

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project name: *Library Management System*

Unique project identifier: *TBA*

Total est cost (exc risk) *£153755*

PM's overall risk rating

Low
7.3
4.7
0
4
2

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
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	8.0	£0.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	8.0	£0.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	8.0	£0.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
3	6.7	£0.00	0	1	2
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0

Issues (open)

1
1

All Issues

Open Issues

All Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	1	0	0
0	1	0	0

Cost to resolve all issues (on completion)

£20,000.00

Total CRP used to date

£0.00

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Library Management System		PM's overall risk rating: Low	CRP requested this gateway: £ -	Average unmitigated risk score: 7.3	Open Risks: 6
Unique project identifier: TBA		Total estimated cost (exc risk): £ 153,755	Total CRP used to date: £ -	Average mitigated risk score: 4.7	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 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	2	(6) Safeguarding	The system does not support libraries best practice, City of London work and is not compliant with regulatory compliance nor IT requirements	The City of London could not fulfil its statutory obligations leading to reduction in stock availability, nonpayment of fines and have an impact on library usage and reputational risk for the City.	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Steering group consisting of representatives from Barbican and Community Libraries, IT, Comptroller and City Solicitor who are involved in developing the specification. Specifications and good practice from other boroughs will be used to inform the specification and will include flexibility to meet future identified requirements	£0.00	Rare	Major	£0.00	4	£0.00		17/08/2021	Sarah Greenwood			
R2	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Limited market for the project or City of London contract is deemed too low value and no bids are received for the Invitation to tender.	no system available for use at the end of the current contract, leading to a reputation risk (see R1) above)	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Pre tender market engagement to scope the likely interest in the tender. Current provider is one of the market leaders in the market. Four providers are available to call off from a framework to ensure a suitable pool of potential bidders	£0.00	Rare	Extreme	£0.00	8	£0.00		17/08/2021	Sarah Greenwood			
R3	2	(8) Technology	Data not migrated to potential new system in time or accurately	Data within the system is not accurate, which could lead to a reputational risk (see R1) or migration of data is not completed before the end of the current contract, leading to a potential gap in service, the mobilisation period would not be required should the current provider be the winning bidder for the new contract.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00		B – Fairly Confident	5 months mobilisation factored into project timetable and project management costs factored into budget estimation. A dedicated IT librarian is employed by DCCS who would support the data migration process.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		17/08/2021	Sarah Greenwood			
R4	2	(8) Technology	system is not sufficiently flexible to meet future needs within the lifetime of the contract	the system becomes obsolete and does not allow for mobile working or future changes to recognised good practice	Possible	Major	12	£0.00		B – Fairly Confident	requirement for provider/system to meet changing requirements during the lifetime of the contract is built into the specification through IT involvement. Contract will be performance managed to ensure that roadmap and upgrades include good practice changes and that user groups are a feature of the contract	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		17/08/2021	Sarah Greenwood			
R5	2	(2) Financial	insufficient funding a) The contract is won by a new supplier requiring capital funding at the start of the contract for system purchases, system setup and data cleansing/mobilisation or b) insufficient revenue funding due to increase in contract costs	potential for the contract to not be awarded if sufficient funds cannot be allocated. This could lead to reputational concerns (see R1). Capital funding would only be required should the current provider not be the new provider	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00		B – Fairly Confident	risk raised to DCCS DLT for information and included within Gateway risk register. A capital bid will be submitted prior to the tender process. No commitment to enter into a contract will be made until the outcome of the capital bid.	£0.00	Unlikely	Major	£0.00	8	£0.00		17/08/2021	Carol Boswarthack			
R6	3	(8) Technology	insufficient resources to complete documentation and commissioning (procurement process before July 2022 due to TOM recruitment freeze and Covid impacts including staff sickness)	insufficient mobilisation time to set up new contract (especially if a new provider) before July 2022	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00		B – Fairly Confident	potential for short term extension to current contract if extenuating circumstances	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		10/12/2021	Carol Boswarthack			
R7							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R8							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R9							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R10							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R11							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R12							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R13							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R14							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R15							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R16							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R17							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R18							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R19							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R20							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R21							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R22							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R23							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R24							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R25							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R26							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R27							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R28							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R29							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R30							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R31							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						

