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**Project Risk Register**

Energy Storage Right

Risk Register

The Risk Register records details of all the risks identified at the beginning and during the life of the project, their grading in terms of likelihood of occurring and seriousness of impact on the project, initial plans for mitigating each high level risk, the costs and responsibilities of the prescribed mitigation strategies and subsequent results.

Our risk register includes:

* a unique identifier for each risk;
* a description of each risk and how it will affect the project;
* an assessment of the likelihood it will occur and the possible seriousness/impact if it does occur (low, medium, high);
* a grading of each risk according to a risk assessment table (refer to *Table below*);
* an outline of proposed mitigation actions (preventative and contingency)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating for Likelihood and Seriousness for each risk | | | |
| L | Rated as Low | E | Rated as Extreme (Used for Seriousness only) |
| M | Rated as Medium | NA | Not Assessed |
| H | Rated as High |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade: Combined effect of Likelihood/Seriousness | | | | | |
|  | Seriousness | | | | |
| Likelihood |  | low | medium | high | EXTREME |
| low | N | D | C | A |
| medium | D | C | B | A |
| high | C | B | A | A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommended actions for grades of risk | |
| Grade | Risk mitigation actions |
| A | Mitigation actions, to reduce the likelihood and seriousness, to be identified and implemented as soon as the project commences as a priority. |
| B | Mitigation actions, to reduce the likelihood and seriousness, to be identified and appropriate actions implemented during project execution. |
| C | Mitigation actions, to reduce the likelihood and seriousness, to be identified and costed for possible action if funds permit. |
| D | To be noted - no action is needed unless grading increases over time. |
| N | To be noted - no action is needed unless grading increases over time. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change to Grade since last assessment | | | |
| NEW | New risk | ↓ | Grading decreased |
| — | No change to Grade | ↑ | Grading increased |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Id | Description of Risk  (including any identified ‘triggers’) | Impact on Project  (Identify consequences [[1]](#footnote-1)) | Likelihood | Seriousness | Grade | Change | Date of Review | Mitigation Actions  (Preventative or Contingency) |
| 1 | We use the ArcGIS Map Service and our project website map function heavily depends on the ArcGIS server. If their sever is down or under maintenance, it will affect our website and service | Most of features in our web application will not able to provide service because affected by ArcGIS server. | L | H | C | New | 1/08/2019 | Currently, there is no preventative action due to ArcGIS is map service provider. However, it has very low probability to happen because they have their backup service. |
| 2 | Half of our data store in local and half of them are web service provided. The web service data could lose if providers do not provide web service anymore. | Part of data could be unavailable due to web service status. | L | H | C | ↑ | 01/05/2019 | Alternative data source and store backup. |
| 3 | Local data process speed depends on local hardware. | The website loading speed will be slow and impact efficiency. | L | M | N | ↓ | 02/05/2019 | Data optimization are required for different hardware. |
| 4 | Some of data is not up to date and provide by some organizations and collected from past few years and not objective. | The past data and not objective data could have problems and caused inaccurate computation in our Algorithm. | M | H | B | ↑ | 10/05/2019 | Collect up-to-date data that published by different professional bodies and organizations. |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)