

Risk register

Created By:- Justin Dudley

Date Created:- 7 September 2017

Date Last Updated:- 12 Dec 2018



Project:- Waste and Cleansing Procurement

|                            | ID   | Date logged | Risk Description   | Risk Owner   | Initial                |        |             | Proximity | Mitigations  | Proximity  | Current                     |             |    | Update  |
|----------------------------|------|-------------|--|--------------|------------------------|--------|-------------|-----------|--|------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----|---|
|                            |      |             |  |              | Rating at point logged |        |             |           |  |            | Risk rating after treatment |             |    |   |
|                            |      |             |  |              | Likelihood             | Impact | Risk Rating |           |  | Likelihood | Impact                      | Risk Rating |    |   |
| Technical                  | 1.1  | 14/09/17    | Scope changes may arise during project.  | Project Team | 3                      | 3      | 9           | 8 months  | Refer to PID and Mandate and any changes to scope should be agreed by the Board  | 10 months  | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
| Risk 1.0                   | 1.2  | 14/09/17    | Client may introduce significant change during project (positive or negative).   | Project Team | 3                      | 3      | 9           | 8 months  | Refer to PID and Mandate and any changes to scope should be agreed by the Board  | 10 months  | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
|                            | 1.3  | 14/09/17    | Basis of estimating contracting figure may be wrong.   | Project Team | 2                      | 3      | 6           | 8 months  | Figures are historic and gained from a mature service.   | 10 months  | 1                           | 3           | 3  |   |
|                            | 1.4  | 14/09/17    | New technology may be developed during project lifetime.   | Project Team | 2                      | 2      | 4           | 8 months  | Project is only a short period and advances during this time is unlikely.  | 10 months  | 1                           | 2           | 2  |   |
|                            | 1.5  | 14/09/17    | Unexpected interactions may occur at key IT interfaces. Data inconsistencies across interfaces may require rework.                         | Project Team | 2                      | 2      | 4           | 8 months  | IT interfaces are minimal check that the tender submission system has been used before   | 6 Months   | 2                           | 2           | 4  |   |
|                            | 1.6  | 14/09/17    | It may prove impossible to meet some requirements within tender limitations.   | Project Team | 2                      | 4      | 8           | 8 months  | Soft market testing completed with recommendations from this testing in place.   | 10 months  | 1                           | 4           | 4  | Down graded as we near the end of the project |
|                            | 1.7  | 14/09/17    | Final solution may not meet requirements.  | Project Team | 2                      | 3      | 6           | 8 months  | Bidders day held and CD process allows tailoring of cost. Will end procurement if no competitive offer received.   | 10 Months  | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
|                            | 1.8  | 14/09/17    | The use of innovative technology to receive tenders may prove unreliable.  | Project Team | 2                      | 4      | 8           | 8 months  | Tender system checked and appropriately trained staff.   | 10 months  | 1                           | 4           | 4  |   |
|                            | 1.9  |             |  |              |                        |        | 0           |           |  |            |                             |             | 0  |   |
| <b>Management Risk 2.0</b> |      |             |  |              |                        |        |             |           |  |            |                             |             |    |   |
|                            | 2.1  | 14/09/17    | Project management systems may not be adequate to support project requirements.  | Project team | 2                      | 3      | 6           | 8 months  | Project structure and a comprehensive file structure in place with appropriate templates. Also a governance structure in place for updates and approvals.  | 8 months   | 1                           | 3           | 3  | Down graded as we near the end of the project |
|                            | 2.2  | 14/09/17    | Poor decision-making may result in inappropriate task allocation.  | Project team | 2                      | 3      | 6           | 8 months  | Strong governance in place with memorandum of understanding setting out responsibilities/tolerances  | 8 months   | 1                           | 3           | 3  |   |
|                            | 2.3  | 14/09/17    | Project may be given inappropriate priority within the programme.  | Project team | 2                      | 4      | 8           | 8 months  | This is currently high on the agenda.  | 8 months   | 1                           | 4           | 4  | Down graded as we near the end of the project |
|                            | 2.4  | 14/09/17    | Other projects may divert key resources  | Project team | 3                      | 4      | 12          | 8 months  | Programme board in place to judge that resources are appropriate to sustain levels of projects.  | 8 months   | 2                           | 4           | 8  | 1 2   |
|                            | 2.5  | 14/09/17    | Business-as-usual demands may reduce project resources, funding or contingency.  | Project team | 3                      | 4      | 12          | 8 months  | As long as current business-as-usual workload and does not increase then Project resource should allow capacity for this project.  | 8 months   | 3                           | 4           | 12 | 2 3   |
|                            | 2.6  | 14/09/17    | Key resources may be unavailable when required. Specific skills may not be available when required   | Project team | 4                      | 4      | 16          | 8 months  | We currently 'buy in' any expertise that we don't have. i.e. Legal, Waste services consultancy   | 8 months   | 2                           | 4           | 8  | Down graded as we near the end of the project |
|                            | 2.7  | 14/09/17    | The client's requirement may be misunderstood.   | Project team | 2                      | 2      | 4           | 8 months  | Experienced staff in place that know the locality and member   | 8 months   | 2                           | 2           | 4  |   |
|                            | 2.8  | 14/09/17    | Client may fail to provide required information on time.   | Project team | 2                      | 4      | 8           | 8 months  | Project team meetings will keep a track of tasks that are outstanding and plot three progress.   | 8 months   | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
|                            | 2.9  | 14/09/17    | Health & safety legislation may change during the project.   | Project team | 2                      | 2      | 4           | 8 months  | Health and Safety legislation unlikely to change during tender period.   | 8 months   | 2                           | 2           | 4  |   |
|                            | 2.10 | 14/09/17    | Corporate reputation incident may damage support for the project. Senior management may lose confidence in project team.                   | Project team | 2                      | 4      | 8           | 8 months  | Project structure and a comprehensive file structure in place with appropriate templates. Also a governance structure in place for updates and approvals.  | 8 months   | 1                           | 4           | 4  |   |
|                            | 2.11 | 14/09/17    | Failure to manage project budget effectively could lead to over spend  | Project team | 3                      | 3      | 9           | 8 months  | Gain a clear understanding of what the project situation is and monitor against spend every month.   | 8 months   | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
|                            | 2.12 | 18/10/17    | The over use of consultants cause the project budget to be over spent.   | Project team | 4                      | 4      | 16          | 8 months  | Review of consultants use and fees required then project cost through the whole project life to gain project financial position.   | 8 months   | 2                           | 4           | 8  | 5   |
|                            | 2.13 | 08/11/17    | SH/WD not working collaboratively due to political instruction causing duplication of for officers and negatively effecting work capacity. |              | 4                      | 4      | 16          | 8 months  | Joint working is agreed for the Board meeting. Whilst it may not be feasible to hold all working group meetings jointly officers will consult with members to ensure that wherever possible joint working is achieved. | 8 months   | 1                           | 4           | 4  | Down graded as we near the end of the project |
|                            | 2.14 | 01/05/18    | Breach of GDPR causing litigation  | Project team | 2                      | 3      | 6           | 8 months  | Advice sort from GDPR compliance officer on how to deal with any potential issues that GDPR compliance might cause. Templates in filing structure.   | 8 months   | 2                           | 3           | 6  |   |
|                            | 2.15 | 20/08/18    | Risk of South Hams in-house service deteriorating due to the uncertainty of the procurement process  | Project team | 4                      | 4      | 16          | 8 months  | Staff communications plan in place which lays out when and where we are going to update the staff on the progress of procurement.  | 8 months   | 4                           | 4           | 16 | 1   |

|                            |          |   |              |   |   |    |                      |   |                      |   |   |    |  |
|----------------------------|----------|---|--------------|---|---|----|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|----|--|
| 2.16                       | 20/08/18 | Risk of West Devon service deteriorating due to the uncertainty of the procurement process  | Project team | 4 | 4 | 16 | 8 months             | Staff communications plan in place which lays out when and where we are going to update the staff on the progress of procurement.   | 8 months             | 3 | 4 | 12 |  |
| <b>Commercial Risk 3.0</b> |          |   |              |   |   |    |                      |   |                      |   |   |    |  |
| 3.1                        | 21/09/17 | Contractual terms may contain internal inconsistencies.   | Project team | 2 | 5 | 10 | 8 months             | Harmonised client/subcontractor terms may reduce risk exposure.   | 8 months             | 1 | 5 | 5  |  |
| 3.2                        | 21/09/17 | No/Low number of bids received  | Project team | 2 | 5 | 10 | 2 Months             | Project team are being extremely accommodating and dialogue continues to be open and engaging. Will continue to monitor.  | 2 Months             | 1 | 5 | 5  | Final tenders are in.  |
| 3.3                        | 21/09/17 | Other departments may not deliver as expected.  | Project team | 3 | 3 | 9  | 2 Months             | Project team meetings bring key people together and will keep a track of tasks that are outstanding and plot there progress.  | 2 Months             | 2 | 3 | 6  |  |
| 3.4                        | 21/09/17 | A key supplier may go out of business.  | Project team | 2 | 5 | 10 | 2 Months             | Unlikely to happen although still needs to be considered. Finance checks done at evaluation stages.   | 2 Months             | 1 | 5 | 5  |  |
| 3.5                        | 21/09/17 | Mergers between suppliers may erode competitiveness.  | Project team | 2 | 3 | 6  | 2 Months             | Very unlikely   | 2 Months             | 1 | 3 | 3  |  |
| 3.6                        | 21/09/17 | Key subcontractors may refuse to work together.   | Project team | 2 | 4 | 8  | 2 Months             | Unlikely to happen although still needs to be considered.   | 2 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  |  |
| 3.7                        | 21/09/17 | Changes in client personnel may require additional project management effort.   | Project team | 3 | 3 | 9  | 2 Months             | Mature/experience staff in place.   | 2 Months             | 2 | 3 | 6  |  |
| 3.8                        | 21/09/17 | New contract cost exceeds budget WD   | Project team | 2 | 4 | 8  | 2 Months             | CD process allows tailoring of cost.  | 2 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  |  |
| 3.9                        | 21/09/17 | New contract cost exceeds budget SH   | Project team | 2 | 4 | 12 | 2 Months             | CD process allows tailoring of cost. Will end procurement if no competitive offer received.   | 2 Months             | 1 | 4 | 4  |  |
| 3.10                       | 21/09/17 | The 'aligned service design' is not achieved significantly affecting contract and future operational costs.   | Project team | 4 | 5 | 20 | 2 Months             | Ensure that whole council memberships are fully briefed and aware of financial impact before recommendations are presented  | 2 Months             | 1 | 5 | 5  | Adjusted as SH council agreed to implement new service by sept 2020                              |
| 3.11                       | 21/09/17 | WD Resource not available to meet timetable   | Project team | 3 | 5 | 15 | 2 Months             | Secure consistent resource for project duration where possible to include consultants and legal support   | 2 Months             | 1 | 5 | 5  | Additional support now in place so likelihood reduced to 1                                       |
| 3.12                       | 21/09/17 | SH Resources not available to meet timetable  | Project team | 3 | 5 | 15 | 2 Months             | Secure consistent resource for project duration where possible to include consultants and legal support   | 2 Months             | 1 | 5 | 5  | Additional support now in place so likelihood reduced to 1                                       |
| 3.13                       | 14/01/17 | Ensuring that the process is competitive to secure the best outcome for both Councils   | Project team | 4 | 5 | 20 | 2 Months             | Ensure that all bidders are given full timely information in order to prepare bids.<br>Ensure that all clarifications are responded to quickly and thoroughly.<br>Ensure that full background information is provided on request.<br>Support all bidders in engaging with process easily. | 2 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  | Down graded as we near the end of the project  |
| 3.14                       | 10/10/18 | Torr Quarry - It appears from the Land Registry that the buildings don't fall within the land boundary as defined by the title plans held by the Land Registry. This could lead to the need for the authority to relocate (demolish and rebuild) the units. |              | 1 | 4 | 4  | Life of the Contract | There is a VERY low likelihood of this occurring. The Council will indemnify the Contractor in the respect of any claims.   | Life of the contract | 1 | 4 | 4  |  |
| <b>External Risk 4.0</b>   |          |   |              |   |   |    |                      |   |                      |   |   |    |  |
| 4.1                        | 21/09/17 | Changes in legislation may impose changes in the solution (positive or negative).   | Project team | 2 | 3 | 6  | 8 months             | No imminent legislation changes that would affect this project  | 8 Months             | 2 | 3 | 6  |  |
| 4.2                        | 21/09/17 | Interest rates may change during the project (favourably or unfavourably).  | Project team | 2 | 4 | 8  | 8 months             | Bank of England base rate has been stable for a number of months and the feeling is that it will not be changing anytime soon.  | 8 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  |  |
| 4.3                        | 21/09/17 | Political factors may influence senior management support for the project.  | Project team | 3 | 4 | 12 | 8 months             | Communications plan will set out who to communicate to and when. Informal members session arranged with additional 'drop in' session to inform all members.   | 8 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  | Through lessons learnt we have improved our communications both in frequency and targeted comms. |
| 4.4                        | 21/09/17 | Pressure groups/ opposition may disrupt project progress.   | Project team | 3 | 4 | 12 | 8 months             | Ensure that whole council memberships are fully briefed and aware of financial impact before recommendations are presented. Communications plan will set out who to communicate to and when.  | 8 Months             | 2 | 4 | 8  |  |
| 4.5                        | 21/09/17 | Force majeure event may occur, disrupting the project.  | Project team | 3 | 3 | 9  | 8 months             | Unknown, unknowns   | 8 Months             | 3 | 3 | 9  |  |
| 4.6                        | 21/09/17 | Client may withhold final acceptance for reasons outside contract.  | Project team | 3 | 3 | 9  | 8 months             | Ensure that whole council memberships are fully briefed and aware of financial impact before recommendations are presented  | 8 Months             | 2 | 3 | 6  |  |

|     |          |   |              |   |   |    |          |  |          |   |   |   |                                    |
|-----|----------|---|--------------|---|---|----|----------|--|----------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 4.7 | 21/09/17 | Failure to respond effectively to public relations / media could negatively impact on decision. | Project team | 4 | 4 | 16 | 8 months | Key Comms milestones identified within Comms Plan and Comms representative on the Project team to manage Comms Plan. | 8 Months | 2 | 4 | 8 | Comprehensive Comms plan in place. |
| 4.8 | 02/02/18 | Bidder capital exposure in luie of Carillion collapse (linked to 2.4)                           | Project team | 3 | 5 | 15 | 8 months | WYG consultants assure us through there own checks that this is not a project risk at this point                     | 8 Months | 1 | 5 | 5 |                                    |
|     |          |   |              |   |   |    |          |  |          |   |   |   |                                    |

**Red** Red - These risks can have a significant impact on the business or project and must be managed by the project board or service management team. Mitigations must be in place and managed to ensure that the risk is not realised or can be controlled

**Amber** Amber - These risks need to be managed to prevent them causing an impact on the business or project. Clear plans with owners need to be in place and they should be managed by the project team or service leads on a regular basis

**Green** Green - These risks have low impact and/or low likelihood of occurring. Have a plan to prevent them escalating but only light touch monitoring required