

# Appendix C - Risk Register Abbey Fields Swimming Pools

RISK IDENTIFICATION				RISK ASSESSMENT - POTENTIAL RISK			COUNTERMEASURE/ MITIGATION	RISK ASSESSMENT - RESIDUAL RISK			Action Date	COMMENTS
Ref	Date reviewed	Risk	Impact	Prob.	Severity	Risk Score	Countermeasure	Prob.	Severity	Risk Score		
<b>Strategic Risks</b>												
S1	Oct-23	The project capital costs rise above the £27 million ceiling set in the Council decision, after construction has started.	Any additional funding required would need to be found within the Medium Term Financial Strategy. This would impact on Council funds.	1	3	3	Three contingencies have been allowed for in budgets. Change control processes will be rigorously enforced and Mace will monitor the budget closely.	1	3	3	2024 - 26	The project will be closely monitored and managed to reduce the risk of any additional costs. The contract with Kier will control costs.
S2	Sep-23	Risk of additional cost and delay once work commences on site, due to one or more additional archaeological finds.	Additional delay could cause prolongation costs and a delay to the provision of the new facility for the local residents.	2	3	6	Kier EWN 67 captures the 40 weeks' additional programme and budget which is partly to allow for the risk of prolongation due to archaeological finds.	1	2	2	Jan-24	Risk also mitigated by 'proving' the entire site by digging over the top 1.5 metres of soil. This complete over almost all the site.
S3	Oct-23	The contractor could be more successful in the negotiations on price than the Cost Consultants working for the Council.	This would mean that the Council would be paying too much for the services and materials provided as part of the contract.	1	2	2	An open-book process has been agreed, where Mace will see and can challenge all sub-contractor packages. An independent review will also be held on costs.	1	2	2	Jan-24	Mace are a nationally-recognised company and their scrutiny of the figures will be thorough and on an open book basis. It will also be overseen.
S4	Oct-23	The main contractor Kier ceases trading. Although unlikely, this has happened before in the industry.	If Kier ceased trading the Council would need to procure a new contractor to complete the works. This could be costly and slower.	1	3	3	The Council will ensure that it maintains full records of the work completed by the contractor, so that it is in a position to pass on the work to others.	1	3	3	2024-26	It is difficult to provide countermeasures to reduce this risk, as the performance of the company is outside the control of the Council.
S5	Oct-23	The main contractor Kier is unable to construct in accordance with the demanding specification of the building.	A failure to construct to the demanding specification for the building could have a number of consequences for the Council.	1	3	3	The Project Team will maintain a close supervision of the work of Kier, to ensure that they are delivering in accordance with the specification.	1	2	2	2024-26	Kier are a nationally recognised company with a reputation for delivering on complicated and demanding construction specifications.
<b>Operational Risks</b>												
O1	Sep-23	One or more pile locations prove to be unacceptable to Historic England.	If one or more pile locations are not acceptable to Historic England the foundation design would have to change again.	1	2	2	Full catalogue of all pile locations being prepared for Historic England's approval	1	2	2	Nov-23	Catalogue complete and awaiting sign off by Historic England.
O2	Sep-23	Risk of soil contamination in parts of the site that have not yet been tested.	Soil contamination would require the treatment or removal of the soil in question.	1	2	2	Remaining area to be 'proof dug' in next few weeks.	1	2	2	Nov-23	
O3	Sep-23	The condition of the existing drainage has been unknown and if it is poor it may need replacing.	The drainage needs to be surveyed by CCTV and a decision made as to the need for replacement.	3	1	3	CCTV surveys will confirm the state of the existing drainage before the contract price is agreed.	2	1	2	Nov-23	CCTV surveys will certainly be required. It is known that some drainage will need to be replaced. This will be costed in the contract price.
O4	Sep-23	There may be insufficient gas mains pressure from the existing supply.	If there is insufficient pressure a gas booster would be required to ensure sufficient pressure in the building.	1	2	2	This will be an early priority for a MEP sub-contractor.	1	2	2	May-24	It is not considered likely that a gas booster will be required.
O5	Oct-23	There may not be sufficient material on site to provide a piling mat of the required thickness due to the 500mm rise in the building.	As the building will now be lifted by 500mm there may not now be sufficient material on site to complete the piling mat.	2	2	4	AR Demolition has undertaken to source additional material if it is required. This will be at an additional cost.	1	2	2	Nov-23	The additional cost can be included within the contingency spend.
O6	Sep-23	The main entrance drive to the building may not be wide enough to accommodate a fire engine.	The building will require access by a Fire Engine, but any widening of the Main Drive will be costly and difficult to achieve.	1	3	3	Several meetings have been held with the Fire Service to discuss this and related issues. A decision is expected soon.	1	3	3	Nov-23	It is hoped that the fact that the drive was acceptable access to the old building will persuade the Fire Service to accept no change.
O7	Sep-23	The design process was put on hold pending discussions with Historic England in order to avoid abortive work.	If the design work is not re-commenced then there may be a delay in starting work on site.	1	2	2	It has been agreed that design work should recommence, following Historic England's approval of the revised foundation proposals.	1	1	1	Oct-23	This will facilitate a prompt start on site.
O8	Sep-23	Hoarding around the site is not in the correct position and needs to be moved before the construction period starts.	The location of the hoarding has prevented the 'proving' of the entire site. It needs to be moved outwards and the ground proved.	2	1	2	The hoarding will be moved after the area has been strimmed, and then the ground will be proved.	1	2	1	Nov-23	This additional work will be completed before the final contract price is agreed.
O9	Sep-23	Delays and uncertainty to the access date due to the need for a decision on the Section 73 Material Amendment and mobilisation.	Any delays to the access date will delay the completion of the works and may result in prolongation costs.	2	2	4	The calculation of the maximum contract price has assumed a start on site date of May 2024, It is intended to do better than this date.	1	2	2	May-24	The project team will work very hard to begin on site as quickly as possible whilst avoiding abortive works.

# Appendix C - Risk Register Abbey Fields Swimming Pools

RISK IDENTIFICATION				RISK ASSESSMENT - POTENTIAL RISK			COUNTERMEASURE/ MITIGATION	RISK ASSESSMENT - RESIDUAL RISK				COMMENTS
Ref	Date reviewed	Risk	Impact	Prob.	Severity	Risk Score	Countermeasure	Prob.	Severity	Risk Score	Action Date	
O10	Oct-23	There is a need to include the reconstruction of the tennis courts and the duck-feeding platform in the project.	The reconstruction of the tennis courts and the duck-feeding platform will now be included in the scope of the project.	3	1	3	Allowance has been made in the project budget for both of these activities. They will be completed at the end of the main project.	1	1	1	Summer 26	Tennis courts will probably be completed by Kier as an additional task. The duck feeding platform will be completed by others after completion.

**Mitigation/Countermeasure**

Sometimes known as mitigation, the countermeasure is what we plan to do to prevent the risk from happening. Generally, Countermeasures fall into one of 6 types:

**Prevention:** steps are taken that removes the threat or completely stop it from happening.

**Reduction:** steps taken reduce the chances of the risk developing or limit the impact.

**Acceptance:** it is decided to accept the risk and do nothing. This is almost always taken in the belief that the risk will not occur or the impact negligible. It is particularly important to record that this is the approach being taken.

**Contingency:** actions are planned to come into force only if the risk occurs.

**Transference:** Usually a specialist form of risk reduction where the impact is passed to someone else. e.g. insuring against a risk, or invoking penalty clauses against suppliers.

**Exploit:** Can the risk be turned into an opportunity?

**Probability Categories**

Description		Probability	Scale Value
H	Probable	>70%	3
M	Could happen	30-70%	2
L	Improbable	<30%	1

**Severity Categories**

Description	Guide Scenario	Scale Value
H	Critical Failure that involves significant rework, modification or reassessment	3
M	Serious Failure or setback that causes additional work and reassessment but not critical	2
L	Marginal Impact has some effect causing rework or reassessment but easily corrected	1

**Risk Category & Action**

	<b>Key/ Critical Risks - closely monitor, manage &amp; develop fallback plans</b>
	<b>Intermediate Risks - monitor and manage to mitigate/ include specific risk allowances in cost estimate/ programme</b>
	<b>Minor Risks - general allowance in base cost estimate &amp; programme</b>

**Risk Scoring Matrix**

Severity	High/ Critical	3	3	6	9
	Medium/ Serious	2	2	4	6
Low/ Marginal	1	1	2	3	
		1	2	3	
		Low/ Improbable	Medium/ Could happen	High/ Probable	
		Probability			

**Residual Risk**

Even with a mitigation strategy, it is unlikely that all elements of the risk will be eliminated. Those risks, which are not prevented, or transferred by countermeasures, are known as residual risks. Probability and impact is assessed in the same way to identify their RAG level. This helps to identify what more needs to be done and whether the countermeasure is sufficient.