Item 6f

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	SCORING				Impact score January 2022								
	0	5	10	20	PDM	Yr Egin	Campuses	Digital	HaPS	SILCG	Pentre Awel	Swansea Waterfront	Skills
Scope and key objectives	No change to project	Limited and minor changes to project	Widespread and major changes to project	Significant change to project	5	10	0	0	5	5	0	0	10
Timescales	No foreseeable delays	Potentially minor delays (0-6 months)	Potentially major delays (6-12 months)	Potentially significant delays (1 year+)	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
Reputation if project fails to deliver	No negative impact	Local and limited negative impact	Regional and limited negative impact	Significant impact	5	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	5
Stakeholders/partnerships commitment	No issues	Limited and minor issues	Widespread and major issues	Significant issues	10	0	5	5	0	0	5	5	0
Project costs	No variance	0-10% variance	10-20% variance	20%+ variance	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0
Procurement	No impact	Minor impact	Major impact	Significant impact	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	0	5
Staff resourcing	No impact	Limited impact	Widespread and major impact	Significant impact	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
				TOTAL	45	40	30	35	40	35	35	40	30
					C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	Scoring guide				Impact score April 2022								
	0	5	10	20	PDM	Yr Egin	Campuses	Digital	HaPS	SILCG	Pentre Awel	Swansea Waterfront	Skills
Scope and key objectives	No change to project	Limited and minor changes to project	Widespread and major changes to project	Significant change to project	5	10	5	0	5	5	0	0	10
Targets	No risk to achievement	Short-term, limited impact to achievement	Widespread, but relatively short term impact on achievement	Significant, long-lasting impact on achievement	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5
Timescales	No foreseeable delays	Potentially minor delays (0-6 months)	Potentially major delays (6-12 months)	Potentially significant delays (1 year+)	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5
Reputation if project fails to deliver	No negative impact	Local and limited negative impact	Regional and limited negative impact	Significant impact	5	5	5	10	10	10	10	5	5
Stakeholders/partnerships commitment	No issues	Limited and minor issues	Widespread and major issues	Significant issues	10	0	5	5	0	0	5	5	0
Project costs	No variance	0-10% variance	10-20% variance	20%+ variance	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0
Procurement	No impact	Minor impact	Major impact	Significant impact	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	5
Staff resourcing	No impact	Limited impact	Widespread and major impact	Significant impact	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
				TOTAL		35	45	35	40	40	35	30	35
				Intevention	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
				Movement	-	↘	↑	-	-	-	↘	↘	-

Suggested project categories relating to the risk and impact assessment score are as follows:

	Number of Red Risks Identified by Impact Criteria								total Red Risks
	Scope and key objectives	Targets	Timescales	Reputation if project fails to deliver	Stakeholders/ partnerships commitment	Project costs	Procurement	Staff resourcing	
Jan-22	3	4	4	4	2	6	2	1	26
Apr-22	3	3	4	4	2	5	1	1	23
Change	-	↘	-	-	-	↘	↘	-	↘

Project Risk and Impact Score	Suggested Project Category	Intervention
100+	A	Joint Committee commissioned task and intervention required. Monitored
50-99	B	Intervention required. Monitored
25-49	C	No intervention required. Continue to monitor
0-24	D	No intervention required. Continue to monitor at a project level

The context in which the project operates and an element of common sense will be considered alongside the impact score to ensure that the right level of intervention and monitoring is in place for the successful delivery of the project.