Name of Area / Activity / Contract:

Risk Register Lead:

Date of Review:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very Likely
w (1)	1	2	3	4
um (2)	2	4	6	8
ıh (3)	3	6	9	12
High (4)	4	8	12	16
	ıh (3) um (2)	ıh (3) 3 um (2) 2	h (3) 3 6 um (2) 2 4	h (3) 3 6 9 um (2) 2 4 6

					GROSS	6 risk	Risk	Existing Actions	NET	risk	Risk	Further	Risk Actions	
Ref	Risk Description	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Level	(in place or completed)	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Description	Action Owner	Target Date
1	monitored appropriately.	authorised. • Items paid for in interim payments are paid again in	 Increased costs to the Authority, contract value is exceeded. Contractor misunderstands variation order and completes incorrect/unnecessary work. Variation order is deliberately changed so as to avoid completing work or completing additional work. 				0				0			
2	contract.	• Completion of the contract is behind schedule due to the poor planning of the contractor.	Impact on service delivery or provision of products/goods. Unwarranted extensions are awarded, outside the terms of the contract.				0				0			

			Effect		GROS	S risk	Risk	Existing Actions	NET	risk	Risk	Further	Risk Actions	
Ref	Risk Description	Cause		Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Level	(in place or completed)	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Description	Action Owner	Target Date
		 Inflated interim payments could be collusion of contractor and WCC staff. Calculations relating to interim payments are not supported/substantiated. Fraudulent dayworks/material reimbursement claims are made for work not done. Deductions made, from the payments to contractors, for liquidated damages are not sufficient/inaccurate. WCC fails to submit a claim for losses to the liquidator, or submits them too late. Payments made to a liquidated contractor in respect of one contract whilst money is still owed to WCC by another contractor. 	Penalty payments due to contractor. Charges made for labour / materials not used or used in smaller quantities.				0				0			
4	Quality standards are not met.	Poor quality materials are used by the contractor. Contractor specifications/conditions are not met. Materials are damaged or stolen. Governance arrangements not in place to monitor performance.	End product not fit for purpose.				0				0			

					GROSS	S risk	Risk	Existing Actions	NET	risk	Risk	Further	Risk Actions	
Ref	Risk Description	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Level	(in place or completed)	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Description	Action Owner	Target Date
5	Lack of a monitoring function / process	Meaningful monitoring function/procedures not established. Lack of governance and accountability arrangements. Monitoring officer' roles and responsibilities not defined. Monitoring officer does not have required skills / unaware of contract terms. Regular meetings on performance and reviewing of agreed plan of work.	Areas to be monitored are not defined (quality and financial) Performance indicators have not been agreed. Data collection processes to monitor performance indicators are not established. Financial monitoring (including payments) are not monitored - over/under payments or potential fraud not detected. Escalation process (where issues not resolved) are not defined/agreed. Future contract needs are not identified or fed into future procurement exercises.				0				0			
6	Poor performance of subcontractors	 No formal agreements in place between contractors and subcontractors. Lack of regular performance monitoring. Escalation process (where issues not resolved) are not defined/agreed 	Customer complaints / negative publicity. Potential breach in regulations. Legal challenge. Delays in service.				0				0			
7	Individuals killed on site - by plant, falling off scaffolding etc.	 Contractor uses uninsured plant bought onto the site, not owned by them. Health and safety regulations are breached. Poor subcontractor management. 	 Large legal/ insurance costs. Fines imposed. Damage to reputation. 				0				0			

					GROSS risk		Risk	Existing Actions	NET	risk	Risk	Further Risk Actions		
Ref	Risk Description	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Level	(in place or completed)	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Description	Action Owner	Target Date
	standards/ legislation are continuing to be	 Contractors/providers not aware of their legal obligations. Timescale of the checking process. Poor/lack of monitoring of e.g. health and safety issues, insurance cover etc. 	Customers/staff are put at risk. Negative publicity. Potential legal challenge.				0				0			
9		 Lack of performance monitoring. Poor security. No/poor stockholding by contractor. No communication with supply chain (contractor or WCC). Stock is difficult to source as it is non standard. High risk areas not identified. 	Delays Poor service Customer dissatisfaction Health and Safety issues				0				0			
10	Environmental pollution.	Contractor pollutes the water courses, the atmosphere etc.	 Legal fees, and time imposed to defend the Authority's position. Damage to reputation. Claims from those affected. 				0				0			
11	Disputes with local residents or landowners.	Lack of communication/ consultation. Poor relationships. Contentious decisions.	 Access to the site may be restricted or refused. Delays (or cancellation of) to the project. Increase in costs. 				0				0			
			Service delivery adversely affected. Additional costs incurred due to WCC having to find other ways to fulfil the commitment. Damage to reputation.				0				0			

					GROS	S risk	Risk	Existing Actions	NET	risk	Risk	Further Risk Actions		
Ref	Risk Description	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Level	(in place or completed)	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Description	Action Owner	Target Date
13	contractors.	 WCC materially change the requirements of the contract (from those described in the tender) without going back out to competition. E.g. anything other than price changed. 	Compensation payments to suppliers challenging our actions. Incur another expensive tender process before one is due. Fines.				0				0			
14	Users do not want/use the contracted services	 Poor communication / marketing. Poor quality product / service. Poor consultation with customers to identify their needs. Poor monitoring of contract performance, usage and/or demand. 	Contract work significantly less than the contractor is expecting. Legal challenge. Negative publicity. Negative effect on remaining users/customers. Unable to determine needs/requirements for future contracts.				0				0			
	of intellectual	safeguard intellectual property. • Contractor pulls out of	 Sensitive / confidential information is lost or deliberately stolen. Vulnerable people are put at risk. Financial penalties/ legal challenge. 				0				0			
16							0				0			
17							0				0			