

## RISK LOG

Project Name: Union Terrace Gardens

Project Manager: Andrew Win

ID	Description	Type	Date Identified	Original Risk			Implication	Mitigation (Counter Measures)	Residual Risk (after Mitigation)			Owner	Updates	Date Last Updated	Status	Close Reason
				Impact	Likelihood	Score			Impact	Likelihood	Score					
1	Failure in obtaining the necessary consents within required timescales.	Project	01.02.17	3	4	12	Impact on the project plan, resulting in a delay in delivering the scheme.	Ensure pre-planning discussions are undertaken with all required personnel and that there is a suitable design for approval	2	3	6	AW			Open	
2	Obtaining the necessary approvals to proceed with project	Strategic	01.02.17	4	4	16	Rejection of the project will impact the scheme and CCMP objectives	Following the correct procedures whilst ensuring all information submitted to committee is robust at the stage of submission.	3	3	9	TG	Meeting with LDA, Ryden and planning to review deliverables on 03.03.17.	27.02.17	Open	
3	Organisational Capacity	Strategic	01.09.16	4	3	12	The scale of the project requires support in resources to allow timescale to be achieved	LDA consultancy team have been established to support the development programme. Officers are required to support with internal project management, reporting and stakeholder engagement.	2	2	4	TG	Ryden have appointed additional resource to support their PM for the project.	25.02.17	Open	
4	Time - programme over-running	Project/Operational	05.11.16	4	3	12	Scheduled completion date not being achieved will result in negative perception, the timeline being extended, costs increasing and impact on resource.	A realistic programme to be determined for all stages of the project. Design timescales to be agreed with the Design Team. Regular project team meetings to monitor progress and actions.	3	3	9	TG	After SI completion, programme plan to be reviewed and adjusted where required for risk mitigation to be updated.	05.02.17	Open	
5	Delay with Stopping Up Order	Project/Operational	08.02.17	4	4	16	As a key driver in the project, any delay in the stopping up order will impact the project plan and staging of delivery.	Undertaking the Stopping Up Order in March gives more time for the Order to be processed and keep in line with the outlined programme.	3	3	9	TG	Doug Ritchie provided suggested timeline for undertaking stopping order. Meeting 03.03.17 to drive forward.	01.03.17	Open	
6	Roads and transport approvals	Project	01.02.17	3	3	9	Objections to the proposals will cause a delay in approvals and will impact on the project delivery and potentially the overall scheme should they be rejected.	Engagement with roads and workshops with departments and consultants	3	2	6	TG	Meeting 03.03.17 regarding intervention and orders required.	27.02.17	Open	
7	Final cost plan exceeds project budgets	Project	03.02.17	4	4	16	There is a risk that the project, as designed, does not proceed	Two stage tender process gives opportunity to achieve certainty of a fixed contract sum at the second stage procurement process	3	3	9	TG			Open	
8	Reduction of overall project budget. Risk of affecting overall design.	Project	01.02.17	3	4	12	Consultation with the public and members based on the Stage A design.	Cost plan provided by LDA highlighting cost savings with limited impact on design.	2	3	6	AW	Meeting held with RS, BM, MC 20.02.17 to review savings.	21.02.17	Open	
9	Revenue income assumptions are not achieved and there is a revenue cost pressure.	Project	10.01.17	3	3	9	Revenue income will impact the overall cost plan as it is based on assumptions. Further market testing is being completed by the consultants to allow revenue estimates to be robust.	Cautious assumptions have been made to date and initial market testing on the commercial space will inform this mitigation.	2	4	8	TG	Robust costings will be developed following SI work.	15.02.17	Open	
10	Failure to reach agreement with Network Rail in respect of land acquisition/ title boundary	Project	01.02.17	3	5	15	As the NR internal clearance process takes six weeks to complete, this could delay progress and impact on current design.	Arrange meeting with network rail to discuss project designs and requirements moving forward	3	3	9	TG	Meeting held 27.02.17	28.02.17	Open	
11	Common Good	Project	08.01.17	2	4	8	Restrictions on the land can impact on uses within UTG	Project team working with the asset team to confirm if there are any restrictions on the land in question and support on how to mitigate this risk.	2	2	4	TG		27.02.17	Open	
12	Failure to agree on the proposals regarding the surrounding ballustrade	Project	01.02.17	2	4	8	Cost implications on the project may impact other aspects of the design being removed.	Ballustrade options provided by Arup and discussed internally. Incorporated into committee report.	2	3	6	TG	Meeting with Arup, LDA and Ryden with internal roads team to review and discuss options 03.03.17.	27.02.17	Open	
13	Implications if the initially agreed project budget is to include works to balustrades as this was not identified within original scope of works	Project	01.02.17	2	4	8	Cost implications on the project may impact other aspects of the design being removed.	Incorporated into the cost plan.	2	3	6	TG		27.02.17	Open	
14	Network Rail- Stakeholder consultation will take 3 months from clearance completion.	Project	27.02.17	3	5	15	As the NR consultation process takes 3 months to complete, this could delay progress and impact on current design.	Negotiations regarding the land to begin with the asset team.	2	4	8	TG		27.02.17	Open	
15	Network rail- electrification of line may impact on the sell of the land.	Project	27.02.17	3	5	15		Project drawings updated and sent to Network Rail to begin the process. Negotiations regarding the land to begin with the asset team.	2	4	8	TG		27.02.17	Open	
16	Network Rail- Authorising access for the SI work.	Operational	27.02.17	4	3	12	Delay in achieving the SI work will impact the schedule.	Meeting with network rail to discuss the requirements.	1	2	2	TG	NWR are happy with April for the SI works in principle and will provide resource for supervision.	27.02.17	Open	

## KEY

Impact	
Catastrophic	4

Score		
Between 1-7	Green	Not a priority

ID	Description	Type	Date Identified	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Implication	Mitigation (Counter Measures)	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Owner	Updates	Date Last Updated	Status	Close Reason
	Serious	3			Between 8-14	Amber		Quick wins now plus medium term plan to address								
	Material	2			Between 15-24	Red		Address immediately								
	Negligible	1														

Likelihood	
Very High	6
High	5
Significant	4
Low	3
Very Low	2
Almost Impossible	1

Type
Project
Operational
Strategic

Status
Open
Closed

Proximity
Timescales or specific date when risk may occur.