Risk Register - Key:

Likelihood Rating

It is unlikely that in many cases the probability of a risk occurring can be calculated in a statistically robust fashion as we do not have the data to do so. However, as an indicator, the likelihood is defined by the following probability of a risk occurring:

Likelihood	Probability
Highly Unlikely	1% to 25% chance in 5 years
Unlikely	26% to 50% chance in 5 years
Likely	51% to 75% chance in 5 years
Highly Likely	76% to 100% chance in 5 years

Risk Proximity

The score for risk proximity supports the Council in focusing on certain risks that may occur soon and ignore risks that will not occur in the near future. This enables risk management to be more efficient.

A number of between 1 and 4, where 1 means the risk is about to occur within the next 3 months and 4 means the risk is not likely to occur within the next year is provided.

Financial Impact

The financial impact to the Council is an important consideration, however this should be viewed alongside the likelihood of the risk occurring and not assumed to be inevitable.

The scoring of the financial impact relates to the cost to the Council if that risk were to occur, however it should not relate to the cost of managing or mitigating the risk.

The financial impact is scored as highly likely it would be prudent for the Council to ensure that it has set aside an adequate financial provision. The financial impact is scored as follows:

Risk Proximity Score	Time scale
1	Occurring within the next 3 months
2	Occurring within the next 6 months
3	Occurring within the next 1 year
4	Unlikely to occur within 1 year

Financial Impact Score	Time scale
£	£1 – £20,000
££	£20,0001 - £200,000
£££	£200,001 - £2,000,000
££££	£2,000,001 plus

Impact Rating
The following table provides the definitions which should be used when determining whether a risk would have a Low, Moderate, Major or Significant impact

	Low (1)	Moderate (2)	Major (3)	Significant (4)
Financial	Less than £20K	£20k or over and less than £200K	£200K or over and less than- £2MK	£2M plus
Service Provision	No effect	Slightly Reduced	Service Suspended Short Term / reduced	Service Suspended Long Term Statutory duties not delivered
Health & Safety	Sticking Plaster / first aider	Broken bones/illness Lost time, accident or occupational ill health	Loss of Life/Major illness – Major injury incl broken limbs/hospital admittance. Major ill health	Major loss of life/Large scale major illness
Morale		Some hostile relationship and minor non cooperation	Industrial action	Mass staff leaving/Unable to attract staff
Reputation	No media attention / minor letters	Adverse Local media Leader	Adverse National publicity	Remembered for years
Govt relations	One off single complaint	Poor Assessment(s)	Service taken over temporarily	Service taken over permanently

	•						
Risk Number: 1 Risk Owner: Project I			Risk Owner: Project Executive				
Risk Title: Project is not financially viable							
Course	0	Commont Co.	aka la	Current R	Risk Score	Risk	Financial
Causes	Consequences	Current Co	ntrois	Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	impact
Full Business Case gateway does not confirm that project is financially viable. The management fee proposed by the potential operator and/or the cost of construction are not in line with current estimates. Significant and unforeseeable change in external financial/macro economic position ("Viable" = that the annualised cost of the project to the Council based on the preferred facility mix is sufficiently close to the income expected to be generated from a management contract in relation to be a sustainable investment).	Project may be halted for review of underlying assumptions. Revisions are tested and agreed. Project recommences on revised brief, timetable and cost estimate.	cost/income facility man 'project cree cost elemer Provide suf to permit acincome. Clodesign team Stage 4 bef Continue to through Bus market testi economic p contingency certainty who was a continue to the continue to through Bus market testi economic p contingency certainty who was a continue to the continue to through Bus market testi economic p continue continue to the conti	ficient detail to consultancy team scurate projections of cost and ose liaison with contractor and on. Progressing design to RIBA fore passing to contractor. assess all aspects of the project siness Case Modelling. Softing exercise undertaken. Monitor rospects, include substantial of in forecasts and secure financial here possible. blic expectations of project cost, highlight danger of as.	Likely (Probability 51% - 75%)	Significant (4)	1	££££
Further actions?			Target Date		Residual Ri	sk Score	
				Likeli			act
Cabinet (Leisure Centre) Committee will ma with project plan. Decisions requiring appro the Constitution will be referred accordingly progress will be made.	val of full Council under	Spring 2019			Signi (4	ficant 4)	

Risk Number: 2			Risk Owner: Project Executive				
Risk Title: Absence of financial support from project partners							
				Current R	Risk Score		Financial impact
Causes	Consequences	Current Controls		Likelihood	Impact	Risk Proximity	
External grants and partner funding does not materialise or offers withdrawn because Council cannot meet funders' requirements	Project could be rendered nonviable by increasing Council proportion of cost. Review project as in R1.	Continue negotiations with partner organisations and external funders. Maintain contacts at senior level to create alignment of expectations.		Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Significant (4)	1	££
Further actions?			Target Date				
				Likeli	hood	Imp	act
Translation of negotiated arrangement into legal documentation. Continue Financial appraisal of contribution's value to the scheme vs financial contribution.		February 20	018	Highly Unlikely (Probability 1% to 25%)		Significant (4)	

Risk Number: 3	Risk Owner: Project Executive
----------------	-------------------------------

Risk Title: Council unable to recover VAT on construction costs

Causes	Consequences Current	Current Controls	Current R	Risk Score	Risk	Financial impact
OddSCS		Current Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	
Project and governance structure means that Council unable to recover VAT incurred on construction costs.	The project cost would increase significantly and possibly become non-viable or show major overspend if HMRC refuses claims.	Obtain best available VAT advice at appropriate stages and before decision making. Reflect VAT advice in negotiations with funding partners.	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Significant (4)	1	££
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score			
			Likelihood Impac		act	
Advice reflected in decisions taken, ongoing advice as required.		Spring 2019	Highly Unlikely (Probability 1% to 25%)		Major (3)	

Risk Number: 4 Risk Owner: Project Executive

Risk Title: Stakeholders expectations on pricing and usage not met

Causes	Consequences	Current Controls	Current F	tisk Score	Risk	Financial impact
	Schoolagh		Likelihood Impact	Impact	Proximity	
Pricing and usage strategy necessary to create viable project is not in line with stakeholder expectations. i.e. hire charges for club use, membership levels etc.	Business Case and procurement of operator specification may need to be reviewed if Council wishes to alter pricing and usage strategy.	Maintain dialogue with main users. Soft market test assumptions with potential operators. Ensure Cabinet agrees pricing and usage strategy. Close working with appointed operator	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Moderate	2	£
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score			
			Likelihood		Imp	act
Dialogue with likely user groups. Ongoing soft market testing to determine external views. Close working with appointed operator is crucial		Spring 2019	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)		Low (1)	

Risk Number: 5			Risk Owner: Project Executive						
Risk Title: Stakeholders dissatisfied with facility mix									
Causes	Consequences	Current Cor	ntrols	Current Risk Score		Risk	Financial impact		
	Current Cor			Likelihood	Impact	Proximity			
Stakeholders dissatisfied with proposed	Council delays decision	Engage effe	ectively through all stages of the	Unlikely	Moderate	1	££		
facilities seek more consultation even after	making. Cost increase	design and	planning process.	(Probability	(2)				
decisions are made.	arising from either			26% - 50%)					
	agreement to	Remain firm	on delivery to time and budget.						
	stakeholder views or								
	time delay could jeopardise project.								
Further actions?		Target Date		Residual Risk Score					
				Likelihood		Impact			
Continue consultation and engagement production	cess.	N/A		Unlikely		Low			
				(Probability 26% - 50%)		(1)			

Risk Number: 6 Risk Owner: Project Executive

Risk Title: Project programme/project delivery delayed

Causes		Current Controls	Current Risk Score		Risk	Financial impact
Causes	Consequences	Current Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	
Delay in programme/ delivery and resulting cost implications due to staff capacity and other information and or decisions being made/available at relevant stages of the project.	Potential for project delay due to a number of potential factors. This could also include the delivery of associated mitigation, accommodation or facilitating works.	Stride Treglown and LA architects appointed to undertake engagement and design work. Mace appointed as project managers and cost consultants. Civil & Structural and Building Services engineering consultancies appointed Other specialisms appointed. Allocate sufficient staff resources by prioritising within project programme. Identify and undertake mitigation, accommodation or facilitating works well in advance and ensure decisions made on these early. Close working with appointed contractors.	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Major (3)	1	££
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score			
			Likeli	hood	Imp	act
Monthly meetings established between the Project Office and relevant teams including the contractor. Good liaison with agencies including Sport England, Environment Agency, Southern Water and other utility companies to identify issues in time to adequately address.		Ongoing	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)		Mode (2	I

Risk Number: 7 Risk Owner: Project Executive

Risk Title: Unexpected costs arise for keeping River Park Leisure Centre open

Causes	Consequences	Current Controls	Current Risk Score Likelihood Impact		Risk Proximity	Financial impact
Unexpected costs arise for keeping existing River Park Leisure Centre (RPLC) open	Rising financial costs to keep RPLC open and running may require difficult decisions between additional capital expenditure and facility availability depending on scale. Expenditure on RPLC depletes reserves.	Monitor condition of existing facility carefully. Allow some contingency in budget planning if possible. Identify, approve & monitor maintenance costs.	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Moderate- Major (2/3)	2	££
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score Likelihood Impa		pact	
Keep building condition under review. Will remain a risk until RPLC closes. The 2018/19 capital programme includes a budget to undertake essential capital works required to extend the life of RPLC.		N/A	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)		Moderate (2)	

Risk Number: 8 Risk Owner: Project Executive

Risk Title: Legal challenges are raised

Causes	Consequences	Current Controls	Current Risk Score		Risk	Financial impact
			Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	impact
Legal challenges to any aspect of decision making and or procurement.	If legal challenges are successful the project is halted. If unsuccessful - a delay in the development and additional costs to the project which may render it unviable.	Ensure any legal challenges can be mitigated by obtaining expert advice and evidence to guide and inform processes. Raise awareness of implications of delay. Input from advisory panels.	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Significant (4)	1	££
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score			1
		A.V.A	Likelihood Impa			
Continue to obtain expert advice on procurement and to inform decision making		N/A	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)		Major (3)	

Risk Number: 9			Risk Owner: Project Executive						
Risk Title: Unable to agree highway requirements									
Causes	Consequences Current Co	Current Co	Current Controls		Current Risk Score		Financial impact		
		illiOiS	Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	impact			
Hampshire County Council is not satisfied with highway proposals for Bar End Road put forward as part of planning application and agreement cannot be reached	Could lead to additional land requirements and costs.	Continue discussions with HCC HCC agreement to planning application.		Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)	Moderate (2)	1	££		
Further actions?			Target Date	Residual Risk Score Likelihood Impact			eact		
Further technical work with Highway Authority		Spring 2019	9	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%)		Moderate (2)			

Risk Number: 10 Risk Owner: Project Executive

Risk Title: Technical studies identify adverse issues

Causes	Consequences	Current Controls	Current Risk Score		Risk	Financial impact
			Likelihood	Impact	Proximity	impact
Issues are identified that require further investigation or mitigation.	Could affect delivery if results have significant cost implications. Could affect ability to deliver certain aspiration.	Undertake studies early in process. Ensure correct scope for studies. Review the scope of these studies and update as required in conjunction with appointed design team.	Highly Likely (Probability 76% -100%)	Moderate (2)	1	££
Further actions?		Target Date	Residual Risk Score			
			Likelihood		Impact	
Review and update studies as required - technical studies undertaken include on site conditions and utilities in consultation with the design team. These technical studies have and will continue to inform the design and project programme.		Spring 2019	Unlikely (Probability 26% - 50%) Moderate (2)			