

<b>Probability</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Score</b>
Very Likely	60%	100%	5
Likely	30%	60%	4
Fairly Likely	10%	30%	3
Unlikely	5%	10%	2
Very Unlikely	0%	5%	1
<b>Cost Impact</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Score</b>
VH	£250,000	£500,000	5
H	£125,000	£250,000	4
M	£62,500	£125,000	3
L	£31,250	£62,500	2
VL	£1	£31,250	1

Threat  
 Opportunity  
 Estimate Uncertainty

**Category**

- Technical
- Commercial
- Reputational
- Safety
- Environmental
- Organizational
- Aesthetic
- Approval
- Construction
- Showstopper
- Non cost risk

TVP P&R		PRE - MITIGATION				RESIDUAL RISK POST MITIGATION							
Risk ID	Risk Description	Threat / Opportunity	Probability of Occurrence	Cost Impact if Occurs	Overall Risk Score	Risk Response	Risk Org	Risk Mitigation Owner	Cost of Risk Intervention	Cost Estimate Notes	Probability of Occurrence	Cost Impact if Occurs	Overall Risk Score
PROJECT RISKS													
1.1	Land required currently in Oracle ownership	Threat	Very Likely	VH	25	Met with Oracle (4/8/15) and land will be passed to WBC. Draft Heads of Terms sent to Oracle solicitors on 6/6/16.	WBC		£0	Initial discussions taken place with land owners	Unlikely	VH	10
1.2	Wokingham Waterside Centre objecting to application	Threat	Fairly Likely	M	9	Met with WWC and have ensured that campsite retained and made WWC aware.	WBC		£0		Unlikely	M	6
1.3	Potential of GCN present nearby	Threat	Fairly Likely	H	12	Met with WBC. They are aware of neighbouring pond and say Oracle have tested it and found no GCN.	WBC		£0	Detailed surveys already undertaken	Very Unlikely	H	4
1.4	SGN Gas Main obstructing construction	Threat	Very Likely	VH	25	Initial Correspondence positive. Detailed Design will ensure elevation of access road is not reduced below current ground level over pipe. On 5/5/16 asked that "options other than gabion wall" would be preferred. Detailed design to be sent to SGN once available. SGN have asked that road is not built on top of existing gas valve. CM	WBC		£0	Detailed discussions have taken place with SGN	Unlikely	VH	10
1.5	TVP Directors not allowing use of TVP Shuttle	Threat	Very Likely	VH	25	Actions to be taken to persuade TVP Directors of benefits. TVP Management confirmed 10/5/16 that the Board agrees in principle with draft heads of terms.	WBC/TVP		£0		Unlikely	VH	10
1.6	SSE works on overhead power lines - potential cost savings missed or design conflicts	Threat	Very Likely	VH	25	Met with SSE and have submitted request for cost estimates for diversions in two scenarios (one where the TVP P&R diversion and SSE work happen together, the second where they do not).	WBC/SSE		£0	Discussions already conducted with SSE and factored into scheme	Unlikely	VH	10
1.7	Allocated budget does not cover the cost to design and implement the scheme	Threat	Unlikely	M	6	Capital programme allocation within each council should be used to supplement delivery where possible	WBC		£0	Unknown Value	Unlikely	M	6
1.8	Opposition from key stakeholders	Threat	Fairly Likely	M	9	Early consultation exercises and continued consultation with key stakeholders	WBC		£0		Unlikely	M	6
1.9	Statutory Utilities in existing verges and road areas	Threat	Likely	H	16	Early C2 collation and adjustment to design as required plus C3 stats design processes.	WBC		£20,000	Need for detailed C2 and trial hole information, costs for contractor trial holes or Sumo surveys only at key locations	Unlikely	H	8
2.0	Lack of topographical information	Threat	Unlikely	M	6	Check and update current land survey information for council sections and organise any missing or commission new surveys.	WSP PB		£0	Detailed surveys already undertaken	Very Unlikely	M	3
2.1	Failure to agree on technical design issues	Threat	Likely	M	12	Internal discussions between various authority technical officers with input from modelling work. Road safety audits will be needed on detailed design.	WBC/WSP PB		£0	Application already submitted, detailed design already agreed	Fairly Likely	M	9
2.2	Lack of co-ordination with other highway works	Threat	Very Unlikely	M	3	Early discussions over highway access arrangements and section 50 notices.	WBC		£0	Officer Role	Unlikely	M	6
2.3	Unforeseen ecological sensitivities	Threat	Very Likely	H	20	Ecology survey undertaken for and plan for any risks	WBC/WSP PB		£0		Unlikely	H	8
2.4	Supply chain insolvencies	Threat	Unlikely	M	6	Local Term Contractor to be used for delivery, existing contract in place	WBC		£0		Unlikely	L	4

The results of the Monte Carlo simulation are recorded below. Please note the following:

1. Risks can be either threats or opportunities. The convention used here is that threats are expected to add cost to the project and therefore they are numerically positive in value and opportunities are expected to remove cost from the project and therefore they are numerically negative.
2. Confidence levels are derived from the simulation. For example the P80 risk value represents the risk value that 80% of the simulation results were equal to or below. Therefore, in theory, if the contingency value were set at the P80 value you could be 80% certain that it would be sufficient.
3. The simulation was run with 10,000 iterations

Scheme Value: £3,200,000

	Pre-Mitigation	Post-Mitigation
P <sub>0</sub>	£116,387	£0
P <sub>50</sub>	£1,714,417	£242,062
P <sub>80</sub>	£2,036,678	£523,118
P <sub>100</sub>	£2,876,353	£1,607,040

Pre-Mitigation Mean Risk	£	<b>1,700,998</b>	53%
Post Mitigation Mean Risk	£	305,007	10%
Estimated Cost of Mitigation	£	20,000	
	£	<b>325,007</b>	10%

