks					
Environmental / Gender / Social Standards (EGSIM)	EGS	16	Project negatively impacts the environment	According to EGSIM Risk Assessment outcome as applicable. For further information see EGSIM Manual and Staff Guidance Note.	
	EGS	17	Project exacerbates gender inequality and/or undermines empowerment of women and girls	According to EGSIM Risk Assessment outcome as applicable. For further information see EGSIM Manual and Staff Guidance Note.	
	EGS	18	Project causes harm to people or infringement of human rights	According to EGSIM Risk Assessment outcome as applicable. For further information see EGSIM Manual and Staff Guidance Note.	

Implementing Organization Risks					
Implementing Organisation	OR	19	Insufficient technical capacity of partner/ grant recipient impedes results delivery and/or results reporting	<i>Partner due diligence checks conducted before project approval provide information on potential risks in this area.</i> <i>No projects with an apparent high risk in this area should be proposed for approval.</i>	
	OR	20	Partner's/ Grant recipient's failure to contribute funds as planned, incl. due to insolvency	<i>Partner due diligence checks conducted before project approval provide information on potential risks in this area.</i> <i>No projects with an apparent high risk in this area should be proposed for approval.</i>	
	OR	21	Fiduciary risk at partner/ grant recipient	Fiduciary risk = the risk that funds are not used for the intended purpose, do not achieve value for money, or are not properly accounted for. This can be caused by lack of institutional capacity, among other reasons. <i>Partner due diligence checks conducted before project approval provide information on potential risks in this area.</i> <i>No projects with an apparent high risk in this area should be proposed for approval.</i>	e.g. Funds are not used as planned due to lack of capacity, competency or knowledge; bureaucratic inefficiency; and/or active corruption.

	OR	22	Breach of law or contracts by partner/ grant recipient	Failure of grant recipient or its contract partners to comply with applicable law or contractual obligations (grant agreements). Includes breaches of labor law, criminal law, data protection law, child labour legislation, UN/EU Sanctions.	e.g. Grant recipient violates occupational health and safety legislation, causing an accident at a project site.
	OR	23	Lack of institutional capacity to comply with environmental, gender, social standards	Refers to the lack of institutional capacity / controls to ensure the grant recipient's compliance with environmental, gender and social standards during its regular (business) operations (i.e. outside of the project scope).	e.g. Grant recipient is engaged in violations of environmental standards leading to a negative sentiment among local communities, who refuse to cooperate with the project, hampering project implementation and causing potential reputational damage for ADA.
	OR	24	Failure to provide reliable data for accountability	Grant recipient does not provide data as required for DAC reporting; baseline and monitoring data; or valid and reliable evaluation results.	e.g. While data is being collected, it turns out at the end of the project, that the data was not relevant or insufficient for demonstrating project outcome.
	OR	25	ADA capacity constraints impede project delivery	ADA unable to effectively undertake quality assurance / monitoring / risk management	e.g. Due to unexpected personnel departure / shortage of technical expertise/ unexpected need for additional capacity for trouble-shooting, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL RISKS					
Results orientation	IR	26	Failure to achieve one or more key outputs or intended outcomes of the project	A 'high' risk in this area would not be acceptable at stage of project approval. A risk that could, however, become apparent during project implementation either due to changed circumstances or flaws in the project design.	e.g. Risk of not achieving a key objective because assumptions underlying the theory of change did not hold true or the project was not managed effectively, leading to major project disruption
Institutional Integrity	IR	27	Reputational damage	Can result as a secondary effect, when other risks from this catalogue materialize; also includes public controversy about the nature of activities funded/ implemented by ADA and/or partners, or criticism by external control institutions, such as Austrian Court of Auditors (Rechnungshof), EU Monitoring Missions, European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF, etc.	e.g. Negative media coverage of ADA work; critique / findings in a published audit report by an international organisation
Contracts / Compliance	IR	28	Claims, charges, penalties or fines against ADA	Due to breach of law or contract by ADA. Includes breaches of national law in the project country where applicable, or Austrian law, including labor law, criminal law, data protection law.	e.g. Corruption, fraud, theft, money-laundering, child labour, misuse of grant funds, breach of reporting obligations, etc.

	IR	29	Vendor or service provider fails to deliver	Failure to deliver on contractual obligations for a variety of possible reasons, including incapacity, legal dispute, etc.	e.g. Service provider contests terms of existing contract with ADA and refuses to deliver.
Finance / Accounting	IR	30	Delays in outflow of funds	Includes delays in payments to vendors and suppliers as well as delays in release of grants.	e.g. Delay in payments due to over-budgeting/ slow project delivery/unexpected political or other developments, impeding project delivery.
	IR	31	Inability to re-claim funds from grant recipients	Funds released to grant recipients cannot be recovered in case of non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the funding agreement (non-delivery of project results, etc.)	e.g. Expenditures by partner NGO not according to funding agreement cannot be reclaimed due to alleged insolvency.
	IR	32	3rd-party funded projects: Ineligible costs	Project expenditure not recognized by auditors / funders due to non-compliance with donor's cost eligibility rule.	e.g. EU rejects to cover the costs for a trip undertaken by project staff, because the EU does not consider the trip to be directly related to the project and necessary for its implementation
	IR	33	3rd-party funded projects: Financial loss due to exchange rate fluctuation	Financial loss due to exchange rate fluctuations occurring between project design and implementation.	

	IR	34	3rd-party funded projects: Cash-flow shortfall	Timing mismatch between cash inflows and cash outflows.	e.g. Inability to meet payment deadlines, when payments to contractors are already due while payments from EU have not yet been received.
	IR	35	3rd-party funded projects: Funding shortfall	Most 3 rd party funded projects are multi-donor projects. Risk that contributions of others fail to arrive, or the project required more funds than budgeted for in order to achieve its objectives	e.g. Pledged funding contribution by co-funder not provided; programme/project's resource requirements higher than anticipated
Personnel	IR	36	Risks for health and/or safety of staff	Health and/or safety concerns restrict ability to carry out work as planned; risk to staff due to unhealthy / unsafe building / office environment.	e.g. ADA staff cannot visit project site due to safety concerns, leading to inability to monitor implementation.
IT	IR	37	IT security breach	Misappropriation of internal data or information by a third party through IT means.	e.g. Systems security breach, hacking, phishing, cybercrime, virus attacks, etc.

