

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: 1-2 Broadgate			PM's overall risk rating: Total estimated cost (exec risk): £ 850,000					Low		CRP requested this gateway Total CRP used to date		£ -		Average unmitigated risk Average mitigated		2.6		1.0		Open Risks 9		Closed Risks 0	
Unique project identifier: 12235								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	2	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 to 5 - Delays or vacation of worksite due to external events and/ or occurrences	Should such an event happen, a number of possibilities could occur: * Change in project scope * Change in project resources * Change in project delivery timescales * Pause to project whilst situation is assessed * Increased costs	Unlikely	Minor	2		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Budget and programme slack to account for likely low impact events		Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20: Regular and on-going liaison with the developer team and CoL colleagues
R2	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	GATE 1 TO 6 - Issues or delays in any required consents such as Permits which cause delay to project delivery	If there was to be any delay in the arrival of any required consents, such as planning permissions, TMOs, Permits, discharge of conditions, heritage, TfL, etc; its likely the project may suffer from some form of unplanned delay, additional work and/ or costs.	Rare	Minor	1		N	A – Very Confident	* Map out the required consents with project team and continually monitor & update throughout the project * Schedule regular meetings with consent approvers, especially those with long lead in times or complex approval procedures.		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20: There may be scope for a land swap to regularise highway boundaries and this could take time but the project is at a sufficiently early stage for the relevant agreements to be prepared.
R3	2	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 TO 6 - issue(s) with external engagement and buy-in lead to project delays/ increased costs	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with local external stakeholders didn't go as planned.	Possible	Minor	3		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Early identification and engagement with key stakeholders.		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20: External opposition to the project is not expected. Some BAU engagement work will be required with local stakeholders as construction approaches to ensure the disruption to the activities is minimised.
R4	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	GATE 1 TO 6 - Project supplier delays, productivity or resource Issues impacts negatively on project delivery	Alternative arrangements which require additional resource may be required if a potential or existing supplier is unable to deliver as agreed for whatever reason.	Rare	Minor	1		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Arrange construction planning meeting with highway contractor prior to construction to ensure that resources are available (i.e. construction pack from them is received in good time)		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20 - Early liaison with the principal contractor will ensure that the required resources are available to meet the TBC programme. The required internal resource is small and easily replaceable if needed.
R5	2	(2) Financial	GATE 1 TO 6 - Inaccurate or Incomplete project estimates, including Baxters uplifts lead to budget increases	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. More specifically, inflationary amounts predetermined earlier in a project may be found to be insufficient and require extra funding to cover any shortfall.	Possible	Minor	3		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Monitor for scope creep * Regular catch-ups with Principal Contractor to review costs during construction.		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	18/12/19		Daniel Laybourn		4/9/19 - The estimate included in the G3/4/5 report has been reviewed and revised a number of times when confirming the scope. Therefore BAU activities will ensure its reviewed as the project progresses.
R6	2	(10) Physical	GATE 1 TO 5 - Utility and utility survey issues lead to increased costs/ scope of works	At the earlier stages of a project, delays could occur which result unplanned costs if utility companies don't engage as expected. Also, extra resource would be needed if further surveys are required. During construction, any issues with required utility companies could result in extra resources being required.	Possible	Serious	6		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Work with design engineers to work out an appropriate provision to cover utility delays or on-site discoveries.		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20: The G2 estimate includes a provisional sum for utilities. Should these increase, the Developer is obliged to fund any and all changes required under the terms of the S278 agreement. At this time, the Project Team are awaiting responses from the affected utilities companies.
R7	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	GATE 1 TO 6 - Third party delays impacts negatively on project delivery (time & costs)	A CoL project may require a third party to complete its work before it can proceed. Should this work be delayed in anyway, its likely to impact (time and cost-wise) on a project.	Possible	Minor	3		N	A – Very Confident	* Include regular meetings with the developer and local stakeholders * Include some slack in the programme to absorb low-level delays		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20 - Regular meetings with the developer will ensure that a fair amount of notice is received should CoL works need to be reprogrammed. The terms of the S278 agreement mean that the Developer is responsible for any associated resultant costs.
R9	5	(10) Physical	GATE 5 - Unforeseen technical and/ or engineering issues identified	Late identification of any engineering or technical issues that disrupt delivery could result in further costs whether they be time, funding or resources.	Possible	Minor	3		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Undertake standard BAU surveys * Consider trial holes if required * Site visits during development's construction		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		1/9/20: Given the standard nature of the project and extensive knowledge of the area, nothing unforeseen is expected to be discovered.
R10	5	(3) Reputation	GATE 5 - Accident during construction impacts on project delivery and/ or costs	Regardless of whether it be a member of public or a contractor on site, should an accident occur in or around site delays are likely to occur	Rare	Minor	1		N	A – Very Confident	Regular site visits with the Principal Designer should it become necessary.		Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	01/09/20		George Wright		4/9/19 - The principal contractor is the term highways contractor for the CoL and is therefore required to prove their H&S credentials at a much higher level. In BAU, the Project Engineer will be visiting site regularly and visits by the Principal Designer can be arranged if there's causes for concern.