

Option Name: Anglian to Affinity Transfer (AZAT)  
 Option Reference:

Contributory factors	Non-standard Civ. Eng.	Standard Civ. Eng.	Combined weight	Combined Upper Bound Optimism Bias (%)	Confidence Grade Criteria			Non-Standard Civil Engineering			Standard Civil Engineering			Adjusted Optimism Bias (%)	Scoring comment - State basis of score. Where score has been updated following Quantitative Risk Assessment state what score was and what it has moved to and why.		
					High Confidence	Medium Confidence	Low Confidence	Proportion of Non-Standard Civil Engineering Capex			Proportion of Standard Civil Engineering Capex						
								Upper Bound	66%	Upper Bound	44%	Lower bound	6%			Lower bound	3%
					Proportion of cost in each confidence band			Mitigation Factor	Proportion of cost in each confidence band			Mitigation Factor					
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low												
<b>Procurement</b>																	
Complexity of contract structure					Clear, well establishment procurement route and processes and/or detailed procurement plan or full commercial business case in place	Contract strategy or outline commercial business case in place, but details still to be developed	No contract strategy or commercial business case in place.				0		0.5	0.5	0.25		
Late contractor involvement in design		3			Design is business as usual and costs are based upon accurate cost models, or significant contractor involvement in design	Design is business as usual and costs are based upon cost models with medium confidence, or initial contractor involvement in key aspects of design	Design is not business as usual for company and the contractor has not been involved in design				0		1		0.5		
Poor contractor capabilities					Contractors and suppliers expected to bid for work have recent experience of similar construction projects and supply of similar process plant and equipment	Contractors and suppliers expected to bid for work have limited recent experience of similar construction projects and supply of similar process plant and equipment	Contractors and suppliers expected to bid for work have little/no recent experience of similar construction projects and supply of similar process plant and equipment				0	1			1		
Government guidelines					There are multiple recent precedents of procuring projects of a similar nature and detailed procurement guidance is in place	Some recent precedents of procuring projects of a similar nature and detailed procurement guidance is in place	There is limited recent experience of procuring projects of a similar nature and detailed procurement guidance is not in place				0	1			1		
Disputes & claims occurred		21			Scope and payment mechanism clearly defined in contract and no dependencies on third parties	Scope and payment mechanism partially defined and there are no major dependencies on third parties	Scope and payment mechanism currently ill-defined and/or there are significant dependencies on third parties				0		0.5	0.5	0.25		
Information management					Information management systems between key stakeholders are in place, clearly defined and effective (e.g. project specific, or already existing for a project under an existing framework)	Some key stakeholders for procurement identified and information management system has been initiated, but details are still to be developed before it can be effective.	Key stakeholders for procurement not identified, or information management systems not in place and effective (e.g. project specific, or already existing for a project under an existing framework)				0			1	0		
Other	2																
Procurement combined			13%	5.72%							Average Mitigation Factor	0.000		Average Mitigation Factor	0.500	3.055%	
<b>Project specific</b>																	
Design complexity		8			Design is business as usual or design contains complexities but these are well understood and detailed plans and designs are in place to address them	Design is not business as usual due to several complexities. The design mitigations to address these complexities have only been partially understood and addressed.	Design is complex, for example due to the nature of the project or interfaces with existing assets, or constraints. Design mitigations are not yet in place.				0	0.5	0.5		0.75		
Degree of Innovation		9			Design is business as usual and/or innovations are well developed and tested for the specific application	Design incorporates technology / innovations that have been partially tested and proven for the specific application.	Design incorporates new technologies and these have not yet been fully tested and proven for the specific application.				0	0.5	0.5		0.75		
Environmental impact		5	22		Environmental impacts well understood (e.g. impact on receiving water bodies, noise, INNS transfer, designated sites, visual amenity etc), mitigations identified where required and included in costs	Some assessment of environmental impacts has been carried out and mitigations have been identified and costed to address the most significant of these. Other mitigations will be required that have not yet been built into the costs.	Environmental impacts poorly understood (e.g. impact on receiving water bodies, noise, INNS transfer, designated sites, visual amenity etc), or significant environmental issues identified without agreement on mitigation to be built into costs				0		1		0.5		
Other		18															
Project specific combined			31%	13.64%							Average Mitigation Factor	0.000		Average Mitigation Factor	0.667	5.167%	
<b>Client specific</b>																	
Inadequacy of the Business Case	35	10			Needs have been clearly identified. Key stakeholders needs identified and included in scope where applicable.	Partial identification of needs and initial engagement with stakeholders to refine requirements.	Initial identification of needs and output specification, without engagement with stakeholders to refine requirements				0	0.5	0.5		0.75		
Large number of stakeholders					Stakeholder approvals not required, or key stakeholder approvals obtained, or key stakeholders largely supportive	Some key stakeholders identified and views obtained, however some other stakeholders remain unidentified.	Stakeholders not clearly identified, views not known or some stakeholders are in active opposition				0		0.6	0.4	0.3		
Funding availability	5				Funding for the project is secure (e.g. project fully funded through price review / pass through arrangement)	Project funding uncertain e.g. project subject to efficiency challenges at price review which may require business case to be revisited	Project funding not secure, e.g. project dependent in part on partnership funding which is not secure.				0		1		0.5		
Project management team	2				Scope of work is business as usual for company delivery teams.	Company delivery team has some experience in implementing projects of this nature, but their relevant experience is not extensive.	Company delivery teams are not experienced in implementing projects of this nature				0	0.5	0.5		0.75		
Poor project intelligence	9	7			Good understanding of key project data and no key assumptions made where there is significant uncertainty (e.g. ground conditions, condition of existing assets, treatment requirements)	Partial understanding of key project data and there has been some work undertaken to reduce the uncertainty around key assumptions (e.g. ground conditions, condition of existing assets, treatment requirements)	Significant gaps in project data and key assumptions made where there is significant uncertainty				0		1		0.5		
Other																	
Client specific combined			34%	14.96%							Average Mitigation Factor	0.000		Average Mitigation Factor	0.560	7.154%	
<b>Environment</b>																	
Public relations		9			Project business as usual and not expected to raise local opposition, or local stakeholders aware and largely primarily supportive, no protest expected.	Project could lead to some local opposition, however there has been some engagement with key stakeholders and it is likely that the major concerns raised can be resolved	Project could lead to local opposition once local stakeholders aware, or stakeholders aware and evidence of significant local opposition				0		1		0.5		
Site characteristics	5	3			Site information well understood (e.g. archaeology, heritage assets, contamination etc.), mitigations identified where required and included in costs	Site information partially understood (e.g. archaeology, heritage assets, contamination etc.), mitigations identified where required and included in costs	Site information poorly understood (e.g. archaeology, heritage assets, contamination etc.) and mitigations not identified				0		0.5	0.5	0.25		
Permits / consents / approvals					No permits and consents required, or permits and consents obtained.	Permits and consents required, but regulators, planning authorities and Government supportive	Permits, consents and approvals required from regulators, planning authorities and/or Government and obtaining these presents a material risk				0			1	0		
Other																	
Environment combined			9%	3.74%							Average Mitigation Factor	0.000		Average Mitigation Factor	0.250	2.869%	
<b>External influences</b>																	
Political					Project is either unlikely to attract political attention, or political stakeholders are supportive	Project could attract political attention, while there is not cross-party political support the majority of political stakeholders are likely to be supportive	Project has the potential to attract political attention and lacks cross-party political support				0	0.5	0.5		0.75		
Economic	3	7			Project has a short lead time and is less vulnerable to changes in funding and input costs	Project has a medium lead time so there is some risk that a change in the economic environment could impact demands and / or input costs.	Project has long lead time and change in economic environment could impact demands and/or input costs				0		1		0.5		
Legislations/regulations	8				Project is business as usual and /or required standards and regulations are well established and unlikely to change	Required standards and regulations are relatively new and therefore less well established.	Key standards and regulations are under development, or subject to change.				0	1			1		
Technology	8				Technology (e.g. treatment processes, smart metering technology) is well established, accepted by regulators and unlikely to change during the project lead time	Technology (e.g. treatment processes, smart metering technology) is relatively new. While it has not yet been accepted by regulators, it is likely to be and therefore a change in the requirements is unlikely.	Technology (e.g. treatment processes, smart metering technology) is new and/or is subject to rapid innovation which may lead to changes in requirements				0	1			1		
Other	1																
External influences combined			14%	5.94%							Average Mitigation Factor	0.000		Average Mitigation Factor	0.813	1.443%	
<b>44.00%</b>																	
<b>19.69%</b>																	