

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:	<b>Moor Lane Environmental Enhancements</b>	PM's overall risk rating:	<b>Medium</b>	CRP requested this gateway:	£ <b>50,000</b>	Average unmitigated risk:	<b>6.9</b>	Open Risks:	<b>14</b>
Unique project identifier:	<b>PV12345</b>	Total estimated cost (exc risk):	£ <b>2,958,680</b>	Total CRP used to date:	£ <b>-</b>	Average mitigated risk score:	<b>3.8</b>	Closed Risks:	<b>4</b>

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	5	(3) Reputation	Project is not delivered to agreed timeline due to technical issues that arise either in design or construction phase	If security measures on Moor Lane are not completed prior to the occupation of 21 Moorfields, their tenant will not be able to occupy the building.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		A programme will be developed taking the security requirements into account and the implementation will be phased to ensure compliance with the development's programme.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		13/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R2	5	(2) Financial	Developer does not agree to full costs of the scheme	This will either extend the project timeline as negotiations would take longer or reduce the project scope to align with agreed costs	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		As the design develops, the likely cost of the scheme will be established. The scope of the project will be tailored to ensure the scheme can be financed by the Section 106 and the Section 278 (where works are required to mitigate the impact of the 21 Moorfields development).	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		13/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R3	5	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Delays in supply, issues in productivity or resource	Negative impact on project delivery, both monetarily and timewise, causing potential delays to programme and increasing costs.	Possible	Serious	6		N		engaging with suppliers and term contractor to programme works and procure materials well in advance, allowing for at least 16 weeks lead in times. Reguol supply chain via existing meetings with principal contractor for monitoring		Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00				Andrea Maravicova		
R4	5	(10) Physical	Unforeseen technical and / or engineering issues identified	Late identification of any engineering or technical issues will disrupt delivery and may increase costs and timelines.	Possible	Major	12		N		Undertake standard surveys and trials, visit sites during development construction		Unlikely	Serious		4	£0.00				Andrea Maravicova		
R5	5	(2) Financial	The full cost of the project is unknown	If the costs are not ascertained soon enough in the project process, the design might exceed the available project budget	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	N		As the design develops, the likely cost of the scheme will be established. The scope and design of the project will be tailored to ensure the scheme can be financed from the available project budget. The s278 works will only commence once the costs are agreed with the developer.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		14/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R6	5	(3) Reputation	Stakeholders object to the amended scheme	The City would not be delivering a scheme that is supported by the local community, and it would not therefore be responsive to their needs. A redesign would be required which could impact on the programme and budget.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Consultation will be undertaken with stakeholders as part of the project process and the design will be adapted if required. Consultation was previously undertaken in 2011 and local stakeholders were supportive of the proposals. The Meanwhile Moor Lane scheme implemented in Autumn 2020 is gathering feedback from users and will inform the permanent scheme.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		05/10/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R7	5	(9) Environmental	The existing Moor Lane design must be significantly reduced in scope to accommodate 21 Moorfields development requirements	The scheme would not fully be delivering on the previously approved objectives of the scheme, missing an opportunity to deliver an environmentally resilient, biodiverse scheme.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Both the 21 Moorfield highway requirements and Moor Lane designs for the Western footway were reviewed together as one scheme by the relevant City officers. The technical feasibility and levels design will be progressed accordingly.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		14/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova	31/05/2022	Scope for Area B as now been confirmed now that the scope for Area A has been finalised.
R8	5	(4) Contractual/Partnership	The expiry of the contract with the City's term contractor in 2022 could cause an increase in the cost of works	If a new term contractor is selected with higher rates, the cost of the works would increase	Likely	Major	16	£0.00	N		A tender process will be undertaken, where a new contractor will be appointed. Notice will be given of any cost implications as soon as possible in the procurement process.	£0.00	Likely	Serious	£0.00	8	£0.00		15/09/2020		Giles Radford	15/06/2022	The new contractor rates are now available and are being used to cost the scheme.

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 Issue	Comment(s)
R9	5	(3) Reputation	LUL object to the scheme on the basis of the scheme being located over their infrastructure	The project design would require further amendment, impacting project programme	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		LUL will be consulted as soon as possible in the design process to ensure the design is developed in accordance with their requirements	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		14/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R10	5	(3) Reputation	Delays to public realm works starting on site due to 21 Moorfields construction delays	The implementation of the project would be delayed	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		Implementation of the project is co-ordinated to align with the developer's programme. Delays in developer's construction were clearly communicated and accounted for in the revised programme.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		14/09/2020		Andrea Maravicova		
R11	5	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	A new national lockdown due to COVID-19 delays the programme, through an inability to carry out necessary surveys or trial holes	delay to programme	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		follow guidance and undertake new ways of working as necessary.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00	£3,500	15/09/2020	Giles Radford	Andrea Maravicova		
R12	5	(2) Financial	The developer does not agree to committed sums required for the s278	The cost of maintaining the s278 area post completion will increase and need to be funded by the City	Likely	Major	16	£0.00	N		The developer will be made aware of the maintenance implications of the s278 works, the HVM maintenance costs will need to be funded by the developer at a minimum	£0.00	Possible	Major	£0.00	12	£0.00		07/07/2021		Tom Noble/PM		
R13	5	(4) Contractual/Partnership	The developer does not agree to the terms on the s278 agreement	The programme will be delayed whilst the agreement takes longer to negotiate	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Respond to the developer in a timely manner on comments and progress negotiations on elements directly if needed	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		08/07/2021		Tom Noble/PM		
R14	3	(9) Environmental	s278 scope: Lack to utility information due to no PAS 128 survey information causes delays to programme and cost increases due to unexpected clashes found after the detailed design process	The programme will be delayed to redesign the relevant area and liaise with utilities, and also increases the project cost due to the re-doing of design/approvals or diversion of utilities necessary	Likely	Extreme	32	£0.00	N		Trial holes and site investigation to be carried out prior to implementation, utility clashes based on current information to be design as soon as possible	£0.00	Likely	Major	£0.00	16	£0.00		09/07/2021		Tom Noble/PM/Engineer	07/05/2022	
R15	3	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	s278 scope: Lack to utility information due to no PAS 128 survey information causes H&S issues on site during implementation	A H&S incident occurs on site, causing a legal dispute on liability and whether Principal Designer duties have been fulfilled	Possible	Extreme	24	£0.00	N		Wording to be included in the s278 agreement to make the developer aware of the risks and limit the City's liability where possible, site investigations to be carried out prior to implementation	£0.00	Unlikely	Extreme	£0.00	16	£0.00		15/07/2021		Ben Manku/Giles Radford	07/05/2022	Standard Surveys and trial holes were undertaken in the area where security measures were proposed and the designs were adjusted accordingly.
R16	5	(9) Environmental	SUDS scheme not feasible due to underground constraints	The SUDS scheme would either have to be removed from the project scope or a redesign of the SUDS would be required which could impact project programme and costs	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		The 2011 design will be reviewed as part of the project scope and amended as necessary. Surveys will be undertaken to ascertain the underground constraints as far as possible, in addition to consultation with LUL. The SUDS design can be further simplified to reduce costs if required. Updates will be provided as part of the next gateway.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		15/07/2021		Andrea Maravicova		
R17	5	(2) Financial	SUDS design costs more than anticipated	The SUDS scheme would either have to be removed from the project scope or a redesign of the SUDS would be required which could impact project programme and costs	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		A SUDS consultant will be appointed to progress to the SUDS design so a cost can be established early on in the design process. The design will be simplified to reduce costs if required.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		15/07/2021		Andrea Maravicova		
R18	5	(2) Financial	underground conditions / depths will require changes to design	The proposal to plant trees could be affected by insufficient depths or presence of underground utilities undetected through standard surveys and design will need to be revised.	Likely	Serious	8	£60,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation		Known utility routes have been considered in the design, additional trial holes and site investigation will be undertaken prior to implementation, data analysed and the design revised prior to implementation.	£10,000.00	Possible	Serious	£40,000.00	6	£0.00		09/06/2022		Andrea Maravicova/Engineer		