

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:	Museum of London gyratory	PM's overall risk rating:	Medium	CRP requested this gateway		Average unmitigated risk	10.0	Open Risks	4
Unique project identifier:	11377	Total estimated cost (exc risk):	£ 17,000,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated risk score	6.8	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	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Successful challenge to a permanent traffic order	Challenge on procedural or other grounds relating to the traffic order	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Ensure that best practice is followed to mitigate against a successful challenge.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		23/03/21	Leah Coburn	George Wright		Robust and extensive engagement will take place during scheme development. Initial discussions with developers indicate they share the project's ambitions. However, recent successful legal challenges mean the risk of challenge remains possible.
R2	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Delays to TfL approving the TMAN for the permanent traffic order	There may be delays to the TMAN approval if TfL have any concerns relating to the impact of a permanent scheme on the network	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Regular and ongoing liaison with TfL teams	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		23/03/21	Leah Coburn	George Wright		In theory TfL have 28 days to approve or reject a TMAN but it is the extensive preliminary engagement with TfL teams that is crucial to its approval.
R3	5	(8) Technology	Additional data and monitoring is required	Post COVID, traffic flows have changed significantly. Stakeholders and Members may want more data to prove the impacts of the scheme	Likely	Minor	4	£0.00	N		Interrogate the data already collected or programmed as far as possible to draw reasonable conclusions	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		23/03/21	Leah Coburn	George Wright		The data currently held is robust and adjustments for COVID could be made to reflect current conditions. However, it is possible that TfL will require updated traffic survey data.
	5	(2) Financial	Capital funding for construction is not yet in place	The project cannot proceed to until capital funding is secured	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		The purpose of the next phase of the project is to work with the two development sites in the project area to establish the scope and financial contribution of the respective s278 agreements. Work will also take place to assess the feasibility of an internal capital bid.	£0.00	Possible	Major		12	£0.00		23/03/21	Leah Coburn	George Wright		Both developers share the project's ambitions for the area and can contribute via s278 agreements. Internally, the project was ranked first in the 2019 DBE project prioritisation exercise.