

RISK REGISTER FOR PROJECT TRANSFORM

Impact	High	6	7	9
	Med	3	5	8
	Low	1	2	4
		Low	Med	High
Likelihood				

High risk, prompt action, monitor at least monthly

Medium risk, contingency plan, monitor at least quarterly

Low risk, monitor at least half yearly

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
1	Failure to gain planning permission	Site availability - (potential ownership issues) /No suitable site available Contamination issues on land Non-compliance with statutory requirements Legal challenge to planning process Insufficient resource Poor project planning Transport issues Green belt Ecological issues Perception of waste imports Public objections	Land treatment needed, increased h & s Total project failure or delay in completion Construction of facilities cannot commence Possible contract default in part or in total Diversion performance is below required level Excessive LATS penalties and increased costs	H	H	9	Early site surveys and remediation of the site Legal review of site ownership and possible advanced purchasing Ensure identified sites meet planning criteria Evaluate Planning options addressing site appraisal, market attitude, WDF process. Ensure planning process adhered to, and applications are robust and compliant. Ensure correct skills/resources available as soon as possible Develop effective Communications Plan	H	H	9
2	Planning permission has onerous conditions	Time taken to achieve planning permission (green belt land)	Unable to operate contract to Service Delivery Plan. Restricted hours could reduce facility throughput/capacity. Increased operating costs Sub-optimal solution Performance below required level Increased costs Impact on procurement programme	L	H	6	Evaluate Planning options addressing site appraisal, market attitude, WDF process. Ensure Planning Applications are robust and compliant with Planning Policy and Procedures. Ensure adequate and realistic time is allowed so as not to hinder procurement	L	M	3

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
3	Ineffective partnership working	Disagreement over partner contributions Disagreement over assets Change of key officers Significant clashes of interest, culture or personality within the partner organisations Conflicting agendas of individual partners Lack of alignment of districts to project objectives Inadequate project management discipline Communication failure between 3 authorities Sharing information between 3 authorities Lack of co-ordination / integration of IT systems to work effectively First time this type of arrangement has been put together	Lack of clarity / incorrect assumptions over roles and responsibilities Lack of guidance/direction for project team members Different perceptions of project objectives Additional costs - uncertainty over plant size Disruption to decision making External criticism Criticism from members Possible delay to project programme LATS compliance costs incurred Internal stakeholders complain Breakdown of relationship causing delays or non-delivery of project objectives Ultimately, partnership collapse	H	M	7	Established Warwickshire Joint Partnership SLA drafted Develop robust Partnership Agreement detailing: - agreed contributions - allocation of assets - joint/agreed resources - penalties Ensure sufficient resources (CSW and external advisors) is available. Implement appropriate Project Mgt & Governance Procedures which address these issues. Develop a Contingency Plan. Development of Joint Working Model around a Joint Venture to be agreed by the Project Board	L	M	3
4	Lack of effective partnership governance	Poor project management approach Lack of project procedures and agreed outcomes Lack of clarity over project team/board responsibilities	Inability to agree scope and objectives of project and partnership Failure to ensure common interpretation & approach Failure to quickly identify and address misunderstandings Ineffective communication between project team and project board Lack of direction Wasted resources Increased dis-agreement between partners Ultimately, partnership collapse External criticism Criticism from members	H	H	9	Appointment of Project Director Implement effective project management arrangements Develop and agree appropriate Governance Framework including agreed reporting procedures	L	M	3

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
5	Failure to deliver "Outline Business Case" on time	Poor overall project management Lack of resources Lack of direction / co-ordination	Total project failure Project delays No PFI funding available for project	H	H	9	Appointment of Project Director Implement effective project management arrangements Develop and agree appropriate Governance Framework including agreed reporting procedures	M	M	5
6	Inaccurate affordability model	Failure to collect accurate data Incorrect assumptions - exact performance is difficult to predict and control. Failure to identify gross errors in the assumptions included within the project Ineffective validation of data Uncertainties - timescales, interest rates etc Commodity and construction prices increase significantly during procurement and construction phases Composition of waste is different from anticipated (poor data, policy changes, changes in collection practices) Composition is outside tolerances of chosen treatment facilities	Poor/inaccurate business case Incorrect plant size Additional costs Not achieving value for money Excessive unanticipated costs Increased project costs and possible exceedance of affordability envelope	H	H	9	Consultancy working together to validate data and ensure OBC contains robust cost estimates / sensitivity analysis. Ensure budget includes contingency amounts to cover for anticipated cost escalations. In house validation and challenge Benchmarking Different funding options and procurement routes being explored Control project timetable. WDA to incentivise WCA performance.	L	M	3
7	Failure to meet / respond to Government targets including: - waste minimisation targets - CHP policies - waste strategy requirements - 50% collective recycling rate	Lack of investment Increase in residual waste Failure to manage collection regimes Political resistance Lack of district support Poor public participation in recycling schemes Financial ability Poor or adverse communication Evolving ministerial priorities A wish to align with Wales and Scottish targets	Increased disposal costs Reduction in PFI credits received Project delay Incorrect plant size No third party income from use of any spare capacity of plant Reputation damage	H	M	7	Identify sites with CHP potential Regular service reviews Prioritisation of statutory services Ensuring sufficient resources Individual strategies developed moving towards a joint approach Communication strategies	L	M	3

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
8	Failure to gain environmental permits for facility	Failing to meet EA criteria	Delay in facility becoming operational	L	H	6	Selection of experienced contractor Regular contact with EA	L	M	3
9	Delays in democratic process	Insufficient evidence to inform decision making process	Too slow to gain permissions Targets missed, increased costs, project delay	L	H	6	Regular briefing to political bodies. Follow project programme, confirm suitable approval process is included	L	M	3
10	Failure to adequately respond to future technology changes	Not thinking outside the box – proliferation of these facilities becoming apparent across country Technology movements in future – we don't know what we don't know Use of Electronic box	Selected technology not suitable Lose support for treatment technology	M	H	7	Horizon scanning/monitoring	L	M	3
11	Failure to adequately respond to future legislative / policy changes	Change in legislation or guidance either at European, national or regional/local level Bottom Ash/Fly Ash legislative changes Potentially more stringent requirements in CHP Policies Changes in Waste Strategy requirements Lack of understanding of implications of changing legislation	Taking wrong approach Choosing wrong technology Required revisit of preferred solution Possible termination of project Excessive LATS compliance costs Increased restrictions and disposal costs	M	H	7	Horizon scanning/monitoring Develop mechanism in Project Agreement to cope with change in law. Consider inclusion of flexibility into the solution (e.g. additional EFW capacity).	L	M	5
12	Ineffective communication with members	Poor/inadequate communication plan Failure to identify and engage key stakeholders	Lack of understanding of the project by members Poor member involvement and engagement Failure to gain appropriate member approvals Increased member challenge and opposition	H	H	9	Effective communication plan Members Advisory Panel to inform/educate wider members Reports to Cabinet/Scrutiny Member workshops Member packs	L	M	3

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
13	Increased pressure from public or pressure/community groups against the preferred solution and location.	Ideological stance Lack of consultation Poor communication Early release of sensitive information	Increase in FOI requests Disruption / delay to project process Negative effect on level of member support Delay to award of planning consent, challenge of planning process Alternative solution/site has to be sought Increased project development costs Excessive LATS costs Impact on CSW reputation Sensitive information lost	H	H	9	Develop and implement a Communications Plan with stakeholder groups. Impartial briefings Web pages Proactive press releases Get approvals as early as possible. Understand impact of timing of decisions upon project	M	M	5
14	Insufficient project resource (numbers and knowledge/experience of staff/project team)	Unpredictable shortage of qualified staff in industry/high demand on resources due to waste infrastructure activities.	Delays to project Loss of project knowledge Incorrect decisions that require re-visiting	M	M	5	Consider extent of support available from advisors. Ensure knowledge is shared effectively amongst CSW support staff. Develop a Contingency Plan	M	L	2
15	Poor advisor appointments		OBC rejection Failure to gain approvals, delays in projects etc	M	M	5	Ensure sufficient resources (CSW and external advisors) is available. Implement appropriate Project Mgt & Governance Procedures. Develop a Contingency Plan	L	L	1
16	OBC rejected by Defra	Bid omissions Competition from other authorities	Loss of PFI credits Possible delay to project programme LATS compliance costs incurred.	L	H	6	Liaise early with Environment Agency. Ensure realistic project timetable includes for peer review (4Ps/OGC). Ensure adherence to project timetable.	L	M	3

Risk No	Risk Description: Failure to: Lack of: Insufficient: Inadequate/Ineffective:	Caused By:	Leads To:	Inherent / Gross risk		Risk Level	Mitigating Action	Residual / Net risk		Risk Level
				L	I			L	I	
17	Lack of funding	Key project requirements not yet fleshed out Budget strategies not incorporated in project development Increase in costs Competing priorities Ceiling on Council Tax increases Limits on borrowing	Project failure	M	H	7	Communicate funding gap to members Identify project as a key priority to attract funding	M	L	4
18	No interim solutions agreed for disposal of waste	Not phasing interim procurement solutions for waste disposal . Lack of available alternatives	Continued reliance on landfill. LAWDC cannot operate a profitable business. LATS penalties incurred	M	M	5	Ensure enough time for procurement of suitable contracts liaise with legal and procurement specialists to ensure due process is followed. Market testing to see what future markets may be	L	M	3
19	Failure to recognise issues around wider scope of the project	Project Scope unclear and ambiguity regarding scope of the project	Hidden costs in the project Inadequate resources being allocated to key aspects of the project	M	H	7	Develop clear project scope and objectives and ensure all partners are in agreement with this.	M	M	5