









RISK SIGNIFICANCE

-  BLACK – SHOWSTOPPER; difficult to quantify impacts
-  RED – High Risk
-  AMBER – Medium Risk
-  GREEN – Low Risk

TREATMENT STATUS

-  RED – Treatment Strategy behind programme
-  AMBER – Treatment Strategy on programme
-  GREEN – Treatment Strategy ahead of programme or complete

Tram – Stakeholder Risks

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner*
					end Sep	end Oct		
263	Failure to demonstrate robust case for scheme against required tests of Affordability, Financial Viability, Economic Viability and Modal Shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case is not acceptable • Approvals delayed • Slips into purdah period 		Regular engagement with stakeholders to ensure clarity of requirements			Aug-Nov 06	Stewart McGarrity A&B
				Progressive development of draft business case				
				Updated Project estimate				
264	Political risk to continued commitment of TS/CEC support for the Tram scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reversal of decisions by incoming administrations in either or both of CEC and Holyrood • Project becomes key political issue during election campaign • Protracted decision making and unnecessary debate during consideration of Business Case 		Monitor likely outcomes and do our best to brief all relevant parties about the project in a balanced way			Aug-Nov 06	Willie Gallagher A Andie Harper B
				'Hearts and minds' campaign including Senior Executive Officer meetings with Councillors and MSPs and utilising the tram sounding board meeting with CEC and selected elected transport leads				
				Regular briefings and discussions with senior CEC and TS officers particularly in relation to Full Council presentations				

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner*
					end Sep	end Oct		
265	Poor project governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient information flow to decision makers Slow or overturned decision making Failure to grasp or create opportunities 		Seek clarity of Delegated Authorities of TS and CEC representatives attending Board meetings [Awaiting CEC's statement of reserved powers, otherwise all aspects agreed.]			Aug 06	Graeme Bissett A Geoff Gilbert B
266	JRC model is insufficiently robust to support the Business Case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business case not approved. Time delay and resultant costs caused by redesign and remodelling. 		Intense engagement of TS, CEC and TEL in the development and delivery of patronage, revenue and BCR projections during August and September.			End Oct 06	Stewart McGarrity A&B
				Hold meeting with JRC and stakeholders to discuss results to gain confidence in performance.				
				Encourage approval for tram to be given appropriate priority at junctions during operation.				
				Scenario modelling of estimate				
267	If there is inadequate progress on the operational system including bus/tram integration, development of network service pattern and TEL Business Plan may not be sufficiently robust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay to JRC programme. Reworking of Plans or poorly developed Infraco arrangements with consequential delays due to re-working/change. Increased operating costs and loss of potential revenue. 		Develop clarity on the role and planned deliverables of TEL to bring about integration including development of ticketing strategies and bus/tram service patterns.			Aug 06	Neil Renilson/ Bill Campbell (TEL) A Stewart McGarrity A
				Model integration plans through JRC with rigorous review process using LB knowledge.				
				Identify optimal position for a combined tram/bus position.				
				Prepare TEL Business Plan (incorporating business case tram for system) with development of necessary policies to cover operations.				
268	Funding not secured or agreements not finalised regarding the total aggregate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible showstopper. Delays and increase in 		Ensure close and continual interactions with TS and CEC to establish funding delivery confidence and agreement.			Oct 06	Graeme Bissett A

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner*
					end Sep	end Oct		
	funding including £45m CEC contribution; developer contributions; cashflow/funding profile; financial covenant; and public sector risk allocation e.g. inflation	out-turn cost may affect affordability.	High	Confidence required in contingency figures.	Yellow			Geoff Gilbert B
269	Agreement on financial over-run risks sharing has not been reached between CEC and TS due to doubts over costs staying in budget.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential showstopper to project if agreement is not reached. 		Hold discussions with CEC & TS to ensure adequate release of funds at appropriate periods of time.	Yellow		Dec 07	John Ramsay (TS) A
				Understand commitments by TS and CEC re: 1A and 1B	Yellow			
				Facilitate agreement between CEC and TS.	Yellow			
270	Uncertainty about requirements for wider area modelling and need and extent of construction works required on road network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased construction cost. Delay while additional funding is found. 	High	Clarify and agree boundaries of scope and funding provision between TS and CEC	Yellow		Oct 06	Willie Gallagher A Trudi Craggs B
271	Failure to reach a suitable agreement with CEC regarding: 1. Roads maintenance responsibility where the tram has been installed in CEC maintained roads; 2. What is and is not realistically within the scope of the tram infrastructure delivery contract; 3. The way in which tram UTC priorities are handled at key junctions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay to project while agreement with CEC is reached. Sacrifices being made to ensure agreement is concluded. 	High	Heads of Terms in place by end Oct	Yellow		Dec 06	Willie Gallagher A
				Final agreement to be approved by Roads Authority, CEC Promoter, CEC in-house legal and tie	Yellow			
				Final alignments in place	Green			Trudi Craggs B
272	Delay in land acquisition due to uncertainty of political commitment to scheme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays to Infracore and the overall Tram project. 	High	Achieve approval as part of the Draft Final Business Case 1	Yellow		Dec 06- Feb 07	Willie Gallagher A
				Develop alternative programme scenarios and commentary.	Green			

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner*
					end Sep	end Oct		
				Manage the political risk and enfranchise all political stakeholders in the benefits of Tram.				Trudi Craggs B
273	Business case is not approved during February 2007 due to lack of political commitment due to impending elections until Summer 2007.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay and resultant cost impacts (inflation) on total cost. Political support may evaporate. 		Maintain procurement programme to deliver critical business case inputs Managing expectations on the part of TS and CEC as to the certainty with respect to costs which are reflected in the business case. Ongoing fortnightly reviews with bidders and mid term contractual mark up to inform above treatment			Feb 07	Stewart McGarrity A Bob Dawson B
274	Failure to engage with Transdev in order to adjust DPOFA in line with the development of the Infraco and Tramco procurements. This includes negotiation to secure Transdev acceptance of a subcontract to support system commissioning responsibilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to achieve most effective commercial solution Delay in resolution of Agreements 		Engage with Transdev to ensure adjustment to DPOFA and negotiate requirements.			Dec 06	Alasdair Richards A & B
275	Negative PR coverage due to perceived mistakes or problems in project becoming public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damage to tie's reputation Loss in confidence of tie's delivery Funder/promoter dissatisfaction 		Control confidential information and closely monitor Fol(S)A requests Develop relationship with press with support for PR advisors to control stories Communications Strategy being followed with Partners to ensure any problems are flagged up early and dealt with appropriately via the media or other stakeholders.			On-going	Suzanne Waugh A Mike Connolly B
1	Change in anticipated inflation rate from 5% (included in base estimate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out-turn cost higher than reported 		Monitor inflation indexes such as BCIS to ensure that correct index is applied to project figures	New risk			John Ramsay A Geoff Gilbert B

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner*
					end Sep	end Oct		
347	ROTS regulations expire in October 2010 and current programme show that Trams will not be fully implemented by this time. New interoperability regulations require tie to appoint a "Notified Body" for approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the absence of a "Notified Body", Tram system will not be able to be commissioned Potential 12 month delay whilst notified body appointed and approvals process is undertaken 		Decision required soon as to whether "Notified Body" should be appointed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check Infraco programme for expected Tram implementation date. If Tram implementation date prior to October 2010, "Notified Body" will not be required. Appoint "Notified Body" and use also for EARL. 	New Risk			Willie Gallagher A Susan Clark B

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Tram – Project Risks

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner
					end Sep	end Oct		
276	Unacceptable or inaccurate assumptions are used during JRC modelling and SDS design is based on the model.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Runtime performance requirements are not achieved. Business case is not approved due to doubts over model. Delay during remodelling and redesign resulting in cost and time impacts. 		Continually monitor JRC output through close interaction and progress meetings. Assumptions Approvals process. Ensure regular interaction with stakeholders to keep them informed of progress and expected model results.			End Oct 06	Stewart McGarrity
277	Infraco tender documents are not issued on time INFRACO TENDER DOCUMENTS ISSUED 3 OCTOBER 2006 (ON TIME) – PHASE 2 ISSUE PLANNED FOR END OCTOBER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay to Infraco contract award and whole project progress. Potential showstopper due to cost and loss of political will. 		Continue to work on developing documents to issue on schedule and conduct tender and ongoing negotiations indicating the phased release of design information Identify what information is critical to pricing by Infraco. Procure legal advisor commitment to documents and deadlines set (action complete). Take on additional resource if necessary and appropriate. Ensure that governance structure facilitates fast decision making, review of documents and agreement to procurement strategy by stakeholders			Oct 06	Bob Dawson
278	Infraco tenderers seek extensions of time during tender period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay to market pricing and confirmation of business case capex requirements 		Agree bid programme with bidders Manage bid process to ensure bidders delivery to agreed dates			Aug-Sep 06 9 Jan 07	Bob Dawson

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment		Due Date	Risk Owner	
					end Sep	end Oct			
279	Third party consents including Network Rail, CEC Planning, CEC Roads Department, Historic Scotland, Building Fixing owner consent is denied or delayed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay to programme. Risk transfer response by bidders is to return risk to tie Increased out-turn cost if transferred and also as a result of any delay due to inflation 	Red	<p>Engagement with third parties to discuss and obtain prior approvals to traffic management plans, landscape and habitat plans, TTROs, TROs and construction methodologies in relation to archaeological and ancient monuments</p> <p>Identify fallback options</p>	Yellow		Aug-Oct 06	Trudi Craggs	
280	SDS deliverables are considered to be below quality levels required or late in production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in submission of information to Infraco Delay in achieving consents and approvals Dilution of effort to de-risk Infraco pricing 		Red	Identification of key areas requiring SDS attention. Re-focus SDS effort.	Yellow			Sep 06-Oct 06
281	Insufficient planning of procurements and controls on management and contract costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak procurement plan Cost creep Damage to reputation 	Red		<p>Present update on procurement plans</p> <p>Closely manage expenditure including examination of opportunities for value engineering, influence of change and optimisation of value for money</p>	Green		Sep 06 Oct 06	Geoff Gilbert
282	Procurement strategy has high level of risk transfer to contractors which results in a failure to sustain suitable interest from the market throughout bid process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased price of bids Withdrawal of bidders during bid process 		Yellow	<p>Make risk allocation clear to bidders</p> <p>Identify feasible alternatives to risk allocation and allow negotiation of risk allocation</p>	Yellow		Oct 07 Mid Nov 06	Bob Dawson
283	Infraco tender returns are outside forecast estimates and business case capex limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Final Business Case requires major change and update Business case not sustainable Confidence is lost by Funders and politicians 	Red		<p>Identify feasible options to enable scheme to proceed</p> <p>Conduct review of scenarios and approach to be taken for business case</p> <p>Discuss contingency options with Funders and politicians</p>	Yellow		Oct 06-Jan 07	Stewart McGarrity
284	Delay to early commencement (Jan 07) of depot works at	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential delay and 		Red	Resolve whether or not Leith alternative is viable	Green		Oct 06	Susan Clark

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment			Risk Owner
					end Sep	end Oct	Due Date	
	Gogar	increased cost should longer timescale		Gain TS agreement for early commencement of works including earthworks.				
285	tie fails to secure sufficient resource to manage all relevant processes. Especially issue of ITN, issue of Business Case and evaluation of Infraco tenders by required time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to advance processes at required rate resulting in programme delays and missing of milestones 		Flexible approach to resourcing including drawing on TSS support, support from other contract services providers e.g. Nicols, Dearle & Henderson etc Develop 6 month Resourcing Plan Develop Long Term Resoucing Strategy			On-going Mid Oct 06 Mid Oct 06	Colin McLaughlin
187	Poor relationships with stakeholders including political, Network Rail and other major organisations, businesses, frontages, special interest groups (including Spokes, SNH etc, Equalities Transport (DDA), medial, community councils and residents associations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project loses political and public support Loss of funding support Delays due to protests 		Regular involvement with stakeholders to keep them informed and to better understand their concerns Develop strategies through Mike Connelly to counteract any negative comments Seek support from pro tram lobby groups to promote positive views Continue with Hearts and Minds campaign			On-going On-going On-going On-going	Andie Harper
339	If CEC are unsuccessful in their representation to Scottish Executive on core measures and the Traffic Regulation Orders process resumes, there could be an adverse recommendation from TRO hearing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Orders delayed Delay in section of project Reporter does not approve and prevents Tram Network from going ahead Ultimately, CEC could be subject to judicial review 		Meeting with Scottish Executive				Trudi Craggs
286	Infraco refuses to accept or fully engage in novation of SDS and as a consequence award is successfully challenged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant delay to delivery of Tram Loss of Reputation Significant extra costs 		Consult with legal Introduce Infraco bidders to SDS as early as possible			Feb 07	Bob Dawson
337	Due to human error or change in EU Legislation, the OJEU process is not followed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge by contractor Possible retender Significant delays Potential showstopper 			New Risk			Bob Dawson

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner

Master Risk ID	Risk Description	Effect(s)	Risk Sig	Treatment Strategy	Treatment			Risk Owner
					end Sep	end Oct	Due Date	
344	Withdrawal of bidders or submission of non-compliant bids due to non-project related issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 3 Infraco bids are submitted Less than 3 compliant Infraco bids are submitted Public sector procurement rules are not met resulting in significant delay 			New Risk			Bob Dawson
139 & 164	Uncertainty of Utilities location and consequently required diversion work/ unforeseen utility services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in MUDFA costs or delays as a result of carrying out more diversions that estimated Re-design and delay to Infraco works 			New Risk			Alasdair Slessor

*Note: A – Stakeholder Risk Owner; B – Project Support to Stakeholder Risk Owner