

Project Type: Commercial building development project

Incident	Category	P (%) Probability	C Consequence	Risk (H/M/L)	Priority	Respons	Responsibility	Action plan	Specific actions	Deadline	Status action
Alignment of target cost (lack of) and scope	Economical/Financial	50 - 100% Great	Critical	H	R1	Reduce	TAT	Co-development of project specifications and drawings. Remind Landlord that it is a target costing process - 18tDKK/m2 in target cost (LANDLORD)	At budget meeting on the April 14, agree to "cost break down structure" and "process flow chart for target costing"		Ongoing
Municipality (interdependence with other projects/buildings in the master plan)	Authorities / external	5 - 50% Considerabl	Critical	H	R2	Reduce		Ask for transparency			Ongoing
Irrelevant involvement in Landlord processes and risks (DB becomes hostage) - cost control	Organizational/process	5 - 50% Considerabl	Large	H	R3	Reduce	PMO and TAT	Tactical balance between setting the right requirements (performance standards), our review process and arms-length approach.	At all meetings; keeping constant focus on SUN requirement when it comes to function and cost		Ongoing
Contractor risk - price in market too high?	Economical/Financial	5 - 50% Considerabl	Large	H	R3	Transfer	PN (TAT)	PN risk. However, stagegates can reduce risk.			
Missing Customer interaction		10 - 25% Some	Critical	H	R3	Reduce		Stakeholder involvement process with focus on customer experience			Ongoing
District plan: politics / architectural requirements from Authority		10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4			CFM participation in authority meetings, and proactive stakeholder management	(The city architect is positive. Authority approval May 10.) DN issue according to SUN for feedback at planning (and date?)		Ongoing
Structured project development / schedule DB and PN (+ TAT) - developer fails to structure a good process	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4	Reduce	PN (TAT)	Proactive scheduling and setting of requirements for process management	Scheduling meeting held 7 April. Meeting sessions has been agreed for continued planning (and date?)		Ongoing
Contractor negotiation fails (at a late stage)	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4		PN	Regnegotiate cost/price more frequently (stage-gates)	SUN issued "process flow chart for target costing" as been agreed. Next step is to plan the next focus with contractor		Ongoing
Business disruption/disturbance in DB because of the project (during and after)		10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4	Reduce		Handover plan ready 1st of October	TBD		Ongoing
Forecasting without a requirements specification - unrealistic	Economical/Financial	10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4	Reduce	PN (TAT)	Strategic brief, Sketch Design and building programme as a basis for estimate			
Landlord and main contractor negotiations fails		10 - 25% Some	Large	H	R4						
Ineffective and inefficient design	Technical	1 - 10% Small	Critical	H	R4		TAT	Review process	Project is currently heading in the right design direction. CFM continues with ongoing design review		
Internal alignment in DB (PMO, CRE etc.)	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5	Reduce		Focus on internal alignment and communication.			
Alignment TAT and DB	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5	Reduce	PMO and TAT	Quarterly alignment of expectations and services.			
Quality control (of Contractor project and execution)	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5		PN (TAT)	Review process and decision process requirements (specify in SB)			
Radical changes to specifications after Strategic Brief hand-over	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5		TAT	Review SB for "missing" large chunks with cost-impact (>10 mio). Insist on PN building programme/sketch design and references (to be specified) prior to lease agreement			
Risk of scope-creep, when lease-agreement is decided	Organizational/process	10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5		TAT	Review process - focus on ensuring that everything is included.			
Project: war by proxy and risk of personal ambitions influence		10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5	Accept					Identified
District cooling (Fjernkøling) – If HOFOR fails to deliver what we have agreed		10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5	Reduce					Ongoing
Delayed hiring of PMO staff		10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5	Reduce					Ongoing
Post Nord - delayed move-out		10 - 25% Some	Some	M	R5						
Ensuring stakeholder input (at the right timing in relation to phases / decision packages)	Organizational/process	1 - 10% Small	Large	M	R5	Reduce	TAT	Stakeholder involvement process	Continue to develop stakeholder map. Stakeholder management meeting on April 4 have been held and stakeholder plan		Ongoing
Structured process / schedule contract negotiation DB and PN (+ TAT)	Organizational/process	1 - 10% Small	Large	M	R5	Reduce		Negotiations have come far (low risk)			
Services and soilconditions, ancient artifacts - lack of investigation / due diligence	Technical	1 - 10% Small	Large	M	R5		PN	PN investigation (they are aware of the risk)			
Group economical considerations / politics cancels the project	Economical/Financial	0 - 1% Very small	Critical	M	R5	Accept	PN (TAT)	Keep project within target. Strengthen QS.	NIRAS "homework" in relation to QS argumentes in meetings.		
Building delayed delivery		10 - 25% Some	Small	M	R6	Reduce	TAT	Ask for realistic planning, review and hand-over plan	PAA has considerable focus on the delivery date, and how design and cost effect it. We must enable L&T to support this objective		Ongoing
DB Internal: Change in core organization/steering committee.		10 - 25% Some	Small	M	R6	Reduce					Identified
DB Internal: Lack of FM supplier involvement - risk of change		10 - 25% Some	Small	M	R6	Reduce					Identified

Incident	Category	P (%) Probability	C Consequence	Risk (H/M/L)	Priority	Respons	Responsibility	Action plan	Specific actions	Deadline	Status action
Project: commercial marked conform?	Economical/Financial	1 - 10% Small	Some	M	R6	Reduce	TAT	Focus on possibility for up- and down scaling. Possibility of removal of square-meters (multitenants). Part of SB requirements, review process and work place design			
District plan: public oppinion and neighbours / lobbyism	Authorities / external	1 - 10% Small	Some	M	R6						
Bad media attention: District plan exemptions, Oil price, safety on building site		1 - 10% Small	Some	M	R6	Reduce					Identified
Irreversible technical setup in relation to change of IFM supplier	Technical	1 - 10% Small	Small	L	R7						
Irreversible technical setup in relation to change of service supplier (network, power etc.)	Technical	1 - 10% Small	Small	L	R7						
Scope of shared services - lack of control	Organizational/process	0 - 1% Very small	Small	L	R8		PMO	Almost no shared services.			
IFM service suppliers - conflict of interests	Organizational/process	0 - 1% Very small	Small	L	R8		PMO	We aim to collaborate			