CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL – DEPARTMENT/SERVICE RISK REGISTER

Learning Transformation Board

RISK REGISTER

Procurement of New Premises for All Saints' Academy, Dunstable:

Central Bedfordshire Council Focussed Risks

Version 1

November, 2009

Introduction

This risk register should be read alongside

- The risk register maintained by the Academy Project Design User Group
- The risk register maintained for the generic work of the Learning Transformation Board (LTB). The Academy project is one strand of the LTB's responsibilities.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

- 1. The 'Risk with controls' entries in the chart below assume the availability of additional Central Bedfordshire Council funding to support the delivery of the project; if this funding cannot be made available these controls should be rescored.
- 2. The figures in the right-hand 'costs' column are in addition to the £300K allowed for by the Partnerships for Schools funding arrangements.

| | | Risk | without co | ntrols | | Risk | with contro | ols | | | |
|----|---|------------|------------|--------|--|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------|
| No | RISKS | Likelihood | Impact | Score | Controls in Place / Remedial Action | New Likelihood | New Impact | New Score | Leading Officer(s) | Target Date | COSTS £ (Est.) |
| 1. | Lack of skilled capacity at key points in the programme for the delivery of the new Academy buildings results in weakened delivery, programme slippage, further costs and damage to the Council's reputation. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Specialist consultant engaged to co- ordinate Council's involvement Competitive appointment of Technical Adviser through Partnerships for Schools Framework Oversight (of above) by line management and governance structure, with regular direct report to Learning Transformation Board Regular scrutiny of Academy Design User Group Risk Register of whole scheme | 2 | 2 | 4 | Rob Parsons | In place April, 2009- LTB 19.10.09 + As above | £100K |

| | | Risk | without co | ntrols | | Risl | with contr | ols | | | |
|----|--|------------|------------|--------|---|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| No | RISKS | Likelihood | Impact | Score | Controls in Place / Remedial Action | New Likelihood | New Impact | New Score | Leading Officer(s) | Target Date | COSTS £ (Est.) |
| 2 | Partnerships for Schools' arbitary £300k on-costs budget cap limits the funding available to the Council to adequately discharge its supervisory functions and provide contingency should the need emerge to obtain: - further specialist external advice - contractrural/legal advice should disputes with contractors arise - adequate compliance with Construction, Design and Management regulations | 3 | 4 | 12 | submission for additional capital funding being submitted to the Council's Executive, including £90k contingency across the residual life of the programme all on-cost budget lines monitored monthly by Head of Service six-monthly review of adequacy of project support funding to be established risk registers and reports for Learning Transformation Board to include any new, emerging financial issues. | 2 | 2 | 4 | Rob Parsons | 8.12.09 In place November, 09 1 st review end-April, 2009 In place, November, 09 | £200K (<u>NB</u> – see risk 3, below) |

| | | Risk | without co | ntrols | | Risk | with contr | ols | | | |
|----|---|------------|------------|--------|---|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| No | RISKS | Likelihood | Impact | Score | Controls in Place / Remedial Action | New Likelihood | New Impact | New Score | Leading Officer(s) | Target Date | COSTS £ (Est.) |
| 3 | Utilisation of a design-and-build contract form militates against effective monitoring, leading to subsequent end-user dissatisfaction and significant unbudgeted rectification costs. Form of contract requires Council to meet cost over-runs in these circumstances. | 3 | 4 | 12 | contractors implementing the scheme are pre-approved on Partnerships for Schools Framework 11 technical site surveys have been undertaken prior to the letting of the contract it has been agreed with Technical Adviser and Design User Group to employ a Clerk of Works to oversee implementation Clerk of Works to be given direct access to Technical Adviser if non- compliance identified Technical Adviser to escalate identified issues to Council, at Senior Officer level, in order to invoke timely solutions. | 2 | 2 | 4 | Technical Adviser Rob Parsons | April, 2010 | Included within £200K, above. |

RISK SCORING CHART - This scoring gives the following risk ranking:

| <mark>High risk</mark> - | score of 16-25 |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Medium risk - | score of 8-15 |
| Low risk - | score of 1-7 |

| | Very High (Catastrophic) | 5 | Low (5X1 = 5) | Medium (5X2 = 10) | Medium (5X3 = 15) | High (5X4 = 20) | High (5X5 = 25) |
|--------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| | High (Severe) | 4 | Low (4X1 = 4) | Medium (4X2 = 8) | Medium (4X3 = 12) | High (4X4 = 16) | High (4X5 = 20) |
| Impact | Medium (Major) | 3 | Low (3X1 = 3) | Low (3X2 = 6) | Medium (3X3 = 9) | Medium (3X4 = 12) | Medium (3X5 = 15) |
| | Low (Reasonable) | 2 | Low (2X1 = 2) | Low (2X2 = 4) | Low (2X3 = 6) | Medium (2X4 = 8) | Medium (2X5 = 10) |
| | Very Low (Low) | 1 | Low (1X1 = 1) | Low (1X2 = 2) | Low (1X3 = 3) | Low (1X4 = 4) | Low (1X5 = 5) |
| | | _ | 1 Very Low (Rare) | 2 Low (Unlikely) | 3 Medium (Possible) | 4 High (Likely) | 5 Very High (Very Likely) |
| | Likelihood (Probability) | | | | | | |

IMPACT & LIKELIHOOD DESCRIPTIONS - This table helps to define levels of impact and likelihood:

| Impact: | Service Delivery | Financial Loss | Reputational | Health & Safety |
|---------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|
|---------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|

| Catastrophic | Total system dysfunction Total shutdown of operations. | Over £5m | Key person resignation/ removal Sustained adverse publicity in national media | Fatality or permanent disability (single event) |
|--------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Severe | All operational areas of a location compromised Other locations may be affected | Up to £5m | Sustained adverse publicity in national media Board and Member dissatisfaction | Greater than 6 months absence for more than 5 people (single event) |
| Major | Disruption to a number of operational areas within a location and possible flow on to other locations | Up to £1m | Significant adverse publicity national media | Greater than 20 days absence for more than 5 people (single event) |
| Reasonable | Some disruption manageable by altered operational routine | Up to £250k | Significant adverse publicity in local media | Short term absence for up to 5 people (single event) |
| Low | No / minimal interruption to service. | Up to £100k | Minor adverse publicity in local media | Short term absence for up to 5 people (single event) |

| Indicators |
|--|
| Likely to occur every 10+ years/up to a 10% chance of occurrence |
| Likely to occur every 10 years/up to a 20% chance of occurrence |
| Likely to occur every 5 years/up to a 40% chance of occurrence |
| Likely to occur every 3 years/up to a 60% chance of occurrence |
| Likely to occur each year/over 60% chance of occurrence |
| |