

RISK REGISTER

Ref	Project	Risk description	Likelihood	Consequence	Level of risk	Remediation
1	Implementation	Project Manager not appointed	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention
2	Implementation	Project Manager with limited background put forward from government redeployees during recruitment	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Job Description Form prior to advertising
3	Implementation	Project teams not established	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention • External consultants
4	Implementation	Lack of availability of key people to participate at required times	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders • Realistic timeframes • Escalate to SLPASC
5	Implementation	People not willing to participate	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders
6	Implementation	Lack of commitment to project	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders • Clear and regular communication
7	Implementation	Stock budget reduction with resultant negativity	Likely - 4	Moderate - 3	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention • Clear communication
8	Implementation	Delays in meeting project deadlines	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set realistic timeframes
9	Implementation	Change in project focus if issues are identified that change the project scope	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage at SLPASC level • Flexible timeframes and project plan
10	Implementation	Delays by the SLPASC in reviewing and endorsing deliverables	Unlikely - 2	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager to get deliverables to SLPASC in a timely manner • SLPASC to respond in a timely manner

11	Implementation	Negative response by some stakeholders to changes being introduced	Likely - 4	Moderate - 3	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good communication • Negotiation with stakeholders
12	Implementation	Budget variations	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention • Development of strong funding bids
13	Implementation	Key underpinning requirements not achievable (eg ownership of stock)	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility in strategies • Negotiation • Escalate to SLPASC
14	Implementation	Lack of communication with all stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC • Communication plan
15	Implementation	Lack of communication between project teams	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing communication from Project Manager
16	Implementation	Too many strategies to implement with conflicting timeframes	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong project management • Good communication between project teams
17	Implementation	Unrealistic timeframes	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good initial planning combined with flexibility
18	Implementation	Lack of focus by Project Manager (eg sidetracked by work not in the priority list)	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong SLPASC • Regular reporting required from Project Manager on achievements
19	Implementation	<i>ad hoc</i> approach to implementation of strategies	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from SLPASC • Strong project management
20	Implementation	Lack of awareness of the project by stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC
21	Implementation	Unrealistic or differing expectations from stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC • Clear documentation
22	Implementation	Lack of agreement across all local	Likely - 4	Moderate - 3	Urgent management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong SLPASC • Clear and regular

		governments			attention	communication
23	Implementation	History, and preconceptions about outcomes and methodology	Likely - 4	Likely - 4	Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong SLPASC Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC
24	SoMaP	Project Manager not appointed	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLPASC intervention
25	SoMaP	Lack of availability of key people to participate at required times	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders Realistic timeframes Escalate to SLPASC
26	SoMaP	People not willing to participate	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders
27	SoMaP	Lack of commitment to project	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders Clear and regular communication
28	SoMaP	Delays in meeting project deadlines	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set realistic timeframes
29	SoMaP	Negative response by some stakeholders to changes being introduced	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good communication Negotiation with stakeholders
30	SoMaP	Lack of communication with all stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC Communication plan
31	SoMaP	Unrealistic timeframes	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good initial planning combined with flexibility
32	SoMaP	Lack of awareness of the project by stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC
33	SoMaP	Unrealistic or differing expectations from stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC Clear documentation
34	SoMaP	Lack of agreement on required statistics	Likely - 4	Major - 4	Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open communication • SLPASC intervention
35	SoMaP	Lack of agreement on performance outcome measures	Likely - 4	Major - 4	Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders • Open communication • SLPASC intervention
36	SoMaP	Impact caused by redevelopment of PLO	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good planning and scheduling • Clear communication with PLO team
37	SoMaP	Failure to find or implement a user friendly collection and display product	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention • Clear and realistic understanding of needs and options • Budget if required
38	Regional Model	Project Manager not appointed	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLPASC intervention
39	Regional Model	Lack of availability of key people to participate at required times	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders • Realistic timeframes • Escalate to SLPASC
40	Regional Model	People not willing to participate	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders
41	Regional Model	Lack of commitment to project	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation with key stakeholders • Clear and regular communication
42	Regional Model	Delays in meeting project deadlines	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set realistic timeframes
43	Regional Model	Negative response by some stakeholders to changes being introduced	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good communication • Negotiation with stakeholders
44	Regional Model	Lack of communication with all stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC • Communication plan
45	Regional Model	Unrealistic timeframes	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good initial planning

					control required	combined with flexibility
46	Regional Model	Lack of awareness of the project by stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC
47	Regional Model	Unrealistic or differing expectations from stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC Clear documentation
48	Regional Model	External consultant not appointed	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-advertise using highly targeted approach Project team to undertake work
49	Regional Model	Consultant fails to meet deadline for delivery of report	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic timeframes Clear and regular communication
50	Regional Model	Development of unrealistic model	Unlikely - 2	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and regular communication
51	Regional Model	Impact of local government structural reform	Likely - 4	Moderate - 3	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of flexible model Escalate to SLPASC
52	Regional Model	Consultant quotes exceed the budget for the project	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show budget cap in RFQ Escalate to SLPASC for additional funds Review scope of consultancy
53	Regional Model	Consultant's recommendations are not acceptable to project team	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear documentation and expectations Clear and regular communication Review expectations
54	Training and PD	Project Manager not appointed	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLPASC intervention
55	Training and PD	Lack of availability of key people to participate at required times	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders Realistic timeframes Escalate to SLPASC
56	Training and PD	People not willing to participate	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key stakeholders
57	Training and PD	Lack of commitment to	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with key

		project			control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stakeholders • Clear and regular communication
58	Training and PD	Delays in meeting project deadlines	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set realistic timeframes
59	Training and PD	Negative response by some stakeholders to changes being introduced	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good communication • Negotiation with stakeholders
60	Training and PD	Lack of communication with all stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Minor - 2	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC • Communication plan
61	Training and PD	Unrealistic timeframes	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good initial planning combined with flexibility
62	Training and PD	Lack of awareness of the project by stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC
63	Training and PD	Unrealistic or differing expectations from stakeholders	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing and open communication from Project Manager and SLPASC • Clear documentation • Communication plan
64	Training and PD	External consultant not appointed	Moderate - 3	Major - 4	Urgent management attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-advertise using highly targeted approach • Escalate to SLPASC • Project team to undertake work
65	Training and PD	No budget to engage consultant	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise requirement with SLPASC • Project team undertake work
66	Training and PD	Consultant quotes exceed the budget for the project	Unlikely - 2	Major - 4	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show budget cap in RFQ • Escalate to SLPASC for additional funds • Review scope of consultancy
67	Training and PD	Consultant fails to meet deadline for delivery of report	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic timeframes • Clear and regular communication

68	Training and PD	Lack of agreement on core competencies	Unlikely - 2	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and regular communication
69	Training and PD	Training needs analysis is too complicated and onerous	Moderate - 3	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and regular communication • Flexible approach • Development of alternative methodology
70	Training and PD	Consultant's recommendations are not acceptable to project team	Unlikely - 2	Moderate - 3	Management control required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear documentation and expectations • Clear and regular communication • Review expectations
71						•
72						•
73						•
74						•
75						•
76						•
77						•
78						•
79						•
80						•
81						•
82						•
						•
						•
						•
						•
						•