Transition Risk Register Extract

Risk Title* or Opportunity Title (max. 80 characters)	Risk Description or Opportunity Description	Cause of risk* or reasons for pursuing opportunity	Consequence of risk* or benefit of an opportunity	Probability	Cost	Time	Reputation	People	Benefit Realisation	Impact Score	CSJV Mitigation Measures	CSJV Mitigation Owner	HS2 Mitigation Measures (if applicable)	HS2 Mitigation Owner	Probability	Cost	Time	Reputation	People	Benefit Realisation	Impact Score
Undertakings & Assurance (U&A) compliance	Compliance and discharge or handover of U&As	> Delay to discharge or handover, or non-compliance with remaining U&As > CSJV retains responsibility past WPs completing	> Reputational damage > Delay in close out impacting overall transition > potential for non-compliance	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	12	> add key closures to the transition schedule > agree early handover and switch from CCPC to RDP of U&A responsibility > collaborative approach and planning with HS2 counterparts		Agree ownership of U&As with follow on contractors Agree date of transer of CCPC responsibility to follow on contractors		Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	12
Lack of resources (CSjv)	There is a risk that lack of resources lead to late or unsatisfactory production of completion deliverables for handover	> Number of alternate projects requiring staff > Market demand for EWC expertise > External demand > key resources leave too early	> Schedule impact > Retention of required people to complete the programme of works > Programme-specific knowledge loss > Not enough people to complete the works	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	16	> Staff enagagement and 'finish well' > Live updates to Work Force Plan > Use of agency resource > Management of career development opportunities for staff > Managed transition > Retention bonus, recruitment fairs, communication of end dates, implemented staff engagement plan 18/10 > EWN to HS2 re scope changes affecting delivery resource		> Clarification of scope. HS2 EWN issued raising concerns		Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	9
Loss of key management resources	Key management resources depart and knowledge is lost	> key resources leave too soon or without control > temp backfills do not have the programme-specific knowledge > part time leadership at end of programme > lack of resilience in team	> package specific recall of details lost to the programme > inefficient close out > reputation erosion > lack of dedicated leadership > low engagement and morale > too lean too fast	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	12	> pull people back in from parent companies with agreements in place as they leave > have a key-resource log, for individuals who are the last or amongst the last on the programme with specific knowledge of certain WPs > succession planning and handover of responsibility > a full time leader is needed as a dedicated resource until the end > backfill gaps with the right temp staff > ensure leaders and specialists have the organisational reach-back that they need > have SCS buy in to ongoing support > identify key resource for reach-back, not marking everyone as potentially needing to give support - only a proportion of key individuals 18/10 > PT management terms of engagement		> Clarification of scope. > Contionued support of retention of key resources		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	Possible (3)	Remote (1)	9
H&S incident	Major H&S incident impacts transition of programme	> teams are too depleted > standards drop > works entwined with others	> Harm to individuals/environment > Cost and schedule impact > Reputational damage	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Remote (1)	12	> Finish Well campaign implementation > Safety first culture; challenge 'urgent' additional scope > risk remains with WPs and shall resource/deliver accordingly > ensure the right resources are in place and the organisational 'reach-back' support is sufficient > continue training, IFE, engagement etc as leading indications of performance		> Support engagement and CSJV campaigns > Share learning from across HS2 programme > Safety first culture		Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	9
Defect liability	Defects being raised with CSJV responsibility to close out	> poor workmanship > poor record keeping and assurance > poor preparation and handover of information > incorrect raising of defect	> additional mobilisation, works, cost, time associated with correcting defects > reputational damage	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Remote (1)	9	> defects are allocated and assigned appropriately - ensuring they can be transferred or done by others > ensure learning from recent experiences >detailed review of potential areas of defects undertaken by delivery and Engineering/Assurance teams > ensuring ability to react to potential defects potentially raised and support client in resolving.		> Continued collaborative approach to closing out defects		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	9
Complacency amongst team	Team becomes complacent	> Lack of attention in final months, focus on part time commitments	> Rework required adding time and cost > Inefficient delivery	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	16	> Roll-out of the 'finish well' campaign > Increased appropriate engagement > Team building, training calendar, face-to-face meetings > Engagement measures to maintain focus on this project > Maintain/enhance visible leadership		> Support of the 'finish well' campaign > Finite scope clarity required		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	9
Communication of strategy	Transition strategy not adequately communicated	> poor communication of intentions for transition > message is inconsistent and not cascaded well or relayed up/down stream	> Inconsistent approach > Process ambiguity and uncertainty > Inefficient working > Resource deficits > Delay to transition and increased cost	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	Possible (3)	12	> communication of strategy & Finish Well > produce and update plan in collaboration with HS2 and parent company stakeholders > share lessons and transition blueprint with other contractors > communication lines with supply chain and wider teams > personal responsibility to cascade and share messaging		> Consistency in approach to EWC close-out and communication of approach > HS2 to clarify position.		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	9
Stakeholder complaints received	There is a risk that complaints from third parties and other stakeholders are received.	Impact on traffic flow with multiple utility works and MWCC works taking place concurrently Impact on local residents and businesses from utility works > Noise / dust / vibration reaching an unacceptable level. > Failure to effectively communicate and comply with S61 agreement and undertakings with the supply-chain > High profile stakeholders protecting their interests / seeking	> Reputational damage, delay to programme, additional restrictions. > Attract closer and more costly, regulatory scrutiny. > Enforcement action affects critical path, incurs fines, negative publicity. > Works are temporarily stopped	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	16	> Communication and monitoring of site activities in place with regular/live feedback/data given to local neighbours & authorities > Continued liaison & interaction with local authority and community groups > Full compliance with consents > Updates of the schedule and progress will be on-going throughout.		> Programme and planning of works with MWCC > Control of how areas are managed and any cross-over with follow on contractors and HS2		Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	8
BIM function resilience	BIM coordination maintained amongst engineering disciplines	> Reducing numbers in team lack specialists to support and certify BIM requirements	> Inefficent working adding to cost and time > Non-compliance and rework required > Unplanned reach-back into parent organisations	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Remote (1)	16	> CSjv BIM team supplemented via malloys providing MPDT manager > CSjv PIM on WFP for duration of BIM activity		> HS2 resource (PQ) has identified resiliance route via his Line Manager		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	6
Future outbreaks of COVID-19	There is a risk that further outbreaks of COVID-19 impacts site and office staff	> Pandemic and subsequent outbreaks	> Impact on staff, supply chain and schedule > Impact to resilience of team, when at minimum resource levels.	Likely (4)	Likely (4)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	12	> Maintained social distancing > Mass testing (Project) > Reinforcement of IT and desk usage procedures > Review of team resilience and Work Force Plan		Managed collaboratively with Client and SCSJV		Possible (3)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	Unlikely (2)	Unlikely (2)	Remote (1)	6