

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project name: 100 Fetter Lane s278

Unique project identifier: PV12348

Total est cost (exc risk) £200000

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

PM's overall risk rating	Low
Avg risk pre-mitigation	10.3
Avg risk post-mitigation	2.8
Red risks (open)	0
Amber risks (open)	6
Green risks (open)	0

	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)

£20,000.00	10%
------------	-----

Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

£20,000.00	10%
------------	-----

" "

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
1	12.0	£0.00	0	1	0
3	10.7	£20,000.00	0	3	0
2	9.0	£0.00	0	2	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
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0

Issues (open)

0

Open Issues

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

All Issues

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:	100 Fetter Lane s278	PM's overall risk rating:	Low	CRP requested this gateway	£ -	Average unmitigated risk	10.3	Open Risks	6
Unique project identifier:	PV12348	Total estimated cost (exc risk):	£ 200,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated risk score	2.8	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 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	(3) Reputation	Project is not delivered to agreed programme due to technical issues that arise either in design or construction phase	Underground services are discovered within excavation zone during construction phase adding time and cost to the project	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Technical issues to be identified by engineering team and developer communications and using surveys, engineering expertise to manage design issues	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		
R2	5	(2) Financial	Developer does not agree to full costs of the scheme	This will either impact on the project programme as negotiations would take longer or the scope of works might have to be reduced to reduce the costs.	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Regular communication with developer to manage expectations of deliverables and costs	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		
R3	5	(3) Reputation	Stakeholders object to the scheme	Further redesign and consultation would be necessary	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Good stakeholder engagement and communications	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		
R4	5	(2) Financial	Cost of materials increasing over the course of project due to international supply chain issues / interest rate rises	Negatively affects construction costs	Possible	Major	12	£20,000.00	N		New highways contract to protect against fluctuating rates	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		Highways team in present discussions with new contractor Corways
R5	5	(2) Financial	The developer does not agree to commuted sums required for the s278 at project completion	The cost of maintaining the s278 area post completion may increase and need to be funded by the City	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N		Regular communication with developer to manage expectations of deliverables and costs	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		
R6	3	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Traffic orders are not applied for or incorrect traffic orders/procedures do not provide a regulatory backing for the legality of the scheme	Stakeholders are not consulted via the due process and exposes the scheme to legal challenge and subsequent program delay	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Identify traffic order specialist via framework consultants prior to any engagement / consultation and form a program for integrating the legal processes	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00				Nick Howdle-Smith		