

Non-Construction Risk Register

February 2026

Peoples Property Portfolio

17-21 Chapel Street

Risk Register

Compiled and managed by:

Andy Stratford (AS) - Freelance Project Manager, Peoples Property Portfolio

Input and consultation with

Harry Jelley (HJ), Company Secretary of Peoples Property Portfolio

Adam Cole (AC), Director of Peoples Property Portfolio

Rosie Freeman (RF), Freelance Fundraiser, Peoples Property Portfolio

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
G	Utilities	The building's age and grade 2 listed status implies significant, potentially hidden, deterioration or defects. Once exposed during detailed pre-construction surveys (e.g. intrusive investigations, structural assessments) or enabling works, these could lead to unforeseen structural issues, increased conservation costs or a requirement for more extensive, complex and costly interventions than initially anticipated, significantly delaying the project.	4	5	20	A series of surveys at both RIBA 1 and RIBA 2 of the building and its services has been undertaken, and has confirmed that the building is suitable for this conversion. There are unlikely to be any major unforeseen structural issues. Whilst we are aware of fluctuations in market conditions and rates, we have a robust fundraising strategy to put us in a strong financial position to account for new costs, and an appropriate apportionment to contingency. We will work closely with our professional advisors especially Architects and Structural Engineers at RIBA 4 taking into account guidance from Historic England and NLHF	3	5	15	AS	04/08/25	RIBA 4 stage Nov 2026 - May 2027 will reveal more detail	22/5/2025	AS	06/11/25
A	Governance	PPP as a relatively new CBS finds it hard to establish financial and governance credibility with key funders and key funder-stakeholders	3	5	15	PPP has created a good governance structure which key funder stakeholders (esp. Historic England, NLHF, CBMDC, AHF) have confidence in. We are building funder portfolio with these respected organisations.	1	5	5	HJ	28/05/26	Action date is the deadline for the NLHF main/Dev application AC: Share offer has been fully scoped out, reported at Board Meeting 19/01/26, with a launch date of Thursday 05/03/26	16/10/2024	AD	25/02/26
A	Governance	Structure of the PPP board proves tricky to set up, lacks necessary skills and does not achieve 'buy in' with stakeholders or funders.	4	5	20	Keep an open mind as to best governance structure - with possibility of different structures for the development phase (PPP Bencom) and then the operational phase beyond that.	2	5	10	HJ	04/08/25	AC: BMDC emphasis, other significant stakeholders e.g. BD25/NLHF AC: Can we really prove our Board and organisation has the legal, financial, and digital expertise to run a business, not just a hobby, 'application 'deep dive' session' Board meeting (19/02/26)	16/10/2024	AC	25/02/26
F	Design Development	Risk: The Asbestos Management Survey may result in the identification of significant asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), leading to substantially increased costs and delays for the project.	4	5	20	Mitigation Objective: To minimize the financial and schedule impact of asbestos discovery by conducting thorough early assessment. As part of RIBA 2 surveys we opted to commission a full intrusive renovation survey with 180 samples from across the building - there were minimal issues for concern and there should be no significantly increased costs or delays due to ACM's.	1	5	5	AS	04/08/25	AC: Updated risk + mitigation AC: 30 June 2025 report received/provided by Acorn Analytical Services, including: Asbestos Survey and Asbestos Testing, resulting, resulting in 5 removals being needed, some areas could not be accessed i.e. lift shaft. AC: Risk is realised scoring is about right, potential risk still exists in areas not accessed	16/10/2024	AD	25/02/26
F	Design Development	Risk: Lack of communication and clarity in project organisation and structure leads to errors, abortive work, and deterioration of project team relationships. Mitigation Objective: To establish and maintain a clear, transparent, and effective communication and organisational structure that fosters collaboration, minimizes errors, prevents abortive work, and strengthens project team relationships.	3	4	12	To counter communication breakdown, errors, and strained team relationships, governance and communication are key. We'll establish a clear organisational chart and RACI matrix at kick-off. Proactive steps include regular, structured meetings, a central information hub, and fostering open dialogue. A clear brief for RIBA Stage 4 technical design will be critical to prevent abortive work. Ongoing monitoring via pulse checks and lessons learned sessions will ensure continuous improvement and strong team cohesion.	2	4	8	AS	28/05/26	AS: Updated risk + mitigation	16/10/2024	AS	30/01/26

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
C	Directors	<p>Risk: Directors of People's Property Portfolio (PPP) do not deliver a suitably robust business plan to enable confidence for funding release, causing the project to come to a standstill, impacting the programme, and resulting in unrecoverable delay.</p> <p>Mitigation Objective: To ensure the timely development and delivery of a robust, funder-ready business plan by the PPP Directors, securing funder confidence and preventing project delays or cessation due to a lack of financial commitment.</p>	4	5	20	<p>To mitigate the risk of PPP Directors failing to deliver a robust business plan, leading to stalled funding, we'll first formalise funder requirements and develop a comprehensive business plan outline. Critically, PPP Directors will engage fully with business plan production, working through a dedicated group with a phased schedule. Proactive pre-submission funder consultation, contingency time for revisions, and a budget allowance in NLHF Dev phase for detailed review at RIBA 4.</p>	2	5	10	HJ	04/08/25	<p>AC: BP = Business Plan AC: Updated risk + mitigation AS: BP drafted for the share offer.</p>	16/10/2024	AS	30/01/26
J	Delivery	<p>Risk: The People's Property Portfolio (PPP) cashflow systems are not compatible with capital project payment terms, leading to stalled design and/or construction works due to payment delays or mismatches.</p> <p>Mitigation Objective: To ensure seamless and timely financial flows between the PPP and capital project stakeholders by aligning cashflow systems and payment terms, preventing project delays and maintaining contractor/supplier confidence.</p>	4	5	20	<p>To prevent project stalls due to incompatible cashflow systems, we'll first map the PPP's financial processes against capital project payment terms to identify mismatches, and ringfence capital funds to capital expenditure. We'll then negotiate flexible payment terms in contracts and implement a robust payment application process. A dedicated financial liaison within the PPP and regular cashflow forecasting will ensure transparent communication and early issue detection. If delays occur, we'll proactively inform contractors and prioritize critical payments, escalating to senior management if needed to maintain project momentum.</p>	2	5	10	HJ	04/08/25	<p>AC: Updated risk + mitigation Increased probability</p>	16/10/2024	AC	23/05/25
B	Stakeholders	<p>Neighbours: The Bradford Resource Centre (PPP) redevelopment project may upset an existing neighbour</p>	4	4	16	<p>Our risk mitigation plan for potential neighbor upset focuses on proactive communication, considerate execution, and efficient issue resolution. Before starting, we'll identify neighbors, share project details (impacts, hours, contacts), and offer a drop-in session. During the project, we'll control noise/dust, manage traffic, and maintain site cleanliness, strictly adhering to working hours. For issues, we'll provide a dedicated contact, log complaints, and ensure timely responses with regular reviews. This strategy aims to minimize disruption and build positive neighbor relations.</p>	2	5	10	AC	04/08/25	<p>AC: Updated risk + mitigation All neiegbours have had an opportunity to comment on the Planning submission and no comments were received.</p>	7/4/2025	AC	23/05/25
D	Funding	<p>Risk: The project becomes too reliant on repayable finance, which makes future letting and operations unviable in the short to medium term due to high debt servicing costs.</p> <p>Mitigation Objective: To ensure the project's long-term financial viability and operational sustainability by optimizing the funding mix, prioritizing non-repayable or patient capital, and ensuring robust financial modeling.</p>	4	4	16	<p>To mitigate over-reliance on repayable finance, we'll reduce reliance on repayable finance by creating a diversified funding strategy. We'll aggressively maximise grant funding for the start-up phase and pursue other non-repayable capital. We'll also explore patient capital and options for scalable payments. Robust financial modeling will include sensitivity analysis and stress testing to ensure viability under various scenarios. Finally, phased development and strategic asset management, including diversified income streams and operational efficiency, will ensure long-term sustainability.</p>	2	4	8	HJ	04/08/25	<p>AC: Updated risk + mitigation</p>	16/10/2024	AC	23/05/25

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
F	Design Development	Risk: Inadequate contingency at early design stages (e.g., RIBA 2/3) leads to extensive pre-contract value engineering (VE), compromising the project vision and operational functionality, potentially resulting in loss of future income. Mitigation Objective: To establish a robust and realistic contingency at early design stages to protect the project's vision, operational functionality, and long-term income potential, minimizing the need for detrimental pre-contract Risk Mitigation Plan: Tenant Understanding at Procurement Stage	4	4	16	To avoid extensive value engineering and safeguard project vision, we'll establish a robust, informed early design budget with a graded contingency strategy, starting at 10% for construction and potentially reducing to 5% as tenders are received and design is honed during VE. We'll formally define the project's vision and KPIs to protect operational functionality. If necessary, proactive, controlled value engineering sessions will prioritize options that minimize compromise, with all decisions meticulously logged	3	3	9	AS	04/08/25	AC: Updated risk + mitigation	16/10/2024	AC	23/05/25
F	Design Development	Risk: Key stakeholder tenants (clients) for meanwhile use or long-term occupancy do not fully understand what they are getting by the procurement stage, leading to misaligned expectations, dissatisfaction, delays, or potential withdrawal. Mitigation Objective: To ensure key tenant stakeholders have a clear, accurate, and comprehensive understanding of the space, its capabilities, limitations, and operational implications well in advance of and throughout the procurement process.	4	4	16	To prevent key tenants from misunderstanding their space by procurement, we'll ensure early and continuous engagement. This involves in-depth needs assessments and design workshops and presentations taking the key stakeholder tenants through the RIBA process, providing detailed visualisations and clear specifications. We'll build time in the programme for stand-back reviews to foster understanding. A dedicated communication channel, transparent review of procurement documents, and clear phasing details will ensure expectations are fully managed before and during the procurement stage.	2	4	8	AS	04/08/25	AC: Updated risk + mitigation AC: Reported at the 29/09/25 Board meeting 'Appendix 3 - PPP Key messages, audience mapping and recommendations FINAL'	16/10/2024	AC	29/09/25
F	Design Development	Client approval process for M&E plans lacks robustness at technical design stage causing post-contract change and potential knock on of increased costs and delay to programme	4	4	16	M&E Client Bill of Quantities (BoQ) Review should be planned into programme. All tenant stakeholders will need to have reviewed their own requirements and in some units this can be further de-risked if tenants do their own detailed fit out. Tenants are mostly established businesses and should know their own requirements.	2	4	8	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	Insufficient human resources from core tenant stakeholders is allocated to their transition from whatever existing premises to Quaker School/BRC.	4	4	16	Needs a lead for each of core stakeholder tenants; a role specification, requirements in advance for tech info especially around M&E. stakeholder tenants need to have human resource capacity. Use PPP board members to help resolve.	2	4	8	AS	31/12/26		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
J	Delivery	Capital Budget: a failure from PPP client to tightly and efficiently control costs during construction delivery (RIBA 5) leads to project going over budget	4	4	16	Regular updates from Main Contractor (MC) and DT QS at weekly Client Meetings. Use of ongoing live AI tracker to see additions and omissions in real time. Quick (but robust) decision making process + have pre-agreed rates for some key adds or omissions.	2	4	8	AS	31/03/28		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
K	Revenue (Ops) Funding	Lack of programme funding beyond Bradford 2025 legacy review again in March 2027	4	4	16	To be analysed in due course. May not be an issue depending on which organisations are tenants.	2	4	8	HJ	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	Risk: Incompatibility of design and client aspirations due to the Design Team (DT) not having a clear brief or fully understanding the vision, leading to abortive work, delays, and a compromised final outcome. Mitigation Objective: To ensure the Design Team fully comprehends and translates the client's vision and aspirations into the design, fostering alignment, minimizing rework,	3	5	15	To mitigate design incompatibility and ensure client aspirations are met, we'll implement a comprehensive, detailed project brief and conduct visioning workshops with the Design Team, embedding them early on. We'll appoint a client Design Champion, and potentially a Usability Champion, who will be fully involved in the design process. Continuous communication through regular reviews, detailed visualisations, and rigorous documentation of all design decisions will ensure alignment, minimizing abortive work and delivering the intended vision.	2	5	10	AS	04/08/25	AC: Updated risk + mitigation	16/10/2024	AC	23/05/25

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
C	Directors	Key leaders of the project are unable to receive remuneration for the significant time they need to commit to reach opening day, meaning they need to drop out to earn a living elsewhere.	3	4	12	It will be imperative to find a way to remunerate people for their hard work. Ensure that the governance model can meet this requirement and that fundraising and budgeting are undertaken with this in mind.	2	4	8	RF	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AC	29/09/25
D	Funding	Incoming funding: cashflow in to expenditure out does not align.	3	4	12	Cashflow needs producing once we have a scoped budget	2	4	8	HJ	04/08/25	AC: Cashflow reported to Board, by Treasurer at Board meeting 29-09-25 AC: Cashflow regular updates to Board at meetings AC: last update 19/01/25, no concerns, reserves policy agreed	16/10/2024	AC	24/02/26
D	Funding	Not achieving funding targets with asks from trusts, foundations etc.	3	4	12	Set realistic and achievable funding targets, and ensure the key funders identified in the project income budget are aligned with the project aims and objectives. Again, phased approach is key.	2	4	8	HJ	04/08/25	AC: 'Fundraising update' reported to Board, by Treasurer at Board meeting 29-09-26 AC: 'Fundraising update' reported to Board at meeting 19/01/25, targets set for Minimum/Optimum/Maximum	16/10/2024	AC	25/02/26
D	Funding	PPP Board are not sufficiently engaged with Trusts and Foundations (T&F's), and PPP board/workers/organisation is not aligned with vision and values of T&F's	3	4	12	Ensure named team members have a clear remit and responsibility to engage with T&F's at the right time and the right level. Set up fundraising sub committee.	2	4	8	HJ	04/08/25	AC: Fundraising Subcommittee formed to Board at meeting 29/09/25 AC: Fundraising Subcommittee regular reporting to Board (last at meeting 19/01/25)	16/10/2024	AC	24/02/26
E	Capital Budget	VAT liability leads to budget overrun.	3	4	12	RISK ALMOST FULLY MITIGATED: PPP have paid for VAT expert advice on "option to tax" amongst other things.	2	4	8	HJ	04/08/25	VAT registration most likely to be put in place in Q3 of 2026	16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	Design of access solutions increase costs at build stage in order to reduce cost to long term operation.	4	3	12	Full and regular review of maintenance needs during RIBA 4 design and development, and this thinking to be included in business planning.	3	3	9	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	Natural Ventilation leads to odour or poor air quality indoors due to Bradford City Centre air quality levels being poor.	3	4	12	Consider at RIBA 4 Design Development stage. The higher up the building that the air is drawn in the better it will be.	2	4	8	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	Inclusion of Photo Voltaic (Solar) / other green energy within Client brief increases costs.	3	4	12	Have tenders closer to construction dates so prices don't go up, if possible. Keep an eye on grant funding for greening the building.	3	3	9	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
G	Planning	Compliance with Planning Conditions / Listed Building Consent delays programme incl Bats.	3	4	12	RISK CLOSED: Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent have been granted	1	4	4	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
G	Utilities	Existing drainage is not compatible with proposed development works under - e.g. subsurface utilities crossing site prevent work. Main issue could be toilets / sewage connections.	3	4	12	Full CCTV drainage survey and GPR and RFL utilities surveys to be commissioned as appropriate at RIBA 4 Nov 2026 to June 2027	2	4	8	AS	30/11/26		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
H	Procurement	Risk of inflation due to delay between costing of Stage 4 technical design and start on site.	3	4	12	Construction Cost inflation of 3.4% in 2026 and 3.1% in 2027 is built into the RIBA 3 costs plan which is based on the Planning Submission and reviewed in January 2026	2	4	8	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
H	Procurement	Risk of additional costs, due to delay between costing of Stage 4 technical design and start on site.	3	4	12	Ensure that the Dev stage report submitted to NLHF to release the main budget for procurement is as comprehensive as required so as not to delay programme. Utilise all possible comms channels with NLHF and advisors to ensure all key conditions for the release are met	2	4	8	AS	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
K	Operations	Maintenance access solutions increase costs.	4	3	12	Relevant for height of building. Must be considered. E.g. window cleaning.	3	3	9	AS	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
K	Operations	Conflict between traffic and pedestrian movement on site and near site.	3	4	12	Design to minimise conflict wherever possible, though Operational Management Plan to be in place post-completion.	2	4	8	AS	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
H	Procurement	Construction procurement route does not comply fully with stakeholder and governance requirements.	2	5	10	Ensure procurement recommendation is a Board approved procurement route. Undertake Detailed procurement planning at an appropriate point when most likely major sources of funds are confirmed.	1	5	5	AS	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
F	Design Development	PPP Workers and Board unable to commit enough time to Design and other RIBA stages.	3	3	9	Utilise the diverse skillsets within the directorship of the PPP. Perform a skills audit.	2	3	6	RF	04/08/25	AD: Some potential overlap with governance risk 'Structure of the PPP board' AD: "Skills Audits" of Board discussed (weakness in SWOT) at NLHF application 'deep dive' session 19/02/26	16/10/2024	AD	25/2/2026
L	FF&E	IT / Changes may impact upon design and budget.	3	3	9	Ensure this is planned at an early stage.	2	3	6	AS	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
L	FF&E	Budget: Client Costs Budget Overruns.	3	3	9	FF&E Budget Review necessary.	2	3	6	AS	31/03/27		16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
B	Stakeholders	Project does not secure strategic support at Exec level of BMDC resulting in unsuccessful funding applications and not enough support regarding the car park	3	3	9	Stay intensively engaged with all relevant CBMDC Depts and ensure this is mitigated	1	5	5	RF	04/08/25		16/10/2024	AS	30/01/26

UID	Department	Potential risk	Uncontrolled			Control Action	Controlled			Owner	Action by DATE	Comments	added on DATE	Last update by	Last update on DATE
			Probability	Impact	Risk rating		Probability	Impact	Risk rating						
D	Funding and programme	Timing of funding confirmation for the totality of the project does not enable parallel RIBA 3 & 4 stages to begin on time. Project aborted due to a lack of time and opportunity passes, partially affected by this calendar year ending and Bradford 2025-connected funding opportunities closing.	5	5	25	RISK CLOSED. NO LONGER RELEVANT The particular funding track and timeline was changed due to other more salient opportunities which evolved as the project evolved	0	5	0	HJ	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/09/25
B	Stakeholders	Site Acquisition: PPP cannot reach agreement with BMDC on land ownership of Quaker School/BRC (asset vs liabilities), and fail to agree sufficient funds to rectify inherent liabilities. Project fails due to PPP being unable to take on these liabilities	3	5	15	RISK CLOSED: - Freehold has been acquired, liabilities were written off.	0	5	0	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	06/11/25
A	Governance	Risk: One proposed governance structure may suit Bradford Metropolitan District Council (BMDC) but not other potential funders/stakeholders, specifically P2C and the Community Land Trust (CLT) concept, potentially hindering project progress or causing failure.	4	5	20	RISK CLOSED: No longer relevant	0	5	0	HJ	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/09/25
G	Planning	Risk: The scheme does not receive planning permission due to a change in the city masterplan and/or increased residential aspects in the immediate neighbourhood.	4	5	20	RISK CLOSED: Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent for the scheme in full were approved in January 2026	3	5	15	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/01/26
J	Delivery	Phased occupation prior / during construction increases project costs & impacts "meanwhile" tenants negatively.	4	4	16	NO LONGER RELEVANT	4	3	12	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
B	Stakeholders	Project does not secure strategic support from BD25	3	5	15	RISK CLOSED: we have had significant support from BD25	1	5	5	RF	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2025
K	Operations	Risk: The BRC site is not cleared of papers, furniture, and other debris, leading to delays in subsequent project stages (e.g., surveys, demolition, construction) and potential health & safety hazards.	3	4	12	RISK CLOSED: we have worked intensively for a year with FoBRC and the site is now more or less clear.	1	4	4	BRC	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/01/26
B	Stakeholders	Site Acquisition: BRC LTD sell or lease to others or decide on another use leading to loss of site to PPP	1	5	5	RISK CLOSED: Building has been purchased	1	5	5	RF	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	06/11/25
G	Planning	Entire planning permission refused and scheme delayed	2	5	10	RISK CLOSED: Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent have been granted	1	5	5	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026
G	Planning	Additional costs incurred as result of planning dept requirements that have not been costed.	2	5	10	RISK CLOSED: Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent have been granted	1	5	5	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	17/10/2024	AS	31/1/2026
H	Procurement	The appointed architect(s) or design team members lack formal conservation accreditation (e.g., AABC, RIBA Conservation Register) or demonstrated equivalent specialist experience in heritage architecture and conservation principles.	3	3	9	RISK CLOSED: We have appointed 3Xa and they have partnered with renowned Bradford based specialist Conservation Architects Knox McConnell	1	5	5	RF	CLOSED	CLOSED	09/06/25	AC	29/09/25
F	Design Development	Pre construction surveys reveal issues	2	4	8	RISK CLOSED	1	4	4	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/9/2025
G	Planning	Change of planning classification use required.	2	4	8	RISK CLOSED: Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent have been granted	1	4	4	AS	CLOSED	CLOSED	16/10/2024	AS	30/1/2026

Purpose of this Non-Construction Risk Register

- To devise strategies for identifying, avoiding specific risks or minimising their impact.
- To agree management responsibility and action plans for dealing with identified risks.
- To be able to set appropriate levels of cost and programme contingency

The Risk Register will be considered when assessing and reviewing the contingency allowance in the Project Budget.

Owners have prime responsibility for ensuring the mitigating action is implemented and reporting back to the project team, although this may be dependent on the action or input of others.
Risks and comments should be emailed to PM Andy Stratford stratfordac@outlook.com

The Main Contractor will be responsible for producing comprehensive construction risk registers to meet all relevant regulatory and best practice requirements. It is out of scope to consider these in this document

Scoring and the risk product - Probability multiplied by Impact

PROBABILITY	1 Improbable	2 Unlikely	3 Possible	4 Likely	5 Probable
IMPACT	1	2	3	4	5
1 Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
2 Marginal	2	4	6	8	10
3 Significant	3	6	9	12	15
4 Serious	4	8	12	16	20
5 Critical	5	10	15	20	25

Definition of risk, default action-no action status, requirement for governance monitoring

Score	Definition	Board report?
1 to 3	Negligible - No action required. Accept the minimal risk identified	No
4 to 5	Very low risk - Action/control measures unlikely to be required. Monitor.	No
6 to 9	Low Risk - Some action required or close monitoring / further analysis	No
10 to 14	Medium risk - Action required. Ensure risk is reduced or controlled	Yes
15 to 25	High Risk - Unacceptable project risk. Reduce or eliminate risk pathway	Yes