

Project Risk Register

Appendix 1

Risks are calculated using a 5x5 matrix of Probability and Impact

P R O B A B I L I T Y	5	Almost Certain					
			HIGH	HIGH	VERY	VERY	VERY
					HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
	4	Very Likely	SIGNIFICANT	SIGNIFICANT	HIGH	HIGH	VERY
							HIGH
	3	Likely	MODERATE	MODERATE	SIGNIFICANT	SIGNIFICANT	HIGH
	2	Quite Possible	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	SIGNIFICANT	SIGNIFICANT
	1	Unlikely	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
			No Service Impact	Negligible	Moderate	Critical	Catastrophic Service Failure
			1	2	3	4	5
			IMPACT				

Identified Risks	Risk Score			Status of Risk Before Mitigation	Action to Mitigate	Risk Score			Status of Risk After Mitigation	Mitigation Due Date	Responsible Person	Complete
	P	I	Total			P	I	Total				
REPUTATION AND PERCEPTION												
1. Objection from parents, parent councils, elected members, etc.	5	3	15	Very High	Food tasting and consultation events to demonstrate quality and positively influence opinions regarding frozen meals	2	3	6	Moderate	Commence January 2019 To conclude by August 2020	Project Manager	Done Ongoing/ on target
2. Objection from school-based staff (Headteachers etc)	5	3	15	Very High	Food tasting and consultation events to demonstrate quality and explain CPU model benefits	3	2	6	Moderate	Commence May 2019 To conclude by August 2020	Project Manager	Done Ongoing/ on target
3. Resistance from pupils (lower meal uptake)	4	4	16	High	Food tasting and consultation events to demonstrate quality	2	2	4	Low	Commence August 2019 To conclude by August 2020	Project Manager	
4. Damage to the school meals service reputation in media	4	4	16	High	Public relations exercise, consultation and demonstration	4	2	8	Significant	Commence February 2019 Conclude October 2020	Project Leader	Done Ongoing
5. Decline in food quality	4	3	12	High	The menu will be fully tested to ensure food	4	1	4	Low	Commence December	Project Manager	Done

Identified Risks	Risk Score			Status of Risk Before Mitigation	Action to Mitigate	Risk Score			Status of Risk After Mitigation	Mitigation Due Date	Responsible Person	Complete
	P	I	Total			P	I	Total				
					quality is maintained					2018 Conclude March 2020		Ongoing
PEOPLE												
6. Resistance by employees and Trades Unions to a smaller and lower skilled workforce	4	4	16	High	Workforce planning, TU consultation, involvement	3	2	6	Moderate	Commence December 2018 Conclude August 2020	HR Lead	Done Ongoing
7. Objection to loss of 'Dinner Ladies' by public and pupils	4	4	16	High	PR consultation, TU involvement	3	2	6	Moderate	Commence December 2018 Conclude August 2020	HR Lead	Done Ongoing
9. Recruitment difficulties and retention issues for lower paid jobs	3	1	3	Moderate	Current recruitment campaigns are successful - no reason why this won't continue	3	1	3	Moderate	N/A		
FINANCIAL												

Identified Risks	Risk Score			Status of Risk Before Mitigation	Action to Mitigate	Risk Score			Status of Risk After Mitigation	Mitigation Due Date	Responsible Person	Complete
	P	I	Total			P	I	Total				
10. Projected financial savings not realised because assumptions did not materialise	3	4	12	Significant	Payback period extended, increased charge for service, less surplus	3	2	6	Moderate	August 2020 (when capital outlay is known and staffing structures confirmed)	Project Leader	
11. Redundancies and compensation payments excessive, reducing savings potential in year 1	4	5	20	Very High	Workforce planning through age profile and temporary contracts, ongoing Council consultation, extended project payback	2	3	6	Moderate	Commence July 2019 Conclude April 2020	HR Lead	Done
13. Meal uptake decreases significantly	3	4	12	Significant	Quality control measures ensure meal quality is retained or improved, Councils to ensure meals are fairly priced	2	2	4	Low	Commence December 2018 Conclude March 2020	Project Manager	Done Ongoing
14. Change to government policy e.g. Free Meal Entitlement (FME) may decrease	3	3	9	Significant	Best assessment is that FME is more likely to increase	1	3	3	Low	N/A		
15. Capital build and equipment costs are higher than anticipated	4	4	16	High	Obtain costing/ quotes prior to project commitment	2	2	4	Low	Costs checked by QS April 2019	Project Manager	Done

Identified Risks	Risk Score			Status of Risk Before Mitigation	Action to Mitigate	Risk Score			Status of Risk After Mitigation	Mitigation Due Date	Responsible Person	Complete
	P	I	Total			P	I	Total				
16. Tayside Contracts unable to obtain capital funding	2	4	8	Significant	Prudential borrowing from DCC loans fund	2	2	4	Low	April 2019	Project Leader	Done
OPERATIONAL												
17. Future frozen food suppliers do not facilitate CPU meal transportation	3	3	9	Significant	Make alternative logistic arrangements	2	2	4	Low	Conclude options appraisal by end August 2019	Project Manager	On target
18. Hub to Dining Centre delivery failure due to transport issues	4	4	16	High	Business continuity plan developed and well understood	2	2	4	Low	Finalise Continuity Plan by June 2020	Logistics Lead	On target
19. Operational difficulties due to CPU design failures	4	4	16	High	Specialist consultants employed to design CPU production	2	2	4	Low	Architect and specialists appointed by April 2019	Project Leader	Done
GENERAL												
20. PKC deciding not to participate in the CPU (Tay Cuisine) venture	3	5	15	High	Two Council CPU proposal approved by AC and DCC.	3	3	9	Significant	September 2019	Elected Members	On target

Note – A previous version of risk No.20 above was withdrawn from the risk register due to the unlikelihood of this risk being realised following Committee approval in all three areas. In light of Perth and Kinross Council's reconsideration of its position this risk has been re-introduced to the register.