Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Risk Register

No	Risk Element	Owner	Consequence	Mitigation	Prob	Imp	RAG Rating
	Business Case / Programme Development						
1	Securing DfT Approval – a full business case may need to be produced for consideration by DfT	Dave Colbert	Significant delays to the programme start date, impacting on overall programme timescales.	Review BCR level. Meet with DfT to consider requiring a strategic outline business case only.	1	3	G
2	The timely production of an acceptable business case	Martin Porter	Programme start date could be delayed impacting on the programme timescales	Existing contract procurement to be used and rigorous monitoring arrangements to be put in place.	3	3	A
3	Independent business case appraisal		Failure to secure a positive recommendation could put scheme delivery and in particular timescales at risk.	Further development of the evidence base and business case in line with growth deal/DfT requirements	3	3	A
3	Secure local contributions from partner organisations.	Kathryn Molloy / Beckie Joyce	Budget profile would not be met, requiring alternative funding to be found and/or an amended/reduced programme.	On-going dialogue with Burnley, Pendle and Hyndburn Councils to confirm the funding and agree appropriate arrangements. Seek formal confirmation of LCC contribution.	2	4	A
4	Delay in decision making	Programme Board / LEP Board	Programme start date could be delayed impacting on the programme timescales	Appropriate governance arrangements which provide clarity around responsibilities and a strong communication plan	3	3	A

	Political						
5	Securing and maintaining political support	Programme Board	A lack of political support could impact on the ability to secure the necessary local contributions and on the overall ability to deliver. Could also lead to greater levels of opposition to the scheme.	Clarity around the scheme objectives and how they contribute to local priorities from the outset. Continued communication and consultation with both District and County Members throughout development and delivery.	2	4	A
	Stakeholder Engagement					
6	Securing appropriate permissions and consents from key stakeholders	Project Leads	Measures to counteract effects of the works could be required with potential to increase time and cost of overall project.	Early communication, consultation and involvement for key stakeholders to secure their buy-in and support.	3	2	A
7	Opposition to the programme or particular elements of the programme	LCC Comms lead	Potential reputational impact and could cause delays in delivering the programme.	A strong communication strategy/plan	4	2	A
	Procurement					
8	Difficulties in securing contractors to implement the work programme	Rob Goulding	Could put spend and delivery timescales at risk.	Early involvement of LCC's Operations Team in the planning and programming of works.	3	3	A
9	Procurement process affects project and programme delivery	Project Leads	Could put spend and delivery timescales at risk.	Procurement items to be identified at the earliest opportunity and built in to the construction programme.	2	3	A

10	Costs escalate beyond the funds available	Programme Board	Insufficient fund available to undertake the full programme of work.	Prioritisation of schemes within the programme. Opportunities to increase contributions would be explored alongside any alternative sources of funding or the programme would need to be scaled back.	4	3	A
11	Acquisition of third party land for key projects	Project Leads	Significant delays in key projects which could mean that the projects cannot be progressed within the necessary timeframe, negatively impacting on the overall delivery of the programme.	Programming of individual schemes to reflect timescales for land acquisition. Schemes designed to minimise potential third party land take.			
	Implementation						
12	Significant disruption to the network	Programme Board	Potential impact on support for the scheme. Short term negative impact on longer term objectives.	Continuous and appropriate programming of work.	4	1	G
13	Lack of capacity to support delivery	Programme Board	Programme cannot meet objectives and spend/time targets.	Appropriate project management arrangements in place from the outset, including the use of project teams and strong monitoring and governance arrangements.	4	3	A
	Benefits/Outcomes						
14	Indirect output/outcomes e.g. GVA uplift not achieved	Programme Board	Reputational loss with the potential to impact on the ability to secure resources.	On-going management and monitoring mechanisms through the monitoring and	2	2	G

				evaluation framework.			

PROBABILITY			Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastorophic
75%	Almost Certain	5	5	10	15	20	25
50%	Likely	4	4	8	12	16	20
25%	Possible	3	3	6	9	12	15
10%	Unlikely	2	2	4	6	8	10
1%	Rare	1	1	2	3	4	5
		IMPACT	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastorophic
Colour Key			1	2	3	4	5