

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:			Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Improvement					PM's overall risk rating:		Medium		CRP requested this gateway		£ 125,000		Average unmitigated risk		7.2				Open Risks		9			
Unique project identifier:			10847		Total estimated cost (exc risk):					£ 12,000,000		Total CRP used to date		#REF!		Average mitigated		5.9				Closed Risks		0			
General risk classification												Mitigation actions										Ownership & Action					
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification on post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/Realised & moved to Issues	Comment(s)				
R1	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Transport for London do not approve the TMAN for the ETO	Delay to programme, due to a number of reasons. Could result in additional traffic modelling to be done	Possible	Major	12	£50,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B – Fairly Confident	Continue to procure and prepare for implementation "at risk". Continue to liaise and engage with TfL at a Project and Political level	£0.00	Possible	Major	£50,000.00	12	£0.00	Possible: Staff time, traffic modelling, consultants work	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		There is a risk that TfL do not approve the TMAN, this may be to the possible impact on bus journey times which have not been quantified, or to objections by neighbouring authorities. Additional traffic modelling or data analysis work may be required				
R2	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Delays to TfL approving the TMAN	Delays to the TMAN being approved beyond Christmas will result in delays to the City being able to make the March deadline and reduce the amount of time we have to inform and engage with the public.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£20,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B – Fairly Confident	Continue to prepare for the public engagement and constantly with the TfL approvals team	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£20,000.00	4	£0.00	Possible: Staff time + modelling	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		In theory TfL have 28 days to approve or reject a TMAN. If approved, great. If not approved and rejected see Risk above				
R3	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	LB Islington object to the ETO	If Islington do not support the ETO, this may delay TfL approval of TMAN and create a project delay	Possible	Major	12	£5,000.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	Provide all information to LB Islington, meet with officers and engage at a senior management and senior political level	£0.00	Possible	Major	£0.00	12	£0.00	Staff time	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		An objective could cause a delay to the submission of the TMAN				
R4	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	LB Camden object to the ETO	If Camden do not support the ETO, this may delay TfL approval of TMAN and create a project delay	Unlikely	Serious	4	£5,000.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	Provide all information to LB Camden, meet with officers and engage at a senior management level	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00	Staff time	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		An objective could cause a delay to the submission of the TMAN				
R5	6	(8) Technology	Traffic impacts are more severe than anticipated	Complaints and objections to additional traffic congestion may mean the experiment needs to be abandoned or altered	Unlikely	Extreme	16	£100,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	D – Very Uncomfortable	Most objections likely from residential areas, where it may be possible to introduce mitigation scheme to keep reassigned traffic on the main routes	£30,000.00	Unlikely	Serious	£50,000.00	4	£0.00	Staff time and consultant fees	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		Mitigation schemes may be required on residential streets, which will require further planning, design and engagement. Complex schemes in their own right				
R6	6	(9) Environmental	Reduction in air quality on alternative traffic routes	Objections may be made from residents and road user groups about an increase in air pollution on streets which receive more traffic	Possible	Minor	3	£10,000.00	N	A – Very Confident	Additional air quality monitoring	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£5,000.00	4	£0.00	Fees	01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		Air quality data will be collected and analysed by consultants.				
R7	6	(3) Reputation	The ETO is ineffective	Due to the limitations of signing and potential confusion over different London zones, compliance may be low	Unlikely	Minor	2	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Review signing, lobby DfT for further signing flexibility	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		Signage is likely an issue due to necessity to adhere to approve signs and many people do not understand the sign restricting access.				
R8	6	(8) Technology	Monitoring strategy data is imprecise	Due to significant utility works it is likely that it will be difficult to attribute traffic reassignment to the Beech Street scheme or to utility works. This may make it look like Beech Street has had a bigger impact in the monitoring data than it actually does	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Undertake additional data interrogation in liaison with TfL bus ops team	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		We believe it will be possible to disaggregate bus journey time data and attribute some delay and congestion to utility works and some to Beech Street ZES.				
R9	6	(3) Reputation	Scheme viewed as revenue raiser	Whilst the scheme is verifiably driven by air quality objectives, there is a reputational risk that it is driven by revenue raising.	Likely	Minor	4	£0.00	N	A – Very Confident	Mostly media and messaging, demonstration of project lifecycle	£0.00	Likely	Minor	£0.00	4	£0.00		01/10/2019	Leah Coburn	AS/KT		Perception management as the project has always been driven by desire to improve the poor air quality on Beech Street				