Norfolk County Council, Appendix D - EDT Risk Register Summary												
Risk Register Name:		Appendix D - EDT Risk Register Summary								Red	Û	Worsening
Prepared by:		Thomas Osborne								Amber	\$	Static
Date updated:		February 2018								Green	①	Improving
Next update due:		June 2018								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
Planning and Economy (Corporate and Departmental)	RM14336	Failure to construct and deliver the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing (3RC) within agreed budget (£121m), and to agreed timescales (construction completed early 2023)	There is a risk that the 3RC project will not be delivered within budget and to the agreed timescales. Cause: delays during statutory processes, or procurement put timescales at risk and/or contractor prices increase project costs. Event: The 3RC is completed at a later date and/or greater cost than the agreed budget, placing additional pressure on the NCC contribution. Effect: Failure to construct and deliver the 3RC within budget would result in the shortfall having to be met from other sources. This would impact on other NCC programmes.	3	4	12	2	3	6	Amber	⇔	Tom McCabe
Planning and Economy (Corporate and Departmental)	RM14248	and deliver Norwich	There is a risk that the NDR will not be constructed and delivered within budget. Cause: environmental and/or 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 would result in the shortfall having to be met from other budgets. This would impact on other NCC programmes.	3	3	9	3	3	9	Amber	\$	Tom McCabe
Planning and Economy	RM14202		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	2	2	4	Amber	\$	Nick Tupper
Planning and Economy	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	Amber	\$	Nick Tupper
Highways	RM14292	Failure to development test and implement the Accounts Payable (AP) interface following the replacement of the HMS system.	There is a risk that payments to Tarmac will continue to be made via a manual process if the Accounts Payable interface allowing automatic payment is not fully tested and functioning. Cause: The Mayrise / Realtime AP interface. Event: Payment to Tarmac continues to be undertaken manually via CHAPS. Effect: continued risk of manual error in the payment process / inefficient payment methods.	3	2	6	2	2	4	Amber	\$	Nick Tupper
Highways	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