| Activity | Potential Hazard / Impact | Initial Risk Rating Without Controls | | | | Residual Risk Rating | | | Responsible |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------|--------|--|----------------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| | | Consequence | Prob. | Risk | (Eliminate so far as is reasonably practicable) | С | Р | Risk | Person |
| РВС | Lack of alignment between organisations around the scope, | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Organisations brought on PBC journey to minimise risk. | 3. Moderate | Unlikely | Low | |
| SSBC / Design | Connections are more complex than anticipated in the CAM-PBC e.g. More kerb moving is needed than assumed or more complex and costly intersection and crossing treatments required. Higher cost per km and therefore fewer km / areas delivered. | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | CAM-PBC Business Case Framework and prioritisation tool enable next stage business cases to be halted if they identify routes are higher cost that anticipated and reprioritisation of routes. Bundles of connections will be procured with the understand that not all investigation will proceed to implementation (i.e. risk is recognised and managed through reprioritisation). | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| Funding - CAPEX | Additional funding over the \$306 million On-going Cycling Programme of the RLTP does not become available and/or can not be rephased causing the existing area projects of Henderson, Mangere East, and Manukau to take all available funding for the next five or so years resulting in a lack of pipeline for delivery and inability to meet outcomes | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Start the investigation phases of other area and connection projects, so that when the larger quantities of funding are available in the later years of the On-going Cycling Programme (when more of the rear loaded funds are sequenced) projects are ready to move into design and construction phases. With the associated business cases being completed, AT will be able to apply for Waka Kotahi co-funding (meaning RLTP funding is not lost, and the pipeline does not stall). | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| Funding - OPEX | CAM PBC OPEX not included in long-term plan causing less customer growth initiatives to be delivered and poor outcomes | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | CAM PBC details OPEX needed. Customer growth initiatives have been capitalised (CAPEX) as much as practical. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| РВС | Industry does not have capacity to undertake the work. CAM-PBC does not deliver as many km / mode share increase as anticipated. | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | CAM PBC has prioritised less-construction heavy connections (i.e. road space reallocation). Bundle up connections to improve deliverability for the industry. Test procurement with the industry. Prioritise connections that the industry can deliver more easily should it become an issue. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| Policy changes | Policy changes not delivering on 3% mode share by distance for cycling. The CAM-PBC will need to deliver more infrastructure to reach the 7% mode share by distance aspiration. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | The CAM-PBC has been set up to enable it to quickly adapt if more funding becomes available. Modelling shows infrastructure could get Auckland to almost 6% mode share by distance but would require all streets to be safe for cycling. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| SSBC / Design | More consultation required than anticipated (egg AT does not have political mandate to implement without consultation, and/or parking removal consultation may be required even with changes to AT parking policy) causing delays and more costly consultation | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | Strategic communications are part of customer growth initiatives. Bundle consultation to gain efficiencies | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| РВС | CAM PBC results in more people riding and therefore greater exposure to accidents causing reputational risk to AT and AC | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Good messaging around reduced risk per km / personal risk | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| SSBC / Design | External changes (egg technology and new devices) cause design to be out of date and infrastructure not fit for purpose | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | Consider bolt down (semi-permanent) infrastructure on critical links | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| PBC | Opportunity - External changes (egg road user costs, Autonomous vehicles) make it more appealing/safer to cycle | 2. Minor | Possible | | CAM PBC recommends policy changes that would positively affect mode share and safety etc | 4. Major | Possible | High | |
| РВС | Travel patterns change (egg from technological changes or Covid impacts) causing cycle demand across the network to change and therefore benefits change | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Prioritisation is agile | 2. Minor | Possible | #N/A | |
| PBC | Other projects/programmes could delay or disrupt progress of CAM PBC (egg utilities works delay implementation, delay of another cycling project delays implementation or benefits realisation of CAM PBC projects that links) because of different priorities etc | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | Prioritisation has considered timing of other projects and has been built in an agile way to enable reprioritisation. A dissemination plan (including external and internal comms) will ensure the CAM PBC is socialised and accessible. WK and AT both in governance team. Internal comms to make sure other projects aware of CAM-PBC. | | Possible | Low | |

Safety Health Environment Quality Risk Register

| Activity | Potential Hazard / Impact | Initial Risk Rating Without Controls | | | | Residual Risk Rating | | | Responsible |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------|--------|--|----------------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| | | Consequence | Prob. | Risk | (Eliminate so far as is reasonably practicable) | С | Р | Risk | Person |
| SSBC / Design | Change to design and delivery standards not being understood throughout AT (and consultants) causing design and delivery delays or cost overruns | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | Include design and delivery team in standards discussions. Internal comms about design departure. | 3. Moderate | Unlikely | Low | |
| PBC | Opportunity for streamlined investment pathway for cycling to reduce need for BC speeding up delivery (will still need investigation, just less approvals needed) | 2. Minor | Likely | Medium | Prioritisation identifies connections that could be delivered by SSBC Lite and are also more likely to be streamlined, therefore can quickly take advantage of any streamlined investment pathway | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | |
| SSBC / Design | SSBC-lites have not been delivered before in AT, so it will be a new process to learn | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Bundle connections to enable learning to be applied quickly | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| PBC | Programme level design departure not approved, causing delays to CAM PBC delivery with each SSBC needing to seek more departures (and potential cost increase if it prevents road space reallocation) | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | The AT Design and Standards team have been involved in developing the departure, and it has been reviewed by AT Tier 3 Leadership, including the Chief Engineer. | 3. Moderate | Unlikely | Low | |
| PBC | Approvals not gained (egg board, planning committee etc) which delays the CAM PBC | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | Pipeline is already set up for the next 3 years with the Henderson, Mangere East and Manukau Cycling SSBCs well underway. | 2. Minor | Possible | Low | |
| PBC | Slow culture/behaviour change results in slower than anticipated benefits realisation | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | Customer growth initiatives targeted at behaviour change, strategic comms | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| PBC | Low bike ownership because of cost or security (egg in area of social deprivation) cause lower than expected cycling trips and therefore lower benefits | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | Policy recommendation to lower cost of bike ownership. Customer growth initiatives to support uptake of bikes. CPTED to be considered in SSBC. Consider reprioritisation during 3 year review. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| PBC | Trade offs to deliver the CAM PBC connections through road space reallocation may adversely affect other modes, or bike users experience and therefore benefits of the investment (egg lower uptake of bikes than anticipated, greater impact on PT etc) | 3. Moderate | Likely | High | Although a programme level design departure is being sought for the CAM PBC, each SSBC / SSBC lite will still investigate impacts at a local level and consider the users of their connections to ensure an appropriate design is delivered. | 3. Moderate | Possible | Medium | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | ļ | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | ļ | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | |
| | | | | #N/A | | | | #N/A | <u> </u> |

Safety Health Environment Quality Risk Register