

Norfolk County Council, Appendix B - EDT Risk Register Summary

Risk Register Name:		Appendix B - EDT Risk Register Summary										Red	↓ Worsening
Prepared by:		Thomas Osborne										Amber	↔ Static
Date updated:		February 2019										Green	↑ Improving
Next update due:		May 2019										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 - Strategic Infrastructure	RM14336	Failure to construct and deliver the Great Yarmouth Third 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 - Strategic Infrastructure	RM14248	Failure to deliver the Broadland Northway within agreed budget (£205m)	There is a risk that the Broadland Northway will not be delivered within the revised budget. Cause: environmental and/or contractor factors affecting delivery within budget. Event: The Broadland Northway is completed at a cost greater than the agreed revised budget. Effect: Failure to deliver the Broadland Northway within the revised budget would result in the further shortfall having to be met from other budgets. This will impact on	3	3	9	3	3	9	Amber	↔	Tom McCabe	
Planning and Economy	RM14202	Insufficient drainage controls in place as new development continues to take place increasing local flood risk on site or downstream.	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 Flood 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	Amber	↔	Nick Tupper	
Highways	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	3	2	6	Amber	↔	Nick Tupper	