| City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------|----------------|---|---|---|---------------------|
| | Project Name: | Creechuchurch | Lane area improv | ements | | 1 | PM's overall | | | CKr requested | | | | Average | • | | 5.0 | | | Open Risks | 7 | |
| | oroject identifier | | | | | Total | estimated cost | £ | 500,000 | Total CRP used to | £ | - | Avero | age mitigated | ł | | 3.6 | | | Closed Risks | 0 | |
| General risk | lassification | The Officers specific description of the | If the risk is realised and becomes an | Likelihood | of the risk should it | calculate | the potential financial cost to | | Not all risk estimations are comparable, | Mitigation actions | The cost of the | Likelho | od Impact of | the The revised 'costed | calculate | | | Ownership | | ho The stakeholder who | If risk has | ree comment section |
| Risk Gatew ID | ay Category | Description of the Risk | Risk Impact Description | Likelihood Classificatio n pre- mitigation | Impact Classificatio n pre- mitigation | Risk score | Costed impact pre- mitigation (£) | Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N | Confidence in the estimation | Mitigating actions | Mitigation cost (£) | Classifi ion pos | ood Impact cat Classific t- ion post ion mitigati | cat impact post- t- mitigation (£) | Mitiga | CRP used to date | Use of CRP | Date raised | Named Departmento Risk Manager/ Coordinator | Risk owner al (Named Officer or External Party) | Date Closed OR/ Realised & moved to Issues | Comment(s) |
| R1 2 | (10) Physical | Project impacted by nearby developments. | There is a possibility that the project programme could be impacted by nearby developments adjacent to the project area which are undergoing planning permission. Timescales for delivery of those projects is yet unkown. | Likely | Minor | 4 | £0.00 | | | Keep in regular contact with stakeholders and planning colleagues and be informed of any changes to their programme and take actions accordingly. | £0.00 |) Likely | Minor | £0.0 | 0 4 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R2 2 | (10) Physical | A delay in establishing vehicular servicing and parking needs in the area. | To deliver the full scope of benefits the project a traffic assessment is required of the parking, loading/unloading, and servicing needs of the area. If this wasn't completed, the project is unable to progress with a feasible design. | Unlikely | Serious | 4 | £0.00 | Ν | | City officers have undertaken an initial desitop assessment of the current provision of parking and servicing needs. This information will be progress further at the next stage.clongsde engagement with stakeholders. | |) Unlikely | Minor | £0.0 | 0 2 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R3 2 | (4) Contractual/Par nership | Procurement of materials causes delays on project delivery. | A significant delay to the receipt of materials will impact the programme for implementation. | Unlikely | Serious | 4 | £0.00 | Ν | | Agree priorities with the CoL Chamberlain and maintain dialogue with Highways Manager/Term Contractor to establish procurement targets to inform the programme and meet stakeholders expectations. | |) Likely | Minor | £0.0 | 0 4 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R4 2 | (5) H&S/Wellbeing | Noisy Works | Noisy Works could generate complaints from local occupiers and delay the programme. | Likely | Minor | 4 | £0.00 | Ν | | All noisy works times will be agreed with Environmental Health Officers and communicated with local occupiers. Flexibility is also built in to allow for these times to be altered accordinate | |) Possible | Minor | £0.0 | 0 3 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R5 2 | (4) contractual / partnership | Stakeholder support is not secured. | The project includes the review of current parking and loading provision, which could change the current vehicular traffic flows. | Possible | Serious | 6 | £0.00 | Ν | | The CoL team will undertake close consultatio with local occupiers to ensure their needs are accounted for a: well as the needs to the functionality of the streets. | £0.00 |) Possible | Serious | £0.0 | 0 6 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R5 2 | (4) Contractual/Par nership | External funding from EC BID is withdrawn. | External funding from the EC BID has been secured via an agreement in principle. A funding letter is yet to be completed at the next stage | | Minor | 1 | £0.00 | N | | The agreement for the additional funding has been agreed in principal by the Board of the EC BID. The letter of agreement will follow to receive the funds in due course. If funding was to be withfurtarwn, the project could be scaled to be delivered within the available budget. | 20.03 | D Possible | Minor | £0.0 | 0 3 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |
| R6 2 | (2) Financial | CoL Capital Bid is unsuccessfull and project cannot go ahead. | The project funding strategy is subject to a capital bid being confirmed. If funding is not secured, the project will need to be re-evaluated in the context of the wider City Cluster programme of work. | Possible | Major | 12 | £0.00 | Ν | | A funding bid has been submitted and is due to be reviewed in Autumn 2023. All paperwork and associated information has been prepared in accordance to the guidelines. | £0.00 | D Pos | sible Mi | inor £0.0 | 0 3 | £0.00 | | 8/10/2023 | DBE | Maria Herrera | | |

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register