



## **Project Risk Log**

Project No: 92523

Date Nov-18

Project Name : Centenary Square

|         | IDENTIFY     |                |  |            |        | ASSESS   |          |            | PLAN             | IMPLEMENT  |
|---------|--------------|----------------|--|------------|--------|----------|----------|------------|------------------|--|
| Risk ID | Raised<br>By | Date<br>Raised | Risk Details.<br>Cause, Risk Event, Effect.  | Likelihood | Impact | Severity | Priority | Risk Owner | Risk Response    | Response Action  |
| 001     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Midland Metro interfaces causing programme issues to CSQ project along boundary.   | 5          | 5      | 25       | 1        | всс        | Threat: Mitigate | Discuss programme with Midland Metro Alliance (MMA) however this impact changes due to delays from MMA and any other 3rd parties. Knock on effect is to accommodate MMA works within CSQ   |
| 002     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Accommodating stakeholder requirements and events both planned and last minute.  | 4          | 3      | 12       | 1        | всс        | Threat: Accept   | This risk is unavoidable with so many stakeholders and various events throughout the year. During the phasing ongoing discussions continue to take place with stakeholders however last minute requirements need to be accepted. |
| 003     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Time risk allowances - this risk is for the allowance of prelims for any delays caused due to ground obstructions, services etc. | 4          | 5      | 20       | 1        | всс        | Threat: Accept   | It is unlikely this cost can be unavoidable however the severity of the impact can be limited by making quick decisions to accommodate the claim.  |
| 004     | всс          |                | Unknown ground obstructions discovered during excavation   | 3          | 4      | 12       | 1        | BCC        | Threat: Accept   | BYUK will remove the obstruction immediately however there will be a cost associated with any removal as such a cost has not been allowed for.   |
| 005     | всс          |                | Unknown or shallow services discovered in the ground that was not traceable or has been installed incorrectly by provider        | 3          | 4      | 12       | 1        | BCC        | Threat: Avoid    | BYUK will survey and anticipate any services however there would be a cost associated with the discovery.  |
| 006     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Discovery of asbestos  | 3          | 4      | 12       | 3        | BCC        | Threat: Accept   | Asbestos will need to be removed immediately however it would need to be tested before it is removed so there is a potential that works can be stopped.  |
| 007     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Diversion of BT cables in the location of trees  | 4          | 4      | 16       | 1        | всс        | Threat: Avoid    | BYUK are to review the cables and installed trees with adequate protection however there is a chance that where these are to be installed there could be clashes with the tree pits.   |
| 800     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Symphony Hall project interfaces and accommodating requests  | 3          | 3      | 9        | 2        | всс        | Threat: Avoid    | BCC may have to accommodate requests by Symphony Hall for changes or accommodating works on the CSQ project.   |
| 009     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Pile location A4 has impacts of delay and cost due to clash of a unknown sewer cover that was covered.                           | 5          | 5      | 25       | 1        | всс        | Threat: Mitigate | Discuss with STW the issue of building over their asset.   |

| Project No:    | 92523            |
|----------------|------------------|
| Date           | Nov-18           |
| Project Name : | Centenary Square |

|         | IDENTIFY     |                |   | ASSESS     |        |          |          | PLAN       |               | IMPLEMENT  |
|---------|--------------|----------------|---|------------|--------|----------|----------|------------|---------------|--|
| Risk ID | Raised<br>By | Date<br>Raised | Risk Details.<br>Cause, Risk Event, Effect. | Likelihood | Impact | Severity | Priority | Risk Owner | Risk Response | Response Action  |
| 010     | всс          | 21.08.18       | Christmas trading and pedestrian movement   | 3          | 3      | 9        | 1        | всс        |               | The project needs to accommodate pedestrian movement while minimising the impact on the project. |

### This Project Risk log should be used in conjunction with the Risk Management Framework policy.

| Risk Respo | nse  | Corresponding Response Action Advice   |
|------------|--|--|
| Avoid      | Typically involves changing some aspect of the project. I.e. The scope, supplier, sequence of activities, so the threat can no longer have an impact or can no longer occur.   | What action is necessary to change IN ADVANCE in order to Avoid the threat? Detail the steps, including how agreement is to be achieved.   |
| Mitigation | Pro-active actions taken to Reduce the probability of the event occurring, and / or reduce the impact of the event should it occur.  | Should the risk happen, what will be done IN ADVANCE to reduce the probability of the threat occuring?  AND  what will be done IN ADVANCE to reduce the impact should the risk effect happen?  |
| Fallback   | Also known as Contingency. Putting in place a fallback plan of actions that will be taken to reduce the impact of the threat should the risk occur. This is Reactive rather than proactive and has no effect on probability. | What action is necessary IN ADVANCE to be able to fall back should the risk occur? E.g. If a preferred supplier is only available until the end of the year, a plan is made now to procure a sub-contract suppler to hand over, should the project extend.                       |
| Transfer   | A third party takes on responsibility for some of the financial impact of the threat, e.g. Through insurance. This is only appropriate for financial aspects of the risk.  | What action is necessary IN ADVANCE to reduce the financial impact should the risk occur? E.g. An insurance policy is taken out. E.g. Supplier penalty clauses are set.  |
| Accept     | A conscious and deliberate decision to retain the threat, having discerned that it is more economical to do so.  | What change is necessary IN ADVANCE to the project to accommodate accepting the risk? If Scope, Timing, Resource plans need to change, detail the actions here. If the decision is to do nothing, the minimum action will be "monitor risk" and provide a cost impact statement. |
| Share      | This is response may be used to plan that the burden or gain of the risk is shared by more than one party, for instance through a procurement contract. This can be applied to threats and opportunities.                    | What action is necessary IN ADVANCE to ensure the sharing will take place? E.g. Fluctuations in the cost of oil could increase transport costs, which could be agreed to be shared bewteen customer and supplier.  |
| Exploit    | Seizing an opportunity to ensure that the opportunity will happen and the impact will be realised. This is the equivalent of the Accept response for threats.  | What action is necessary to change IN ADVANCE in order to exploit the opportunity? Detail the steps, including how agreement is to be achieved.  |
| Enhance    | Pro-active actions taken to increase the probability of the event occurring, and increase the impact of the event should it occur.   | Should the risk happen, what will be done IN ADVANCE to increase the probability of the opportunity occuring?  AND  what will be done IN ADVANCE to increase the impact should the risk effect happen?   |
| Reject     | A conscious and deliberate decision to ignore the opportunity, having discerned that it is more economical not to do so.   | This response requires an informed decision, what action will inform the project board of the details of the opportunity? How will it be recorded and how will it inform future projects (e.g. Lessons Learnt process).  |

#### Likelihood

| Level | Likelihood     | Description of<br>Likelihood                                 |
|-------|----------------|--|
| 1     | Rare           | Very unlikely to occur<br>(less than 10%)                    |
| 2     | Unlikely       | Unlikely to occur (less than 20%)                            |
| 3     | Possible       | May occur about half of<br>the time (between 20%<br>and 60%) |
| 4     | Likely         | Likely to occur (between 60% and 80%)                        |
| 5     | Almost Certain | Very likely to occur<br>(above 80%)                          |

|   | R             | ISK / IS | SUE SE | VERITY | MATRI | X      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------------|----------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | 5             | 5        | 10     | 15     | 20    | 25     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 4             | 4        | 8      | 12     | 16    | 20     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ₩ | 3             | 3        | 6      | 9      | 12    | 15     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ₹ | 2             | 2        | 4      | 6      | 8     | 10     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1             | 1        | 2      | 3      | 4     | 5      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | $\overline{}$ | 1        | 2      | 3      | 4     | 5      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |               |          |        | IMPACT | -     | IMPACT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Impact

| ſ | Area    |  | Impact Lev              | els(Negative impacts       | only)                      |   |
|---|---------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| ı | Aicu    | 1 - Lowest   | 2                       | 3                          | 4                          | 5 - Highest   |
|   | Cost    | Insignificant. Budget<br>can absorb<br>increased costs     | Minor impact on budget  | Moderate impact on budget  | Major impact on budget     | Catastrophic impact on budget   |
|   | Time    | Insignificant.<br>Existing schedule<br>can absorb increase | Minor delay to schedule | Moderate delay to schedule | Major delay to<br>schedule | Catastrophic impact<br>on project schedule<br>(or impact on<br>Strategy Timeline)                               |
|   | Scope   | Insignificant. Scope<br>change can be<br>accepted          | Minor scope change      | Moderate scope change      | Major scope change         | Catastrophic scope change   |
|   | Quality | Insignificant impact on quality                            | Minor impact on quality | Moderate impact on quality | Major impact on quality    | Catastrophic impact<br>on quality (i.e.<br>causes regulatory<br>non-compliance or<br>unusable by<br>customers). |

Where a project is using a single Impact score of 1 to 5. Average the results of Cost, Time, Scope and Quality and round up to the nearest whole numbe

| Area    |  | Impact Levels(Negative impacts only) |                            |                         |   |  |  |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
|         | 1 - Lowest   | 2                                    | 3                          | 4                       | 5 - Highest   |  |  |
| Cost    | Insignificant. Budget can absorb increased costs     | Minor impact on budget               | Moderate impact on budget  | Major impact on budget  | Catastrophic impact on budget   |  |  |
| Time    | Insignificant. Existing schedule can absorb increase | Minor delay to schedule              | Moderate delay to schedule | Major delay to schedule | Catastrophic impact<br>on project schedule<br>(or impact on<br>Strategy Timeline)                               |  |  |
| Scope   | Insignificant. Scope change can be accepted          | Minor scope change                   | Moderate scope change      | Major scope change      | Catastrophic scope change   |  |  |
| Quality | Insignificant impact on quality                      | Minor impact on quality              | Moderate impact on quality | Major impact on quality | Catastrophic impact<br>on quality (i.e.<br>causes regulatory<br>non-compliance or<br>unusable by<br>customers). |  |  |

= 2 4 = 1 = 2

Average 2.
Rounded Up

# Project Risk Log

| Likelihood | l Impact | <b>Priority</b> | Risk Response |
|------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1          | 1        | 1               | Avoid         |
| 2          | 2        | 2               | Mitigation    |
| 3          | 3        | 3               | Fallback      |
| 4          | 4        | 4               | Transfer      |
| 5          | 5        | 5               | Accept        |
|            |          |                 | Share         |
|            |          |                 | Exploit       |
|            |          |                 | Enhance       |
|            |          |                 | Reject        |

## Project Issues Log

| <b>Priority</b> | Status |
|-----------------|--------|
| High            | Open   |
| Medium          | Closed |
| Low             |        |