

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks RegisterProject name: *Pedestrian Priority Programme*Unique project identifier: *TBC*Total est cost (exc risk) *£6000000*

PM's overall risk rating

Medium
3.3
1.0
0
3
9

Avg risk pre-mitigation

Avg risk post-mitigation

Red risks (open)

Amber risks (open)

Green risks (open)

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

	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%
£0.00	0%
£0.00	0%
£0.00	0%

Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

" "

Costed risk post-mitigation (open)

" "

Costed Risk Provision requested

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
2	3.5	£0.00	0	1	1
2	4.5	£0.00	0	1	1
2	2.5	£0.00	0	0	2
3	2.3	£0.00	0	0	3
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	3.0	£0.00	0	0	1
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
2	4.5	£0.00	0	1	1

Issues (open)

0
0

All Issues

Open Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

All Issues

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:	Pedestrian Priority Programme	PM's overall risk rating:	Medium	CRP requested this gateway	£ -	Average unmitigated risk	3.3	Open Risks	12
Unique project identifier:	TBC	Total estimated cost (exec risk):	£ 6,000,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated risk score	1.0	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	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	Unlikely	Minor	2		N	B - Fairly Confident	* Work as a team to scenario plan at an early stage to estimate costs and impacts of high, medium and low occurrences. * Budget and programme slack to account for likely low impact events		Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00	n/a	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn		4/1/21 - The scale and impact of the required construction lends itself to a low risk score in the event of an occurrence external to the project. The project team will continue to assess and mitigate against such risk as part of its BAU processes.
R2	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	GATE 1 TO 6 - Issues or delays in any required consents 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; it is likely the project may suffer from some form of unplanned delay, additional work and/or costs.	Rare	Minor	1		N	B - Fairly 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	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn		4/1/21 - The scheme only requires standard internal consents. Therefore the risk is already very low before BAU processes ensure that these are acquired in good time before construction.
R3	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	GATE 1 TO 5 - Judicial Review, which leads to project delay/further costs	Should judicial review occur at this early stage, its certain this would have major implications on project delivery. Extra legal advice could also be required to deal with the situation.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	* Consider legal advice. This could be the internal teams or external advice such as QCs if necessary. * Should judicial review be a distinct probability, establish a very detailed and concise project plan, programme and design log which details change and the reasons why. * Reaffirm statutory documentation requirements via internal advice. * Ensure and check that any public advertisements are in place as required (and replaced if needed)	£0.00			£0.00		£0.00						(Most likely to occur on the bigger projects. Should this happen at such an early stage, the project could go on hold or at least be delayed and so the costed impact would be mainly consist of this plus any additional funds for extra unplanned legal support. Risk may need splitting into separate reputational, time and cost risks should it be a large or contentious project i.e. Bank)
R4	2	(10) Physical	GATE 1 TO 3 - Accessibility and/or security concerns lead to project change that in-turn results in additional resources being required to compensate.	Further changes to the project's design and scope may be required if accessibility concerns are raised.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	* Regular reviews of designs (especially just prior to Gateways) in liaison with specialist groups and contacts	£0.00			£0.00		£0.00						(Standard change risk. Add or subtract topics from the risk description as appropriate)
R5	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	GATE 1 TO 5 - TfL buses engagement and their requirements on a project.	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with TfL buses didn't go as planned. Also, they may change their requirements for a project.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	* Ensure early engagement with TfL buses in the design phase so they can consult internally * Design the scheme to minimise bus impacts or attempt to provide a benefit so TfL buses are more inclined to help fund the project.	£0.00			£0.00		£0.00						(only include this risk if your project is directly affecting the TfL bus network)
R6	2	(8) Technology	GATE 1 TO 4 - Modelling issues (results and implications, issues with the delivery, buy-in, required re-runs, etc)	Modelling can play a major role in defining a project and confirming its viability. Any issues could have many different and combined outcomes where additional resource may be required to rectify. Also, further modelling may be required following consultation if there's design changes needed.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	* Early engagement with TfL to identify requirements, their timescales and costs * Ensure information & data requirements for modelling are agreed and scoped out fully * Regular engagement with design and modelling consultants * Budget for basic modelling re-runs post consultation	£0.00			£0.00		£0.00						(Do consider splitting this out into different risks if one particular part of this risk stands out i.e. stakeholder acceptance of the results, future local changes meaning the model becomes redundant, etc)
R7	2	(2) Financial	GATE 1 TO 6 - Lack of available skilled staff resource being available which leads to delays	Additional resource may be required for a number of reasons i.e. new and unplanned requirement identified, loss of team member, etc	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	* Resource plan at least two Gateway stages forward in an effort to locate resources as early as possible * Use existing framework contracts where possible	£0.00			£0.00		£0.00						(a standard risk for any project especially in terms of continuity)

R8	2	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 TO 6 - issue(s) with external engagement and buy-in lead to additional resources being required to compensate	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with local external stakeholders didn't go as planned. These issues could arise from the public consultation results.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	* Early identification and engagement with key stakeholders via the project's communications plan. * Consider specific working groups should it be required.	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00							[A standard risk - you need to do some more work with certain stakeholders than was planned for. Separate out any stakeholders that are going to have a much larger input into a scheme i.e. the Ned Hotel and Mansion House at Bank or the John Cass Primary school at Aldgate. General Transport for London engagement would be included within this, although separate out if you're directly impacting the TLRN. If its a S278 scheme, separate out and add the Developer risk as well as this]
R9	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	GATE 1 TO 6 - Project supplier delays, productivity or resource issues impacts negatively on project delivery	Referring both to internal and external suppliers to projects, 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 Rineys just 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	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn	4/1/21 - BAU activities 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.
R10	2	(2) Financial	GATE 1 TO 6 - Inaccurate or incomplete project estimates, including baxters/ inflationary issues leads 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	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn	4/1/21 - Currently, the £470k +/- 20% estimate is very approximate and is purely based on previous projects to give a 'ballpark' figure. BAU activities will ensure its reviewed as the project progresses.
R11	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 sums to cover utility delays or on-site discoveries.	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	n/a	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn	4/1/21 - The current estimate includes a provisional sum for utilities as agreed with the Developer. Should these increase, the Developer is obliged to fund any and all changes required under the terms of the S278 agreement.
R13	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	04/01/2021		Daniel Laybourn	4/1/21 - Whilst there's not a lot the project team can do if the Development is delayed, regular meetings with the developer will ensure that a fair amount of notice is received should CoL works need to be reprogrammed. The Developer would be responsible for any associated resultant costs.