

Appendix D

South Bristol Enterprise Support Project – Risk Register

The South Bristol Enterprise Support project will monitor risk at both Delivery Partner and Project Consortium levels.

The initial risk register (see below) will be updated and reviewed at the first Consortium Meeting and risks allocated ownership to individual members. Additional risks will be added at each Consortium Meeting with mitigation and scoring agreed by consensus.

At an operational level risks will be addressed in monthly meetings and any which are deemed high risk will be notified to the Consortium Chair to see if the risk requires an exceptional notification across the Consortium members for approval of mitigation steps. If a risk is low or medium rating then it will be put on the agenda for the next Consortium meeting.

The risk register currently assesses risk against:

- Impact - the disruption which would be caused to the project progress should the risk not be addressed. This is scored out of 10.
- Probability - the likelihood that the risk would happen should the mitigating action not be taken. Again this is scored out of 10.
- Score - the score from the Impact x Probability out of 100.
- Ratings - a low scoring risk 0 - 25, medium risk 26 - 66 and high risk 67 - 100.

Risk	Impact	Probability	Score	Mitigation
ERDF funding reduced	7	2	14 - low	Project Consortium requested feedback on the value for money case given the removal of the workspace element. MHCLG fed back that the value for money case is well aligned to the proposed outputs so we wouldn't expect any reduction in funding.
Funding unsuccessful at full application	10	5	50 - med	Although the SUDs committee provided confirmation that a full application could proceed there were no indications of how a support only project would be viewed. As such there has been limited resource investment from the Project Consortium until the project is approved.
Project start-up is delayed	4	8	32 - med	All previous ERDF projects have been delayed in approval and contracting processes – in fact an anticipated delay was the main reason MHCLG suggested the capital element couldn't proceed. Outputs and financial projections have been amended to anticipate this delay.
Partners fail to	7	3	21 - low	The project management and

meet output profile				governance is in place to address any output slippage and react quickly to manage underperformance. Important lessons have been learnt from previous projects to tackle underperformance with the most urgent and stringent action.
Issues with match funding	10	3	30 - med	Bristol City Council has received indicative approval to utilise its budget, however, the project still requires approval from Council Cabinet which will be undertaken as the highest priority should the full application be successful. All other delivery partner match is in place and secured. Update at 18.10.19 – Project will go to Cabinet in Dec 19.
Issues with grants	5	3	15 - med	In past ERDF programmes SME grants have proved difficult in terms of generating demand, meeting too much demand, and providing clear messaging for customers. Although there are several SME grants available they don't overlap and referrals based on a diagnostic of the SME will help ensure that the best grants are available to the most appropriate enterprises.
Issues with demand generation	5	7	35 - med	In previous ERDF projects generating demand from entrepreneurs and businesses has, at times, proved difficult. A key strength of the consortium is that it already has established networks, demand generation pathways, and brand presence in the region and therefore partners have confidence they can generate the demand from individuals and customers across the SUDs region. Should any shortfall be experienced then the Consortium would address this together and boost referrals, re-profile marketing spend and
Issues with scale up subcontract	3	5	15 - low	The subcontract for scale-up support will be tendered shortly after the project goes live. However, there is a risk that demand for the contract could be relatively low. As such BCC conducted a PIN notice exercise to assess the market and ensure that there was sufficient demand for the

				contract.
Failure to meet timescales	8	2	16 - low	Again the contract management and governance processes will ensure that the project remains on target and timescales are met. Claims, reporting and outputs will all be managed with regular checkpoints on a monthly (via the Partner Meetings) and quarterly basis (via the Consortium Meetings).
Failure to recognise risks and take appropriate actions	3	1	3 - low	The risk register will form a central part of the project governance and will be regularly updated and assessed. As explained above there is sufficient project infrastructure to be reactive in addressing risks.
Workspace delayed or cancelled	2	5	10 - low	Construction of the original workspace (contained in the outline application) is now separate to this full application and therefore the impact on this project is relatively low.
Funding process from WECA	8	2	16 - low	The Funding Board at WECA has been briefed on the project, with an outline submission, and we have been advised to submit a full business case in October – which has been completed. A decision will then be made before the end of 2019 as to whether or not they proceed. As the intervention is relatively low (28% of total contract value) compared to the additional investment it leverages, then the likelihood is quite high of a successful application.
WECA match funding is not successful	8	4	32 - med	In the case the WECA match funding is not successful then the funding case will be put to Bristol City Cabinet as part of the approval process. Additional finances could then be made available to offset this risk.