Risk ID	Risk Owner	Date Registered	Cause: Description of Risk	Inherent Risk	Imapact Description	Probability	Risk Status	Risk Response	Risk Actionee	Residual Risk	Residual Risk	Residual Risk	Risk Status
				Impact		1 low; 2 med; 3				Imapct	Probability	Cost of Imapct	
				1 low; 2 med; 3		high				1 Low; 2 med; 3		x Probability	
				high						high		post response	
			Anticipated impacts and		Reputational Damage			Regular consultation					
			benefits from the project					with stakeholders					
			might not be as great as										
	De alex Citeres	45/07/2040	expected	2		2							Cl I
1	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3	No. destruction officer at the con-		M	Dec. Inc. of the Co.			1	L	Closed
					New designs affect existing			Regular consultation					
	De also Citario		Impact of services (inc. Scottish Water infrastructure on design)	2	infrastructure			with stakeholders					Cl I
2	Douglas Grierson			3	B	1	L			1	1	L	Closed
			Fail to appoint design team		Project does not go ahead and rep			continue to work with					
		4.5 /0= /0.04.0						Procurement Team					
3	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3		2	М			2	2	M	Closed
			Budget does not allow for all		aspirations exceed available			Regularly engage with					
		4.5 /0= /0.04.0	community aspirations		budget			stakeholders			_		
4	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		2		2	M			2	1	L	Closed
_			Condition of sea wall worse	_	Could limit the scope of works for	_		Early inspection of the		_	_		
5	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018	than anticipated	3	the front green	2	M	sea wall		3	2	M	Closed
			Delays in Planning Process		Delay in project resulting			Planning Officers will					
					reputational damage and			be included in					
6	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		2	additional costs	2	M	steering group		2	1	L	Active
			Poor response to public		Not a true representation of the			Use various media					
			consultation		community			formats to publicise					
								public consultations					
7	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		2		3	Н			2	2	M	Closed
			Poor response to		Failure to complete project			work with					
			construction tender		resulting in reputational damage			procurement to					
								establish best way to					
								advertise contract					
8	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3		2	M			3	2	M	Active
			Loss of political goodwill		Failure to complete project			Elected Members will					
					resulting in reputational damage			be updated on a					
9	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3		1	L	regular basis		2	1	L	Active
·			Failure to secure Additional		project does not deliver all			Continue to source	·				
			Funding		community expectations resulting			additional funding			1		
					reputational damage			opportunities					
10	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		2		2	M			2	2	M	Active
			Health and safety risks		serious injury or death			Contractor has robust	·				
			during construction					health and safety			1		
								practicies in place					
11	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3		1	L			3	1	L	Active
			Lose support of stakeholders		Project fails to meet stakeholeder			All stakeholders will					
					expectations resulting			be given regular			1		
					reputational damage			project updates					
12	Douglas Grierson	16/07/2018		3		2	М			3	1	L	Active
			Delays in construction (inc.		Project falls behind Programme			Timming of works will		_			
			weather related)					try and minimise risks					
13	Douglas Grierson	08/08/2018		2		2	М			2	2	M	Active
			Staff resource being available		Project falls behind Programme			provide regular					
			to progress the project		-			updates to SMT					
14	Douglas Grierson	08/08/2018		3		2	М			3	2	M	Active

Risk ID	Risk Owner	Date Registered	Cause: Description of Risk	Inherent Risk	Imapact Description	Probability	Risk Status	Risk Response	Risk Actionee	Residual Risk	Residual Risk	Residual Risk	Risk Status
				Impact		1 low; 2 med; 3				Imapct	Probability	Cost of Imapct	
				1 low; 2 med; 3		high				1 Low; 2 med; 3		x Probability	
				high						high		post response	
			Tender costs may exceed		Project cannot be constructed to								
			budget		approved designs			Budget consideration					
								without any third					
								party funding to be					
								included as part of					
								brief for design					
15	Douglas Grierson	08/08/2018		3		3	Н	consultants		3	2	M	Active
			Future flood defences taking		project does not deliver all			Further development					
			up a substantial part of the		community expectations resulting			with flood risk team					
			Front Green / Changing the		reputational damage. Could limit			to agree on a way					
			character of the Front Green		the scope of works for the front			forward					
			and Lochgilphead		green. Reputational Damage.								
16	erz Ltd	04/06/2019		3		3	н			2	1	L	Active
			Project misses Town Centre		£200,000 Town Centre funding			Continue discussion					
			Fund deadline of 31st March		will be lost			with Roads and					
			2020					Amenity Services					
17	erz ltd	15/07/2019		3		2	M	·		3	2	М	Active