

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Crossrail Liverpool Street Phase 2			PM's overall risk rating: Low			CRP requested this gateway			£ 25,700		Average unmitigated risk		5.3		Open Risks		9						
Unique project identifier: 11375			Total estimated cost (exec risk): £ 1,639,391			Total CRP used to date			£ -		Average mitigated risk score		3.9		Closed Risks		0						
General risk classification																							
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 on 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	3	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 TO 6 - issue(s) 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	£13,125.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B – Fairly Confident	* Early identification and engagement with key stakeholders via the project's communications plan and the planned working group.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£5,000.00	3	£0.00	Additional staff time or consultant resources to carry out extra engagement-related work.	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - The project has established an effective working group with the local external stakeholders that sits beneath an overarching steering group. However, standard associated risks still remain with these and other key stakeholders that may require more work than is envisaged.
R2	3	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 TO 6 - 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	£3,500.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	* Map out any resources using the Annual Procurement Plan with the procurement team * Consider early engagement with internal suppliers where required (Highways, Traffic Enforcement, Open Spaces, M&E, etc)	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00	Additional staff time to identify alternative procurement sources or methods.	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - 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 and therefore no mitigation (other than usual BAU work) is planned.
R3	3	(10) Physical	GATE 1 TO 3 - 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	Minor	3	£0.00	N	A – Very Confident	* Regular reviews of designs (especially just prior to Gateways) in liaison with specialist groups and internal contacts * Use of a design log to record design changes, and the reasons why. * Use the CoSAT tool and undertake an EqIA at the appropriate time.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00	N/A - CRP not requested	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - 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, accommodating such changes would have no negative impact on the project as the changes could be incorporated in the next design revision.
R4	3	(2) Financial	GATE 1 TO 6 - Inaccurate or incomplete project estimates, including baxters/ inflationary issues	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	Serious	6	£13,125.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	* Undertake internal re-estimates prior to each Gateway stage, including discussions with procurement/ finance in regards to external factors such as baxters/ inflation	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00	Funds would be used to cover any unexpected uplifts which can be accommodated within the stated amount.	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - The next stage of work is not proposed to include any construction work, and therefore the no CR is requested at this stage. Future scheme proposals will be designed with the new budgetary amount in mind.
R5	3	(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	Serious	6	£1,200.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B – Fairly Confident	* Early engagement with TIL 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	Possible	Serious	£1,000.00	6	£0.00	Extra traffic modelling	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - The stated costed impact is for another modelling run should it be needed.
R6	3	(10) Physical	GATE 1 TO 5 - Utility and utility & topo survey issues lead to further information being required.	At the earlier stages of a project, delays could occur which result unplanned costs if utility companies don't engage as expected or further topographical or utility surveys are required.	Possible	Serious	6	£11,500.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B – Fairly Confident	* Work with design engineers to work out an appropriate sums to cover utility delays or on-site discoveries. * Consider and budget for trial holes if the location is thought to be particularly difficult.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£8,000.00	6	£0.00	Additional survey and investigation work	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - further survey work may be required to assess the plausibility of any future options.
R7	3	(4) Contractual/Partnership	GATE 1 TO 6 - Third party delays impact on project delivery	This project will require third parties to complete their work before it can proceed. Should this work be delayed in anyway, its likely to impact (time and cost-wise) on a project.	Likely	Minor	4	£0.00	N	A – Very Confident	* Include regular meetings with such stakeholders if required. * Track the activities of third parties on a tracker * Include some slack in the programme to absorb low-level delays	£0.00	Likely	Minor	£0.00	4	£0.00	N/A - CRP not requested	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - At this stage should any of the local stakeholders involved delay the City's work, officers could easily pause or slow down the pace of their work to accommodate. Also, the working group should help in identifying delays such as these at an early stage.

R8	3	(3) Reputation	GATE 1 TO 5 - British Land, Network Rail, Crossrail, TfL Buses and LUL engagement and their requirements on a project.	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with main 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	£13,125.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	8 – Fairly Confident	* Establish the working group as proposed and create a log of their aspirations/ requirements for the project.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£4,700.00	4	£0.00	Additional resources to accommodate any changes to the project driven by these key stakeholders. This could be (but not limited to) additional staff time, consultants work, data gathering & analysis, etc).	17/09/2019	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - At this time, a number of local stakeholder are quite advanced in their planning and these requirements are known. Further more detailed information on these will be gathered by the working group. However, it is possible that even with the working group, a stakeholder could change their requirements for whatever reason that requires the project to alter its plans.
R9	3	(10) Physical	GATE 3 TO 4 - Expenditure for on-street measures to support the trialing of on-street measures to better inform permanent change recommendations to committee	At the item of writing the Jan 2021 issue report, Officers were looking to trial on-street measures with TfL to better inform later design recommendations to committee. In doing this, some expenditure may be required for on-street measures to complement any trial measures tested. These could be (but not limited to) signing and lining, minor signal amendments, etc	Possible	Serious	6	£7,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	8 – Fairly Confident	* Continue work with TfL to better identify potential risk drawdowns as early as possible. * Work within TfL's existing annual signal review programme if possible to reduce any need to establish methods of working, etc	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£7,000.00	6	£0.00	Expenditure on measures to complement any on-street trials	09/12/2020	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		21/12/21 - Covered in the Jan 2021 issue report, this risk is to cover any tiny works costs that may be required the on-street trials that are being considered by officers. The scale of these is likely to be on the 'signing & lining' spectrum.