

MRB Diving In Risk Log - DEVELOPMENT PHASE

| Risk ID | Description | Owner | Cause | Impact | Category | Overall Impact Score (dropdown score 1 = Low Impact) | Overall Likelihood Score (dropdown score 1 = Unlikely) | Score | Rating | Risk Response (actions) | Manageability of the Risk | Summary of Management Action Plan | Risk Closed | Closed date | Status | Change since last report? | Impact | Likelihood | Score | Rating |
|---------|---|--|---|---|--------------------|---|---|-------|--------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------|------------|-------|--------|
| DEV1 | Building, plant and / or boiler failure jeopardises operation | Project Sponsors | Plant is beyond economic lifespan. Recurrent issues which are difficult to address Difficult to find a solution without potentially abortive costs (due to long term changes to building) | Long term closure of swimming or CIO Loss of visitors and income Impact on project momentum and potential future viability Momentum and support lost Project slows/stops | Physical | 5 | 4 | 20 | Major | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Responsive maintenance and repair > Review options for replacement in line with long term plan. Potential to implement in Phase 1 > Contingency set aside by BCC to address boiler / plant failure > Continued investment in urgent building repair and maintenance, including Historic England funding for major/priority repairs and BCC revenue support for compliance and maintenance. >phasing of capital works to prioritise (where possible) major risks to the operation | | | | | 5 | 3 | 15 | High |
| DEV2 | Inflation rate has increased / is increasing significantly | Construction PM | Economic climate Huge fluctuation in the market that is difficult to predict | Affordability of capital works / scope of project | Financial | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | Risk is out of our control but we can manage the impact > Inflation built into project costs (advice sought) > Monitor situation with support from QS > Review affordability and scope - VE may be required > Explore opportunities around procurement (e.g. early purchase of materials) | | | No Target | | 4 | 4 | 16 | High |
| DEV3 | Impact of material and labour shortages on costs | Construction PM | Brexit, UK/European/Global labour market Strong construction market (big projects buying-up supplies) | Cost increase Programme extension Risk to availability of good contractors | Competitive | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Monitor situation > Adjust/explore procurement strategy to mitigate issues > Build in sufficient contingency and inflation into costs. > Potential need to value engineer scheme as required > Look at phasing opportunities to avoid peaks in issues | | | No Target | | 4 | 4 | 16 | High |
| DEV4 | Unable to bridge the funding gap | Project Sponsors | Availability of funding - competition and funder priorities. Gap is too high or increases. Timescale to raise funds. Perception that funding not needed/urgent (due to recent investment being secured) | Shortfall on project cost or need to curtail project which may impact on benefits/outcomes. Confidence of decision-makers in relation to project delivery. | Financial | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Confirmation of Levelling Up provides significant boost to project, helping de-risk investment > BCC to try and secure remaining £7m earmarked capital > Procuring professional support to plan and deliver a targeted fundraising plan to bridge the remianing (smaller) gap. >Looking at range of potential funders; grants, individuals, LEP, WM Combined Authority. >Working closely with the CIO to showcase the benefit and impact of funding and build a compelling case for support. >Work with fundraising consultants to provide training for project and CIO to build an entrepreneurial culture across the team. >if necessary, reduce the scope/cost of the project avoiding significant impact on outcomes | | | No Target | | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium |
| DEV5 | Long term impact of Covid on business plan / potential growth | CIO | Succesive lockdowns/ restrictions/ covid safety measures (e.g. social distancing) limiting activity, numbers and access. Pace of economic and social recovery. | Opportunities to diversify income have been curtailed/delayed by pandemic. Potential increase in operating deficit which may need working capital subsidy (reducing level of project capital funding available) | Economic | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Continuing to be responsive to (probably) long term situation and changes. >Reviewing business plan and opportunities for funding and income generation for the short to medium term, as well as planning for longer term particularly focusing on aligning Baths activity to supporting covid/post-covid recovery priorities. >Seek working capital to support deficit if necessary | | | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |
| DEV6 | Design/planning process indicates major operational disruption from construction, with major consequences for the business plan | Project Sponsors | Complexity of phasing. Extent of work required to the building limits scope for phasing. | Longer periods of closure to complete works - loss of visitors and income. Higher operating deficit which may need working capital subsidy (reducing level of project capital funding available) | Financial | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Construction strategy thought about early in the design process. >Buildability and constructability advice. >Close coordination between design work and business planning. >Seek working capital to support deficit if necessary | | | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |
| DEV7 | Detailed design and development stage investigations uncover issues around reinstating water to the Gala Pool - works prohibitive or over-complex/intrusive etc | Construction PM | Unforeseen defects/issues Predicted impact to reinstating water | Cost increase Review of design approach Change plans (maintain swimming in Pool 2) loss of time / cost to recalibrate project | Physical | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Input already received from consultants during feasibility stage >Prioritise further surveys/investigations to address risk, building on knowledge and assessments already undertaken. >Maintain flexibility in approach to use of space - responsive to change. >Keep stakeholders informed and engaged in addressing issues. | | | No Target | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV8 | BCC processes compromise delivery and/or affect partner/funder confidence | BCC Client | Heavy administrative requirements Lengthy processes Lack of resource | Loss of time risk to funding or support | Professional | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | Prioritisation of project within BCC - active engagement with key departments to allocate resource and ensure work is given priority. Clarity around processes and requirements - built into project planning to avoid unnecessary delays. Effective escalation and issue resolution process through BCC Sponsor and Client. | | | No Target | | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium |
| DEV9 | Delays or constraints to development stage due to ongoing pandemic impact / restrictions | Project Director | Increased number of people going off sick with Covid Further government restrictions (e.g. closure of Baths, liimtatons on travel, social distancing) Constraints to project staff due to impact of restrictions, personal circumstances, etc Pressure on project resource due to ongoing focus on dealing with Covid impact Delayed impact on people and organisations starting to become apparent | limit ability to undertake design, recruitment, activity/consultation etc Limits to learning and testing business plan Ways of working affected | Project Management | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Continue to adopt alternative ways of engagement (e.g. digital consultation, video conferencing) >Consult NLHF / other funders about mitigation measures, extensions of time etc >Explore innovations with consultants to keep working going where possible - e.g. use of technology to facilitate design (3D modelling, aerial / other imaging etc) > Restrictions easing and general move towards recovery | | | No Target | | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium |
| DEV10 | Impact of Phase 1 capital works on Activity pilots, development work and operation | Public Programme Development Manager / Construction PM | Capital works limiting access to spaces | Constraints / disruptions to activity People less willing/able to attend activity Evaluation/analysis of activity may not give accurate picture | Other | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Careful coordination of programming and construction works, focusing on business continuity and ways to minimise disruption > exploring ways to use the capital works to engage > Robust / clear comms around disruption > Exploring spaces /alternative places to host activity whilst still badging as MRB, including Library and other local partner spaces (helping create strong coherence between Moseley Road partners) | | | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--------------------|---|---|----|--------|--------|--------------|--|--|--|-----------|--|---|---|----|--------|
| DEV11 | Scope of work for phase 1 not completed pushing up costs at Phase 2 | Construction PM | Price escalation (labour shortages and materials costs) - so buying less for money Cost Plan is high level - scope / issues/ design may change through subsequent RIBA stages Requirements from funders/partners for conservation standards | Scope of work at phase 2 reduces (and potentially outcomes/benefits) Additional funding may be needed Requirement to defer work | Financial | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Comprehensive/integrated approach to project design, planning and management to ensure a full view of cost, programme and risk/opportunities are considered and managed. > Proactive cost management working with specialist CPM and QS. Collaboration with Design Team to reduce risk of scope or design creep and to identify opportunities to maximise investment. > Early surveys and investigations to identify any likely building issues > Potential for early contractor input | | | No Target | | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium |
| DEV12 | Suitable space to deliver activity pilots | Public Programme Development Manager | Phase 1 capital works constraining space Balancing wellbeing programme and income generation with pilot activity Lack of available space offsite | Ambition / impact / benefit of pilots reduced Alternative consultation and engagement opportunities need to be found Increased work needed to deliver activity plans | Project Management | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Flexibility within plan > Forward planning of MRB programme and team > Connections with other spaces nearby > Creative design of pilots | | | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV13 | Failure to recruit and retain suitable volunteers | Public Programme Development Manager | Lack of public support Opportunities do not appeal to local audience Covid restrictions / impact making people less willing / able to volunteer | Inability to complete core tasks, limiting opportunities to deliver public benefit | Project Management | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Recruitment of project staff with confidence and capability in volunteer recruitment management (backfilling CIO role who already has shown skill in this area) > Upskilling of current CIO staff through training >Working with partners to design volunteering opportunities which are relevant to local community >High quality volunteer role descriptions with range of opportunities and flexibility >Experimenting with new methods of advertising and recruiting volunteers >supplement elements of volunteer roles with paid roles if necessary/possible | | | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV14 | Delays to or issues with delivering pilots | Public Programme Development Manager | Late procurement/recruitment design/production / overall programme takes longer higher costs than anticipated poor response to ideas / lack of engagement | shorter testing period lack of feedback from pilot to inform activity plan poor value for money | Project Management | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Start planning / recruitment/procurement process early - ensure project and activity team are on top of programme and monitor progress. Respond early to emerging issues/risks >recruit experienced and professional team to lead the work and with expertise to respond to issues proactively and effectively >Sufficient capacity built into team to deliver proposals - review if required >develop with local people and partners to ensure relevance and positioning to respond to local interests and need | | | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV15 | Breakdown of relationships with activity partners | Partnerships and Participation Manager | Relationships lost in transition of project staff Clash of vision/purpose personality clashes | Inability to deliver aspects of pilot programme, lack of connection to local communities | Stakeholder | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Genuine enthusiasm already exists between MRB and proposed partners. In some cases they have wanted to work together for a while. >Recruitment of project team with high quality experience in partnership working > Good communication between project team and current MRB staff > High-quality hand over between relationship holders >partnerships developed on shared vision and values - clarity up front about purpose and what partners hope to achieve from working together. Building trust and relationships >Planning to keep partners informed and engaged >explore alternative partners if absolutely necessary | | | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low |
| DEV16 | Failure to procure suitable consultants / suppliers / contractors rapidly, or of the right calibre (all workstreams) | BCC Client and Project Director | Slow processes / bad planning Lack of interest in opportunity Competitive market Issues raised as part of the process (e.g. challenge by a bidder as part of OJEU process) Lack of skills available (good contractors all busy) Contract price set too low | Lower quality team, lack of choice Requirement to readvertise - loss of time, cost Delays to starting planning / delivery of areas of work Poor performance | People | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early planning to ensure procurement processes are lined up and key people are prepared/ ready to support. >Good quality briefs, with thinking done up front (pre NLHF bid) about what needed from professionals and basis for assessing suitability (should also improve the quality of submissions). >And contract price proportionate to work required and benchmarked to ensure competitive. >Ensure compliance with procurement rules and regulations. >Ensure well planned and inclusive procurement process, with targeted advertising and promotion. >Use of partner networks to extend reach where appropriate. >Ensure assessment panel is of the correct calibre to identify and appoint high quality bidders - involving relevant partners and appropriate expertise. | | | | | 5 | 1 | 5 | Medium |
| DEV17 | Breakdown of relationship between BCC and CIO | Project Sponsors | Issues / problems arising Disagreements around goals / vision / outcomes, or resolving specific project decisions Conflicting motivations Poor performance Change in key personnel / personality clashes | Project culture is affected Inability to reach consensus / make decisions Delays Breakdown of project | Stakeholder | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Relationship has been building over 3 years and there is a strong level of trust and transparency, huge confidence in CIO as operator and mutual determination to deliver the vision. Thepartners have worked together to plan this project and acknowledge potential risks / contentious issues. >Deliberate/conscious focus on relationship building at all levels of the project - led from the top! >Key roles and responsibilities formalised in collaboration agreement. >Proactive management of issues and conflict >Support from wider coalition to manage challenges and relationships >Maintaining a culture of openness and honesty. Fostering a spirit of partnership and collaboration with a focus on outcomes. >Addressing contentious areas of work sensitively but directly - prioritising areas where there may be debate/disagreement. | | | No Target | | 5 | 1 | 5 | Medium |
| DEV18 | Failure to recruit new Project roles rapidly, or of the right calibre | Clients and Project Director | Role profiles not clear / too restrictive / too demanding Contract period too short to appeal / provide stability or pay pitched too low Promotion too limited or in the wrong places Lack of quality applicants available or lack of skills Delays within partner organisation to initiating / managing process | Lower quality candidates, lack of choice Requirement to readvertise - loss of time, cost Delays to starting planning / delivery of areas of work Poor performance | People | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Draft role profiles prepared and bench-marked against similar roles in BCC, CIO and the National Trust, with salaries that reflect the skills, knowledge and experience needed. >Early planning to make sure recruitment can begin as soon as possible with market relatively strong . >Clear role profiles and strong proposition to appeal to the right people. Also careful consideration of the length of post to increase appeal. >Ensure well planned and inclusive recruitment process, with targeted advertising and other promotion. Potential for recruitment events to encourage good applicants/applications (particularly local applicants) and break down barriers to applying. Use of partner networks to extend promotion. >Ensure interview panel is of the correct calibre to appoint high quality candidates - involving relevant partners. Maintain thorough performance leadership process once in post, to monitor delivery and take action to respond to any failure of performance as appropriate | | | No Target | | 5 | 1 | 5 | Medium |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------------------------------------|--|--|----------------|---|---|----|--------|--------|--------------|---|--|--|-----------|--|--|---|---|---|--------|
| DEV19 | Poor integration between project and operational staff and volunteers | Project Director / CIO Client | Time and resource pressures Tensions around level of pay Willingness to engage | Lack of coordination of activity Poor visitor experience Limited learning and capacity building Delays and barriers to project delivery low morale | People | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Conversations / planning underway to address risk and prepare for project >Leadership from CIO and Project Management Team to encourage and support good working relationships >targeted and careful recruitment of the new team; plus strong focus on induction, training and management for all staff and volunteers working on the project >Project and operational teams co-located including investment in co-working space at the Moseley School of Art >Conscious investment in team building, briefing and consultation sessions about the project, good communication throughout | | | No Target | | | 5 | 1 | 5 | Medium |
| DEV20 | Cost of restoration becomes prohibitive at Detailed Design stage - original costs estimates insufficient and budget is exceeded | Construction PM | Expectations / requirements around the level of restoration increase. Scope creep. Unforeseen issues uncovered by surveys etc. | Requirement to reduce scope/scale of plans. Loss of time and cost to revise designs. | Financial | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Design work at feasibility stage undertaken to a high standard, going beyond RIBA stage 1 to mitigate some elements of design and business risks; e.g. phasing of work, conservation approach, cost planning. A capital works risk register has also been developed to support contingency planning. >Clear design brief, including Conservation Approach created at Feasibility stage to inform the level /standard of restoration expected during design development. This will need continued coordination with Historic England in particular. >Procurement of experienced professionals (Construction PM, Designers, Cost consultants) - and careful management to ensure they work together to identify/resolve issues early. Proactive approach to risk management. >Prioritising surveys according to risk Heritage advice from / consultation with coalition partners (particularlry Historic England and National Trust) >Proactive consultation with decision makers (including HE and planners) >Design contingency included in cost plan to address likely increase | | | No Target | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV21 | Impact of coronavirus on partners | Project Manager | Resources limited or diverted to address impact of Covid19 / focus on recovery. Loss of some partners | Unable to achieve value / aspirations of working with specific partners Lose access to target audiences Additional time / resource to build new partnerships | Stakeholder | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Remain responsive to changing situation and flexible to working differently / with new partners >Identify / align work that may help partner recovery. | | | No Target | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | Low |
| DEV22 | Loss of key personnel | Project Sponsors | Career development, family/personal circumstances, retirement etc. | Loss of continuity, experience, knowlegde. | People | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Build and maintain a good project team spirit, with excellent communication and joint working between key BCC staff , CIO, coalition and external consultants. >Clear project documentation, reporting, records of project work and tracking information that can be easily understood by all the team and picked up by new personnel as required. >Develop and maintain well-functioning project steering group and project board, to maintain project momentum. >Partner commitments to providing support / formalising any essential personnel requirements in agreements etc. | | | No Target | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | Low |
| DEV23 | Lack of political or senior officer support within BCC for progressing with the Delivery Phase | Project Sponsors | Political change/elections Change in priorities / pressure on Council resources | Loss of funding Loss of support for project Loss of confidence across stakeholders | Political | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Coalition have engaged with BCC Leader and Cabinet members and key directorates throughout project development to date - support is high >Formalising relationships / commitments to the project within BCC. >Maintain engagement with and support from Leader and Cabinet members - particularly through support / influence from Coalition partners >Demonstrate public benefit of project to Balsall Heath and Birmingham. >Maintain local support. >Increase stakeholder support for project and potential investment. >Successful fundraising | | | No Target | | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV24 | Loss of / reduction to BCC capital funding | BCC | Political change/elections Change in priorities / pressure on Council resources | Insufficient funding available to deliver the project Loss of match funding Review of project delivery and outcomes | Financial | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Formalising relationships / commitments to the project within BCC. >Maintain engagement with and support from Leader and Cabinet members - particularly through support / influence from Coalition partners >Demonstrate public benefit of project to Balsall Heath and Birmingham. >Maintain local support. >Increase stakeholder support for project and potential investment. >Successful fundraising to match BCC investment >if necessary, rescope the project | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV25 | Resistance around integration of the library | Project Director | Public objections Lack of resource to implement change High / disruptive level of complexity or issues to resolve | Reduction in ambition and potential benefit Focus needed on resolving issues/stakeholder management | Stakeholder | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Continue to build support within Balsall Heath and BCC. >Early engagement with Library users and integration of their ideas into the design process. >Testing activity to understand what works, learn, and demonstrate potential. | | | No Target | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV26 | Decline in support from the local community and / or negative feedback from local people | CIO Client | Perceived departure from local priorities Issues around pilot work Poor / negative communication or PR Lack of engagement with range of local audiences New team members don't engage/engage badly | Disengagement by local people Loss of partners Bad publicity Drop in support for / users of MRB Loss of stakeholder support | Stakeholder | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Baths remain focused on serving local people and building their programme around local need. >Activity planning focused on amplifying this goal building on success to date, and involving local people in co-creation. >Recruitment and management of new team members (ideally including members of local community) will seek to ensure a good understanding of collaborative working and community engagement. >Increased capacity through the project to communicate what's happening and involve local people. >Relationships built through the project <i>and</i> coalition with local media - good communication planning to delivery great stories and content. >Give specific focus efforts on regaining community support | | | No Target | | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV27 | Information not being shared between client and consultants | Project Manager / Project Director | Poor communication / relationships. Lack of clarity around requirements | Lack of coordination Key requirements and information is missed | Communications | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Good project management practice and structure during the Development Phase will ensure good communication between the clients (BCC/ CIO) and the appointed project management team and any consultants employed (especially those involved in developing the capital building proposals to RIBA Stage 3) >clear understanding by team and consultants of roles and responsibilities >clear briefs and documentation for clarity on information available | | | No Target | | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|---|---|----|--------|--------|--------------|--|--|--|-----------|--|---|---|---|--------|
| DEV28 | Poor service delivery by procured consultants and contractors | Project Manager / Project Director | Poor quality consultants Breakdown in relationships Lack of (or unsuitable) performance measures Poor direction / briefing / management | Requirement to readvertise - loss of time, cost | Contractual | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Preparation of clear briefs prior to all procurement, including specifications, terms and conditions, performance measure, timescales, request for references, etc. >Expression of Interests will be requested for particularly skilled or challenging work, to draw out competent consultants before tendering/ quotation process takes place. > Once consultants etc. appointed ensure good client : contractor management and direction, including performance management. >Escalate any serious concerns to BCC procurement team and/or Sponsors / Clients, plus relationship manager for consultant >Break clauses in contracts | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV29 | Breakdown of coalition partnership | Project Sponsors | Lack of necessary leadership Organisational priorities change Loss of key people | Loss of benefits of collaboration (detailed separately) Loss of expertise to the project | Stakeholder | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Commitments set out in Coalition MOU >Key representatives maintain / build advocacy and organisational support within their respective organisations. >Partnership building sessions held throughout the project >Individuals building a culture of support and collaboration >Responsiveness to issues / conflict / challenge as well as opportunities | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV30 | Additional resource gets diverted into dealing with operational / building issues | CIO Client | Ongoing issues with building / plant taking up lots of staff/vol time Imperative to keep swimming going | CIO project reps/leads distracted from project and/or extra pressure to do both CIO input not as available as needed. Potential delays / things missed. Increased pressure on wider team | Project Management | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Good working relationships between Project Management Team and CIO to identify and manage key 'pinch points'. >Monitor situation and plan accordingly >Pull in support from wider team and partners to alleviate pressure >Agree priorities for CIO input and deadlines | | | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEV31 | Disagreement amongst partners about priorities / proposals / alterations to the building | Project Sponsors | Different partner perspectives / expectations / requirements Lack of clarity around plans and decisions | Need for compromise Relationships affected Delays Withdrawal of partner support | Stakeholder | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Development of propopsals has been done collaboratively and openly. Decisions have been documented and any areas for further discussion identified. >Proposals include philosophy of approach to building adaptation and conservation as a priority >Ongoing collaborative development and consultation, in partcular working with Historic England colleagues around costs/balance of conservation and reuse. | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV32 | Managing transition from NT to BCC (and CIO) | NT/BCC/CIO | Covid necessitated change in direction - also relatively short space of time to address change. Getting the right BCC resources in place and teams ready to deliver Capacity within all three organisations to plan and manage handover | Readiness of BCC (and CIO) for Development Phase Delays to project start up (inc procurement etc) Lack of time to deliver / quality of delivery | Project Management | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >BCC have significant experience in managing multi-million pound capital projects and have longstanding experience of managing the Baths prior to this project. Also lots of good work in place to set the project up for success already. >Transition plan in place between NT and BCC to boost capacity in short term to support transition > Strong support within BCC (priority project) to deliver the project and key stakeholders working to secure capacity and structure to support project. >Project planning and preparation ongoing during NLHF decision making period to ensure groundwork in place. > Phase 1 works (funded by Levelling Up) will mean that a significant part of the transition will have happened / be underway prior to NLHF development phase. | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEV33 | Audience 'clash' within pilot spaces | Public Programme Development Manager | Bringing together several audience groups within one space | Poorer experience Benefit from consultation/engagement reduced Reputational damage | Stakeholder | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Proactive planning and management of programme and invigilation > Staff and volunteer training around managing different audiences > Design of spaces enables engagement with different groups | | | No Target | | 2 | 2 | 4 | Low |
| DEV34 | Planning permission not secured | Construction PM | Poor application Objections from stakeholders Unacceptable proposals / level of impact | Time and cost to resolve issues Reputational damage Loss of confidence in and support for the project | Legal | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Project has already engaged early with the planning team within BCC and the Conservation Officer and Historic England are involved in the development of plans; this will be ongoing. >Project has also been shaped by local people and there has been ongoing consultation - again this will continue to build support for formal plans. >High standard of planning application. >Reapply asap | | | No Target | | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low |
| DEV35 | Failure to connect MRB with wider Balsall Heath redevelopment | Project Director | Lack of engagement Lack of coordination with other initiatives Lack of resource | Disjointed design Loss of impact and benefit Loss of support / missed opportunities for funding, influence, impact | Other | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Engagement embeded in the coalition and project. >Clear areas where initiatives can work together (e.g. public realm improvements) >Oversight from Steering Group | | | No Target | | 2 | 1 | 2 | Low |

MRB Diving In Risk Log - DELIVERY PHASE

| Need help with Risks & Issues? Hover your mouse over this cell. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|--|--|-------|--------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------|---------------------------|--------|------------|-------|--------|
| ----- Current risk rating ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residual (Target) Risk Rating | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk ID | Description | Owner | Cause | Impact | Category | Overall Impact Score (dropdown score 1 = Low Impact) | Overall Likelihood Score (dropdown score 1 = Unlikely) | Score | Rating | Risk Response (actions) | Manageability of the Risk | > | Status | Change since last report? | Impact | Likelihood | Score | Rating |
| DEL1 | Procurement of construction works returns price in excess of budget | Project Director / Construction PM | Market inflation Contractor availability or lack of competition in the market Increased scope and/or specification during design process Level of risk within specification Original budget was insufficient Brexit - increasing costs and availability of materials, suppliers, etc | Requirement to reduce scope or compromise specification (value engineering) Potential loss of benefit Inability to bring parts of building into full use Failure to secure approvals to proceed Requirement to retender (time and money) | Financial | 5 | 4 | 20 | Major | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Revise, refine and consolidate capital costs during the preparation of the Stage 2 bid, whilst other specialist consultants / surveys will have informed cost estimates such as services and specialist conservation, resulting in a high level of confidence in cost estimates. >scrutiny and expertise from coalition partners around both the Capital and Activity Plan costs. >value engineering may be required, seeking opportunities that do not impact on outcomes - to be carefully coordinated with business planning work > Contingency and inflation have been built into the project costs. >Potential to seek through further external fund raising. A review of BCC capital contribution may be possible subject to business case. | | | 4 | 4 | 16 | High |
| DEL1.5 | Procurement of construction works returns price by more than 40% or over a value of £500k of agreed budget,requiring a second BCC Cabinet paper, extending procurement timeline of 28 to 35 weeks minimum. | Project Board/Project Director | Market inflation Contractor availability or lack of competition in the market Increased scope and/or specification during design process Level of risk within specification Original budget was insufficient Brexit - increasing costs and availability of materials, suppliers, etc | Requirement to reduce scope or compromise specification (value engineering). Potential loss of benefit Inability to bring parts of building into full use Failure to secure approvals to proceed Requirement to retender (time and money) which may result in underspend of capital LUF funding despite 12 month extension. Carries reputational risk for BCC and the | Financial | 5 | 4 | 20 | Major | | | > QS to ensure detailed and profiled tender specification documents that actively reflect the market at the time the ITT's are issued. >twin track BCC procurement process where possible within the local authority constitution with BCC Directorial signoff to reduce the timeline where permissible.>scrutiny and expertise from coalition partners around both the Capital and Activity Plan costs. >value engineering may be required, seeking opportunities that do not impact on outcomes - to be carefully coordinated with business planning work > Contingency and inflation have been built into the project costs. >Potential to seek through further external fund raising. A review of BCC capital contribution may be possible subject to business case. | | | | | | |
| DEL2 | NLHF (stage 2) funding not obtained for Delivery Phase or other match funding fails | Project Director | Competition for funding Readiness of project or change to potential outcomes/benefits Availability of funding and funder priorities. Gap is too high or increases. Quality of application | Shortfall on project cost or need to curtail project which may impact on benefits/outcomes. Delays to rescoping the project resulting in potential loss/underspend of LUF funding despite 12 month funding extension Less flexibility to rephase work (as phase 1 will be complete) Loss of momentum Increased costs to deliver (due to delays) | Financial | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | | >Development of the Diving In project is a major priority for BCC and the CIO - significant time, energy and resource will be invested in the Development Phase to produce the strongest project possible and provide assurance around delivery of outcomes. >Specialist fundraising (and other) support will be engaged during the Development and Delivery Phases to raise funding and integrate fundraising within the business planning process >If NLHF funding was not secured, it is highly likely that the Delivery Phase would be delayed significantly until further external match-funding could be secured (or other new Council resources were forthcoming) or to rescope the project within available resource. > Some urgent works being completed in Phase 1, mitigating some risks to the building >Should a source of significant match funding secured during the Development Phase not materialise for some reason, BCC would explore alternative options, working with Fundraising Consultants to explore options | No Target | | 5 | 3 | 15 | High |
| DEL3 | Impact of material and labour shortages on costs | Construction PM | Brexit, UK/European/Global labour market Strong construction market (big projects buying-up supplies) | Cost increase Programme extension Risk to availability of good contractors | Competitive | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Monitor situation > Adjust/explore procurement strategy to mitigate issues > Build in sufficient contingency and inflation into costs. > Potential need to value engineer scheme as required > Look at phasing opportunities to avoid peaks in issues | No Target | | 4 | 4 | 16 | High |
| DEL4 | Inflation rate has increased / is increasing significantly | Construction PM | Economic climate Huge fluctuation in the market that is difficult to predict | Affordability of capital works / scope of project | Financial | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | Risk is out of our control but we can manage the impact > Inflation built into project costs (advice sought) > Monitor situation with support from QS > Review affordability and scope - VE may be required > Explore opportunities around procurement (e.g. early purchase of materials) | No Target | | 4 | 4 | 16 | High |
| DEL5 | Building works overrun, leaving very little time (currently just 1 year) for get in and programmes to mature | Construction PM | Issues encountered on site Underestimation of programme Level of change to works / specification | Increased cost of keeping the project going Shorter period of project support in initial handover and operational phase Difficulty achieving business plan targets Pressure on CIO team and business Less time to train staff and volunteers | Financial | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Detailed planning/modelling of construction strategy, programming and phasing of works to minimise disruption to the operation >Business continuity and risk planning to address potential delays; e.g. recruiting new staff, increasing off site >Book space off site to run training etc to enable some elements of operational readiness to continue in parallel >Robust communication throughout to ameliorate period of uncertainty and help manage changes to programme | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |
| DEL6 | With swimming pool potentially out of action for a while, there is little time to create an holistic feeling programme/proposition | Activity leads | Construction work will require closure of swimming for a period to undertake servicing/ other works | Loss of income and business Disjointed programme during delivery phase Additional work for staff to manage operation whilst keeping business / building open | Service | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Phasing of capital work is looking at how to keep parts of the building open throughout the construction phase. Potential benefit of reinstating swimming in the Gala Pool, is minimising the closure as enabling work can be done whilst Pool 2 open. >Maintaining support through an off site programme >Digital engagement providing online presence and ways to keep in touch with people >Closer working with the library and other partners to maintain level of programme delivery in partnership with their teams and through their spaces | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------|---|---|----|--------|--------|--------------|--|-----------|--|---|---|----|--------|
| DEL7 | A decline in the economy or change to local demand or economic environment impacts the business plan | Project Sponsors | Longevity of project will see the local / national / global economy and context change over the course of the project Ongoing development of Birmingham and Balsall Heath - potential for new businesses or change in peoples' interests and habits | Drop in support and visitors <i>OR</i> potentially greater demand for local leisure, wellbeing and skills-based provision Greater competition amongst local businesses Difficulty achieving business plan targets (or potential over-demand putting pressure on the team) Stretched resources - lack of capacity for partnership or engagement. <i>OR</i> potential for even greater level of collaboration | Economic | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > this presents risks and opportunities for MRB: the nature of the business and strong local support may increase demand for the facilities at the Baths and Library (in particular where smaller / similar provision disappears) >Responsiveness to changing context will be crucial - a role for BCC Senior Officers/Councillors and CIO Trustees, plus wider national and international support from Coalition partners. >Maintaining political support for the Baths and ongoing integration of the Baths/Balsall Heath in BCC strategic planning (like the current review of Birmingham's Big City Plan which will incorporate Balsall Heath as a priority area) >Review viability of uses as necessary, and adjust as appropriate in liaison with HLF project monitor. | No Target | | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium |
| DEL8 | Disruption to operation from construction works; e.g. noise, dust, vibrations | Construction PM / CIO | Noise, dust, vibrations etc from construction | Visitor experience compromised Potential closures depending on extent loss of customers | Project Management | 3 | 5 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early and consistent coordination between CPM/ contractor team and Operation to plan works happening alongside operational activity. >Mitigation measures where possible (e.g. sealing work areas, noise dampening etc) >Proactive comms with audiences (potentially seeking engagement opportunities to talk about works) | | | 3 | 4 | 12 | Medium |
| DEL9 | Operation affected by shutdowns/ testing etc required by construction team | Construction PM | Technical / H&S requirements for installations, commissioning and testing in conflict with day to day operational needs / H&S | Periods of closure, potentially short notice | Project Management | 3 | 5 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early and consistent coordination between CPM/ contractor team and Operation to plan works happening alongside operational activity. >Scheduling of works - where possible - during quieter times/overnight etc >Proactive comms with audiences (potentially seeking engagement opportunities to talk about works) | | | 3 | 4 | 12 | Medium |
| DEL10 | As construction proceeds, <i>major</i> unexpected building issues and associated additional costs arise | Construction PM | Hidden issues that only come to light during opening-up work or restoration works Delays | Cost to address issues Use of contingency Potential need to value engineer (depending on level of cost) - possible impact on outcomes or compromises to scope/quality | Project Management | 4 | 4 | 16 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Detailed design investigations/surveys should help minimise unexpected finds (though won't eliminate). Balance of level of risk with potential intrusive / destructive investigations. >Use of technology / innovation to help with investigations (e.g. thermal imaging) >Build an appropriate amount into of contingency into the Delivery phase budget. >proactive approach to managing budget and risk across whole delivery team >Discuss and where possible, resolve within Project Steering Group, escalating to Project Board as necessary. Where necessary, liaise with NLHF / other funders project monitor to agree and sign off way forward | No Target | | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium |
| DEL11 | Building, plant and / or boiler failure jeopardises operation | Project Sponsors | Plant is beyond economic lifespan. Recurrent issues which are difficult to address Difficult to find a solution without potentially abortive costs (due to long term changes to building) | Long term closure of swimming or CIO Loss of visitors and income Impact on project momentum and potential future viability Momentum and support lost Project slows/stops | Physical | 3 | 4 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Responsive maintenance and repair > Review option to bring forward reservicing works in delivery phase > Contingency set aside by BCC to address boiler / plant failure > Some urgent works to building addressed in Phase 1 > Subject to timing, length of closure may be reduced due to phase 2 works being programmed | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |
| DEL12 | Failure to reach agreement around formal tenure of the building | Project Sponsors | Assignment of liabilities and associated implications and risks for respective partners Breakdown in communicationsand/or collaborative working | Uncertain future for building, plans and partners Impact on partnership | Legal | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early conversations have already been happening, with partners understanding the issues/areas for discussion and agreement to tackle these collaboratively. This will be an area of priority for governance work during the development phase in order to get the fundamentla principles and agreements in place. >open, collaborative approach >detailed exploration of options, pros and cons, with time to manage/mitigate risks >Support from Coalition partners | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEL13 | Insufficient parking to accommodate increased visitors, particularly for specific uses (e.g. wedding and events) | Project Sponsors | Constraints of urban environment and space available Potential for 'residents only' parking zones | Low take up of events Low visitor numbers | Physical | 3 | 4 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >retain focus of core offer on local people and repeat visits (gala pool swimming) >Development of area behind the Baths to provide (limited) parking for event attendees, logistical/production support for activity and for disabled users >Explore opportunity around the train station in Balsall Heath - BCC continue to pursue - and transport network >Project team to work with other BCC teams around sustainable transport solutions | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |
| DEL14 | Capacity of CIO to run whole building / full offer | CIO | Lack of internal capacity and capability to take on bigger offer Unsuitable structure / governance | Difficulty achieving business plan targets Pressure on CIO team and business Impact on service provision for local people | Other | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Major project focus and priority is building capacity and resilience within the CIO; developing the offer and roles; diversifying income; training and development for the team; governance development; exploring tenure options; and providing partner and coalition support for the Baths. >Programme of governance development work focused on capacity and capability building >some groundwork being done via NLCF project to help support income diversification >Determination and focus from the CIO towards this goal and full engagement with the Diving In project | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEL15 | Building works overrun affecting swimming, causing longer period of closure | Project Sponsors | Issues encountered on site or in reinstating pool Underestimation of programme Level of change to works / specification | Loss of income and business / customers Additional operating overhead and cost of keeping project running | Financial | 3 | 4 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >May depend on period of closure, but CIO have good management plans/procedures in place for closure. Key focus will be on getting works completed and engaging with audiences - trailing 'exciting new offer coming soon' message. >Strong comms plan / action to keep people interested / engaged and updated. >Detailed planning/modelling of construction strategy, programming and phasing of works to minimise disruption to the operation >Business continuity and risk planning to address potential delays; e.g. recruiting new staff, increasing off site >Phasing of capital work is looking at how to keep parts of the building open throughout the construction phase. Potential benefit of reinstating swimming in the Gala Pool, is minimising the closure as enabling work can be done whilst Pool 2 open. >Maintaining support through an off site programme >Digital engagement providing online presence and ways to keep in touch with people >Closer working with the library and other partners to maintain level of programme delivery in partnership with their teams and through their spaces | No Target | | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|---|----|--------|--------|--------------|--|-----------|--|---|---|---|--------|
| DEL16 | Legal negotiations delay programme (leases, licenses, building contract, etc) | Project Director / Manager | Disagreement between parties Negotiations not started early enough Complexity of issues / agreements Staff / consultant capacity | Project delays (e.g. starting construction) Associated cost of delay Negative impact on relationships | Legal | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early negotiations >Use of standard precedents where possible (e.g. building contracts that are familiar to the contractor) and setting out expectations in the tender process for transparency >Early agreement about principles and expectations re contracts/leases/licenses - conversations have been underway from feasibility stage >Review of programme to look at opportunities to mitigate delay, make up lost time | | | 3 | 2 | 6 | Medium |
| DEL17 | Insufficient (skilled) swim staff / volunteers for enhanced swim programme | CIO | Lack of available expertise Competition from other pools (including pay) | Limitations to swim programme Vulnerability to staff / volunteer absense | People | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Early planning of staff and volunteer requirement >Early and targeted recruitment, induction and training | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEL18 | Full VAT recovery is not achieved | Finance lead | Elements of work or activity ineligible for VAT recovery | Additional project cost | Financial | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >VAT recovery should be achievable with BCC as project lead / client for the capital works BUT needs to be confirmed - to be kept as a priority >Careful consideration will be given to tenure and governance arrangements with the CIO to avoid VAT issues for the organisation. | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| DEL19 | Outcomes (particularly in relation to activity) may only be visible in the long term | Project Sponsors | Impact of delivery phase is too hard to evidence or is misunderstood Focus on construction and project delivery Normal lag in benefit realisation happening after project delivery | Evidencing impact for stakeholders and funders will take longer Nervousness from stakeholders, funders etc about benefit of investment | Other | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Project evaluation should evidence how change is happening throughout the project and any direct benefits from project delivery (e.g. construction apprentices, public engagement and profile, volunteering, heritage impact, links to wider Balsall Heath work etc) >Ongoing public value analysis to track potential benefits of business plan as this becomes more detailed and robust. >Tracking impact of digital engagement | No Target | | 2 | 2 | 4 | Low |
| DEL20 | Failure to secure (sufficient or quality) delivery partners or subtenants to support the public offer; e.g. café operator, fitness instructors. | CIO | Lack of early engagement Availability of suitable local businesses or partners Level of risk for small businesses / organisations | Delay to getting full offer up and running - opportunity cost Impact on business plan targets | Financial | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >continuing a consultative approach (as per early stages of the project), engaging with local businesses and stakeholders about working together. >exploring models for delivering uses and potential people to work with through activity testing and business plan development >Capital works allow for reasonable level of fit out to reduce financial outlay expected from tenants/small businesses >early planning and promotion of opportunities, working with specialist agents as required >build on profile of the project to increase appeal | No Target | | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low |
| DEL21 | Poor contractor performance | Construction PM | Lack of skills/experience on complex heritage projects Bad site / project / commercial management by the contractor issues with drawings and specifications Lack of collaboration | Delays to works Poor workmanship Excessive focus on contract | Project Management | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >robust procurement materials and process, careful assessment and investment in setting up and managing contractor relationships. Consideration of procurement strategy / type of contract that suits the project approach and team culture. >references from other clients >'vetting' of key members of the team to ensure good fit, expertise and approach >investment of time and focus on technical design stage to ensure specifications and tender information is robust >performance indicators for contract management (potentially to include collaboration) >review opportunities to terminate contract | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| DEL22 | Breakdown of relationship between BCC and CIO | Project Sponsors | Issues / problems arising Disagreements around goals / vision / outcomes, or resolving specific project decisions Conflicting motivations Poor performance Change in key personnel / personality clashes | Project culture is affected Inability to reach consensus / make decisions Delays Breakdown of project | Stakeholder | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Relationship has been building over 3 years and there is a strong level of trust and transparency, huge confidence in CIO as operator and mutual determination to deliver the vision. Thepartners have worked together to plan this project and acknowledge potential risks / contentious issues. The partnership is likely to mature over the course of the project. >Deliberate/conscious focus on relationship building at all levels of the project - led from the top! >Key roles and responsibilities formalised in collaboration agreement. >Proactive management of issues and conflict >Support from wider coalition to manage challanges and relationships >Maintaining a culture of openness and honesty. Fostering a spirit of partnership and collaboration with a focus on outcomes. >Addressing contentious areas of work sensitively but directly - prioritising areas where there may be debate/disagreement. | No Target | | 5 | 1 | 5 | Medium |
| DEL23 | Loss of key personnel | Project Sponsors | Career development, family/personal circumstances, retirement etc. | Loss of continuity, experience, knowlegde. | People | 3 | 3 | 9 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Build and maintain a good project team spirit, with excellent communication and joint working between key BCC staff , CIO, coalition and external consultants. >Clear project documentation, reporting, records of project work and tracking information that can be easily understood by all the team and picked up by new personnel as required. >Develop and maintain well-functioning project steering group and project board, to maintain project momentum. >Partner commitments to providing support / formalising any essential personnel requirements in agreements etc | No Target | | 2 | 2 | 4 | Low |
| DEL24 | Loss of interest from local community, partners, operational staff and volunteers and other stakeholders | Project Director / Activity leads | Length of project development, leading to loss of momentum Lack of 'buy in' to plans - feeling that proposals haven't taken on board local need/interest or involved local perspectives. | Drop in support Negative word of mouth and PR Lack of engagement in activity Drop in visitor numbers | Stakeholder | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Build on the additional momentum and the networks developed during the Development Phase to ensure good quality engagement and involvement throughout the Delivery Phase. > Develop high quality Activity Plan (in the Development Phase) to give focus and ensure that this provides a varied programme of activities and engagement that will attract a good level of participation from existing and new audiences, including volunteers. >As Activity Plan is rolled out, review regularly and adjust programme as necessary. >Develop detailed Communications Plan prior to Delivery Phase initiation and review regularly throughout > Manage pace of communication and consultation plus expectations around timeframes > Seek local advocates/ambassadors to create dialogue between audiences and the project >Focus efforts on rebuilding support | No Target | | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low |
| DEL25 | Damage to the Listed Building as a result of works | Construction PM | Condition of building Poor workmanship / not following method statements Poor design / planning | Loss of fabric Intervention by Conservation Officer or HE Additional cost | Project Management | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low | Reduce | Satisfactory | >Ensure quality of design, specification, RAMS >Procurement of suitably experienced contractor >Insurance of works in place | No Target | | 3 | 1 | 3 | Low |

MRB Diving In Risk Log - POST COMPLETION

| Risk ID | Description | Owner | Cause | Impact | Category | Overall Impact Score (dropdown score 1 = Low Impact) | Overall Likelihood Score (dropdown score 1 = Unlikely) | Score | Rating | Risk Response (actions) | Manageability of the Risk | Summary of Management Action Plan | Risk Closed | Closed date | Status | Change since last report? | Impact | Likelihood | Score | Rating |
|---------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------|---|---|-------|--------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------|------------|-------|--------|
| BAU1 | Slow growth of business | Project Sponsors / CIO lead | Economic decline Change in local demand / increase in competition Operational readiness | Slower / unable to reach sustainable state - lower profit / financial surplus may necessitate subsidy if available Supporting operational requirements (people, building maintenance etc) becomes more difficult, potentially prohibitive | Financial | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > New components of the business will be tested throughout the development and delivery phases, with some uses (e.g. mini cafe) being established following Phase 1 investment. > Building design will allow for a level of flexibility so that operation can be resilient to changes in market / demand (learning from Ally Pally) as well as focusing design on priority outcomes and business requirements. > Delivery of activity and business plan will be closely monitoring so that the team are responsive to change and demand. > Project will continue to develop activity <i>with</i> the community to ensure they feel ownership and involvement in the project and it remains relevant. Responsiveness to changing climate; activity will be responsive to community need. > Development of a robust, multi-pronged business case with some capacity for adaptation / back up; e.g. mixture of operating models (in-house, out-sourced, profit-share, commission etc) as well as ongoing fundraising and public sector commissioning opportunities. > Ongoing support from partners - may need negotiation where additional subsidy required | | | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| BAU2 | Failure to meet benefit targets set for the project | Project Sponsors | Optimism bias in setting targets Slow growth Lack of demand Systems not in place to ensure benefits delivered (e.g. local recruitment / procurement) | Loss of benefit Loss of confidence in this and other projects Inability to secure future funding Project funders unhappy / withdraw support | Other | 5 | 3 | 15 | High | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Benefit scoping done with experienced consultants with provision for monitoring progress throughout project > Active learning and evaluation built into commission to Evaluator to capture issues and learn as we go > Benefits/outcomes driving delivery - Systems put in place to ensure that benefits are delivered locally, nationally, internationally > Phased approach should allow us to test/check benefit delivery whilst project in progress and adjust where necessary > Community-led approach should help ensure high level of public benefit > Economic and public benefit also part of BCC's procurement and other policies | | | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| BAU3 | Difficulties integrating the Baths and Library operations effectively | Project Sponsors | Competing priorities Staff not working closely together Lack of joined-up planning | Visitor experience compromised Failure to take advantage of opportunities to share resource / maximise opportunities Loss of revenue | Stakeholder | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Strong enthusiasm from the Baths and Library teams for working together and already happening at an operational level. > Ways of working embedded early in the project and cultivated/tested through the development phase > Governance and market research work to explore potential operating models, with input from partners and funders around areas of good practice > Physical connection of building (also quite early in the project) will enable teams to test and develop operational management. | | | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| BAU4 | Maintenance liability greater than anticipated | General Manager | Any residual works (not completed during project) make running costs high Wear and tear on building from building in full use underestimated | Profit/financial surplus lower than anticipated Longer period needed to become sustainable Greater call on contractors | Financial | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Management and Maintenance plan in place (plus quinquennial surveys) will help plan how ongoing needs of building and business are met. These will be developed with specialist consultants plus access to benchmarking data from partners like NT and HE plus Historic Pools network. > Sensitivity analysis to be built into business modelling | | | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| BAU5 | Lack of support from local community | Chair/CEO of CIO | Change happening too slowly or goes too far. Not enough change / benefit for local people. Perceived gentrification Project loses touch with local interests/needs | Disconnect between Baths/Library and core purpose Local people don't use the facilities Business suffers | Stakeholder | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Project will continue to develop activity with the community to ensure they feel ownership and involvement in the project and it remains relevant. Responsiveness to changing climate; activity will be responsive to community need. > Processes (e.g. procurement, recruitment etc) will ensure that development is led and benefit it targeted locally | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |
| BAU6 | Capability of operational team | Chair/CEO of CIO | Failure to recruit/train suitable and sufficient staff to operate the new business Change in business greater than anticipated - people not ready | Pressure on staff and volunteers Poor visitor experience Building / operation not looked after properly | People | 4 | 3 | 12 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Succession planning; governance work focusing on skills needs/gaps for the CIO. > Development of team during the course of the project. > Targeted and timely recruitment in response to a carefully developed business plan. > Early planning and sound HR policies for support and recruitment. > Mentoring and support from partners to develop team. | | | No Target | | 4 | 2 | 8 | Medium |
| BAU7 | Breakdown or withdrawal of partnership between BCC and CIO | Project Sponsors | Insurmountable differences / differing priorities Change of key people / loss of key relationships | Poor leadership Operation unable to function effectively Unable to deliver business plan | Stakeholder | 5 | 2 | 10 | Medium | Reduce | Satisfactory | > Key roles and responsibilities formalised in collaboration agreement and subsequent legal agreements (leases, partnership etc). Effective escalation and arbitration processes. > Proactive management of issues and conflict grounded in longstanding relationship and positive partnership development throughout the project. > Back up plan in case partners unable to continue or to enable operation to continue functioning | | | No Target | | 4 | 1 | 4 | Low |

[illegible]

MRB Diving In: CAPITAL RISK REGISTER

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|----------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1.00 | Site | The site comprises Moseley Road Baths with potential for works within Balsall Heath Library | | | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1.01 | Site | Current service distribution routes are not recorded. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Survey and investigation to be undertaken within MRB and Library the building. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs | BS Engineers | Stage 0/ 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.02 | Site | It is proposed that the land to the rear of MRB owned by BCC be used for site compound. This has yet to be fully agreed BCC. Access roads to the proposed site compound offers restricted access for deliveries. Ownership and rights of access along this road are to be confirmed. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Confirmation with BCC concerning usage of land. Highways Authority confirm rights of access along road. Restricted access factored into design and clearly communicated to tendering contractors. | preliminaries costs in OOC based on this space being available | Client | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ 30,000.00 | £ 6,000.00 | |
| 1.03 | Site | Ground Conditions - bearing capacity and depth of proposed foundations for any extension. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations note - for some parts this may only be feasible after demolition of existing buildings. Ground investigations complete. Bearing capacities as expected. | normal foundations (strip footings) have been allowed for in OOC | Stru Eng. | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ 30,000.00 | £ 3,000.00 | |
| 1.04 | Site | Deleterious materials within the ground, and services. | L | M | M | 30.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations note - for some parts this may only be feasible after demolition of existing buildings. To include materials identified within the structure. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Stru Eng. | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.05 | Site | Below ground services. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations note - for some parts this may only be feasible after demolition of existing buildings. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Stru Eng. / Serv Eng. | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.06 | Site | Unrecorded below ground cellars and ducts. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations note - for some parts this may only be feasible after demolition of existing buildings. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Stru Eng. | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.07 | Site | Drainage capacities, condition and invert. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Carry out surveys and investigations to determine the existing drainage locations, depth, sizes, capacities and discharge points. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Stru Eng. / Serv Eng. | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.08 | Site | Conditions of existing structure unknown, specifically conditions of reinforcement to balcony and wrought iron trusses to roof.. | L | M | M | 30.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations. Intrusive surveys with regards to the Gala pool balcony and roof have been undertaken. Surveys to other areas potentially required. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Stru Eng. | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ 10,000.00 | £ 3,000.00 | |
| 1.09 | Site | Asbestos. | L | M | M | 50.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations and asbestos register to be issued. Management surveys are available and costs are currently based upon this information. Risk associated with additional asbestos not currently identified. Full intrusive surveys have not been completed. Reduced risk of further asbestos being identified. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. Allowance for removal included in OOC (£50K) - also see items 8.01 and 15.10 below | PM | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.10 | Site | Exposure of unforeseen structural issues during works. | M | M | M | 75.00% | Carry out investigations to minimise areas of uncertain structures. | allowance for additional structural works has been allowed in OOC. There is also a 5% design developmentn risk and 15% contingency allowance | Stru Eng. | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 37,500.00 | |
| 1.11 | Site | Extent of structural variations to MRB due to development of building. | L | L | L | 10.00% | To be clarified during design development stage. | part of 5%design delopment and 15% contingency risk allowances | PM / Client | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.12 | Site | Extent of structural refurbishment to MRB and Library to be included with structural variations within this building. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Develop strategy with Client. | allowance for additional structural works has been allowed in OOC. There is also a 5% design developmentn risk and 15% contingency allowance | PM / Client | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.14 | Site | Number and size of proposed service penetrations. | L | L | L | 10.00% | To be considered within the advanced phases of the project. | forms part of bwic services allowance within OOC | Ser Eng. | Stage 2/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.15 | Site | Proposed fire strategy and increased compartment size not acceptable to approving authorities. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Early discussions with the Building Regulations / Approved inspector and Fire engineer. Risk mitigated to be based upon current advice and strategy. | no specific allowance in OOC for fire officer requirements (part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances?) | Archi/Bui Cont. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|--------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1.16 | Site | Confirmation that area being considered has not previously flooded. | L | L | L | 5.00% | Early discussions with BCC and Severn Trent Water. Drainage capacity to be considered. | No indication from BCC that flooding has been a problem in the past. No specific allowance included in OOC | Stru Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.20 | Site | Phased delivery of the project has potential to hinder delivery business operation and contractors works programme | L | M | L | 40.00% | Construction programme linked with business case, appropriate sequence of working to be agreed with client prior to tender | | PM/Client/Design Team | Stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 1.21 | Site | Building condition such that interim repairs may be required prior to the project works commencing. | L | M | L | 30.00% | Utilise building condition survey to develop interim programme of works and factor these within cost plan/ | allowance included by JD in Total Project Costs | Arch/PM/Cost M | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 122 | Site | Historic England undertake repairs to the caretakers flat prior to capital works. | L | L | L | 75.00% | Make provision within the cost plan for the repair works and review at subsequent stage. Likely to have a positive impact on costs. | ANG Artelia Group have included their own estimate of cost in the OOC, not the cost stated in the contingency cost column | Arch/PM/Cost M | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 123 | Site | Histroic England undertake repairs to flat roofs and rooflights | L | L | L | 30.00% | Make provision within the cost plan for the repair works and review at subsequent stage. Likely to have a positive impact on costs. | ANG Artelia Group have included their own estimate of cost in the OOC, not the cost stated in the contingency cost column | Arch/PM/Cost M | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 124 | Site | Structural movement has been identified by Mann Williams and Historic England are proposing to carry out these repairs within the next three years. The grant funding for these works has yet to be agreed. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Make provision within the cost plan for the repair works and review at subsequent stage. Likely to have a positive impact on costs. | ANG Artelia Group have included their own estimate of cost in the OOC, not the cost stated in the contingency cost column | Arch/PM | Stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £0 | £ - | |
| 125 | Site | Adaptations for accessibility conflict with significance of listed building | L | M | L | 25.00% | Brief sympathetic to approved inspector | new entrance ramp has been allowed for in the OOC | Arch/Client | Stage 1 - 2 | Feb-21 | | £ - | |
| 2.00 | Briefing | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | | - |
| 2.01 | Briefing | Procurement | M | L | M | 40.00% | A schedule of matters requested but not fully covered is being prepared for review. Provision to be made in the cost plan however the amount allowed may not be sufficient. | | Client/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 20,000.00 | |
| 2.02 | Briefing | Operational model between CIO and BCC Library services to be agreed. | M | L | M | 30.00% | Upon decision of which Option to progress, further consultation to be held with BCC | Steering Group agreement that greater degree of library remodelling will need to be funded separately. | Client/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 3.00 | Stat Consent | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3.01 | Stat Consent | The building is Grade II* listed and therefore an application for listed building consent will be required to undertake the work. | M | L | M | 40.00% | Early consultation with HE & Local Authorities conservation officer. Appointment of conservation specialist design team. | Donald Insalls have sought input from HE and Conservation Officer and cost plan includes allowance for level of conservation agreed. | Arch | Stage 0 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 3.02 | Stat Consent | The listed status will influence material choice, design and cost. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Early consultation to allow agreed conservation philosophy, design development and informing the cost plan. Conditions discharge. | OOO based on using suitable materials | Arch | Stage 1/2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 3.03 | Stat Consent | Part L Compliance, Clients environmental standards. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Requirement to be established through consultation and strategy to be established. Improvements to be limited to insulation of the roof void only following discussion with Building Services engineer. Strategy of applying L2B agreed with Building Control. | allowance for insulation to pitched roofs and new and existing flat roofs included in OOC. | Serv Eng. / Arch | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 3.04 | Stat Consent | BREEAM requirements of Local Authority during planning process. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Requirements to be determined through early consultation. Strategy of compliance to be developed. Agreed in principle with LPA | BREEAM compliance has not been allowed for in the OOC | Serv Eng. / Arch | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ 214,000.00 | £ 21,400.00 | |
| 3.05 | Stat Consent | The listed status is likely to constrain the external distribution of services. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Limitation of equipment requiring flues. Distribute ductwork within roof voids. | OOO includes an allowance for bwic services installations. New services allowed based on m2 budget cost provided by Max Fordham | Serv Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 3.06 | Stat Consent | Building Regulation Approval. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Early appointment of BC consultant | BC consultant included in allowance for professional fees within Total Project Cost | Assent/Design team | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

BREEAM typically adds between 1% and 3% to capital cost, but can be expected to be recovered within a 2-5 year period. Say 2% of capital cost (£10,704,719 x say 2% = £214K)

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|--------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 3.07 | Stat Consent | Planning/Listed Building consent - conservation and grant funded scheme potentially may extend programme. | | | | 0.00% | Close liaison with NHLF, Local Authority. Planning consultant appointed to manage the process. Risk however remains and could effect the delivery phase. | | Arch | Stage 2/ 3 | Feb-21 | | | |
| 4.00 | Occupation | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.01 | Occupation | The refurbishment will affect all areas of the building and cause significant disruption. | L | M | L | 30.00% | Fully develop phasing plan, identify and mitigate risks / disruption. Option to fully close the facility to be reviewed, in cost benefit analysis | | Client | Stage 3/4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 4.03 | Occupation | Noise and disruption affecting retain facilities. | | | | 0.00% | Create buffer zones, sequence works accordingly. Consider closure of facility to undertake refurbishment. | part of percentage-based preliminaries allowance in OOC | Client/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 4.04 | Occupation | Period of decant effect upon the Client | | | | 0.00% | Consider programme alternatives. Work with the Client closely. | allowance for decant costs included by JD in Total Project Costs | Client/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 4.05 | Occupation | Business continuity and the effect upon the remainder of the site. Swimming operation, library services. | | | | 0.00% | Consider and review throughout the project. Ensure Client is fully aware of the implications in connection with works. Ensure that the requirements are translated into employers requirements and are considered during the contractor selection process. | Allowance made in business plan for closure | Client/PM/ Design Team | Stage 2 onwards | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 4.06 | Occupation | Down time due to dismantling and reinstallation of specialist equipment, particularly large elements. | | | | 0.00% | Ensure the Client is aware. | | PM/Client | Stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.00 | Financial | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.01 | Financial | Budget adequacy in light of: design development and developing client requirements. | L | M | M | 30.00% | The cost plan will be developed by the QS as the design develops. Close liaison between the design team and QS is critical. | there are a 5% design development risk and 15% contingency risk allowances within the Total project Costs | Cost M/Design team | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.02 | Financial | Operational Costs. The development of a cost plan covering Operational Costs is reliant upon a clear strategy being developed. Very broad estimates to date only have been developed. | L | M | M | 20.00% | Develop firm operational model as a high priority. | JD has included allowances in the Total Project Cost for operations costs | Client. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.03 | Financial | Discovery of elements requiring further attention or repair. | L | M | M | 75.00% | Undertake intrusive investigations as part of an enabling works package to allow the cost plan to be fully informed at an earlier stage. Consider intrusive investigations to a limited degree at an earlier stage. Make adequate provision by way of contingency. allowed elsewhere. | no allowance in OOC for enabling works (stated as a specific exclusion). However, there are allowances in the OOC for additional repairs, plus the 5% design development risk and the 15% contingency risk allowances | Arch/PM/Cost M | Stage 3/4 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 37,500.00 | |
| 5.04 | Financial | Market buoyancy. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Monitor tendering trends and provide within contingency. | inflation allowance included in Total Project costs | TTCM | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.05 | Financial | Cost of materials | L | M | M | 20.00% | Cost advice from specialist. Monitor impact of Brexit. | | TTCM & PM | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.06 | Financial | Market conditions. Effect of change in procurement regulations creating requirement for open tender conditions. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Procurement strategy developed to mitigate risk as far as possible. Early dialogue with some contractors. Risk mitigation strategy. | | Client /PM/Cost M | Stages 2-5 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 5.07 | Financial | Upgrade to works in Gala Pool for swimming use | | | | | Cost allowedanced made within associated option for upgrading finishes etc in Gala Pool space. Further discussion with HE if this is the chosen option. | | Cost M/Design team | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|----------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 6.00 | Design | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6.01 | Design | Design departure from the original concept during design development. | M | M | M | 25.00% | Regular design review and close client and PM involvement. Strategic group established as a reference point. Covered elsewhere. | part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances? | Client/PM /Eng | Stage 0 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.02 | Design | Scope "creep" as a result of client change. | M | M | M | 25.00% | Agree stage sign off and implement change control procedure from an agreed design freeze position. Covered elsewhere. | part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances? | PM | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.03 | Design | Increased scope or standard of conservation repairs; areas identified inc doors/joinery, brick repairs, terracotta floor, flat roofs, metal windows | L | H | H | 25.00% | | | PM | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ 560,724.00 | £ 140,181.00 | |
| 6.04 | Design | Change of use of certain spaces may present challenges with regards to the ventilation strategy. Risk of not achieving planning consent for required alterations. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Upon agreement of proposed design further develop detailed services design. Provision made for appropriate design mitigation measures within cost plan. | allowances for services in OOC based on budget costs/m2 provided by Max Fordham. Separate allowances have been included for bwic. There is also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances. | Arch/ Ser Eng. | Stage 2-4 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 7,500.00 | |
| 6.05 | Design | Maintenance access to be considered. | L | L | L | 0.00% | Consider during all design team meetings. Discuss with PD. Strategy to be developed as part of the Stage 3 report. | forms part of bwic services allowance in OOC | Design team | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.06 | Design | Accuracy of the current plans to be confirmed and therefore room sizes may change from those currently presented. | | | | 0.00% | Review following detailed survey. Full detailed survey complete and model provided. | | BBA | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.07 | Design | Design development associated with the potential shared entrance with the Library. | L | L | L | 0.00% | Review costs. | part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances? | Cost M/Design team | Stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.08 | Design | Acoustics - sound reverberation, break out of sound internally and externally. | L | M | M | 20.00% | Potential for acoustic shielding of plant and internal reverberation issues. Acoustic investigations required. | there is no allowance in the OOC for acoustic requirements | Design Team/ Acoustic consultant | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |
| 6.09 | Design | Insufficient WC allowance for visitor day / future simultaneous uses. | L | M | M | 20.00% | Calculate in accordance with British Standard BS 6465 | allowance included in OOC for new wc spaces based on a cost per m2. To be reviewed when design developed | Design Team | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |
| 6.10 | Design | Insufficient allowance for changing place | L | M | L | 20.00% | Calculate structural requirement and design standard | | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |
| 6.11 | Design | Vehicular parking / access to site is not compliant / sufficient space for setting down car users. | L | L | L | 0.00% | Consultation with BCC regarding usage of land to rear for disabled parking. | allowance for work to parcel of land to rear of site included in OOC, based on DIA sketch included in Options Appraisal | Design Team | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.12 | Design | Practicalities of use, flow rates, temperatures etc. are all considerations at this time. however no known issues of meeting regulations at this time. | | | | 0.00% | Consider as part of future plant design | allowances for services in OOC based on budget costs/m2 provided by Max Fordham. There is also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances. | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.13 | Design | Pool size questioned whether proportion is suitable for business requirements | L | L | L | 0.00% | Each pool size considered in options appraisal. Accept that it is not viable to expand the pool size. | | Design Team | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.14 | Design | Pool 2 viability of cubicles due to insufficient width to the pool edge (legal risk associated with reuse) | L | L | L | 0.00% | Obtain building control advise, obtain specialist risk advise. | allowance included in OOC for new male and female changing facilities (option 2) | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.15 | Design | Sufficient cubicle provision with insufficient allowance for changing areas and other facilities | L | L | L | 0.00% | Follow method in sport England | allowance included in OOC for re-using existing cubicles in gala swimming (option 1), but new cubicles in option 2 | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 6.16 | Design | Isolated stair core from one another, wasted circulation / lost opportunity for escape in multiple directions | L | L | L | 0.00% | Explore opportunities to connect | | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|---------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 6.17 | Design | Landscape presents lost opportunity to use space | L | L | L | 0.00% | Explore opportunities for use as proposition develops | allowance for work to parcel of land to rear of site included in OOC, based on DIA sketch included in Options Appraisal | Design Team | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 7.00 | Programme | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.01 | Programme | Effect of the phased strategy which may extend the programme. | M | M | M | 50.00% | Prioritise the development of the phasing strategy. Provide regular programme feedback in relation to the effect on the programme. | preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | Client / PM | Stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 7.02 | Programme | The construction period is untested. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Undertake early discussion with contractors etc. | preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | PM/Cost M | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 7.05 | Programme | Lead in period for materials | M | L | L | 10.00% | Undertake review of design and associated lead in times for materials during next phase. Build in buffer within programme to accommodate. | | Design Team | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 7.06 | Programme | Agreement and sign off of associated lease agreements and licenses. | M | L | M | 40.00% | Legal team to undertake early negotiations to draft agreements in principal, prior to Stage 3 design. | | Client | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 8.00 | Environmental | | | | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.01 | Environmental | Asbestos is known to be present within the building as identified within the asbestos management survey. | L | M | M | 40.00% | Undertake further intrusive investigations to determine the full extent. Carry out abatement phase utilising a licensed contractor as part of the enabling works phase. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. Allowance for removal incuded in OOC (£50K) - also see items 1.09 above and 15.10 below | PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 8.02 | Environmental | Previous works to Gala pool found high level of pigeon guano which require a programme of decontamination. Further decontamination of other areas to be refurbished may be required. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Factor into design and programme. | allowances included in OOC | Arch/PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 8.03 | Environmental | Ecology - nesting birds. Risk of wildlife / impact on construction programme | L | L | L | 15.00% | Consider appointment of ecological consultant and undertake survey and apply mitigation measures. | consultant cost included in professional fees allowance in Total Project Costs. There is no allowance in the OOC for mitigation measures (stated as a specific exclusion) | Arch/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | | | |
| 8.04 | Environmental | Aggressive pool environment, potentially corrosive is appropriate treatments are not allowed for | L | L | L | 10.00% | Structural engineer to provide method of protection | allowances included in OOC | Arch/Stru | Stage 2 -3 | Feb-21 | | | |
| 9.00 | Fire | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.01 | Fire | Requirement for smoke ventilation. Requirement for generator supported power supply. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Mechanical smoke vent to be determined | allowance for services in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances. | Fire Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 9.02 | Fire | Top floor occupancy and evacuation. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Strategy to be developed with Fire Eng. Fire engineer to report current progress. | no allowance in OOC for works to second floor. 2nd floor currently not being brought into regular use. | Arch/Fire Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 9.03 | Fire | Strategy for the evacuation of disabled people. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Strategy to be developed with the Client. Provision made within the design. | part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances? | Arch/Fire Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 9.04 | Fire | Listed nature of building may affect ability to upgrade existing windows/ doors/ walls/ floors. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Strategy to be developed and agreed with Building Control, Arch, Fire Eng. Historic England and Planners. | Repair strategy as stated in DIA Options Appraisal | Arch/Fire Eng./Client | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 9.06 | Fire | Fire tender access. Long hose lengths (in excess of 50m) and thus fire engineering burden | L | L | L | 10.00% | Fire engineer to assess | | Client/PM/Fire Eng./ Serv Eng | | | | | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|-------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 9.07 | Fire | Alarm and detection systems. Non-compliant / unacceptable risk in event of fire | L | L | L | 20.00% | Design has been prepared by fire engineer | allowance for services in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances. | Fire Eng. | | | | | |
| 9.08 | Fire | Use of building in intermediate stages of development. Unacceptable risk when certain escape routes unavailable during construction. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Fire engineer to assess | no specific allowance in OOC for fire officer requirements (part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances?). Liaison required with Activity Workstrem and operation. | Fire Eng. | | | £ 10,000.00 | £ 2,000.00 | |
| 9.09 | water | Heavy requirement on water supply to refill pool | L | M | M | 100.00% | Early discussion with Severn Trent | | | | | £ 10,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |
| 9.10 | water | Drainage of second pool - pressure on drainage system or requirements for disposal | L | M | M | 100.00% | Early discussion with Severn Trent | | | | | £ 5,000.00 | £ 5,000.00 | |
| 10.00 | Energy Efficiency | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10.01 | Energy Efficiency | The opportunities to economically improve the fabric so as to limit the carbon foot print are limited. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Basic restoration will improve environmental performance. Client / funder to identify the requirements. Standards may be lesser because this is a refurbishment of an older listed building. To be modelled and reviewed considering options. | insulation has been allowed to the pitched roofs and new and existing flat roofs.Secondary glazing has been allowed to the existing windows. New windows to be double glazed.Air source heat pumps and photovoltaics have also been allowed for | Client/Ser Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 10.02 | Energy Efficiency | Assumptions that electrical heating will be more economic in future than current gas heating | L | L | L | 10.00% | Analysis and models made on most up to date information available | Heat Pump included in costs | Client/Ser Eng. | Stage 1 | Feb-21 | | | |
| 10.03 | Energy Efficiency | Scope for insulation of fabric, conflict with significance of listed building | L | L | L | 10.00% | Super insulate locations where this is practicable, e.g. slate roofs. Ongoing coordination with HE and Conservation Officer | insulation has been allowed to the pitched roofs and new and existing flat roofs. | Arch/Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | | | |
| 10.04 | Energy Efficiency | Scope for air tightness, conflict with significance of listed building | L | L | L | 20.00% | Accept air tightness impracticable to improve, mitigate elsewhere. | no allowance in OOC for air leakage testing | Arch/Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 10,000.00 | £ 2,000.00 | |
| 11.00 | Services | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11.01 | Services | Existing heating system is life expired and in risk of failure. Replacement parts for the existing boiler may not be available. | L | M | M | 40.00% | Cost interim repair / replacement of boiler system. Investigate possible replacement of system prior to capital works stream or prioritisation of servicing works. | Maintenance Allowance in BCC maintenance budget (separate from project) in line with Max Fordham assessment. Separate contingency held for major failure | Client | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.02 | Services | Existing steam heating system runs at 200 degrees and 10 bar pressure through uninsulated steel pipework. Potential H&S risk. | L | M | M | 25.00% | CIO to carry out operational risk assessment and mitigate immediate risk prior to capital works. Heating system replaced with low surface temp system. | allowance for services in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances | Client | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.03 | Services | Pool water treatment plant is in poor condition, with the automated sampling equipment inoperable. | L | M | M | 40.00% | CIO to undertake repair / replacement of system prior to capital works. | £220K included in OOC for new pool water treatment plant based on budget estimate provided by Max Fordham | Eng | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.04 | Services | Pool sand filters are from the 1920's and beyond there anticipated design life. | L | M | M | 40.00% | No immediate sign of system failure. Provision made for replacement of filtration system within capital work stream. | £220K included in OOC for new pool water treatment plant based on budget estimate provided by Max Fordham | Eng | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.05 | Services | Electrical services are a mix of ages, with a large proportion of system on ground floor no longer supported by manufacturer. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Provision made within the capital works for the full replacement of the system. | allowance for services in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances | Arch / Eng | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|----------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 11.06 | Services | BCC aspiration to become carbon neutral by 2030 know as city route to zero (R20) | L | L | L | 10.00% | Consideration within building services design to achieve R20 aspirations. | air source heat pump and photovoltaics allowed for in OOC | Arch / Eng | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.07 | Services | Risk of lead pipework | L | M | M | 40.00% | Detailed investigation within enabling works package. Provide contingency as a discovery item. All services to be renewed | OOO allows for new services inside the building. Max Fordham have raised the possibility of incoming water supply pipes being lead. No allowance in OOC for dealing with any external lead pipework | Ser Eng./Cost M | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.08 | Services | Gas service | L | L | L | 10.00% | Detailed investigation within enabling works package. Provide contingency as a discovery item. Mitigated through investigation | no allowance in OOC for work to incoming gas supply | Ser Eng./Cost M | Stage 2/3 | Feb-21 | £ 30,000.00 | £ 3,000.00 | |
| 11.10 | Services | The extent and condition of existing below ground services is not known | L | L | L | 20.00% | Carry out intrusive investigations note - for some parts this may only be feasible after demolition of existing buildings. Included elsewhere | part of surveys and investigations allowance in Total Project Costs. No allowance in OOC for work to existing gas and water below ground services (£100K included for new incoming electric supply) - part of 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances? | Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 30,000.00 | £ 6,000.00 | |
| 11.11 | Services | The extent of existing building service installations which either feed or are fed from MRB to the Library is not known | L | L | L | 20.00% | Initial surveys indicate connection between two buildings and design based on assumption of this connection to be retained. Further internal intrusive surveys will be necessary where connectivity into the existing building services is required. | services costs are based on cost/m2 provided by Max Fordham and assume linked services to the Baths and Library | Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.12 | Services | The extent of distribution of existing building services installations within buildings affected by the MRB project is not known | L | L | L | 15.00% | Internal surveys (including intrusive surveys) will be necessary to establish the locations and routes of existing services, such as pipes and cables, and to check if any services pass through the existing building and refurbishment areas which serve adjacent buildings. As above | services costs are based on cost/m2 provided by Max Fordham and allow for completely new services (but no works allowed to second floor) | Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.13 | Services | The extent and locations builders work and structural openings through existing walls/partitions/floors/etc. is not known. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Survey of existing building will be required to establish the provision of holes, including intrusive survey work. | allowances have been included in the OOC for bwc services | Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.14 | Services | Capacity of utility connections and respective building loads are not known. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Determine building loads and establish available capacity of utility connections. Mitigated through survey. | a new incoming electric supply has been included in the OOC (£100K), plus a £20K allowance for upgrading the incoming data supply. No allowances have been included for work to the existing incoming gas and water supplies | Ser Eng. | stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.15 | Services | Alterations and works on the electrical infrastructure may need a power shutdowns to enable power supplies to be transferred. This will incur disruption to the buildings operations. | M | M | L | 15.00% | Shutdowns to be co-ordinated with the CIO, with an understanding of the Clients constraints for shutdowns. Early and consistent coordination with operational team re construction programme. | | Ser Eng. | stage 2-3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.16 | Services | Spaces and rooms within areas of MRB which are to be kept in operation. It may therefore may be necessary to modify and alter existing electrical installations and systems or provide new installations depending on the extent of the works. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Make provision for tracing all circuits and make provision for temporary supplies to affected areas. | allowances have been included in the OOC for temporary supplies between phases | Arch/Ser Eng. | stage 1-2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.17 | Services | Alteration to existing external foul/combined drainage downpipes. The condition/capacity of the existing structure is not known. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Further survey of existing structure will be required. Drainage strategy to be developed within design team and agreed with Client. | allowance has been included in the OOC for works to the existing below ground drainage | Arch/Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.18 | Services | Maintenance access for future plant locations | L | L | L | 10.00% | Consider during the design process. Strategy to be developed by design team. Refer also to H/S risk assessment. | an allowance has been included in the OOC for the new plant and filtration room, based on a cost/m2, to include maintenance access | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.19 | Services | Maintenance access for future plant locations - There is a risk of difficulties with access for maintenance and future replacement of plant located at rooftop level. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Factor into design process. Ref H&S | as last item | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|----------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------|------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 11.20 | Services | Noise from rooftop plant locations - Location of plant at roof level can increase noise issues and particular attenuation measures may be required. These may have cost / space / aesthetic implications. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Early appoint of acoustic consultant and consideration during planing design | as last item | Arch/Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.21 | Services | Lighting to Pool Areas - Lighting at high level within the pool space will present maintenance difficulties. Careful consideration of lighting techniques will be required to ensure that adequate provision for maintenance is achieved. | L | L | L | 25.00% | Factor into design process. Ref H&S | allowance for services in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 20,000.00 | £ 5,000.00 | |
| 11.22 | Services | Size and location of plant room space - It is not clear what level of plant room space is required, however a clear heating and ventilation strategy has yet to be developed. This presents a risk that additional plant space may need to be identified. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Design to factor anticipated floor space requirement for plant. Continually review during each design phase. | an allowance has been included in the OOC for the new plant and filtration room, based on a cost/m2, to include maintenance access | Arch/Ser Eng. | stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.23 | Services | Impact upon spaces of services distribution - Space for distribution of new services, particularly ventilation, within existing buildings which have fixed dimensional parameters may impact upon space planning and usability of spaces. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Careful design and modelling to be undertaking during detailed design | | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.24 | Services | Utilities services connections - The existing roadway of Alcester Road is known to be heavily congested with services and any additional services in this area or modifications to the roadway may prove difficult or expensive. | M | M | L | 30.00% | Undertake full condition survey of existing building services. Allow for robust design in early stages of project. | a new incoming electric supply has been included in the OOC (£100K), plus a £20K allowance for upgrading the incoming data supply. No allowances have been included for work to the existing incoming gas and water supplies | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.25 | Services | Compatibility of existing steam fed heating system and potential upgrade. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Undertake full condition survey of existing system. Early design decision on compatibility or potential replacement. Currently plan is to replace system | new services installation allowed for in OOC based on cost/m2 budget costs provided by Max Fordham. There are also the 5% design development risk/15% contingency risk allowances | Ser Eng. | stage 1 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.26 | Services | A full drainage survey of the building has not been undertaken and its current condition is unknown. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Provision made within the capital works costs for repairs. Full survey to be undertaken at next RIBA stage. | allowance for surveys and investigations included in Total Project Costs. Allowance included in OOC for work to existing below ground drainage system. See also 11.36 below | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.27 | Services | Clarification of space requirements for new plant, insufficient space allowed for new plant | L | L | L | 10.00% | Stage 1 design undertaken by M&E consultants | new plant and filtration spaces allowed for in OOC as per DIA Options Appraisal, based on cost/m2 and input from Max Fordham | Arch/Serv Eng | Stage 1 -2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.28 | Services | Clarification of space requirements for new plant if library incorporated, insufficient space allowed for plant | L | L | L | 10.00% | Stage 1 design undertaken by M&E consultants | as last item. No separate plant space allowed for Library | Arch/Serv Eng | Stage 1 -2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.29 | Services | Suitability for basement for air handling plant, insufficient space allowed for plant | L | L | L | 10.00% | Stage 1 design undertaken by M&E consultants | new plant and filtration spaces allowed for in OOC as per DIA Options Appraisal, based on cost/m2 | Arch/Serv Eng | Stage 1 -2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.30 | Services | Condition of pool tank "run-arounds" unknown, could not inspect, associated costs not clarified | L | L | L | 20.00% | Open up by contractor and inspect | £220K included in OOC for new pool water treatment plant based on budget estimate provided by Max Fordham | Serv Eng/Struc | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.31 | Services | Significance of historic plant and capacity to change, consent to remove may not be achievable if found to be significant | L | L | L | 10.00% | Architect to assess significance. Retention not currently required | | Arch | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.32 | Services | Clean air zone, gas fired plant may not be viable | L | L | L | 10.00% | M&E Consultant to investigate | air source heat pump allowed for in OOC | Eng | Satge 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.33 | Services | Backward compatibility of new plant to existing systems, dual plant strategy may not be viable. | L | M | M | 50.00% | M&E Consultant to investigate | new plant allowed for based on cost/m2 provided by Max Fordham. Allowance made for building closure in business plan | Eng | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

assumed included in 11.08 and 11.10 above

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|--------------|------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 11.34 | Services | Practicality of removing old plant which is extremely large and may be costly to deconstruct on site | L | L | L | 20.00% | Buildability advise beneficial | allowance in OOC based on budget cost provided by Max Fordham. Tanks at second floor level left in-situ | Arch / Eng | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.35 | Services | Suitability of old runs for new plant presents unknown risk of associated builders work and appearance of new system | L | L | L | 20.00% | M&E Consultant to investigate | | Arch / Eng | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.36 | Services | Condition of above and below ground drainage unknown. | L | L | L | 30.00% | Commission fully drainage survey of existing systems | new above ground drainage has been allowed for in the OOC. New below ground drainage has been allowed to the new toilets, kitchen, café etc. An allowance has been included for work to the existing drainage | Arch / Eng | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 11.37 | Services | Roof drainage (particularly flat roofs) historically pool and present greater risk with climate change | L | L | L | 20.00% | Consider redesign of existing systems at next stage | an allowance has been included in the OOC for work to the existing flat roofs and rainwater goods | Arch / Eng | Stage 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 12.00 | Structure | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.01 | Structure | Pool 2 has isolate pockets of rust and continuing corrosion, if appropriate treatment is not allowed for. | L | M | M | 40.00% | Structural engineer to provide method | allowance included in OOC | Eng | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 12.02 | Structure | Condition of pool 2 and Gala Pool structures. Cost of remediation / risk of future failure. | M | M | M | 50.00% | Core surveys of the pool structure required | allowances included in OOC. Work undertaken to Gala Pool trusses (including base of trusses where corrosion present) during restoration work | Eng / Cost M | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 12.03 | Structure | Balcony repair, edge channels need treatment, concrete repair required regardless of use | L | L | L | 25.00% | Structural engineer to provide method | allowance included in OOC based on previous estimates | Arch / Eng | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 12.04 | Structure | Excessive cost of balcony repair impacts viability of the proposal | L | M | M | 50.00% | Challenge earlier proposal, considering impact on significance | allowance included in OOC based on previous estimates | Eng / Cost M | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 100,000.00 | £ 50,000.00 | |
| 12.05 | Structure | Strategy of repair to flat roofs, impact of rainwater drainage, and cost | L | L | L | 20.00% | Consider at a later stage which options are most viable | allowances in OOC based on overlaying existing asphalt roofs with Derbigum, as DIA Options Appraisal | Arch / Eng | Stage 2 / 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 13.00 | Execution | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13.01 | Execution | Limited access to site including narrow entrance from Edward Rd. Limited space available to the rear of building. Location of crane, lay down spaces and material storage to be resolved. | L | M | L | 20.00% | Consideration in phasing of working and design | preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | Client/Arch/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |
| 13.02 | Execution | Reliance on specialist conservation buildings contractors to perform. Potential to delay subsequent phases. | M | M | M | 30.00% | Early dialogue and develop a preferred supplier following appropriate diligence exercise. | CPM procurement strategy required | PM/Cost M | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 14.00 | Interface | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 14.01 | Interface | Other projects occurring on the site or adjacent. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Close liaison with Client, BCC. Establish communication strategy. | No other capital works will be undertaken. Close coordination will be required re BAU activity / delivery of project activity work | Client/PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 14.02 | Interface | Maintenance activities ongoing during the delivery phase | L | L | L | 10.00% | Close liaison with Client and BCC | | Client | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 14.03 | Interface | Potential additional service connections | L | M | L | 20.00% | Diversion will be required within the enabling works package to maintain business continuity. | no allowance in OOC for diversion of existing services (stated as a specific exclusion) | Ser E/PM/Client | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ 50,000.00 | £ 10,000.00 | |

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|-----------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 15.00 | Health & Safety | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15.01 | Health & Safety | MRB personnel will not be able to use the rear courtyard egress or fire egress. There will be no access for Fire and Emergency vehicles from the rear. There will be no Client deliveries from the rear of the building. | L | M | L | 15.00% | Access for emergency vehicles will be managed by the Principal Contractor for the construction works as part of the Construction Health and Safety Plan. | preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | Client / PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.02 | Health & Safety | Maintained access for plant at rear elevation. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Consider during all design team meetings | | Client/PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.03 | Health & Safety | Vibration, noise and dust from construction work, some of which must take place close to or on the existing walls (foundations, window amendments, removal of flues etc.) | L | L | L | 10.00% | Discussions with the Client must make clear the unavoidable issues which will affect their staff and visitors. Whilst vibration, noise and dust can be controlled to some degree by the construction methodology the enclosed site and the scope of works will result in disturbance to occupants and activities. Impact on alarm systems needs to be managed (e.g. dust triggering fire alarms). Existing windows and openings can be dust sheeted and protected from physical damage (though this will result in loss of natural light and ventilation). | preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | Client/PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.04 | Health & Safety | Any services running under or across the rear courtyard space may require isolation and relocation. This will include IT cabling, drainage and power. | L | L | L | 20.00% | At some point there may be a need to temporarily close the access road, early consultation with Highways Authority. It may be possible to negotiate some amendments to the local vehicle traffic arrangements at this early stage of the project. | no allowance in OOC for diversion of existing services (stated as a specific exclusion) | Client/PM | Stage 3-4 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.05 | Health & Safety | Site entry limitations – Demolition of buildings to the rear of the pool - Access road is narrow and is used by pedestrian. This road also affords access to Gurdwara Guru Ramdas Singh Sabha yard area | L | L | L | 20.00% | Which ever option is chosen, it will be critical to the project that the car park to the rear be given over to the contractor, as a site compound, given the limited amount of space in and around the building. | preliminaries costs in OOC based on this space being available | PM | stage 2 - 3 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.06 | Health & Safety | Pedestrian travel along the access road to the rear and along Alcester Rd. These will be disrupted, as these are the only entrances into the site. It is likely that the Moseley Road Bath side of Alcester Road will be partial footpath closure to facilitate the works to the facade and roof. | L | L | L | 25.00% | Given the need to undertake works to the façade and the limited space for a contractors compound, this is an unavoidable constraint that must be agreed with the highways department. | no allowance in OOC for footpath closures (stated as a specific exclusion) | Client/PM | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 20,000.00 | £ 5,000.00 | |
| 15.07 | Health & Safety | Underground services, ducts and structures – The courtyard is to be surveyed in detail, but this will not reveal nor identify underground services or obstructions. Current records, where available, are unlikely to reveal the full history of the site. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Detailed site survey to be completed. | part of surveys and investigations allowance included in Total Project Costs. | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.08 | Health & Safety | The design will create and maintain a good deal of internal services and glazing, the glazed roof and existing high-level windows in particular are key features of the scheme. These will require some degree of high level maintenance and cleaning. | L | L | L | 25.00% | To eliminate future work at height, all maintainable equipment should be set within easy range of simple MEWP equipment. This should include items such as up-lighting, detectors and any motorised equipment. To promote MEWP access the base flooring should be level, with sufficiently robust floor ducting to carry proposed wheel loading. Permanent fixed features such as fixed furniture should be eliminated or sited away from MEWP transit routes. It will be possible to incorporate some degree of self-cleaning and access for future maintenance into the design as the concept develops. Design team will develop a maintenance and cleaning strategy. Further consideration is required for access to the gutter and protection from falls. | regarding last sentence of column K, an allowance has been included for a mansafe roof access system | Ser Eng. | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ 30,000.00 | £ 7,500.00 | |

assume included in 14.03 above

| Risk ID | Category | Description | Time Risk (H/M/L) | Cost Risk (H/M/L) | Risk Status | Probability of Occurrence (%) | Risk Management Response | ANG /Artelia Group Comment / plus PM comments | By Whom | When | Last Review | Contingency Cost | Factored Amount | Programme Risk |
|---------|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------|---------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 15.09 | Health & Safety | A Contractor Compound will be required for workforce welfare and materials storage. The nature of the site works prevents such space being found within the courtyard, unless sufficient facilities can be created by decanting. In any event a materials set-down area will be needed, preferably close to the site entrance. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Use car park to rear (as in recent similar projects) as a site compound. Consider use of areas of the existing building to provide welfare and site office accommodation. This will reduce some pressure on adjacent spaces. | preliminaries costs are based on this space being available. Preliminaries costs have been calculated as a percentage of the estimated construction cost (20% allowed) | Client/PM | stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.11 | Health & Safety | Work within confined spaces, basement, roof voids etc. | L | L | L | 10.00% | Remove as many risks from the area as possible. Appoint specialist to advise. During the abatement phase it is assumed that additional points of access will be formed. | | PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.12 | Health & Safety | Maintenance access for lighting and smoke detection | L | L | L | 15.00% | Lighting not to be installed above 10M and scissor lift to be utilised for access. Smoke detection at high level to be considered further. | | Ser Eng. | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.14 | Health & Safety | Replacement of glazing, may require work at high level and the manoeuvring of large steelwork elements. | L | L | L | 20.00% | Specialist contractors have been consulted who suggest the employment of a high level scaffold as a safe high level working plat form. | scaffolding allowed for in OOC | Arch/PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.15 | Health & Safety | The effect of high level construction on further construction activities. | L | L | L | 15.00% | The contractor will need to consider carefully the sequence of work activities such as the slate roof replacements. | | PM | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 15.16 | Health & Safety | Maintenance access / risk of falling, particularly through roof lanterns | L | L | L | 30.00% | Assess pre-planning and introduce improvements | | Arch/PD | Stage 2 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 16.00 | Post Occupation | | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16.01 | Post Occupation | Burden of environmental compliance on future design. Impact of short term spending decisions on future design. | L | L | L | 15.00% | Ensure design team briefed, obtain high level sign off of strategies. Close coordination with CIO re operational requirements and pragmatic approach to long term maintenance requirements. | | Client / PM | Stage 7 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 16.02 | Post Occupation | Preparation space for café insufficient to meet catering needs | L | L | L | 20.00% | Develop robust business case. Obtain specialist catering advice. | Catering advice has been sought at feasibility phase through external consultant and from NT advisor to provide initial assurance of concept proposals. Further advice to be sought as design develops, potentially calling on partner expertise, and ensuring close coordination with business planning. | Client / PM | Stage 7 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |
| 16.03 | Post Occupation | Preparation of space for events is insufficient to be accommodated by catering provision | L | L | L | 20.00% | Develop robust business case. Obtain specialist catering advice. | as above | Client / PM | Stage 7 | Feb-21 | £ - | £ - | |

Factored Total £ 431,581.00