

CDC Fleet Replacement Risk Register									
DIRECTORATE: Communities and Place									
SERVICE AREA: Waste and Environment									
ID	Risk/ Opportunity Summary	Risk/ Opportunity Description of Impact	Initial Risk Score			Internal Controls	Current/Residual Risk Score		
			Original Impact	Original Likelihood	Original Risk Score		Impact	Likelihood	Risk Score
1	Vehicles are scheduled for replacement on the Capital Fleet Replacement Programme as they are reaching the predicted end of their economic life .	The reliability of these vehicles will decline over time leading to increased disruption to residents, increases in the cost of maintenance, and increases in costs from the hire of replacement vehicles.	5	5	25	Replacement vehicles to be procured. This will lead to a high capital expenditure (circa. £6m) but will reduce annual maintenance cost and reduce the reliance on hire vehicles.	3	3	9
2	A 7.5 tonne RCV is scheduled for replacement in 2027/28 but has reliability issues and is regularly off the road.	The 7.5 tonne RCV is used to collect refuse and garden waste from narrow access properties. As this is a specialist vehicle limited support can be provided by other vehicles in the fleet. A hire vehicle has been in use to increase the resilience of this service and reduce the impact on residents. The hiring of a vehicle incurs additional costs.	3	3	9	The replacement of this vehicle has been identified to be brought forward from 2027/28 to 2026/27. This removes the need to hire in an additional vehicle. The aim is to improve the reliability of the vehicle providing services to properties in narrow access areas.	2	1	2
3	CDC declared a climate change emergency in 2019 and is aiming for a carbon reduction of 80% by 2030 and 100% by 2045 (against a 1990 baseline)	The waste fleet contributes 43% of CDC's direct emissions. This is largely from diesel fuel use.	3	5	15	One EV is to be purchased to test the suitability of this type of vehicle in an area such as Cotswold, where a long range is required to complete all collections. The purchase of an EV allows us to test this vehicle type in all weather conditions. This requires the installation of additional EV charging infrastructure. A fuel tank to be installed at the depot, to allow the remaining fleet to be fuelled using HVO. This is estimated to provide a 80% to 90% reduction in net CO ₂ emissions. HVO to continue to be sourced where it continues to be environmentally practical (e.g. meets appropriate sustainability criteria), and affordable to CDC.	1	2	2
4	Plastic film collections need to be offered to residents from 1st April 2027 in order to maintain compliance with Simpler Recycling	Once this material is obligated under pEPR, CDC will receive additional funding to reflect the collection, handling and reprocessing of this material. The current vehicles are not designed to collect this material type. This limits the ability to plan for the collection of plastic film.	3	5	15	Replacing the recycling vehicles is an opportunity to redesign the vehicles based on the requirement to collect plastic film. Options are extended in that we can consider both the collection of film commingled with another material, or as a separate stream, with its own compartment.	2	2	4
5	Legislation changes (pEPR, DRS, ETS, Simpler Recycling) will change the value, volume, and composition of waste in future years.	The current vehicles were designed before many of these initiatives were proposed. Changes in the volume and composition of waste cause some issues already e.g. requiring us to place a limit on the amount of cardboard that residents can present at the kerbside. Further changes would likely cause increased operational strain on the services, and these may in turn lead to disruption to residents.	3	5	15	Replacing the recycling vehicles is an opportunity to redesign the vehicles based on our current understanding of legislation changes. It is important to recognise however that although we have a better understanding of the changes that are being made, we have a limited understanding of what the impacts of these changes might be.	2	5	10

Risk Response Categories

Avoid	A decision is made no to take a risk. Where the risks outweigh the possible benefits, avoid the risk by doing things differently
Accept	A decision is taken to accept the risk. Management and/or the risk owner makes an informed decision to accept that existing actions sufficiently reduce the likelihood and impact of a risk and there is no added value in doing more
Transfer	Transfer all or part of the risk to a third party e.g. contractor or partner who is better able to manage the risk
Reduce	Implement further actions to reduce the risk by minimising the likelihood of an event occurring and/or reducing the potential impact should the risk occur Further actions are recorded in the risk register and regularly monitored
Exploit	Whilst taking action to mitigate risks, a decision is made to exploit a resulting opportunity

RISK MATRIX

Almost certain	5	10	15	20	25
Probable	4	8	12	16	20
Possible	3	6	9	12	15
Remote	2	4	6	8	10
Improbable	1	2	3	4	5
	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
	IMPACT				

Measures of Likelihood and Impact

LIKELIHOOD MEASURES

1 Improbable	Has not occurred before Has not occurred at other similar organisations Extremely unlikely to occur (less than 10% chance) but may do so in at least 10 years' time
2 Remote	Remote risk but could happen within next 3 to 10 years Has not occurred at Publica but isolated cases have occurred at other similar organisations
3 Possible	Could happen at least once every 1 to 3 years New circumstances with little data to indicate likelihood of occurrence 50 / 50 chance of it happening
4 Probable	More likely to happen than not Could occur within next 3 – 12 months Has occurred in the last five years Has occurred at some other similar organisations
5 Almost certain	Has occurred in the last two years Has occurred at many other similar organisations More than an 80% chance of it happening Likely to happen within next three months or is occurring at present

IMPACT MEASURES

1 Insignificant	Negligible impact on achievement of service objectives/delivery Negligible impact on delivery of project – slight slippage or reduction in quality/scope with no overall impact Negligible financial impact Health and Safety of very small number of individuals affected Limited impact on staff and culture – a few individuals only affected Minor legal/regulatory impact – no sanction or legal action likely No damage to reputation or will not result in adverse media comment
2 Minor	Moderate impact on service objectives/delivery - only partially achievable without additional time / resources Some impact on project – slight slippage against published milestones/targets and some 'nice to have' elements not possible Minor injuries possible to relatively small number of individuals Likely to affect motivation of small groups of staff Some legal/regulatory impact – could lead to warnings/threats of sanctions/ legal action Some public embarrassment but no damage to reputation or standing in the community Financial impact can be contained within service budget (>£10,000)
3 Moderate	Service objectives/delivery not achievable without considerable additional time / resources Moderate effect on project timetable and significant elements of scope or functionality may not be available Moderate number of injuries possible – not life threatening Moderate impact on staff motivation within particular service(s) Significant legal/regulatory impact leading to reprimand, sanctions or legal action Some public embarrassment leading to limited reputational damage (adverse local press) – short term impact Financial impact cannot be contained within budget and needs additional resourcing (<£250,000).
4 Major	Significant impact on achievement of service objectives/delivery even with additional resources (possibly leading to closure of facilities / service being withdrawn) Failure to meet key project deadlines or project fails to meet needs of proportion of stakeholders Possibility of serious injury to individuals Significant impact on employee motivation generally – possibly leading to poor quality service in particular service(s) Serious legal/regulatory impact leading to sanctions or legal action with significant consequences Loss of credibility and public confidence in the service / organisation (of interest to the national press) Significant financial impact (>£250,000)
5 Extreme	Unable to achieve corporate objective or prolonged closure/withdrawal of service Major project's viability jeopardised through delay or level of quality makes it effectively unusable Possibility of fatalities or multiple serious injuries Severe impact on staff motivation generally, leading to dissatisfaction and industrial unrest Major legal/regulatory impact leading to sanctions or legal action with substantial financial or other consequences Highly damaging to reputation with immediate impact on public confidence Incident of interest to government agencies Incident potentially leading to resignation or dismissal of an Executive Director on Publica Board. Severe and unmanageable financial impact