

Risk Potential Assessment

1. Policy, programme or project name <i>(Also note previous name if it has changed since last assurance review)</i>	Oxford and Abingdon Scheme
2. Change driver <i>(Primary reason for change)</i>	Other : Flood Risk Management There are over 4300 properties (2014 baseline rising to over 6000 with climate change) at risk from flooding in Oxford in the 1:100 year 'do nothing' scenario as well as vital infrastructure such as main arterial roads in to the City Centre and railways. In line with Defra policy the Environment Agency and the Local Councils are working together to deliver a programme of work to reduce and manage the risks to life, property and infrastructure in these communities from flooding.
3. Programme/project type	The Scheme involves both: 1. Policy development/delivery and 2. Property/construction enabled business change.
4. Objectives and expected benefits	Objectives: The risk to the majority of the 4300 properties in the 'do nothing' scenario is managed by the continued operation and maintenance of the main weirs in Oxford and the continual maintenance of the watercourses. However, even with this ongoing work approximately 1700 properties are at risk in a 1:100 year flood event. The proposed scheme reduces this figure to fewer than 600 properties at risk. Additional benefits: Reduction in flood risks to key infrastructure (including 2 main arterial roads in to Oxford, railway, potable water supply, energy supply and schools), secured business operation, cultural and heritage assets, recreation and tourism, infrastructure and essential services.
5. Department, Agency, or NDPB name & parent department name (if applicable)	Name: Environment Agency Parent Dept: Defra
6. Contact Details: Senior Policy Owner (SPO) (for Starting Gate) Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) <i>(for existing project or programme)</i>	Name: Joanna Larmour Address: Environment Agency, Red Kite House, Howbery park, Crowmarsh Gifford, Wallingford, Oxon, OX10 8BD Telephone No. 01491 828550 Email: joanna.larmour@environment-agency.gov.uk
7. Programme/Project Manager details	Name: Richard Harding Address: Environment Agency, Kings Meadow House, Kings Meadow Road, Reading, RG1 8DQ Telephone No. 07771 504833 Email: richard.harding@environment-agency.gov.uk
8. Primary contact point for administration of assurance reviews	Name: Louise Spurway Address: Environment Agency, Osney yard, Bridge Street, Osney, Oxon, OX2 0AZ Role: Secretary Telephone No. 01491 828551 Email: louise.spurway@environment-agency.gov.uk
9. If a programme, please list names of the constituent projects. If a project, please give name of the over-arching programme.	The Oxford and Abingdon Scheme is a standalone project developed from the Oxford Strategy Appraisal Report StAR (approved internally by the EA in Sept 2010). The Oxford StAR recommended a number of short term measures (localised works) which have been implemented but noted that in the longer term larger options would need to be considered. The Oxford StAR noted that the likely preferred option, subject to climate change, would be a medium sized western conveyance channel and this need should be reviewed regularly. A recent completed Initial Assessment of this option has confirmed that its viability has increased and is now justified. Further work during appraisal will confirm exact alignment and size, thus benefits and costs will be subject to further change.
10. Costs <i>(Indicative estimate or as defined in latest business case)</i>	Capital: £120m at qu2 2018 (revised figure from Initial Assessment) PV costs: £139m (revised figure from Initial Assessment) Business Case Status: Strategic (approved by EA Board in Sept 2010)

UNCLASSIFIED

Risk Potential Assessment

11. Expected duration (yrs) of major contract or service (if known & appropriate)	Phase 1: 4 years (appraisal and design) Phase 2: 2 - 4 years (major construction of flood channel). Commencing 2018. Construction duration depends on funding profile.
12. Next planned review	Starting Gate / Project Validation Review (PVR)
13. Requested start date for next review <i>Assume Starting Gates will take place 6 to 8 weeks after the Assessment Meeting. Assume 10 to 12 weeks after the Assessment Meeting for all other MPA assurance reviews</i>	Week Commencing Date: <i>to be confirmed</i>
14. Overall Assessment <i>Derived from Table C</i>	MEDIUM
15. Date of previous assurance review & ID No.	Type of Review: _____ Date: _____ ID No. _____
16. Name of responsible Minister	
17. RPA approved by SPO (for Starting Gate) or SRO (for other type of assurance review)	Name: Joanna Larmour _____ Date: 22 July 2014
18. Validated by organisation's Portfolio Manager or an equivalent e.g. Head of PPM Centre of Excellence	Name: Julia Simpson _____ Date: 24 July 2014 Role: Deputy Director, Area Manager West Thames Email: julia.simpson@environment-agency.gov.uk Tel. No. 01491 828585
19. Departmental Assurance Co-ordinator (DAC) NB. Previously the DGC	Name: Ralph Palmer, Defra
20. RPA Version No. & Date	Version No. 1 _____ Date: July 2014

Data Protection Act 1998

It is intended that the data collected via this form will be used by the Cabinet Office for its own purposes and also to inform other areas of Government business. The data may also be used to make you aware of services, advice and guidance. Issues related to the use of personal data within this form should be addressed to: Gateway.Helpdesk@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

UNCLASSIFIED

Page - 2 - of 16

Risk Potential Assessment

Guidance for Completion of the RPA

What is the RPA for?

This version of the Risk Potential Assessment (RPA) is designed to provide a standard set of high-level criteria for assessing the strategic risk potential of programmes and projects, and of emerging policies and initiatives that are expected to be delivered through a programme or project in the future.

The RPA is used to initiate a Starting Gate, a Project Assessment Review (PAR) or an OGC Gateway™ review, by helping to determine who should arrange and manage a review and decide on the make-up of the review team. This RPA replaces the earlier 2009 RPA previously used only for OGC Gateway reviews.

Once agreed the completed form should be sent to the **Departmental Assurance Coordinator (DAC)**¹ for onward transmission to the Cabinet Office Major Projects Authority (MPA), where appropriate.

This assessment is an indicator of risk potential and is not an exhaustive risk analysis model. However, it can be the starting point for a more exhaustive risk assessment. The RPA enables a conversation to be had about the risks and responsibilities for delivery of a programme or project, and its visibility, reporting and assurance in a wider portfolio management context. The RPA can also help to identify areas where specific skills sets, commensurate with the level of programme or project complexity, may be required.

How to complete this RPA

Assurance reviews are applicable to a wide range of change programmes and projects, including policy driven, business, property/construction, ICT enabled or procurement/acquisition-based change initiatives.

The RPA should be completed as early in the life of a change initiative as possible, e.g. when policy is being formulated or to support the development of the Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP). The RPA should subsequently be reviewed before its use to initiate all MPA assurance reviews.

The RPA requires the Senior Policy Owner (SPO) or Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) or Project Executive, to consider the initiative from two perspectives: firstly through a strategic assessment of the Consequential Impact, should the programme or project fail to deliver its objectives or outcomes (see Table A); followed secondly, if appropriate, by an assessment of Complexity (see Table B).

Each table is made up of a series of assessments, with the result indicated by marking X in the appropriate box between VERY LOW (VL) and VERY HIGH (VH). These assessments are made using the knowledge and judgement of the SPO/SRO and policy/programme/project team, and should be considered in the light of the strategic context for the initiative. Examples have been provided as a guide to what might be considered as VL or VH assessments. For each assessment a short explanatory note of the reasoning for each mark should be given (where appropriate) in the text box to provide an audit trail of the considerations.

Table A – Consequential Impact Assessment

Having considered each **Strategic Impact Area** an overall assessment is required to determine the Consequential Impact Assessment. This is based on the holistic assessment of all five areas in total; there is no formula or calculation involved. The overall assessment should be shown by an **X** in the final (pink) section of Table A.

An explanatory note **must** be given in the text box provided to give the reasoning for the overall assessment.

During policy development, when assurance may be provided through a Starting Gate or equivalent review, completion of only Table A is required. Only the Overall Consequential Impact Assessment mark should be entered in Box 14 on the cover sheet. If this assessment indicates that the impact is **MEDIUM or above**, the RPA should, after agreement of the SPO, be submitted to the DAC.

For existing programmes/projects if, after completing Table A, the Overall Consequential Impact Assessment is considered to be **VERY LOW**, completion of Table B is **optional** and the completed RPA can be sent to the DAC, who will discuss with the programme/project what assurance activity might be most appropriate.

¹ This role was previously called the Departmental Gateway Coordinator (DGC) but with expansion in the range of assurance reviews available, the original role name is no longer accurate. In some organisations Departmental Gateway/Assurance Coordinator will be somebody's job title; in others someone with a different job title will fulfil the DAC function.

Risk Potential Assessment

Table B – Complexity Assessment

If the Consequential Impact Assessment (Table A) is assessed as **greater than VERY LOW**, completion of the Complexity Assessment (Table B) is **required**. The approach for Table B largely follows the same format as for Table A, but for convenience is broken down into four **Complexity Areas**.

Having assessed each factor in each of the four complexity areas, an assessment is then required to determine a summary assessment for each area. Again an **X** should be marked in the appropriate (yellow) score box for each complexity area and an explanation given in the notes box.

At the end of Table B there is a (yellow) table headed **Complexity Assessment Summary** where the area summary assessment results should be recorded.

Consideration should now be given to reaching an **Overall Complexity Assessment** for the initiative, based on the four area assessments. Again, there is no scoring or formula for determining this; it is the policy/programme/project team's holistic assessment.

The Overall Complexity Assessment is recorded in the final (green) section of the Complexity Assessment Summary with an **X** marked in the appropriate box. **An explanatory note must be provided** to support the overall complexity assessment for audit trail purposes.

Finalising the Risk Potential Assessment

As the environments in which programmes or projects operate will vary, there may be other aspects that might not be covered by the RPA which affect the impact and/or complexity assessments in this form. These additional aspects, if considered material to the overall impact and/or complexity assessments, should be reflected with explanatory notes in the overall assessments in Tables A and B respectively.

Having completed the Consequential Impact Assessment (Table A) and the Complexity Assessment (Table B), the overall **Risk Potential Assessment** for the programme or project is determined by plotting the respective assessments on Table C.

Using the overall results from the Consequential Impact and Complexity Assessments and the respective axis of Table C, mark an **X** in the appropriate cell where the two assessments intersect. This will then indicate what level of review may be required, as suitable for the Low, Medium or High Risk level of the initiative. **The overall level of review (L/M/H) should then be noted in Box 14 on the cover sheet of the RPA.**

The SPO or SRO (as relevant) must agree the completed RPA, after which the completed RPA should then be sent to the DAC, who in turn will copy it on to the organisation's Portfolio Manager (or an equivalent e.g. Head of Centre of Excellence), for validation.

For all submissions the Portfolio Manager (or equivalent) should independently validate the RPA and be satisfied that it fairly reflects the initiative's strategic profile within the organisation's overall change portfolio. If the RPA is deemed by them to be inaccurate, a discussion with the SPO/SRO should be held to reach a consensus.

Using the RPA for assurance purposes

Once an RPA is agreed the DAC will instigate the assurance review process by arranging an **Assessment Meeting**. There are lead times between the Assessment Meeting and the review itself (see below Table C) which depend on a number of factors; your DAC can offer advice on those lead times.

PLEASE NOTE: It may not be possible for the MPA to organise a review at shorter notice, based on limited availability of reviewers.

The initial RPA assessment will normally be used throughout the life of the integrated assurance and approval process, even though the risk potential might decline as the programme/project progresses through the change lifecycle. Should the RPA marking increase, the higher assessment may take precedent. Departments, Agencies and NDPBs, in discussion with the MPA, should undertake periodic reviews of their portfolios to ensure a consistent and appropriate use of the RPA in setting risk levels, and hence the appropriate assurance regimes.

The RPA will also be reviewed at each Assessment Meeting to ensure there have been no material changes since it was completed. Following the Assessment Meeting the constitution of the review team and duration of the review will be determined.

For further information see contact details on last page.

Risk Potential Assessment

Table A
Consequential Impact Assessment

A strategic assessment of the consequential impact should the initiative fail to deliver its objectives to time, cost or quality

Strategic Impact Area		Very Low	Low	Med	High	Very High	
A1. Political	None, or unlikely to have any political interest.			X			As a prerequisite for major policy initiative or manifesto commitment, a high level of on-going Ministerial or political interest. Likelihood of PAC, or equivalent strategic body, interest.
Explanatory Notes (Completion mandatory)	Ministers and the public are aware that there are over 4300 properties at risk from flooding in Oxford and the surrounding communities. One of Defra's key targets for risk management authorities is to reduce the number of properties at risk from flooding (145,000 households over this spending review period and a further 300,000 households under SR13 (6 years to 2020/21)). It is important that we prioritise the areas with greatest risk (both in terms of probability and consequences) such as the River Thames at Oxford. A major project of this nature has a long lead time and the significant contribution to achievement of Defra's target will therefore be delivered in a future spending review period.						
A2. Public	No public service impact. No information security or environmental implications. No interest from external pressure groups likely.			X			Significant public or business interest, e.g. related to information security, or to environmental issues. High degree of interest from pressure groups or media. Involves contentious change.
Explanatory Notes (Completion mandatory)	Significant public interest for those living or working in flood risk areas, especially where flood insurance costs are higher. Businesses and infrastructure would be impacted by flooding, and also from the works during the construction of the Scheme. Environmental impacts and public interest expected locally but not on a national scale.						
A3. Financial	Little or no exposure of public funds or additional financial burden. No financial impact from environment or social costs. Limited or no savings to be delivered.			X			Very significant financial exposure of public funds, or additional financial burden. Significant financial impact from environmental or social change. Will, or likely to, require HM Treasury financial approval. Very significant savings expected to be delivered.
Explanatory Notes (Completion mandatory)	Total pv costs are estimated at £139.4m Oxfordshire County Council has already successfully secured £26m from their LEP bid towards the scheme, with Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee pledging a further £12.5m. The partnership funding calculator indicates the scheme would qualify for up to £61m flood defence grant in aid (fdgia) so a further £39.9m contributions are needed with Oxfordshire County Council taking the lead in securing this funding based on the current leading option (medium size western conveyance). A financial risk would be a reduction in the total amount of benefits as the modelling is updated, resulting in the scheme no longer being economically viable (the updated modelling could also increase the benefits) or cost estimates are too low, increasing the need for further partnership funding.						
A4. Operational business and commercial change	Low priority, limited impact on the organisation's administration, operations or staff. No impact on third party organisations. No changes to regulatory requirements.		X				Departmental priority, addressing high profile business issue. Essential to fulfil legislative/legal requirements. Significant impact or additional burden on business or staff, on external commercial markets, regulations or trade. The

Risk Potential Assessment

							change is novel or contentious.
Explanatory Notes (Completion mandatory)	Although a large project this is core business for the Environment Agency and the project team are liaising closely with other large schemes within the Environment Agency (River Thames (Datchet to Teddington) scheme, Thames Estuary Package (TEP) 1 and the Boston Barrier). Commercial markets able to undertake scale of these works across the UK marketplace.						
A5. Dependencies	Stand alone - no dependency on, or for, other change initiatives, programmes or projects.		X				Highly dependent on other legislation, programmes, projects or change initiatives for its successful delivery, and/or vice versa.
Explanatory Notes (Completion mandatory)	Dependencies are low for the Oxford and Abingdon Scheme other than ensuring we work closely with other existing and proposed schemes on the River Thames, particularly over downstream messages. The funding for other schemes across England may be affected if this project requires a large proportion of the national funding pot over several of years during the construction period.						

Overall Consequential Impact Assessment

A6. Little or no impact on the public, political stakeholders, public finances, operational business or dependent programmes/projects	VL	L	M X	H	VH	Very high impact on the public, political stakeholders, public finances, operational business or dependent programmes/projects
Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory) This scheme will have an overall MEDIUM consequential impact. Public and political interest in the local communities surrounding the scheme in Oxford is already ongoing. There will also be interest from other people living at risk from flooding across England due to the level of public investment and that it is being targeted towards this one specific location. In the national context, the public interest in this scheme has therefore been assessed as medium. Local political (MP and elected members) leadership and public support will therefore be important in delivery of the scheme.						

Table B

Programme/Project Complexity Assessment

An assessment of the complexity factors that may affect the achievement of the programme/project objectives

B1 Strategic Profile		Very Low	Low	Med	High	Very High	
B1.1. Political	No political involvement or not requiring any special handling or additional engagement.			X			Multiple political interests requiring handling. Political agenda changing, unclear direction or increasing opposition. External political interests involved e.g. EU.
Explanatory Notes	The scheme will be delivered in partnership with 3 local authorities and deliver economic, social and environmental benefits across the area. Of political interest are the impacts of people, their homes and businesses, planning consent, environmental impacts, the funding from public sector, and the potential need for additional local development to provide local sources of funding for the scheme.						
B1.2. Public	No or very low public profile. No change in public interest or service provision. No interest from external pressure groups.			X			Very high public profile, significant interest from public and/or from active pressure groups/media. Complex external communications.
Explanatory Notes	Public consultation as part of the Oxford StAR consultation led to many responses with a good level of overall support. Private and publicly owned land will be required to construct the scheme via either negotiated or compulsory purchase. There is strong support from the						

Risk Potential Assessment

	Oxford Flood Alliance and although several local landowners have expressed concern none have shown any serious opposition. Engagement is happening with environmental groups and the challenges to the unique environment of Oxford will be resolved/mitigated through working with them. Statutory consultees were consulted at StAR stage and concerns have been addressed, subject to the normal expected discussion as appraisal and design develops.						
B1.3. Business performance	No significant change to the organisation's business. No change to the operation of external bodies.			X			Very high business performance profile. Changing demands or expectations of performance or staff or behaviours. Significant increase in delivery status expected.
Explanatory Notes	Creation of new flood risk assets will mean some new skills and training needs, and ongoing funding for future maintenance and capital refurbishment / replacement. Reducing the number of properties and people at risk will reduce the impact on and costs of the emergency services, local health providers and the local authorities.						
B1.4. Organisational objectives	No links to strategic targets or published performance indicators. Strategic status (portfolio position), mandate and objectives clear, stable and unlikely to change.			X			Critical link to delivery of key strategic objectives and/or published targets. Strategic status, mandate or objectives likely to change.
Explanatory Notes	Strategic targets set by Defra include the reduction of flood risks to 145,000 households over the current spending review period and 300,000 households over the next. This Scheme will make a significant contribution towards the delivery of the target in the next spending review period. There is scope to achieve the target without this scheme through other schemes across England, but this is a large scheme delivering significant benefits.						
Strategic Profile summary assessment	Strategic profile low, changes unlikely to threaten objectives	VL	L	M X	H	VH	Strategic profile very high and changes highly likely to threaten achievement of objectives
Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory)							
The scheme has been assessed to have a MEDIUM overall strategic profile. It will have a high level of public interest and impact locally, and will help secure major outcomes in terms of flood risk reduction and achievement of strategic targets for Government.							
[Note: Record summary assessment mark to Complexity Assessment Summary table below]							

Risk Potential Assessment

Table B

Programme/Project Complexity Assessment

An assessment of the complexity factors that may affect the achievement of the programme/project objectives

B2 Delivery Challenge		Very Low	Low	Med	High	Very High	
B2.1. Policy/Legal	No legal matters or legislation involved. Policy and legal implications fully understood, aligned and stable. Policy development assurance review (e.g. Starting Gate or equivalent) undertaken.			X			Affects complex, multiple or cross-border jurisdictions. Legal, legislative or cross organisational policy unclear or changes and challenges highly likely. No policy development reviews undertaken.
Explanatory Notes	Planning consents (waste, minerals, town & country, environmental etc) required and will involve several planning and consenting authorities unless a single authority takes the lead.(As has been suggested) Some impact on Defra policy for flood and coastal risk management and the scheme will fully test the Partnership Funding approach for Defra FDGiA. Need for Project Validation Review to be confirmed. Oxford StAR approved by Environment Agency in Sept 2010, but not sent to Defra.						
B2.2. Security	No security or public data handling implications.	X					Significant national security or public data handling issues or requirements.
Explanatory Notes	Scheme may benefit some Critical National Infrastructure (CNI) which will require carefully handling of information for these sites (if applicable – unknown at this stage). Some commercially confidential information and data handling expected during the tendering process for construction works – this is routine for the Environment Agency and we have the systems in place to manage this.						
B2.3. Requirements for business change	Stable business, no significant changes envisaged to requirements. Implications established of wider strategic changes, e.g. green agendas, sustainability. Clearly defined, agreed measurable outcomes. Limited change to business operations.			X			Multiple, interdependent and complex requirements that are dependent on wider emerging or change initiatives e.g. sustainability. Extensive change to business operations or additional information reporting requirements. Significant unplanned changes to business requirements or outcomes likely to be imposed or required.
Explanatory Notes	Roles and responsibilities for FCRM have changed as a result of FWMA 2010, and these new ways of working with Lead Local Flood Authorities and other Risk Management Authorities are still evolving. The scheme will help to move the various organisations towards better partnership working and provision of improved service to people at risk from flooding.						
B2.4. Technology development, production and/or techniques	Involves no new or novel technology development, implementation, production, products, tools or techniques. Extensive previous use	X					First or extensive use of leading edge, novel or innovative technology. High degree of design, build or implementation complexity or uncertainty. Technology or methodology likely to be

Risk Potential Assessment

	of development and/or production techniques.						subject to major changes.
Explanatory Notes	The scheme is not new, novel or dependent upon new technology being developed. The majority of the new channel is expected to involve constructing a new naturalised 2 stage channel utilising existing watercourses with culverts under both the roads and railway.						
B2.5. Commercial and supplier delivery	Established contracts or existing frameworks to be used. Commercial environment stable. Experienced sector suppliers. Single supplier or short supply chain.			X			Complex or innovative commercial arrangements. Supplier market limited and/or very specialist. Multiple suppliers or complex/volatile supply or logistical chain.
Explanatory Notes	Commercial and Procurement Strategy is still being developed for the project. Initial and enabling works will be delivered through the Water and Environmental Management (WEM) framework in place for all FCRM Risk Management Authorities. Delivery model for the construction component (the flood channel) still to be confirmed at this stage, but will either be WEM lot 4 (or future framework) or tendered outside of the existing framework under standard industry forms of contract (i.e. New Engineering Contract). Supplier market stable and able to undertake the work.						
B2.6. Financial provision	Funding from within organisation budgets, no influence from economic climate. Supplier's funding all in place.			X			Complex cross-organisational funding arrangements. Funding not agreed or in place. Third party or supplier funding not in place. Economic conditions likely to affect funding options or availability.
Explanatory Notes	Cross-organisational funding arrangements for the Scheme needed - funding expected from FDGiA (central government), with additional funding from local government and private sector. Full funding currently not agreed or in place. Local Authorities have committed to providing funding for the appraisal and scoping stages of the project (to produce Strategic Outline Case). Economic conditions likely to affect funding options or availability, particularly in securing funding from local government.						
B2.7. Governance and programme/project management	Straightforward and stable governance structure. Recognised formal PPM methodologies in use. Key post holders in place.			X			Complex or multi-faceted governance or management structures. Governance, management structures or key post holders likely to change.
Explanatory Notes	Governance complicated due to the partnership between local authorities and the Environment Agency which is required to deliver the Scheme. However, the Scheme organisation and governance is being formulated using PRINCE2 and MSP to ensure clarity and use of industry standard models. With a programme duration of 8 years (construction element could reduce), key post holders may change during this period so these risks will be mitigated through good records management.						
B2.8. Stakeholders	Single stakeholder community, fully bought-in. No expected change in stakeholder environment or from agreed requirements and outcomes.			X			Complex stakeholder community. Stakeholder environment volatile or with significant external change factors.
Explanatory Notes	This Scheme involves many stakeholders (local government, businesses, landowners,						

Risk Potential Assessment

	tourism and recreation, environmental and commercial interests) as well as people and their communities. Well established Flood Risk Action group in Oxford fully supportive of proposal. No groups openly opposing proposals at this stage.						
B2.9 Dependencies	Stand alone, no or few dependencies on or for other programmes or projects. All statutory approvals or authorisations in place.			X			Complex dependency relationships with other initiatives or organisations. Significant external statutory authorisations or approvals (e.g. legislation, financial approvals, planning consent etc) remain outstanding or require explicit management. Dependencies changing or conflicting and/or coordination increasingly challenging.
Explanatory Notes	External statutory authorisations and approvals are needed for the Scheme, including financial approvals and planning consents. These remain outstanding and require explicit management within the project.						
B2.10. Change and implementation	Single or co-located programme/project and supplier teams; single site delivery. No conflicting internal business change issues to affect change. Simple acceptance and cut-over issues. No "big bang" delivery. Change and benefits management fully embedded.		X				Complex national or international delivery environment. Changing or uncertain implementation, cultural or physical challenges to changes likely or expected. Big bang implementation. Complex testing and cut-over issues.
Explanatory Notes	Contractual relationships will be established along normal lines. Co-location will be established between several organisations and during construction it is expected that an integrated project office will be created to manage the implementation and delivery on site.						
Delivery Challenge summary assessment	Challenges to deliver are very low and change is unlikely to threaten objectives	VL	L	M X	H	VH	Very high degree of challenge and changes are highly likely to threaten achievement of objectives
<p>Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory) Funding and planning are the two main issues at this stage, although a construction project of this size will also mean other delivery challenges during the construction period (e.g. lorry movements, land acquisition, minerals extraction, waste management). These are all issues we manage on all FCRM projects.</p> <p>[Note: Record summary assessment mark to Complexity Assessment Summary table below]</p>							

Risk Potential Assessment

Table B

Programme/Project Complexity Assessment

An assessment of the complexity factors that may affect the achievement of the programme/project objectives

B3 Capacity and Capability		Very Low	Low	Med	High	Very High	
B3.1. Programme or project team	Fully resourced and skilled team. Stable team, no recruitment issues. Specialist support (e.g. commercial, legal) in place or available when required. Experienced with similar change or technology projects.		X				Personnel resources or funding not available when required. Significant resource changes likely leading to skill gaps or disruption to key posts. No previous experience with similar change or technology.
Explanatory Notes	Full time Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) in place as Programme Executive. Project teams and boards being established across the programme, and a partnership collaborative agreement with Local Authorities is being drafted. Specialist support to be bought-in as required, to augment existing in-house skills. Project team are already learning from the Thames Estuary Programme (phase 1), River Thames Scheme and Boston Barrier teams through close liaison and sharing of experiences.						
B3.2 Stakeholders and organisation	Fully resourced and skilled, available when required. Open to and comply with change. Common and accepted priority across an engaged stakeholder community.			X			Key resources or skills lacking or unavailable when required. Changing environment. Business priority is low, inconsistent or changing. Significantly differing priorities between stakeholder groups.
Explanatory Notes	Need to manage resources carefully. Major demands on staff both within the Environment Agency and Local Authorities. Differing resource availability, capability and priorities across the partners involved in this Scheme. These aspects have been flagged as a risk and will be managed during the Scheme delivery / implementation.						
B3.3. Suppliers (internal or external)	Experienced, strong and stable market or suppliers. Supplier resources skilled and available, with ongoing support and commitment.	X					No, weak or overstretched market - unlikely to meet demand. Suppliers unable to sustain support, withdraw, or cannot meet requirements.
Explanatory Notes	Experienced, strong and stable market and suppliers for FCRM delivery. Supplier resources skilled and available for delivery of this Scheme.						
B3.4. Strategic leadership and business culture	Good capacity, continuity and experience in leadership roles. No unforeseen organisational pressures. Open culture for change, no staff or trade union concerns.		X				Strategic leadership subject to change. No previous responsibility for or direct experience of change of similar magnitude or complexity. A challenging cultural, staff or workload environment.
Explanatory Notes	Good experience of delivering FCRM schemes. We've undertaken many partnership projects with local authorities, and although this is a large projects the nature and scale are not significantly different from others around the country.						
Capacity & Capability	Capacity and	VL	L	M	H	VH	Significant capacity or

Risk Potential Assessment

summary assessment	capability in place and change unlikely to threaten objectives			X			capability issues. Changes highly likely to threaten achievement of objectives
--------------------	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory)

Capacity and capability within the programme / project teams is good and a MEDIUM risk. Changes throughout the Scheme delivery programme will be carefully managed to keep the risks low, especially any changes in resources and priorities. Putting in place a Partnership Agreement will help to ensure continued commitment from all parties to the delivery of the Scheme, and appropriate resource allocation.

[Note: Record summary assessment mark to Complexity Assessment Summary table below]

Risk Potential Assessment

Table B

Programme/Project Complexity Assessment

An assessment of the complexity factors that may affect the achievement of the programme/project objectives

B4 Scale		Very Low	Low	Med	High	Very High	
B4.1 Time	Timescales not challenging, no external drivers. No imposed changes expected to the agreed schedules. Contingency available and tested business continuity plans.			X			Schedules very challenging. Immovable deadlines. Major changes to deadlines or imposed deadlines likely to occur. Very limited or no contingency or contingency options available.
Explanatory Notes	Until this Scheme is completed, thousands of people and property remain at significant flood risk. We therefore need to ensure early delivery of the Scheme to reduce the risks before the next big flood occurs. There is a risk that the timescales to secure planning consents will delay the start of construction, and there is a risk of some detail changes to the scheme as we develop the full business case.						
B4.2 Budget	<p>Budgets within delegations and local control.</p> <p>Costs relatively small to overall organisational programme/project spends.</p> <p>Budgets agreed and stable. Appropriate financial management systems established.</p> <p>Change management system in place.</p>			X			<p>Budgets outside organisational spend delegations.</p> <p>Cost estimates subject to significant pressures from ongoing or expected change.</p> <p>Costs are significant, relative to the organisation's programme/project spend.</p> <p>Financial management system not in place or audited. Cross organisational/multi-faceted funding with complex financial control and reporting.</p>
Explanatory Notes	Budgets outside organisational spend delegations and hence require Defra and HMT approvals. Cost estimates subject to pressures from ongoing or expected change to reduce costs and delivery efficiency savings. Costs are significant and could take a large proportion of national funding available for all risk management authorities in England for several years. Partnership funding contributions will be held by Oxfordshire County Council.						
B4.3 Benefits	Benefits relatively small. Benefits easily and clearly defined, owned, measurable and achievable. No expected changes which might increase scale of benefits.			X			<p>Magnitude of benefits significant. Complex benefits realisation challenges.</p> <p>Changing benefits management environment or realisation responsibilities.</p> <p>Achievability of benefits in doubt. Difficult to measure.</p>
Explanatory Notes	Present value benefits are estimated at £1075m over the 100year appraisal period (including climate change) against present value costs of £139.4m giving a benefit:cost ratio of 7.7. The benefits of damages avoided by flooding from the River Thames and its tributaries are clearly significant, but assessing flood damages is not an exact science and they are therefore difficult to measure precisely. The hydrology and modelling study will ensure the latest, best available data and models are used to confirm the benefits of the scheme – the outputs from this modelling may refine and adjust the benefits delivered (could lead to a						

Risk Potential Assessment

	slight increase or decrease in benefits, which will require careful communication and management).						
B4.4. Quality	Quality requirements clear, easily achievable and stable.			X			Quality targets extremely challenging, likely to change significantly or hard to achieve.
Explanatory Notes	Quality targets vary across the projects within the programme; however they can be clearly defined. One of the risks with the Scheme is the widespread use of property level protection. Pilots have been undertaken but this is the largest deployment of this type of flood protection products.						
Scale summary assessment	Small scale, changes unlikely to threaten objectives	VL	L	M X	H	VH	Very large scale, and changes highly likely to threaten achievement of objectives
Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory) The scheme in itself is not complex; however the processes to deliver the outcomes are challenging and relatively unusual within the Environment Agency. [Note: Record summary assessment mark to Complexity Assessment Summary table below]							

Complexity Assessment Summary

(Insert the marks allocated for each of the four (yellow) summary assessments from Table B above)

Complexity Areas summary assessments	VL	L	M	H	VH
Strategic Profile (B1.1 – B1.4)			X		
Delivery Challenge (B2.1 – B2.10)			X		
Capacity and Capability (B3.1 – B3.4)			X		
Scale (B4.1 – B4.4)			X		
B5. Overall Complexity Assessment			X		

Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory)

[Note: assessment above to be used on Table C]

Risk Potential Assessment

Table C

Risk Potential Assessment

Plot overall summary assessments from Table A (line A6) and Table B (line B5) and mark with an **X** in grid below

Overall Consequential Impact Assessment (Table A summary)	Very High				High Risk	
	High	Medium Risk				
	Medium			X		
	Low					
	Very Low	Low Risk				
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High

Overall Complexity Assessment (Table B summary)

Now transfer the Risk Potential Assessment score from Table C to Box 14 on the cover sheet of this form.

Please send the fully completed and approved RPA to your Departmental Assurance Coordinator (or equivalent), who will pass it on to your organisation's Portfolio Manager (or equivalent) for validation.

Who arranges the review?

In central government the arrange and manage process for Starting Gate, OGC Gateway™ and Project Assessment Reviews is generally as follows:

Major Projects & High Risk Assurance Reviews: By the Major Projects Authority

Medium Risk Assurance Reviews: By Departments, under delegation from the MPA

Low Risk Assurance Reviews: By Departments, usually through consultation with their DAC/Centre of Excellence (or equivalent).

All RPAs indicating a requirement for Medium or High Risk reviews will be checked at the Assessment Meeting.

Scheduling and lead times:

When planning the following assurance reviews please assume the approximate lead times below.

These lead times are from the review's Assessment Meeting to the start date of the required review, **not from submission date of the RPA.**

Starting Gate: 6 - 8 weeks
 OGC Gateway™: 10 - 12 weeks
 Project Assessment Review: 10 - 12 weeks

Lead times may vary because of a number of factors, for further guidance contact your DAC.

Note: Failure to provide sufficient information in this RPA may delay the timing of your assurance review.

DAC submission of RPA:

Please delete the user guidance pages, and ensure the security classification is correct, before sending the completed RPA to gateway.helpdesk@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

Risk Potential Assessment

Copyright

© Crown Copyright, May 2011

You may re-use this document template (excluding logos and trademarks) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>

or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Further Information

If you have further questions about the use or completion of this RPA, please first contact your organisation's Departmental Assurance Coordinator (or equivalent), or the MPA via Gateway.Helpdesk@cabinet-office.gsi.gov.uk

This document is available from the Cabinet Office website at:

<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/content/major-projects-authority>

Further information about the Cabinet Office Major Projects Authority, and guidance for central government bodies on the requirements for integrated assurance and approvals is available online: <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/content/major-projects-authority>

Major Projects Authority
Cabinet Office
HM Treasury Building
1 Horse Guards Road
London SW1A 2HQ

<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/government-efficiency>