# Winnipeg Sewage Treatment Program Integrated Management System



## **Risk Register**

### DOCUMENT NUMBER: PG-RM-TO-01

Rev	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Date	Approved by	Date

N:\WSTP Projects\R&R\S984\_NEWPCC\_PIPE\RFP\Appendices\593-2016\_Appendix\_G\_PG-RM-TO-01 Risk Register.xls

#### Appendix G - Project Risk Register - NEWPCC Pipe Improvements

Risk Registe	r Template V	ersion 4.5-nw	/a2										
	System							Program Informatio	n about the Risl	k Event			
Risk ID; Sequential ID	Last Reviewed Date	Status Change Date	Identification Date	Project	Phase	Task Group	Contract (Bid Op)	Operational or Capital	Facility	Process Area (optional)	Discipline (Optional)	Risk Type; Program or Project Level Risk	Category of Risk; Design, Construction, HR, Procurement etc
								example					
								example					
-													
								hh					
						1							

#### Print 7/13/2016 11:52 AM

#### Project Budget or Target Cost (\$,000) Insert \$ value

	Risk E	Event Identification								Risk Event	Assessment			Π
Threat or Opportunity (T / O)	Due to (Cause Event)	this could occur (Result Event )	Resulting in (this Effect)	Threat / Opp Owner (per Agreement); CofW or Shared	Threat / Opp owner (Individual responsible)	Status (Identified / In Development / Defined / Closed)	k 1	Magnitude of Risk Event(1-5)	Likelihood (1-5)	Assessed Score C X L	Estimated Impact (\$,000) what is cost if risk occurred)	Financial Impact (% Target Cost)	Financial risk prior to Mitigation	k 2
Т	Design assumption for Digestion and de-watering at SEWPCC	Bios lids decision report recommends no digestion or dewatering at SEWPCC	Revise project definition design work based on biosolids decision report	CoW		ldentified		2	3	6	80	#VALUE!	36	
0	Using a specialist contractor	We may increase productivity for producing O&M manuals	Reduce project delivery cost	Shared		In Development		5	1	5	60	#VALUE!	- 2	
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	$\square$
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	Щ
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	Щ
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#IN/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A #N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	H
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	+
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	Н
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	П
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	Π
										0		#VALUE!	#N/A	Π
										0			 	Π

	Risk Response A	Assessment (based	on an Impleme	nted Risk Manag	jement Plan - fut	ture state)				Risk Response	Plan - Execution	n Log		Contingency Plan		
Risk Response Type (Avoidance, Transferance, Mitigation, Acceptance)	Risk Response Plan - Actions	Residual Magnitude occur (1-5)	Residual Likelihood (1- 5)	Assessed Residual Score	Cost of Mitigation (\$,000)	Adopted	Financial risk after mitigation	Trigger date (mandatory review date)	k Date for each 3 action	Mitigation Evaluation	Action Log Reference	Comments	k 4	Contingency plan	Risk Leve k Before 5 Mitigation	el Risk Level After n Mitigation
Mitigate - Obtain early direction on biosolids strategy for SEWPCC before biosolids decision report is finalised		3	4	12	20										Med	High
Employ specialist contractor for O&Ms, tie in with specific deliverables from constructor and designers		2	3	6	20										High	Med
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	Se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	Se NOLASSESSE
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
				0											Not Assess	se Not Assesse
											•					

#### Print 7/13/2016 11:52 AM

#### Assessment of the Magnitude of Opportunity

	Insignificant Savings	Minor Savings	Moderate Savings	Major Savings	Significant Savings
	1	2	3	4	5
Cost <sup>1</sup>	< 2% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 5% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 10% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 15% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	> 20% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>
Time <sup>2</sup>	Time savings <½ day	Time savings ½ – 1 day	Time savings >1 day, < 1 week	Time savings >1 week, < 1 month	Time savings >1 month
Other <sup>4</sup>					
Notes 1 - Project Manager to replace with project speci 2 – Use Target Cost where the project is subject 3 – Replace with project specific values 4 - To be defined by the Project Manager if requ	ific values t to a Target Cost ired				

#### Assessment of the Magnitude of Threat

	Negligible	Moderate	Substantial	Severe	Disastrous
Descriptor	Small effect on costs	Moderately effects costs	Considerably affects cost	Serious threat to the organization, public etc.	The impact is totally unacceptable to the organization
	1	2	3	4	5
Safety	Negligible – No injury, near miss	Minor – minor cuts, bruises, muscle strain	Serious – broken bones, muscle and ligament injuries	Serious / permanent injury / illness	Catastrophic – Single or Multiple fatalities
Financial Impact upto a maximun value (re-work / loss etc) <sup>1</sup>	< 2% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 5% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 10% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	< 15% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>	> 20% of Project Budget <sup>2</sup>
Schedule, impact on critical path <sup>2</sup>	Not likely to impact dates	Likely to absorb float between planned dates and target dates	≤ 1 month	≤ 2 month	> 2 month
Environment	Negligible Environmental effect	Nuisance / minor but reversible Environmental harm	Moderate but short term Environmental harm	Localised, long term Environmental harm	Extensive long term Environmental harm
Regulatory	negligable, near miss	report required to regulatory body	Inspection by Manitoba Env safety officer etc	CEC review	Clean Environment Commission (CEC) Hearing

Image / Reputation	Single Public Enquiry	Multiple Public Enquiries and / or informal Councillor and / or MP Request	Moderate Media Political – Formal Council and / or MP Request / Moderate Public Impact	Provincial Government, Major Political & Media Scrutiny / Major Public Impact	Federal Investigation
Moral	No Impact	Grumblings at wter cooler	Moderate / Increasing Absenteeism	Major Negative / Loss of Staff / "Go Slow"	Catastrophic Negative / walk out
Legal	No Liability	Written Claim Damages < \$10,000	Damages > \$10,000 < \$250,000	Damages >\$250,000 < \$1,000,000	Damages >\$1,000,000
Other <sup>4</sup>					

Notes

1 - Project Manager to replace with project specific values
2 - Use Target Cost where the project is subject to a Target Cost
3 - Replace with project specific values

4 - To be defined by the Project Manager if required

### III. Assessing Liklihood/probability of Risk Occurrence

Descriptor	Rating	Frequency	Probability					
Almost certain	5	Is expected to occur during projects of this type	> 95%					
Likely	4	More likely as not, regularly occurs during projects of this type	60% < x < 95%					
Moderate	3	As likely as not, might occur at sometime during a project of this type	30% < x < 60%					
Unlikely	2	Could occur at some time during the project, rarely occurs on projects of this type	5% < x < 30%					
Rare	1	Only occur in exceptional circumstances on projects of this type	< 5%					
Note on the use of Specific Probability Data and Distributions:								
judgement and expen a variety of sources, misleading and introd	The first step in assessing the likelihood / probability of a risk should always be to apply the project teams engineering judgement and experience, in most cases this approach is all that is required. Specific probability data is available from a variety of sources, however unless the assumptions underpinning such distributions and data hold, the results can be misleading and introduce greater risk. Such data should be checked carefully before it is used							

Total Severity	Category	Response
20-25	Critical	Expected cost to the project is unacceptably high. This risk must be eliminated or transferred before proceeding with the project. Attempt to avoid or transfer risk
10-20	Serious	Expected cost is high compared to total project cost. It probably is cost effective to eliminate or transfer this risk.
5-10	Important	Consider eliminating or transferring. If accept then manage proactively.
0-5	Acceptable	Accept and manage

PROGRA	PROGRAM - Not Priced in BTC Count of Risks (Before Mitigation)									
		0	Insignifican	Minor	Magnitude Moderate	Major	hatostrophic			
	_	U	1	2	3	4	Э			
	Rare	1	Low	Low	Med	High	High			
	Unlikely	2	Low	Low	Med	High	Extm			
Liklihood	Moderate	3	Low	Med	High	Extm	Extm			
	Likely	4	Med	High	High	Extm	Extm			
	Almost Ce	5	High	High	Extm	Extm	Extm			
	Total Numbe	er	0							

#### Date

DateChange10/19/2012Added project name10/20/2012Added calculation in column AA and AB

**By** NWA NWA