









Norfolk County Council, Appendix E - EDT Risk Register Summary													
Risk Register Name:		Appendix E - EDT Risk Register Summary									Red	 Worsening	
Prepared by:		Thomas Osborne									Amber	 Static	
Date updated:		October 2016									Green	 Improving	
Next update due:		December 2016									Met		
Area	Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Description	Current Likelihood	Current Impact	Current Risk Score	Target Likelihood	Target Impact	Target Risk Score	Prospects of meeting the Target Risk Score by the Target Date	Change in Prospects of meeting the Target Risk Score by the Target Date	Risk Owner	
Corporate (CES)	RM14250	Infrastructure is not delivered at the required rate to support existing needs and the planned growth of Norfolk.	Not securing sufficient funding to deliver all the required infrastructure for existing needs and planned growth leading to: • congestion, delay and unreliable journey times on the transport network • a lack of the essential facilities that create sustainable communities e.g. good public transport, walking and cycling routes, open space and green infrastructure Not meeting the funding profiles (e.g. LGF) and losing the funding.	3	4	12	3	2	6	Amber		Tom McCabe	
Corporate & Departmental (H&T)	RM14248	Failure to construct and deliver Norwich Northern Distributor Route (NDR) within agreed budget (£178.55m)	There is a risk that the NDR will not be constructed and delivered within budget. Cause: environmental / building contractor factors affecting construction progress. Event: The NDR is completed at a cost greater than the agreed budget. Effect: Failure to construct and deliver the NDR within budget could result in the inability to deliver other elements proposed in the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) Implementation Plan. It would also result in a reduction in delivering economic development and negatively impact on Norfolk County Council's reputation. Exceeding the budget will also potentially impact wider NCC budgets and its ability to deliver other highway projects or wider services (depending on the scale of any overspend).	3	3	9	2	2	4	Amber		Tom McCabe	
E&P	RM14231	Increase in the amount of left over waste collected by local authorities.	The risk is that the amount of waste exceeds the budget provision in 2016/17. Increases in the tonnage of residual waste above projected tonnages would lead to additional costs of around £107 per tonne. An increase could be caused by any combination of factors such as increases in household numbers, change in legislation, or export related issues, economic growth, weather patterns, a collapse in the recycling markets or an unexpected change in unit costs.	3	5	15	1	5	5	Red		David Collinson	
H&T	RM14029	Failure to meet energy reduction and sustainability targets	Highway fails to meet its energy reduction and environmental sustainability targets, leading to expenditure budgets being exceeded as well as adversely impacting on NCC's targets and reputation. Street lighting energy makes up by far the largest proportion of electricity consumption at over 90% of the departmental total.	4	3	12	3	2	6	Green		Nick Tupper	
H&T	RM12988	Experiencing more extreme weather conditions than planned / budgeted for	Conditions resulting from extreme weather may result in the need to manage / divert resources to minimise associated risk, increase in the number of insurance claims for damage / accidents caused by damaged road surfaces and accelerate the deterioration of the carriageways with consequent need for increased capital investment.	4	3	12	4	2	8	Green		Nick Tupper	

E&P	RM14202	Insufficient drainage controls in place as new development continues to take place increasing local flood risk on site or	The SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) Approving Body role recommended by the Pitt Review and included in the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 has been abandoned. Flood risk controls on new development is to be continued through the planning process. The Local Lead Flooding Authority has been given a role as a statutory consultee but no funding to deliver this role. Without high levels of support, planning authority may continue to overlook flood risk in decision making.	3	3	9	3	2	6	Green	↔	Nick Johnson
E&P	RM14203	The allocation and level of funding for flood risk mitigation does not reflect the need or priority of local flood risk within Norfolk.	There are 37,000 properties at risk from surface water flooding caused by intense rainfall within Norfolk. Historically funding for flood risk management has focused on traditional defence schemes to protect communities from the sea and rivers and not surface water flooding. There is a risk that funding continues to ignore properties at risk of surface water flooding. This is exacerbated by a reduction in the overall level of funding from government and governments requirement to seek local contributions for schemes to be successful.	3	3	9	1	4	4	Green	↔	Nick Johnson
E&P	RM12031	Failure by any service provider to provide contracted services for disposal or treatment of waste	Would result in higher costs for alternative disposal and possible disruption to Waste Disposal Authority and Waste Collection Authority operations. If any service provider, i.e. contractor, Norse via an SLA or another authority via an agreement is unable to provide a service for a significant period due to reasons such as planning, permitting, fuel or weather related issues, the Authority may have to use alternative existing contracts which may cost more and require tipping away payments to be made to the Waste Collection Authorities where they are exposed to additional costs for transporting waste significantly out of their area.	3	3	9	1	3	3	Green	↔	David Collinson
H&T	RM14242	Failure to meet Lafarge Tarmac contract requirements as result of slow implementation of new HMS	The project to replace the Exor system with Yotta has reached mobilisation with target date of 29th February 2016 for works ordering through Yotta for Lafarge Tarmac works and payments from Yotts for Lafarge Tarmac from 1 April 2016. Approx. £40M works are ordered and paid through the HMS system each year and there is a contractual 2 day payment period between receipt of invoice from Lafarge Tarmac and payment by NCC.	2	4	8	2	3	6	Amber	↔	Nick Tupper
H&T	RM14050	Rising transport costs	Rising transport costs and changes to legislation (e.g. Bus Service Operators Grant and concessionary reimbursements) could lead to savings not being made on the local bus budgets	2	3	6	1	3	3	Green	↔	Sean Asplin
E&P	RM14239	Failure to deliver the Recycling Centre service within budget for 2016-17	Contract for Mile Cross Recycling Centre is subject to a five year price review commencing September 2016. Initial submission from the contractor highlights a price increase. This will only apply for the second half of the financial year. An SLA contract for 19 Recycling Centres delivered through open book accounting NCC pay the full cost of the service. Fluctuating markets for recyclate (including the possibility of a collapse in prices for some materials) and operational issues that affect the costs of the service mean that the cost of the service may go up or down and potentially affect the final outturn position of the 2016-17 budget.	1	3	3	1	3	3	Green	↔	Kate Murrell

