

## GPGS PROJECT RISK REGISTER 2015/16

Prepared By: KAREN BROWN

Date/Version Ref: August 2015 – Version 1.1

Ref	CAUSE / RISK	EFFECT	ORIGINAL RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN TO MITIGATE THE RISK	LATEST RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	FURTHER ACTION REQUIRED/DATE	TARGET DATE	TARGET RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	RISK LEAD/ Link to SRR
1	The programme is inadequately resourced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Inability to achieve forecast savings</li> <li>Inability to deliver programme</li> <li>Moral damage</li> </ul>	Likely / High (4 x 4) = Score 16 Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BT &amp; GPGS Team merged</li> <li>GPGS vacant post advertised</li> <li>Vacant BT Posts (senior and assistant) advertised</li> </ul>	Possible/ High (4 x 3) = Score 12 Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure officers in roles as advertised.</li> </ul>	Sept 2015	Unlikely / High (2 x 4) = Score 8 Amber	KB
2	Lack of senior leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Lack of buy in from other services</li> <li>Morale issues</li> </ul>	Unlikely / High 2 x 4 = Score 8 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPGS ensure senior commitment for officers &amp; members</li> </ul>	Unlikely / High 2 x 4 = Score 8 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised business case being approved by Board</li> <li>Revised business case being approved by Cabinet / Full Council</li> </ul>	Sept 2015  Oct 2015	Highly Unlikely / High 1 x 4 = Score 4 Green	JD
3	Lack of buy in from service managers and officer across the organisation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Ability to successfully transition change</li> </ul>	Possible / High 3 x 4 = Score 12 Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	Possible / High 3 x 4 = Score 12 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		Unlikely / high 2 x 4 = Score 8 Amber	KB
4	Collaboration with Keir on Town Hall Re stack not effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage,</li> <li>Inability to achieve forest savings</li> <li>Additional costs being incurred</li> </ul>	Possible / Medium 3 x 3 = Score 9 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good strong pre-existing working relationship with kier</li> <li>An element of work already committed to / contracted</li> </ul>	Possible / Medium 3 x 3 = Score 9 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeking a capped quote from Kier for support</li> <li>Adding Kier to GPGS Board</li> </ul>	Sept 2015	Unlikely / medium 2 x 3 = Score 6 Amber	KB
5	Inability to obtain sufficient flexible workers to enable Town Hall restack plans to be effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project could become unviable</li> <li>Ability to realise income could be impaired</li> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li></li> </ul>	Possible/ Medium (3 x 3) = Score 9 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>96 Officers already working flexibly</li> </ul>	Unlikely / Medium 2 x 3 = Score 6 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently looking at 70 Plus workers for tablet solutions.</li> <li>Management could take a more instructive approach to working styles.</li> </ul>	Dec 2015	Very unlikely / Medium (1 x 3) = Score 3 Green	KB
6	Securing Income <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to secure tenants for the rental space in the Town Hall and other affected buildings such as Venture house</li> <li>Inability to sell vacated buildings that form part of the plan -87 New Square / 6 Ashgate road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Viability of project could be jeopardised</li> <li>Financial impact</li> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Morale negatively affected</li> </ul>	possible / Medium (3 x 3) = Score 9 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest already shown in all locations</li> <li>Tenants secured in basements area</li> <li>Final stage negotiations for Registry Officer on ground floor.</li> </ul>	Unlikely / Medium (2 x 3) = Score 6 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise registry office contract</li> <li>Advertise other space</li> <li>Programme work to maximise opportunities – Venture house for April 2016.</li> </ul>	Oct 2015  Oct 2015  Ongoing	Likely / Medium (4 x 3) = Score 12 Amber	KB / MS

Ref	CAUSE / RISK	EFFECT	ORIGINAL RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN TO MITIGATE THE RISK	LATEST RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	FURTHER ACTION REQUIRED/DATE	TARGET DATE	TARGET RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	RISK LEAD/ Link to SRR
7	ICT Infrastructure insufficient to cope with increasing technological demands of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to transition change</li> </ul>	<p>Likely / Very High 4 x 5 = Score 20 Red</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<p>Likely / Very High 4 x 5 = Score 20 Red</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on ICT infrastructure as part of establishing solid foundations for the project, being approved at cabinet</li> <li>ICT infrastructure programme being delivered</li> </ul>	<p>Oct 2015  Ongoing</p>	<p>Unlikely / High 2 x 4 = Score 8 Amber</p>	JK
8	Council has insufficient funds to establish the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Low morale</li> <li>Project possibly stopped</li> <li>Loan potential required</li> </ul>	<p>Possible / Medium  3 x 3 Score 9 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation planned cost model have been developed in close consultation with Finance</li> <li>Wok programmed to smooth the impact of funding requirements and maximise payback.</li> </ul>	<p>Unlikely / Medium 2 x 3 Score 6 Amber</p>				JD / BD
9	<p>PPP Partnership unable to support the needs of GPGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient project days</li> <li>Insufficient expertise to support requirement</li> <li>Insufficient resource to meet delivery requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational Damage</li> <li>Impact on delivery timescales</li> <li>Impact on ability to achieve return on investment at pace predicated</li> </ul>	<p>Possible / High 3 x 4 Score 12 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work planned to smooth impact on resource for both CBC and Arvato</li> <li>Arvato have seats on GPGS board and aware of priorities</li> <li>Arvato have bolstered resource in relation to ICT in response to concerns raised.</li> </ul>	<p>Unlikely / High 2 x 4 Score 8 Amber</p>				JD / JK
10	Lack of trade union support of the GPGS Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on buy in from staff</li> <li>Impact on ability to consult effectively on programme</li> </ul>	<p>Possible / low 3 x 2 Score 6 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unison have a place on the GPGS Board</li> <li>Members and Officers committed to including Unions</li> </ul>	<p>Unlikely / Low 2 x 2 Score 4 Green</p>				JD/JB
11	Lack of political support for the GPGS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational Damage</li> <li>Project could stop</li> <li>Impact on Officer and Union Support levels</li> </ul>	<p>Unlikely / High 4 x 2 Score 8 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members have committed to original project via cabinet and GPGS board</li> <li>Members have committed to a 4 year corporate plan which GPGS makes a vast contribution to.</li> </ul>	<p>Very Unlikely / High 4 x 1 Score 4 Green</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members to approved revised business case autumn 2015.</li> <li>Members to continue to have 3 seats at the GPGS Board.</li> </ul>		<p>Very Unlikely / High 4 x 1 Score 4 Green</p>	JD/ JB
12	Risk of scope change throughout the duration of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confusion amongst stakeholders</li> <li>Impact on overall business case</li> <li>Impact on cash flow</li> <li>Impact on councils overall financial position</li> </ul>	<p>Likely / Medium 4 x 3 Score 12 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A revised business case has been developed which looks at work to concentrate on in the next 18 months</li> <li>All changes to be controlled through GPGS o Bard / Cabinet as required.</li> </ul>	<p>Likely / Low 4 x 2 Score 8 Amber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised business case to be approved at Board / Cabinet</li> <li>All changes to business case must be financial viable and approved b Finance team.</li> </ul>		<p>Likely / Negligible 4 x 1 Score 4 Green</p>	KB / JD

Ref	CAUSE / RISK	EFFECT	ORIGINAL RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN TO MITIGATE THE RISK	LATEST RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	FURTHER ACTION REQUIRED/DATE	TARGET DATE	TARGET RISK RATING LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT	RISK LEAD/ Link to SRR
13	The impact of potential future changes in funding. (Increased income, decreased central government support)  The councils financial stability could impact the viability GPGS, I.e less income from parking or planning and impact on the bottom line.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on overall business case</li> <li>Impact on cash flow</li> <li>Impact on councils overall financial position</li> <li>Impact on ability to complete project</li> <li>Impact on timescale project needs to be completed on</li> </ul>	Possible / Medium 3 x 3 Score 9 Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful budget planning and monitoring</li> <li>Reserves</li> </ul>	Possible / Medium 3 x 3 Score 9 Amber				JD/BD
1		•		•					

**RISK ASSESSMENT KEY**

<b>Rating Key: Total Risk Score = Likelihood x Impact Scores</b>		
0-4 Green	5-14 Amber	15+ Red

Risk Likelihood Key					Risk Impact Key				
Score -1	Score - 2	Score - 3	Score - 4	Score - 5	Score -1	Score - 2	Score - 3	Score - 4	Score - 5
Highly Unlikely	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Definite	Negligible	Low	Medium	High	Very High

Likelihood	Definite (5)					
	Likely (4)					
	Possible (3)					
	Unlikely (2)					
	Highly Unlikely (1)					
		Negligible (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	Very High (5)
		Impact				

**Unacceptable** risk - immediate control improvements required.

**Acceptable Medium** Risk - close monitoring and cost effective controls required.

**Acceptable Low** Risk - regular review plus low cost improvements.