

North West Appendix K: Risk Register

Version 1.0

Document Status

Responsibility	Name
Author	██████████
Reviewer	██████████
Approver	██████████

Revision Status

Version	Date	Reason for Issue
0.1	31 May 2021	Draft for review.
0.2	18 June 2021	Updated draft.
0.3	18 Aug 2021	Updated following comments.
0.4	30 Aug 2021	Updated following comments.
1.0	30 Aug 2021	For IQA

Disclaimer

This is a draft document for review by specified persons at Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency. This draft will subsequently be updated following consideration of the comments from the persons at Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency. This document is therefore still in a draft form and is subject to change. The document should not be disclosed in response to requests under the Official Information Act 1982 or Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 without seeking legal advice.

Table of Contents

1	Risk Management Process	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Identification	1
1.3	Analysis	1
1.4	Evaluation	3
1.5	Treatment.....	3
2	Programme-Wide Risks	4
3	Project-Specific Risks	10
3.1	Projects 1 & 4: Urban RTC & SH16 Main Road Upgrade	10
3.2	Projects 2 & 3: ASH, Rural RTC & Regional Active Mode Corridor	12
3.3	Project 5: Fred Taylor Drive FTN Upgrade	14
3.4	Project 6: Northside Drive East Upgrade	15
3.5	Project 7: New Northside Drive West.....	16
3.6	Project 8: Dunlop Road	16
3.7	Project 9: Don Buck Road FTN Upgrade	17
3.8	Project 10: Royal Road FTN Upgrade	18
3.9	Project 11: Taupaki Road - Nixon Road Upgrades	19
3.10	Project 12: Brigham Creek Road Upgrade	20
3.11	Project 13: Māmari Road FTN Upgrade	21
3.12	Project 14: Trig Road Upgrade	22
3.13	Project 15: New Spedding Road West	23
3.14	Project 16: New Spedding Road East	24
3.15	Project 17: Hobsonville Road FTN Upgrade	25
3.16	Project 18: Coatesville Riverhead Highway Upgrade.....	26
3.17	Project 19: Riverhead Road Upgrade	27
3.18	Project 20: Access Road Upgrade	28
3.19	Project 21: Station Road Upgrade.....	29

Acronym/Term	Description
AC	Auckland Council
AT	Auckland Transport
BCR	Benefit-cost Ratio
CC2W	City Centre to Westgate / North West Rapid Transit Network project that was the subject of an IBC approved by the AT Board in 2019 and is currently being considered as part of the Auckland Rapid Transit Plan being developed by AC, AT and Waka Kotahi
Class A, B, C & D	Risk score class after evaluation of likelihood x consequence. Refer to Tables 3 & 4 below for further detail.
CRL	City Rail Link
DBC	Detailed Business Case
GPS	Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021
IBC	Indicative Business Case
IQA	Internal Quality Audit
MCA	Multi Criteria Analysis
MoD	Ministry of Defence
MoE	Ministry of Education
NoR	Notice of Requirement
NW	North West
NZDF	New Zealand Defence Force
OAG	Office of the Auditor General of New Zealand
OIM	Owner Interface Manager
PAB	Programme Alliance Board
Partners	AT, Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, Auckland Council and Manawhenua
PTUA	Public Transport Users Association
RC	Resource Consents
Risk	An uncertain event that may have a positive or negative influence on the ability to achieve objectives
RMA	Resource Management Act
RTN	Rapid Transit Network

SH16/18 Connections	Project led by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency to improve connections between SH16 in Whenuapai and SH18 in Hobsonville
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SGA	Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Alliance
SM014	Waka Kotahi's Cost Estimation Manual SM014
WK	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

1 Risk Management Process

1.1 Introduction

Risk management has been undertaken throughout the development of this North West Detailed Business Case (DBC) in accordance with the Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Alliance's (SGA's) 'Risk and Opportunity Management Plan' which comprises of the following stages:

- Risk (threat and opportunity) identification – relative to context.
- Risk analysis – likelihood and consequences based upon current control measures.
- Risk evaluation – scoring of the risk to determine it's relative magnitude.
- Risk treatment – to eliminate or reduce the consequences or likelihood of the risk occurring.

The remainder of Section 1 of this Risk Register outlines the process that has been followed in each of these stages. Section 2 then summarised Programme-wide risks and Section 3 summarises Project-specific risks

1.2 Identification

Threat and opportunity identification has been a continuing process throughout the development of the DBC and has included the following:

- Initial risk workshops to identify threat and opportunities at the start of the DBC.
- Regular identification (and update) at the North West team meetings based upon the DBC's development and subsequent feedback from the team and partners/stakeholders.
- Specific risk workshops with the North West engineering team throughout the development of the design.
- Ad-hoc emails/conversations with team members.

Identified risks were captured within the North West DBC SharePoint risk register, Risk Owner assigned and subsequent analysis undertaken (as detailed below).

1.3 Analysis

The likelihood of occurrence and consequence of the risks have been analysed using the criteria identified in Tables 1 and 2 below based upon the current control measures.

Table 1: Likelihood Risk or Opportunity Rating

Likelihood Risk or Opportunity Rating		Likelihood of Risk or Opportunity Occurring	%
5	HIGHLY LIKELY	May occur in next 12 Months	> 85
4	LIKELY	May occur in the next >1 to 2 years	55 – 85
3	POSSIBLE	May occur in next >2 to 6 years	30 – 55
2	UNLIKELY	May occur once in >6 to 10 years	5 – 30
1	RARE	May occur once in 10 years	< 5

Table 2: Semi-Quantitative Threat Criteria

Semi-Quantitative Threat Criteria							
Rating Scale	Reputation			Performance			
	Stakeholders	Public / Media	Legal / Compliance	Project Delivery	Project Cost	Health & Safety	Environmental
Severe	Disruption to stakeholder relationship slowing progression of nationally strategic activity, and/or Loss of route availability of a national strategic high-volume highway	Sustained national and/or international media coverage AT/Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and the PAB do not envisage any exposure in reputational risks at this level	High profile prosecution(s) with potential for custodial sentence	Programme slippage resulting in late delivery by more than 180 days	Negative financial impact of more than \$25M	Loss of life, permanent disability or injury, or multiple serious injuries	Permanent pollution damage or other environmental damage
Major	Disruption to stakeholder relationship slowing progression of regionally strategic activity, and/or Loss of route availability of a national strategic highway	Sustained media coverage (weeks) Possible Ministerial inquiry leading to loss of Ministerial confidence/formal enquiry by OAG or statutory agency Widespread and significant community concern and/or high-profile community concerns raised	Individual prosecution Potential prosecution with maximum fine / imprisonment High profile legal challenge or prosecution with heavy fines	Programme slippage resulting in late delivery by between 90 and 180 days	Negative financial impact between \$10M to \$25M	Serious injury (injuries) requiring specialist medical treatment or lost time greater than three weeks	Significant and widespread pollution or other environmental damage, with long term effects
Moderate	Disruption to stakeholder relationship slowing progression of regional activity, and/or Loss of route availability of a regional strategic highway	Short term (days) media coverage Parliamentary/Ministerial questions or 3rd party investigation Community complaints	Breach with legal rebuke / abatement notice/restrictions Some legal constraints imposed, minimal fines	Programme slippage resulting in late delivery by between 30 and 90 days	Negative financial impact between \$2M to \$10M	Injury requiring medical treatment or lost time of one day to three weeks	Pollution or other environmental damage at a localised level, with medium term effects
Minor	Disruption to stakeholder relationship slowing progression of site-specific activity, and/or Loss of route availability of a regional connector highway	Local media coverage for 1-5 days Official information request. Negative feedback from Minister Reputation within industry is damaged Some community complaints Marginal impact on stakeholder confidence.	Breach with letter from authority requesting action	Programme slippage resulting in late delivery by between 7 and 30 days	Negative financial impact between \$0.5M to \$2M	Injury requiring short term medical treatment and workplace absence less than one day	Minimum pollution or other environmental damage. Short term effects only
Insignificant	Disruption to stakeholder relationship, and/or Loss of route availability of a regional distributor highway	Local media coverage for 1-day Reputation intact Internal knowledge only Minimal impact on stakeholder confidence	Breach managed at a regional level	Programme slippage resulting in late delivery by less than 7 days	Negative financial impact of less than \$0.5M	Injury requiring short-term first-aid care and no absence from the workplace	Small scale pollution or other environmental damage is localised with no resultant effects. Contained locally

1.4 Evaluation

Based upon the likelihood and consequence outcomes from the risk analysis, the risks have been evaluated using the Tables 3 & 4 below to identify their Class from A to E. The significance of a Class A threat is 'very high' compared to Class E which is considered 'very low'. Likewise, for opportunities.

Table 3: Threat Rating Matrix

RISK RATINGS LIKELIHOOD x CONSEQUENCE						
Likelihood	5 Highly Likely (May occur this year) >85%	Class B (5)	Class B (10)	Class A (15)	Class A (20)	Class A (25)
	4 Likely (May occur once in the next 2 years) 55-85%	Class C (4)	Class C (8)	Class B (12)	Class A (16)	Class A (20)
	3 Possible (May occur once in the next 2-5 years) 30-55%	Class D (3)	Class C (6)	Class C (9)	Class B (12)	Class A (15)
	2 Unlikely (May occur once in 5-20 years) 5-30%	Class D (2)	Class D (4)	Class D (6)	Class C (8)	Class C (10)
	1 Rare (May occur once in 20 years) <5%	Class E (1)	Class E (2)	Class E (3)	Class D (4)	Class C (5)
		1 Insignificant	2 Minor	3 Moderate	4 Major	5 Severe
		Consequence				

Table 4: Opportunity Rating Matrix

Likelihood	5 Highly Likely (May occur this year) >85%	Critical Opportunity (25)	Critical Opportunity (20)	High Opportunity (15)	Medium Opportunity (10)	Low Opportunity (5)
	4 Likely (May occur once in the next 2 years) 55-85%	Critical Opportunity (20)	Critical Opportunity (16)	High Opportunity (12)	Medium Opportunity (8)	Low Opportunity (4)
	3 Possible (May occur once in the next 2-5 years) 30-55%	Critical Opportunity (15)	High Opportunity (12)	Medium Opportunity (9)	Medium Opportunity (6)	Low Opportunity (3)
	2 Unlikely (May occur once in 5-20 years) 5-30%	High Opportunity (10)	Medium Opportunity (8)	Medium Opportunity (6)	Low Opportunity (4)	Low Opportunity (2)
	1 Rare (May occur once in 20 years) <5%	High Opportunity (5)	Low Opportunity (4)	Low Opportunity (3)	Low Opportunity (2)	Low Opportunity (1)
		5 Severe	4 Major	3 Moderate	2 Minor	1 Insignificant
		Consequence				

1.5 Treatment

Risk Owners were responsible for identifying and then undertaking 'planned risk treatment' actions appropriate to the risk score identified during the evaluation. These actions were reviewed on a 6-weekly basis in the Northwest Team meetings to capture updates and identify further treatment actions where appropriate. Risks were also closed once further investigation into the risk found that the initial threat or opportunity was no longer a consideration.

