Risk Potential Assessment

1. Policy, programme or project name *(Also note previous name if it has changed since last assurance review)*	**Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme**
2. Change driver *(Primary reason for change)*	**Other: Flood Risk Management** **There are over 3500 at risk from flooding in Oxford in the 1:100 chance 'do nothing' flood scenario as well as vital infrastructure such as the main railway line and key road routes. In line with Defra policy the Environment Agency, Local Councils and key stakeholders 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	The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme has agreed 4 main objectives with its partnership sponsoring group. These are: - To reduce flood risk to at least 1000 homes and business - To reduce flood impacts on transport and infrastructure and utilities. Particularly the Botley and Abingdon Roads, Railway line and sewerage system. - To safeguard Oxford's reputation as a thriving centre of commerce that is open to business and - To create and maintain new recreational amenities, wildlife habitat and naturalise watercourses accessible from the centre of Oxford These have been developed into a series of SMART sub-objectives. The scheme is forecast to deliver more than £1bn of national economic benefit, move at least 1000 properties to a lower flood risk category, provide improved protection to the roads and railway line (to at least the same standard as the 2007 flood), deliver at least 5Ha of biodiversity plan habitat and deliver enhancements to public access that better connect the city with its surrounding communities.
5. Department, Agency, or NDPB name **& parent department name** (if applicable)	**Name: Environment Agency** **Parent Dept: Defra**
6. Contact Details: **Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)**	**Name: Ken Allison** **Address: Environment Agency, Kestrel Way, Exeter, EX2 7LQ** **Telephone No. 02030257151** **Email: ken.allison@environment-agency.gov.uk**
7. Project Director details	**Name: Joanna Larmour** **Address: Environment Agency, Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Crowmarsh Gifford, Wallingford, Oxon, OX10 8BD** **Telephone No. 02030259666** **Email: joanna.larmour@environment-agency.gov.uk**
8. Primary contact point for administration of assurance reviews	**Name: Chris Savage** **Address: Environment Agency, Goldcrest House, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, GU10 4LH** **Role: Project Assurance and Approvals Manager** **Telephone No. 02030259458** **Email: chris.savage@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 Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) is a standalone project developed from the 2010 Oxford Flood Risk Management Strategy. The Oxford Strategy set out three phases of work to manage flood risk over the next 100 years. The first was a series of short term measures (localised works including desilting; temporary barriers and culvert works) which have been implemented. The second phase (this project) is the provision of improved flow capacity through the floodplain to the west of the city, and the third phase, to provide climate change mitigation, through upstream flood storage.** **This project is part of the Environment Agency's 6 year capital**

	investment programme expenditure and will be an early contributor of benefits into the next capital investment programme period and targets.
10. Costs *(Indicative estimate or as defined in latest business case)*	**Capital: £ 120m** **Operational (Running costs): £1m pa (including existing system maintenance)** **Whole life: £216m** **Business Case Status: Strategic Outline Case approved by HM Treasury 1 September 2015** **Note: all costs are cash costs, excluding inflation, from the HM Treasury approved SOC. They will be updated with the final OBC figures in early 2017.**
11. Expected duration (yrs) of major contract or service (if known & appropriate)	**Main construction contract - 3 year duration**
12. Next planned review	**First RPA review completed in August 2014. This confirmed a Project Validation Review was not required and that Oxford FAS would be a Tier 2 major project with external assurance lead by Defra as the lead government department for the Environment Agency.** **The last external assurance review was the OGC Gateway 1 Review in May 2015. The project was rated as Amber at this review.** **The OGC Gateway 2 is the next planned external assurance review. This is planned be carried out in conjunction with the submission of the Outline Business Case.** **There are ongoing discussions between the Environment Agency, Defra and the Infrastructure and Projects Authority as to whether this can be incorporated into the existing assurance review to streamline the process.**
13. Requested start date for next review *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*	**Week Commencing Date:** *to be confirmed – may not do a separate gateway review – TBC by Ian Hodge*
14. Overall Assessment *Derived from Table C*	**MEDIUM**
15. Date of previous assurance review & ID No.	**Type of Review: OGC Gateway 1** **Date: 1/5/2015** **ID No.**
16. Name of responsible Minister	
17. RPA approved by SPO (for Starting Gate) **or SRO** (for other type of assurance review)	**Name:** **Date:**
18. Validated by organisation's Portfolio Manager or an equivalent e.g. Head of PPM Centre of Excellence	**Name:** **Date:** **Role:** **Email:** **Tel. No.**
19. Departmental Assurance Co-ordinator (DAC) *NB. Previously the DGC*	**Name:**
20. RPA Version No. & Date	**Version No. 2** **Date: 15/12/16**

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.

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, local politicians and the public are aware that there are over 3500 properties at risk from flooding in Oxford and the surrounding communities in the 'do nothing' scenario. One of Defra's key targets for risk management authorities is to reduce the number of properties at by 300,000 as part of the 6 year capital investment programme. The Oxford Scheme is forecast to be an early contributor to the next capital investment programme period. It maintains a high political profile.						
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)**	There is still 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. There is environmental and public interest locally, particularly around perceived downstream impacts. However, this is 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)**	The project capital construction costs are approximately £120m of which around half will be funded through Flood and Coastal Risk Management Grant in Aid government funding. HM Treasury approval is therefore required and has already been obtained for the Strategic Outline Business Case. Significant partnership funding contributions have been secured from the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (£26m), Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (£14m) Oxfordshire County Council (£6.5m), Oxford City Council (£1.5m) and Thames Water (Between £1m - £3m) with negotiations ongoing with some other key investors. We are also exploring shared liability for the future maintenance with Oxford City Council and other landowners who may provide landscape maintenance as a benefit in kind contribution.						

Risk Potential Assessment

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 change is novel or contentious.
Explanatory Notes **(Completion mandatory)**	Although the scale of this project is large the fundamentals behind its design are part of the core business for the Environment Agency. It also adopts passive design principles meaning that there will be minimal additional operation and maintenance needs after completion. We continue to liaise closely with other large schemes within the Environment Agency (River Thames Scheme, TEAM2100 and the Boston Barrier). Commercial markets are able to undertake the scale of the required work within our existing frameworks. We have engaged with Tier 1 and Tier 2 suppliers as part of our procurement strategy.					
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 FAS other than ensuring we work closely with other existing and proposed schemes on the River Thames, particularly over downstream messages.					

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)
[Note: If score is Very Low (VL) completion of Table B below is optional. If Table B is not completed, note this score in Box 14 on the cover sheet. Alternatively, this score is to be used in Table C if Table B is completed.]

This scheme will have an overall MEDIUM consequential impact. This is the same as in the original RPA assessment. There is continued public and political interest in the local communities surrounding the scheme. On the whole this is local to the Oxford area, however the scheme is also known about at a ministerial level. There is a significant level of Flood and Coastal Risk Management Grant in Aid funding allocated to the scheme which has the potential to bring interest from other communities across the UK. Local political (MP and elected member) leadership and support will continue to be important in the delivery of this scheme.

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

B1Strategic 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 is being delivered in partnership with 3 local councils to 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 and private sectors. The complexity has been increased to High from Medium since the last RPA update as Oxfordshire County Council are currently going through devolution discussions with its district councils which is, by its nature, very political.						
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 consultations delivered as part of the Oxford Scheme have demonstrated a good level of overall support as well as helped the project team understand and take on board local needs as part of the outline design. The team have received positive feedback about the approach they have taken in engaging. The project team are also actively engaging with downstream communities about perceived downstream impacts and what the scheme will mean to them. There remain high profile and active community and stakeholder groups and as the design develops and becomes more real the complexity of these interactions has increased. The team retains good capacity and capability to continue to deliver the stakeholder engagement plan proactively. Nevertheless, in complexity terms the score has been raised from a Medium at the previous iteration of the RPA to a High in this revision.						
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	The completed scheme will require some new skills and training needs to local teams which will be managed as part of preparing for operational service. However, none of these are new to the Environment Agency as a whole. 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 300,000 households over the current 6 year capital investment programme. The Oxford Scheme is forecast to deliver its benefits in the next capital investment programme period so will not impact the delivery of the overall public target of 300,000 properties.						

Strategic Profile summary assessment	Strategic profile low, changes unlikely to threaten objectives	VL	L	M	H X	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 HIGH overall complexity in relation to strategic profile. This is an increase from medium at the previous RPA. This is due to the local political environment increasing in complexity as the county and district work through devolution discussions and the interactions with stakeholders and local communities increase in complexity as we develop the design into something which is more tangible for them. The team maintains a well resource and capable team and continues delivering a strong stakeholder engagement approach which is well placed to manage these complexities.

[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) are required and span more than 1 Local Planning Authority. However, we have worked with partners and agreed a single determination will be made by the county with the other planning authorities who are all represented on our partnership groups. Legal agreements will be needed with a number of landowners. We have secured authorisation to run a Compulsory Purchase Order whilst we continue with a negotiated agreement and will be able to switch to this if required. As we have progressed our understanding and agreements in the above two areas the complexity for this item has been reduced from a Medium in the original RPA to the Low in this version. Due to the size of the scheme it is also testing the Partnership Funding approach on this scale. We don't expect any review of the Partnership Funding policy to impact the scheme but we will provide lessons learned for consideration when it is reviewed.						
B2.2. Security	No security or public data handling implications.	X					Significant national security or public data handling issues or requirements.
Explanatory Notes	There is some commercially confidential information and this will continue through the subsequent stages. The level of protective marking is routine for the Environment Agency and we have the systems in place to manage this. We have shared our process for protective marking with partners.						
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	The roles and responsibilities of the Sponsoring Group and Programme Board are clear and have been re-confirmed prior to submission of the Outline Business Case. At project initiation the Risk Management Authority roles were still fairly new under the Floods and Water Management Act they are now much clearer in their wider corporate roles. The scheme						

objectives and sub-objectives have been confirmed and developed through our benefits realisation work.

Due to the above the complexity score has decreased from a Medium in the original RPA to a Low in this revision. The scheme will have some training need for local field teams to take on the operation and maintenance but it is primarily a passive design scheme and will not require additional skills that don't already exist within the Environment Agency.

B2.4. Technology development, production and/or techniques	Involves no new or novel technology development, implementation, production, products, tools or techniques. Extensive previous use of development and/or production techniques.	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 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 will involve constructing a new naturalised 2 stage channel utilising existing watercourses with culverts under both the roads and railway. The existing floodplain will remain fully functional.						

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	The Commercial and Procurement strategy has been developed in conjunction with input from Defra Commercial and the IPA. Following assessment and review of options the work is all planned to be delivered using the well-established Water and Environmental Management (WEM) Framework contract. The supplier market is considered stable and able to undertake the work. Further to this we have completed the IPA project initiation routemap exercise and as a result carried out detailed market sounding with tier 1 and tier 2 supply chains. The findings from this support our approach of using the WEM framework.						

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	The scheme is funded using the principles from the partnership funding policy. This is complex in being able to demonstrate both economic affordability in Present Value terms for FCRMGiA and contributions as well as demonstrating financial affordability in real cash terms taking account of inflation. Funding agreements remain complex and negotiations will not have completed for all organisations at the time of Outline Business Case submission. Whilst the very strong progress has been made with significant contributions already achieved it is a complex area of work. As a result the complexity assessment for this has increased from a Medium score in the original RPA to a High score in this iteration.						

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 is via a partnership between the local councils, Thames Water, the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, the Oxford Flood Alliance and the Environment Agency. The Scheme organisation and governance have been formulated using PRINCE2 to ensure clarity, use of industry standard models and 'management by exception'. Terms of Reference and tolerances for Programme Board and Sponsoring Group have been reviewed and updated to ensure they remain well-structured for the next stage of the project. Some key post holders of both governance groups have changed since the Strategic Outline Case stage; however, the project team have briefed and supported incoming members to aid their transition into the team.						
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	The Scheme involves many stakeholders (local government, businesses, landowners, tourism and recreation, environmental and commercial interests) as well as people and their communities. The well-established Flood Risk Action group in Oxford are members of the sponsoring group and are still fully supportive of proposal. Landowner engagement is ongoing, with one potential landowner objecting to the scheme. There are ongoing landowner engagement workshops to reach design agreements and manage the risks of objection. We have a dedicated stakeholder engagement team and detailed communications plan. We continue to receive positive feedback on our approach which is shared as best practice with other projects.						
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, planning permission(s) and Compulsory Purchase Order. Management approaches to these have been agreed and implemented as part of developing the Outline Business Case.						

				X		
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.					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. The project team have secured and moved into a co-located hub in the Environment Agency's Reading Office with partner members invited to co-locate. Co-location days have also been established between the project team and supplier teams.					

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

Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory)

The scheme has been assessed to have an overall MEDIUM complexity regarding the Delivery Challenge assessment. This is the same as at the previous RPA. Strong progress has been made in agreeing approaches to gaining planning permission and running a CPO process in the background in case negotiated land agreements cannot be achieved. The partnership is strong and the project team has the capacity, capability and plans to deliver.

Partnership funding on this scale is complex. The scheme has made great progress securing the contributions to date and has the resources needed to deliver the negotiating plans. This will remain technically challenging through the Full Business Case stage.

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

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	The Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) is in place, as well as a Project Sponsor and a full time Project Director. Fully resourced and stable, skilled team in place. Specialist support has been bought-in as required to augment existing in-house skills. High level resource plan in place that is being developed into a detailed resource plan for the Outline Business Case. This includes management of future transitions in team structure linked to programme need. Well established network of sharing major project learning through the Major Project Community of Practice and links directly into other project teams and via peer to peer project meetings.						
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	Large demands on staff both within the Environment Agency and Local Councils. Wider political environment changes around the Oxfordshire devolution agenda has resulted in changes to the governance group membership as well as availability of key external staff who now have competing priorities. This is being actively managed by the Project Director through building personal relationships but the complexity has increased. Therefore the score for this item has been raised from a Medium at the original RPA to the High complexity in this version.						
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. Have retained same supplier for appraisal, detailed design and site supervision stages which ensures continuity. 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 across the leadership team, including experience of working in partnership. Continuity has been maintained in the leadership team with a good culture established across the project team. Project Director has completed the Cabinet Office Project Leadership Programme and has been certified by the APM as a Registered Project Professional.					
Capacity & Capability summary assessment	**Capacity and capability in place and change unlikely to threaten objectives**	**VL**	**L**	**M X**	**H**	**VH**	**Significant capacity or capability issues. Changes highly likely to threaten achievement of objectives**

Explanatory Notes (Completion Mandatory)

Overall the Capacity and Capability section has been rated as MEDIUM complexity. This is the same as the previous RPA. The scheme in itself is not complex; however the major project structure and process is relatively new to the Environment Agency. The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is seen as setting a good standard and sharing lessons for other major projects to adopt.

Of note is the high complexity score of the stakeholder and organisation sub-section. Whilst well managed external influences have made this area more complex than at project initiation.

[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	The schedule for delivering the work is very challenging with limited float and key dependencies on financial contributions being tied into specific years and deliverables. There remain some key risks that carry significant time delays and critical path impacts if realised such as securing planning consent and land agreements. Partners are fully aware of these risks. The interplay on these means that the schedule is of high complexity. This is an increase since the original RPA score of medium due to the better understanding of how items on the schedule interact. An experienced project management professional has been bought in to provide support to the Project Executive on overseeing and providing challenge to the schedule to ensure an issues are identified early and acted on.						
B4.2 Budget	Budgets within delegations and local control.\n\nCosts relatively small to overall organisational programme/project spends.\n\nBudgets agreed and stable. Appropriate financial management systems established.\n\nChange management system in place.			X			Budgets outside organisational spend delegations.\nCost estimates subject to significant pressures from ongoing or expected change.\n\nCosts are significant, relative to the organisation's programme/project spend.\n\nFinancial management system not in place or audited. Cross organisational/ multi-faceted funding with complex financial control and reporting.
Explanatory Notes	Budgets are outside organisational spend delegations and 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 when viewed in isolation but less so in the context of the £2.3 billon 6 year capital investment programme. We have a dedicated funding and benefits realisation team supported and an external cost consultant providing a since source of financial reporting for the scheme.						

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			Magnitude of benefits significant. Complex benefits realisation challenges. Changing benefits management environment or realisation responsibilities. Achievability of benefits in doubt. Difficult to measure.
Explanatory Notes	Present value benefits are estimated at over £1,110m over the 100 year appraisal period (including climate change) and primarily relate to national flood risk damages avoided to homes, businesses and infrastructure. The hydrology and modelling study has ensured the latest, best available data and models have been used to confirm the benefits of the scheme. The outputs from this modelling have refined and adjusted the benefits delivered, leading to a slight increase in benefits from the SOC stage. The model has been subjected to external peer review. Further to this we have developed our benefits realisation approach with the partnership including mapping how the schemes outputs deliver primary, secondary and tertiary benefits and linking these back to the overall scheme objectives.						
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 across the project are well defined and stable. We are following the standard PRINCE2 approach to managing quality which is embedded in standard Environment Agency processes.						

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)
Whilst the scale of the project is large it is of MEDIUM complexity overall. This is the same as at the previous RPA. In this assessment it is of note that the time sub-measure has increased from a medium rating to high. This is due to the increased understanding of the tasks required and how they relate to one another. An experienced project management professional has been brought in to provide support to the Project Executive on overseeing and providing challenge to the schedule to ensure an issues are identified early and acted on.

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

Risk Potential Assessment

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)

The overall complexity assessment has been scored as HIGH. This is on the basis as being the highest of the 4 complexity area summary assessments. This is an increase from medium from the original RPA but does not change the overall risk of the project which remains medium risk. The complexity increase is driven by changes to the external stakeholder and political environment. The team is well set up to manage this complexity – the summary of each section is included below.

Strategic Profile

The scheme has been assessed to have a HIGH overall complexity in relation to strategic profile. This is an increase from medium at the previous RPA. This is due to the local political environment increasing in complexity as the county and district work through devolution discussions and the interactions with stakeholders and local communities increase in complexity as we develop the design into something which is more tangible for them. The team maintains a well-resourced and capable team and continues delivering a strong stakeholder engagement approach which is well placed to manage these complexities.

Delivery Challenge

The scheme has been assessed to have an overall MEDIUM complexity regarding the Delivery Challenge assessment. This is the same as at the previous RPA. Strong progress has been made in agreeing approaches to gaining planning permission and running a CPO process in the background in case negotiated land agreements cannot be achieved. The partnership is strong and the project team has the capacity, capability and plans to deliver. Partnership funding on this scale is complex. The scheme has made great progress securing the contributions to date and has the resources needed to deliver the negotiating plans. This will remain technically challenging through the Full Business Case stage.

Capacity and Capability

Overall the Capacity and Capability section has been rated as MEDIUM complexity. This is the same as the previous RPA. The scheme in itself is not complex; however the major project structure and process is relatively new to the Environment Agency. The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is seen as setting a good standard and sharing lessons for other major projects to adopt. Of note is the high complexity score of the stakeholder and organisation sub-section. Whilst well managed external influences have made this area more complex than at project initiation.

Scale

Whilst the scale of the project is large it is of MEDIUM complexity overall. This is the same as at the previous RPA. In this assessment it is of note that the time sub-measure has increased from a medium rating to high. This is due to the increased understanding of the tasks required and how they relate to one another. An experienced project management professional has been brought in to provide support to the Project Executive on overseeing and providing challenge to the schedule to ensure an issues are identified early and acted on.

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

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 Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	Very High				**High Risk**	
	High	**Medium Risk**				
	Medium				**X**	
	Low					
	Very Low			Low Risk		

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