

**City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register**

 Project name: *St Mary Axe Experimental Timed Closure*

 Unique project identifier: *12072*

 Total est cost (exc risk) *£270000*

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

PM's overall risk rating

Medium

Avg risk pre-mitigation

5.9

Avg risk post-mitigation

3.3

Red risks (open)

0

Amber risks (open)

6

Green risks (open)

1

	Minor impact	Serious impact	Major impact	Extreme impact
Likely	4	8	16	32
Possible	3	6	12	24
Unlikely	2	4	8	16
Rare	1	2	4	8

Costed risks identified (All)

£0.00 0%

Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

£0.00 0%

" "

Costed risk post-mitigation (open)

£0.00 0%

" "

Costed Risk Provision requested

£0.00 0%

CRP as % of total estimated cost of project

- (1) Compliance/Regulatory
- (2) Financial
- (3) Reputation
- (4) Contractual/Partnership
- (5) H&S/Wellbeing
- (6) Safeguarding
- (7) Innovation
- (8) Technology
- (9) Environmental
- (10) Physical

Number of Open Risks	Avg Score	Costed impact	Red	Amber	Green
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	6.0	£0.00	0	1	0
3	5.7	£0.00	0	2	1
1	6.0	£0.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
2	6.0	£0.00	0	2	0

Issues (open)

0

Open Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0

All Issues

0

All Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0

 Cost to resolve all issues  
(on completion)

£0.00

Total CRP used to date

£0.00

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: <b>St Mary Axe Experimental Timed Closure</b>										PM's overall risk rating: <b>Medium</b>		CRP requested this gateway		£ -		Average unmitigated risk		5.9		Open Risks		7			
Unique project identifier: <b>12072</b>				Total estimated cost (exec risk):						£ 270,000		Total CRP used to date		£ -		Average mitigated risk score		3.3		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 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	(3) Reputation	Issue with external engagement and buy-in lead to project delay and/or change	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with local external stakeholders didn't go as planned. These issues could also arise from the public consultation results.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		* Early identification and engagement with key stakeholders	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - Engagement with large occupiers who have vehicle access from St Mary Axe has already begun to gather information on delivery/ access requirements and any concerns.		
R2	4	(3) Reputation	Procurement procedures impact negatively on project delivery	Additional resource may be required if there is a delay or issue with a project's procurement of goods or services from external suppliers.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		* Consider early engagement with internal suppliers where required (Highways, Traffic Enforcement)	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - The project does carry some risk in this regard as it's planning to procure external services in the next stage of work. However, this proposed work is standard in nature so early engagement is recommended to mitigate this risk.		
R3	4	(10) Physical	Accessibility and/or security concerns lead to project change	Further changes to the project's design and scope may be required if accessibility/ security concerns are raised.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		* Regular reviews of designs (especially just prior to Gateways) in liaison with specialist groups and internal contacts * engagement with City Access Team and City of London Access Group (COLAG)	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - It's quite possible that changes could be required as a result of accessibility/ security concerns. However, as the project is in the design stage, changes could be incorporated in the next design revision. Active engagement with stakeholders is planned.		
R4	4	(2) Financial	Inaccurate or incomplete project estimates	If an estimate is found at a later date to be inaccurate or incomplete, more funding and/or time resource would be needed to rectify the issue or fund/ underwrite the shortfall.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		* Undertake internal re-estimates prior to each Gateway stage, including discussions with procurement/ finance	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - Whilst the estimates drafted for the February 2020 report are based on the latest available information, there could be changes in the rates used, external to the project, which increase project costs. BAU processes will enable the project to monitor this risk and consider subsequent mitigations against it.		
R5	4	(10) Physical	Utility and utility & topo survey issues lead to further information being required.	At the earlier stages of a project, delays could occur which result in unplanned costs if utility companies don't engage as expected or further topographical or utility surveys are required.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		* Work with design engineers to work out an appropriate sums to cover utility delays or on-site discoveries. * Budget for trial holes	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/2020 - trial holes are planned for the areas that require foundation posts for signage or gates.		
R6	4	(3) Reputation	Stakeholder engagement and their requirements on a project.	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with stakeholders takes longer, requires more work or doesn't go as planned. Also, they may change their requirements for a project which results in abortive work and costs.	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N		* Keep in regular contact with those stakeholders which the project requires approval from for the scheme	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - Stakeholders are aware of scheme and at this time it has been agreed in principle, subject to some minor traffic modelling.		
R7	4	(4) Contractual/Partnership	A partner for management of the traffic gate cannot be found	If a nominated partner cannot be identified to agree to a SLA to manage the opening and closure of the gate, it could delay the start date of the scheme or impact on the effectiveness of the experiment	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		*Engage with existing stakeholder groups to help identify a willing partner	£0.00			£0.00	4	£0.00		03/02/2020		Averil Pittaway		03/02/20 - A number of existing groups (Lunchtime Streets steering group and Eastern City Cluster Partnership group) are supportive of the schemes and may provide a suitable opportunity to identify a supportive partner		