

Appendix 2 - Report Risk Register – Disposing of the Temple Cowley Pool site to Catalyst Housing.

| No. | Risk Description | Gross Risk | | Cause of Risk | Mitigation | Current Risk | | Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid | Monitoring Effectiveness | Residual Risk | |
|--|--|------------|---|---|---|--------------|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Risk Score Impact Score: 1 = Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic Probability Score: 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | I | P | | | I | P | | | I | P |
| 1 | Conditional contract not becoming unconditional. | 4 | 2 | Failure of Catalyst to achieve an implementable planning consent. | Through the conditional contract and the definition of implementable planning consent. | 2 | 2 | Establish close working relationships and monitoring systems with the purchaser. | Effective partnership working. | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Catalyst Housing withdrawing from the contract due to financial reasons. | 4 | 1 | Purchaser decides not to proceed. | Monitor Catalyst performance and enforcing the contract against the bail -out RP along with HCA assistance. | 2 | 2 | Manage and monitor and subsequently remarket site. | Effective partnership working. | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | Delays to the delivery programme. | 4 | 5 | Objection to the proposals. | Working with the community and managing stakeholders. | 4 | 5 | Management of Stakeholders | Completion of the development | 2 | 2 |



The proposal submitted by the CIC

| No. | Risk Description | Gross Risk | | Cause of Risk | Mitigation | Current Risk | | Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid | Monitoring Effectiveness | Residual Risk | |
|--|---|------------|---|---|--|--------------|---|--|---|---------------|---|
| Risk Score Impact Score: 1 = Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic Probability Score: 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | I | P | | | I | P | | | I | P |
| 1. | Project is not deliverable | 4 | 3 | Redevelopment costs too high to deliver scheme | Detailed investigation and project planning and suitably qualified professionals | 4 | 3 | CIC funds the investigative works | Check costs at RIBA planning stages | 1 | 2 |
| 2. | CIC cannot raise funds to cover investigative works | 4 | 3 | Project does not progress or council asked to fund | CIC provide assurance that funds available | 4 | 3 | CIC appoints appropriate project manager with construct to cover works | Progress through RIBA stages | | 1 |
| 3. | CIC cannot find development, housing and or leisure provider partners necessary to secure project | 4 | 3 | CIC cannot find partners willing to take on projects and associated risks | CIC completes process to bind suitable partners in development agreement | 4 | 3 | Signed of development agreements | Partners on project board | 1 | 2 |
| 4. | Running costs not viable | | | The net running cost of the centre is not sustainable lending to CIC not being viable | Detailed project planning and business case work leading to business plan supported by appropriate development partners. Net running cost underwritten by operator | 4 | 3 | Costed project plan Business plan agreement with operator | Overarching project plan and gateway management | | |

This page is intentionally left blank