Local Transport Review Risk Register   Cabinet 23 Sept 2014   **Annexe H**

Risk description and consequences	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigation
The reduction and withdrawal of services are likely to have an impact on communities and passengers in the affected areas. Opposition is likely to be strong and could impact on our political reputation and signal a loss of confidence to SCC operators.	5	5	25	**Reduce** - We will ensure that residents understand why particular changes are being proposed in certain areas.
The application of legacy S106 funding to sustain services is only a short term solution. Once this runs out other funding will need to be secured to maintain services . This presents a savings pressure to Local Bus in the long term future.	4	4	16	**Contingency -** The application of S106 should sustain services until 2018/19. During the review a longer term solution will need to be found to help maintain services beyond this period.
The renegotiation of existing contracts during Autumn 2014 with operators will present a further financial squeeze on them which could lead to the withdrawal of commercial (not funded by SCC) or primarily commercial provided (SCC fund Sunday/evening service) services in Surrey. This would have a wider impact on economic and social access for Surrey residents and commuters.	5	3	15	**Reduce** - During the negotiations understand the impact of a reduced contract on the operator. If the consequences are more severe than the saving generated from the reduced contract consider other contract options

The managed service withdrawals and the renegotiation of existing contracts are they only workstreams of the review that we have autonomy over. The other workstreams are based on the successful output of the intended measure. So there is a risk that these work streams may not yield the expected results which would lead to a shortfall on our savings target	5	3	15	**Mitigate -** In the event that we're unable to meet the required savings for the other workstreams. We'll meet the shortfall through saving more through managed service withdrawals and renegotiation of existing contracts.
It might be difficult to agree an approach that would see Parish Councils running a community transport service for small rural areas that have their local bus services withdrawn. Support and resources may be limited or not available which would affect establishing a service of this nature. A lack of transport alternative would impact the rural community.	3	4	12	**Reduce -** Surrey will look to provide the investment for a minibus for each Parish partner and would work with them in establishing a service that would be financially viable for them to run .
Surrey may not secure the funding to commission the Surrey University Patronage Study. If we are not able to commission the study we won't be able to implement the recommendations which would mean that we're not able to achieve the required savings from this workstream.	3	2	6	**Mitigate** - The bid for funding went into the Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTP). A decision will be made on this in September 2014. If the bidding outcome is unsuccessful the project team will look internally to see what funds could be used for this or alternatively look to other worsktreams to deliver further savings.

Any routes reduced or withdrawn to key employment sites in Surrey could see businesses relocating outside of Surrey which would stifle economic growth in the County.	3	2	6	**Mitigate -** Accessibility to key employment sites and other categories such as healthcare and schools will be factored into the decision making when managing service reductions.
When reviewing our reimbursement methodology we must not reduce reimbursement too much as this could impact on our contract prices	3	2	6	**Mitigate -** MCL have been commissioned to review whether this is best value for money. Findings from the study are due in September 2014.

Impact - Should a risk materialise the 'Impact' of that risk on the project:

1 – **Minor:** Little or no adverse impact on the project

2 – **Low:** Some impact, but can be overcome without too much difficulty

3 – **Medium:** Significant impact on the project requiring management attention

4 – **High:** Major issue for the project with the potential to stop the project

5 – **Catastrophic:** Would stop the project

Likelihood - The 'likelihood' score indicates the chance of that risk occurring:

1 – **Unexpected:** Little or no chance of risk materialising (less than 10% chance)

2 – **Unlikely:** Low chance of risk materialising (10% - 30% chance)

3 – **Likely:** Good chance of risk materialising (30% - 70% chance)

4 – **Very Likely:** Probable that the risk will materialise (70% - 90% chance)

5 – **Expected:** Expect risk to materialise (90% plus chance)

Risk Rating Score - The risk rating is determined by multiplying the 'Impact' and 'Likelihood' scores to provide an overall rating:

Risk Ratings between 16 - 25: Are major risks that require the immediate attention of the Project Board.

Risk Ratings between 9 - 15: Are significant risks to be monitored by the Project Board.

Risk Ratings below 9: To be monitored by Project Manager and Project Team.

Risk Response

Mitigate = Terminate the risk by doing something differently

Reduce = Treat the risk by taking action to control it

Transfer = Managament of risk transferred to third party

Accept = Tolerate the risk

Contingency = Actions planned for when risks occur