

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:	Leadenhall Street traffic management - Eastern City Cluster	PM's overall risk rating:	Medium	CRP requested this gateway	£ 57,000	Average unmitigated risk	3.1	Open Risks	12
Unique project identifier:	12295	Total estimated cost (exec risk):	£ 480,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated risk score	1.1	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	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		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22- The project is in the very early stages of planning meaning that this risk is very minor. The project team will continue to assess and mitigate against such risk as part of its BAU processes.
R2	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	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; its likely the project may suffer from some form of unplanned delay, additional work and/ or costs.	Unlikely	Minor	2		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		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - No change. This scheme will require 3rd party approvals by Transport for London and potentially from adjacent boroughs. Normal BAU processes will mitigate however.
R3	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	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		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)		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - No change. Although we can ensure all due processes are followed, a JR can occur during the traffic order process and will need to go through the Court process for determination. Fully compliant processes which are documented and made public may reduce the likelihood of an individual or organisation making a JR claim
R4	2	(10) Physical	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		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Regular reviews of designs (especially just prior to Gateways) in liaison with specialist groups and contacts * Regular meetings with associated projects and programmes		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - Accessibility will be assessed during the design phases using the new Col accessibility tool. This is a new BAU process which will help to mitigate this risk. Also the project is working alongside the relevant security project which will help to ensure synergies are maintained.
R5	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	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		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.		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - BAU project discussions have already taken place with TfL buses. Its expected these discussions will be sufficient to mitigate any potential associated risks.
R6	2	(8) Technology	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 design changes needed.	Possible	Minor	3		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		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - No change. As this is an experimental traffic experiment, the requirements for modelling should be modest if required at all.
R7	2	(2) Financial	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	Minor	3		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		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - The new resourcing framework is now in place to cover resource requirements should there be any issues.
R8	2	(3) Reputation	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		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Early identification and engagement with key stakeholders using the City Cluster Vision Programme Stakeholder Engagement plan and established communication routes * Consider specific working groups should it be required.		Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - At this stage, this risk is thought to be low and will be tracked in partnership with the City Cluster Vision Programme which this project is a part of.

R9	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	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 term contractor just prior to construction to ensure that resources are available (i.e. construction pack from them is received in good time)	Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - A very minimal risk given the very small amount of on-site work that could occur.
R10	2	(10) Physical	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	Minor	3		N	B – Fairly Confident	* Work with design engineers to work out an appropriate sums to cover utility delays or on-site discoveries. *Quite minor construction works required for this project so risk should be limited.	Rare	Minor		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - utility surveys are currently taking place and Leadenhall St has already been heavily surveyed in the past. Both these points lead to a low risk score at this time.
R12	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	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.	Unlikely	Minor	2		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		1	n/a	n/a	20/06/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - at this stage, this risk is low but will become more important at the subsequent stages of work. Also, its more likely than not that these risks will be monitored by their own individual projects (most likely S278) which can then feed into this project and the City Cluster Vision Programme.
R13	2	(10) Physical	Removal or amendment of Transport for London's experimental traffic restriction on Bishopsgate leads to an increase in general traffic on Leadenhall Street	Those currently walking and cycling on Leadenhall Street are seeing a benefit from the reduced levels of general traffic. If TfL's Bishopsgate ETO is removed or amended, traffic levels on Leadenhall St could increase that could result in cycling and walking comfort levels reducing. Therefore it would require the implementation of a experimental traffic restriction (a bus gate) on Leadenhall Street to maintain current cycling and walking comfort levels.	Possible	Serious	6	£62,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	A – Very Confident	* Under approved BAU processes, undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment, Road Safety Audit Stages 1 & 2, drafting of a monitoring strategy and discussions with TfL now to enable an experimental timed point closure to proceed quicker in future if its needed.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£57,000.00	6	£0.00	05/04/21	Leah Coburn	Daniel Laybourn		5/4/22 - Please see the related May 2022 Issue Report for more details.