



Risk Register

Outline Business Case - Appendix P

17 January 2020

Mott MacDonald
22 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JD
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)1223 463500
mottmac.com

Risk Register

Outline Business Case - Appendix P

17 January 2020

Document reference: 392438-MMD-BCA-XX-RP-BC-0046

Information class: Standard

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

Contents

1	Risk Rating Descriptions	1
2	Risk – Strategic	2
3	Risk – Technical	3

Risk Rating Descriptions

Risk Likelihood Ratings:

Description	Descriptor	Scale
May only occur in exceptional circumstances, highly unlikely	Very Low	1
Is unlikely to occur in normal circumstances, but could occur at some time	Low	2
Likely to occur in some circumstances or at some time	Moderate	3
Is likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	High	4
Is highly likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	Very High	5

Risk Impact Ratings:

Description	Descriptor	Scale
Insignificant disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Little or no loss of front line service No environmental impact No reputational impact Low financial loss (proportionate to budget involved)	Negligible	1
Minor disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Minor disruption to front line service Minor environmental impact Minor reputational impact Moderate financial loss (proportionate to budget involved)	Marginal	2
Noticeable disruption to internal business and corporate objectives Moderate direct effect on front line services Moderate damage to environment Extensive reputational impact due to press coverage Regulatory criticism High financial impact (proportionate to budget involved)	Significant	3
Major disruption to corporate objectives or front line services High reputational impact – national press and TV coverage Major detriment to environment Minor regulatory enforcement Major financial impact (proportionate to budget involved)	Critical	4
Critical long term disruption to corporate objectives and front line services Critical reputational impact Regulatory intervention by Central Govt. Significant damage to environment Huge financial impact (proportionate to budget involved)	Catastrophic	5

2 Risk – Strategic

Project Risk Ref No.	Project Risk Category	Project Stage	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Inherent Risk Rating			CCC Project Manager	Associated Strategic Risk Ref	Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Owner
					Low/High	Impact	Score				Low/High	Impact	Score	
S24	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Transport Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping exercise delayed due to: CAM Board Approval Planning West Cambridge / Bourn Airfield Liaison	If scoping exercise is delayed then this will impact on compiling Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment, delaying Transport Works Act (TWA) Order submission.	5	5	25	Austin Newallie	4	Prepare scoping option and parts of the Environmental Impact Assessment in advance where possible to ensure scoping is submitted as soon after board approval as possible	4	5	20	CCC PM
S31	Project Scope	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Preferred technology cannot deliver operational performance in line with Outline Business Case (OBC).	Cannot procure suitable technological guidance solution that enable the scheme to meet its objectives	4	5	20	Austin Newallie	4	Work with technology suppliers to ensure available technology meets performance requirements.	4	1	4	Project Board
S31	Project Scope	KD-2-3	COST: Preferred technology cannot deliver operational performance in line with Outline Business Case (OBC).	Cannot procure suitable technological guidance solution that enable the scheme to meet its objectives	4	5	20	Austin Newallie	4	Work with technology suppliers to ensure available technology meets performance requirements.	4	1	4	Project Board
S28	Project Management	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Scheme does not obtain planning powers	Current preferred planning route is a Transport Works Act (TWA). Scheme fails to demonstrate its case and that it is within the public interest.	4	4	16	Austin Newallie	4	Prepare Transport Works Act (TWA) with input from legal and planning advisors	3	4	12	Project Board
S3	Project Scope	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Recommended route option not accepted by Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)	Need to revise Outline Business Case (OBC) with consequent impact on programme	3	5	15	Austin Newallie	6	Provide necessary evidence to Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to enable decision on made in advance of executive board/July Board with stakeholder buy in.	2	5	10	Project Board
S15	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Changed timings for Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) key decision points	Programme may not fit requirements	3	4	12	Austin Newallie	6	Communicate effectively to agree programme. Regular review and update of programme.	2	4	8	Executive Board
S16	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Lack of stakeholder support for project	Objections at public enquiry, further public engagement required	3	4	12	Austin Newallie	9	Ensure decisions are informed by business case and demonstration of public benefits	3	3	9	CCC PM
S22	Statutory Process	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Late decision on approval route leads to delay in production of Environmental Impact Assessment / planning supporting documents	Delay in planning submission	4	3	12	Austin Newallie	4	Method agreed whereby scoping submitted Q3 2019 following board approval. EIA may need to start at risk to meet current programme.	2	3	6	Project Board
S26	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) not confirmed	City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) not confirmed before Transport Works Act (TWA) submission which could weaken or delay submission	3	4	12	Austin Newallie	1	Develop programme of all workstreams. Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to identify when City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) will be decided.	3	4	12	Project Board
S28	Project Management	KD-2-3	COST: Preferred technology cannot deliver operational performance in line with Outline Business Case (OBC)	Cannot procure suitable technological guidance solution that enable the scheme to meet its objectives	4	3	12	Austin Newallie	4	Work with technology suppliers to ensure available technology meets performance requirements	3	3	9	Project Board
S24	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Transport Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping exercise delayed due to: CAM Board Approval Planning West Cambridge / Bourn Airfield Liaison	If the scoping exercise is delayed then this will impact on compiling Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment, delaying Transport Works Act (TWA) Order submission	5	2	10	Austin Newallie	4	Prepare scoping option and parts of the EIA in advance where possible to ensure scoping is submitted as soon after board approval as possible	4	2	8	CCC PM
S14	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Development of processes and procedures related to Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) funding introduces new decision points and reporting requirements	Delay to programme and increased costs	3	3	9	Austin Newallie	6	Align business case development work with existing key decisions to ensure decision making is clear and understood	2	3	6	Project Board
S24	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Park and Ride	Failure to obtain consensus on basis for choice of P&R site	3	3	9	Austin Newallie	6	Ensure scheme assessment rigorously covers all impacts and is adequately covered within business case	1	3	3	CCC PM
S26	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) not confirmed	City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) not confirmed before Transport Works Act (TWA) submission which could weaken or delay submission	3	3	9	Austin Newallie	1	Develop programme of all workstreams. Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to identify when City Deal Tranche 2 funding (2020-2025) will be decided.	2	3	6	Project Board
S6	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Special Interest Groups exert undue influence on the project	Decisions on scope of scheme not determined in a robust and defensible manner that would stand up during an enquiry.	3	3	9	Austin Newallie	9	Implement and deliver a robust stakeholder communication plan. Review influences on governance process. Demonstrate public benefits.	3	3	9	CCC PM
S10	Project Management	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Proposed developments for West of Cambridge not approved	Outline Business Case (OBC) undermined/benefits reduced	2	4	8	Austin Newallie	4	Low risk but could lower BCR as fewer users for P&R/Boway. Liaise with planning/DC officers.	2	4	8	Executive Board
S27	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Assurance requirements remain in draft form	Scheme documents currently state management principles being used (e.g. PRINCE2) but this is not being fully implemented within Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).	2	4	8	Austin Newallie	4	Seek clarity and validation of Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) assurance system	1	4	4	Project Board
S12	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Recommended route not underpinned by adequate stakeholder / landowner engagement	Programme extension	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Consult in autumn 2018. Sufficient stakeholder engagement (e.g. University). Landowner engagement has been stepped up and nearly all owners have now been found and met.	2	3	6	CCC PM
S12	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Recommended route not underpinned by adequate stakeholder / landowner engagement	Programme extension	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Consult in autumn 2018. Sufficient stakeholder engagement (e.g. University). Landowner engagement has been stepped up and nearly all owners have now been found and met.	2	3	6	CCC PM
S14	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Development of processes and procedures related to Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) funding introduces new decision points and reporting requirements	Delay to programme and increased costs	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	6	Align business case development work with existing key decisions to ensure decision making is clear and understood	1	3	3	Project Board
S15	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Changed timings for Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) key decision points	Programme may not fit requirements	3	2	6	Austin Newallie	6	Communicate effectively to agree programme. Regular review and update of programme.	2	2	4	Executive Board
S16	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Lack of stakeholder support for project	Scheme fails to attract and retain support	3	2	6	Austin Newallie	9	Ensure decisions are informed by business case and demonstration of public benefits	3	1	3	CCC PM
S20	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Uncertainty regarding lead authority for scheme	Creation of Combined Authority including Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) creates uncertainty as to eventual scheme sponsorship	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	6	Ensure legal and procedural process for delivery outlined in Business Case and communicated to Elected Members	2	2	4	Executive Board
S20	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Uncertainty regarding lead authority for scheme	Creation of Combined Authority including Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) creates uncertainty as to eventual scheme sponsorship	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	6	Ensure legal and procedural process for delivery outlined in Business Case and communicated to Elected Members	2	2	4	Executive Board
S21	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	COST: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Bus Strategy Review	Uncertainty regarding outcome of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) review of bus policy. Potential impacts on credibility of public transport solutions, including this scheme.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Ensure there is a public transport operational strategy	1	3	3	CCC PM
S21	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Bus Strategy Review	Uncertainty regarding outcome of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) review of bus policy. Potential impacts on credibility of public transport solutions, including this scheme.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Ensure there is a public transport operational strategy	1	3	3	CCC PM
S23	Consultation/Comms	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Consultation Fatigue	Risk that Public and Elected Members lose sight of and confidence in policy delivery	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Establishing a clear understanding of how consultation and stakeholder engagement supports scheme business case towards development and delivery	1	3	3	Project Board
S24	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	COST: Park and Ride	Failure to obtain consensus on basis for choice of P&R site	3	2	6	Austin Newallie	6	Ensure scheme assessment rigorously covers all impacts and is adequately covered within business case	1	2	2	CCC PM
S25	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Policy/governance change within the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) could introduce new or conflicting priorities.	Delay to delivery and scope creep. Potential for project to be significantly amended or cancelled.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	7	Continued to update and refine the requirements of the scheme within the business case	1	3	3	Project Board
S25	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Policy/governance change within the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) could introduce new or conflicting priorities.	Delay to delivery and scope creep. Potential for project to be significantly amended or cancelled.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	7	Continued to update and refine the requirements of the scheme within the business case	1	3	3	Project Board
S27	City Deal Governance	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Assurance requirements remain in draft form	Scheme documents currently state management principles being used (e.g. PRINCE2) but this is not being fully implemented within Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	4	Seek clarity and validation of Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) assurance system	1	3	3	Project Board
S29	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	COST: Lack of landowner Data / records	Difficultly contacting landowners leads to unknown objections.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Bruton Knowles engaged to identify gaps and advise on procedures.	1	3	3	CCC PM
S29	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Lack of landowner Data / records	Difficultly contacting landowners leads to unknown objections.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	9	Bruton Knowles engaged to identify gaps and advise on procedures.	1	3	3	CCC PM
S3	Project Scope	KD-2-3	COST: Recommended route option not accepted by Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)	Need to revise Outline Business Case (OBC) with consequent impact on programme	3	2	6	Austin Newallie	6	Provide necessary evidence to Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to enable decision on made by mid 2018 with stakeholder buy in.	2	2	4	Project Board
S30	Project Management	KD-2-3	COST: Numerous consultants acting for Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)	Communication issues leads to delay in programme or rework.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	13	Ensure all parties invited to regular meetings and regular contact maintained. Design / Landscaping and procurement now sits with one consultant.	1	3	3	CCC PM
S30	Project Management	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Numerous consultants acting for Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)	Communication issues leads to delay in programme or rework.	2	3	6	Austin Newallie	13	Ensure all parties invited to regular meetings and regular contact maintained. Design / Landscaping and procurement now sits with one consultant.	1	3	3	CCC PM
S6	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	COST: Special Interest Groups exert undue influence on the project	Decisions on scope of scheme not determined in a robust and defensible manner that would stand up during an enquiry.	3	2	6	Austin Newallie	9	Implement and deliver a robust stakeholder communication plan. Review influences on governance process. Demonstrate public benefits.	3	2	6	CCC PM
S8	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) emergent LTP (including CAM) is inconsistent with existing planning policy	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) transport policies divergent from existing policy. Therefore cannot be delivered within timescales.	1	5	5	Austin Newallie	7	Business Case to be clear on assumptions. LTP now emerging, appears to be in line with CMC scheme.	1	5	5	Project Board
S9	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Recently commissioned CAM Study recommends alignment not compatible with current options	Study conflicts with scheme developed to date	1	5	5	Austin Newallie	9	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) currently aligned with CMC in terms of route choice.	1	5	5	CCC PM
S10	Project Management	KD-2-3	COST: Proposed developments for West of Cambridge not approved	Outline Business Case (OBC) undermined/benefits reduced	2	2	4	Austin Newallie	4	Low risk but could lower BCR as fewer users for P&R/Boway. Liaise with planning/DC officers.	2	2	4	Executive Board
S22	Statutory Process	KD-2-3	COST: Late decision on approval route leads to delay in production of EIA / planning supporting documents	Delay in planning submission	4	1	4	Austin Newallie	4	Method agreed whereby scoping submitted Q3 2019 following board approval. EIA may need to start at risk to meet current programme.	2	1	2	Project Board
S23	Consultation/Comms	KD-2-3	COST: Consultation Fatigue	Risk that Public and Elected Members lose sight of and confidence in policy delivery	2	2	4	Austin Newallie	9	Establishing a clear understanding of how consultation and stakeholder engagement supports scheme business case towards development and delivery	1	2	2	Project Board
S8	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	COST: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) emergent LTP (including CAM) is inconsistent with existing planning policy	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) transport policies divergent from existing policy. Therefore cannot be delivered within timescales.	1	3	3	Austin Newallie	7	Business Case to be clear on assumptions. LTP now emerging, appears to be in line with CMC scheme.	1	3	3	Project Board
S9	External Stakeholders	KD-2-3	COST: Recently commissioned CAM Study recommends alignment not compatible with current options	Study conflicts with scheme developed to date	1	3	3	Austin Newallie	9	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) currently aligned with CMC in terms of route choice.	1	3	3	CCC PM

3 Risk – Technical

Project Risk Ref No.	Project Risk Category	Project Stage	Project Risk Description	Potential Impact	Inherent Risk Rating			CCC Project Manager	Associated Strategic Risk Ref	Risk Mitigation Measures	Residual Risk Rating			Risk Mitigation Owner
					Relevance	Impact	Score				Relevance	Impact	Score	
T6	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: BA surveys commence in spring 2019 to meet current programme	If surveys undertaken in 2019 season then data may be time expired and may need to be redone if programme experiences delay.	3	5	15	Austin Niv adlie	NA	May need agreement to proceed at risk without GCP board approval on route. Abortive surveys may be required to cover several options. JM has prepared a note on lifespan of surveys.	2	5	10	Service Provider
T16	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Base year model not matching observed flows	Results not suitable for CBC	3	4	12	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Obtain latest validation report and review New PT model and updates to CSRM (D Model) underway. Latest LMR is awaited. Various issues identified and dealt with during model creation / testing. Modelling programme being monitored by Heather Clarke who has regular contact with Atkins.	2	4	8	Service Provider
T18	CCC Resources	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Information sharing between large number of parties/disciplines	Delays and lack of clarity	4	3	12	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Agree communication procedures. Hold regular meetings with entire team. Use of Project site and BM.	3	3	9	Service Provider
T24	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Roadrisk	Degree of elevation of Bin Brook crossing leads to visual impact due to structure	3	4	12	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Design produced for levels over Bin Brook	2	4	8	Service Provider
T38	CCC Resources	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Political process / Availability for workshops	Stakeholders may not be available, or purdah period delays decisions or limits effectiveness of workshops	3	4	12	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Communicate effectively to agree programme	2	4	8	Project Board
T40	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Proposed solution cannot operate at adequate speed.	Reduced speed of optical guidance technology leads to impact on business case and leads to objections / questioning at Public Inquiry	4	3	12	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Advice being sought from Present Mason on consents route. Attempt to word order to allow any allowable guidance technology under the rules. Keep up to date on technology developments to assess risk heading low and TWA submission.	3	3	9	Project Board
T8	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Failure to adhere to webTAG compliance (e.g. optioneering process, BCR creation)	Impact on the approval process and potential for judicial review and challenge at inquiry	2	5	10	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Complete review of work to date and present in CARL	1	4	4	Service Provider
T11	Project Scope	KD-2-3	COST: Inability to meet policy objectives in local plans relating to net biodiversity gain	Challenge at planning application stage	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Early engagement with LPA ecologist, willingness to look for opportunities - could lead to increase cost of scheme	2	3	6	CCC PM
T11	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: A428/9 Neats Road Dumbell roundabout overlaid by Bourn Airfield development - no proposal in Bourn development scheme to improve roundabout	Requirement to improve borne by A428	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Liaise with LPA and CC	2	3	6	Project Board
T24	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Roadrisk	Degree of elevation of Bin Brook crossing leads to visual impact due to structure	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Design produced for levels over Bin Brook	2	3	6	Service Provider
T28	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Junctions options negatively impact Highways England network	Highways England will not allow that section of the scheme to be implemented	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Include Highways England in the optioneering process and ensure they accept the modelling results	2	3	6	Service Provider
T28	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Junctions options negatively impact Highways England network	Highways England will not allow that section of the scheme to be implemented	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Include Highways England in the optioneering process and ensure they accept the modelling results	2	3	6	Service Provider
T3	Project Scope	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: If Cambois section and Bourne section are to be in TWA, it will need to be included in BA	Delay in planning submission	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Engagement and agreement on route of the scheme in these two areas so BA can properly assess the impacts as cumulative impact or in the BA for the scheme. Advice to be sought from Present Mason.	3	3	9	CCC PM
T39	Project Management	KD-2-3	COST: Interpretation of Green Belt	Interpretation of appropriate development on Green Belt is ambiguous	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Work with LPA to ensure strategic planning policy compliance	2	3	6	Service Provider
T41	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Change in mode undermines consultation and/or Biv Assessment	BA based on one mode choice, a change at TWA submission could undermine assessment and lead to delay and rework to assess alternative option.	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Advice sought from Present Mason on approach to TWA submission / BA.	3	3	9	Project Board
T41	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Change in mode undermines consultation and/or Biv Assessment	BA based on one mode choice, a change at TWA submission could undermine assessment and lead to delay and rework to assess alternative option.	3	3	9	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Advice sought from Present Mason on approach to TWA submission / BA.	3	3	9	Project Board
T18	CCC Resources	KD-2-3	COST: Information sharing between large number of parties/disciplines	Delays and lack of clarity	4	2	8	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Agree communication procedures. Hold regular meetings with entire team. Use of Project site and BM.	3	2	6	Project Board
T15	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Lack of buy into modelling due to "Black-Box" approach	Lack of buy-in, risk to application	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Document decisions in methodology note. Methodology to reduce "Black-Box" approach where possible. New PT model and updates to CSRM (D Model) underway	2	2	4	Service Provider
T15	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Lack of buy into modelling due to "Black-Box" approach	Lack of buy-in, risk to application	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Document decisions in methodology note. Methodology to reduce "Black-Box" approach where possible. New PT model and updates to CSRM (D Model) underway	2	2	4	Service Provider
T21	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Change in guidance approach	Decision to change from kerb guided to optical guidance raises uncertainty regarding pavement finish and required width, leading to unauthorised vehicle incursion and design changes.	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Work with technology review to consider design features. Consider variation in design to suit local circumstances and address incursions by unauthorised vehicles	2	2	4	Project Board
T22	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Park and Ride	Need HE agreement for exit from Scotland Farm	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Regular HE engagement	2	2	4	CCC PM
T26	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: City Centre Congestion/uncertainty re complementary access measures	Still uncertainty re bus routes and city centre strategy. Interdependent project. City Centre workshop.	2	3	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Liaise with City Centre Access to identify work being undertaken.	1	3	3	Project Board
T29	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Significant Statutory Undertakers diversions required	Significant Statutory Undertakers diversions required	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Undertake C3 diversion requests on recommended option	3	2	6	Service Provider
T30	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Unfavourable ground conditions along the route	Increased construction costs and delays to programme	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Early desktop ground investigation (GI) to identify potential issues. Further GI if required.	3	2	6	Service Provider
T31	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Scope/deliver of a "green bridge" is not acceptable to Highways England	Bridge design amended to a "standard" arrangement. Potential loss of environmental benefits	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Include Highways England in the development process and seek early agreement on Asset Protection Agreement	2	2	4	CCC PM
T34	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Encroachment into the root protection zone of protected trees along the R116 Rance access	Loss of 3no TPO trees	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Mitigation planting. Protect through design changes.	3	2	6	Service Provider
T38	CCC Resources	KD-2-3	COST: Political process / Availability for workshops	Stakeholders may not be available, or purdah period delays decisions or limits effectiveness of workshops	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Communicate effectively to agree programme	2	2	4	Project Board
T42	Supply Chain	KD-2-3	COST: Suitable supplier of optical guidance equipment.	Only Siemens appear to be a likely supplier in current conditions. Could lead to competition issues.	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Keep up to date on technology developments to assess risk heading low and TWA submission.	3	2	6	Project Board
T6	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: BA surveys commence in spring 2019 to meet current programme	If surveys undertaken in 2019 season then data may be time expired and may need to be redone if programme experiences delay.	3	2	6	Austin Niv adlie	NA	May need agreement to proceed at risk without GCP board approval on route. Abortive surveys may be required to cover several options. JM has prepared a note on lifespan of surveys.	2	2	4	Service Provider
T9	Supply Chain	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Lack of interest in scheme from suitable contractors	Unable to deliver competitive procurement	1	5	5	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Early contractor involvement to encourage participation. Liaise with TGM for recent experience on Leigh guided busway.	1	5	5	Project Board
T23	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Rail-running	TA identifies need for local traffic management to manage rail-running associated with other PMR	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	-	2	2	4	Service Provider
T23	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Rail-running	TA identifies need for local traffic management to manage rail-running associated with other PMR	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	-	2	2	4	Service Provider
T26	Design	KD-2-3	COST: City Centre Congestion/uncertainty re complementary access measures	Still uncertainty re bus routes and city centre strategy. Interdependent project. City Centre workshop.	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Liaise with City Centre Access to identify work being undertaken.	1	2	2	Project Board
T27	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Potential duplication/conflict	Combenton greenway	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Understand interdependency	1	2	2	CCC PM
T27	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: Potential duplication/conflict	Combenton greenway	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Understand interdependency	1	2	2	CCC PM
T33	Design	KD-2-3	COST: On-street sections, e.g. Grange Road / Adams Road: additional design required at safety audit	Exception report required or additional land to provide an option which is safety compliant	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Undertake a safety assessment as part of the optioneering process	1	2	2	Service Provider
T33	Design	KD-2-3	SCHEDULE: On-street sections, e.g. Grange Road / Adams Road: additional design required at safety audit	Exception report required or additional land to provide an option which is safety compliant	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Undertake a safety assessment as part of the optioneering process	1	2	2	Service Provider
T8	Scheme Development	KD-2-3	COST: Failure to adhere to webTAG compliance (e.g. optioneering process, BCR creation)	Impact on the approval process and potential for judicial review and challenge at inquiry	2	2	4	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Complete review of work to date and present in CARL	1	2	2	Service Provider
T3	Project Scope	KD-2-3	COST: If Cambois section and Bourne section are to be in TWA, it will need to be included in BA	Delay in planning submission	3	1	3	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Engagement and agreement on route of the scheme in these two areas so BA can properly assess the impacts as cumulative impact or in the BA for the scheme. Advice to be sought from Present Mason.	3	1	3	CCC PM
T31	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Scope/deliver of a "green bridge" is not acceptable to Highways England	Bridge design amended to a "standard" arrangement. Potential loss of environmental benefits	3	1	3	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Include Highways England in the development process and seek early agreement on Asset Protection Agreement	2	1	2	CCC PM
T34	Design	KD-2-3	COST: Encroachment into the root protection zone of protected trees along the R116 Rance access	Loss of 3no TPO trees	3	1	3	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Mitigation planting. Protect through design changes.	3	1	3	Service Provider
T9	Supply Chain	KD-2-3	COST: Lack of interest in scheme from suitable contractors	Unable to deliver competitive procurement	1	2	2	Austin Niv adlie	NA	Early contractor involvement to encourage participation. Liaise with TGM for recent experience on Leigh guided busway.	1	2	2	Project Board

