

Annex 3 – Key Risks to the OXLEVI programme

Ref no.	Risk	Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating Action
R.01	Insufficient capacity in DNO network or Prohibitive POC / substation upgrade costs	Requirement for additional private investment/council investment or delay to delivery caused by: Unexpected/unknown complexities in DNO connection requirements. Lack of prior information regarding capacity at sites. Poor DNO records, Insufficient budget planned for DNO works.	Medium	Medium	All shortlisted sites reviewed for local substation capacity and distance from sites, and local LV network presence. Flexibility built into procurement to adjust site locations if costs are prohibitive. Reserve sites identified in case of requirement to adjust locations Reduction in project scope
R.02	Capital Budget overrun	Inadequate budgeting or financial forecasting or unexpected costs mean planned programme cannot be delivered within budget envelope.	Medium	Medium	Budget and financial forecasting based on industry estimates, and actual costs from recent projects, with allowance for high level of inflation. Stop/Go decision points built into project governance at point of contract award and full Business case SCB decision (after feasibility studies completed), and at each delivery phase gate. Site selection process to be flexible to allow financially infeasible sites to be replaced with feasible sites if costs are higher than expected. Potential to reduce scope of project workstreams or seek additional investment from commercial partners.
R.03	Income from EVCP insufficient to cover ongoing council revenue costs	Council income share from EVCP is insufficient due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to secure required income share 	Low	Medium	Rigorous council revenue cost projections. Council income projections based on central

		<p>offer in procurement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EVCP usage is lower than expected. • Inadequate revenue cost projections • Energy price increases reduce profit margins 			<p>government data – to be assessed by commercial partner during procurement. Monitor energy price trends. Stop/Go decision points built into project governance at point of contract award and full Business case SCB decision after feasibility studies completed. Flexibility in contracting to allow for EVCP tariff increases if necessary. Consider inclusion of minimum income level clause for councils in contracting.</p>
R.04	Lack of council staff resource for delivery	<p>Project is dependent on a wide range of inhouse expertise across multiple organisations and multiple departments to cover diverse work packages. Council teams working on EV are small.</p>	Medium	Medium	<p>LEVI project capability funding of c£500k is available to support staff resourcing in Phase 1. Council income from EVCP may be used to support delivery resourcing for future delivery phases. Rigorous assessment and projection of staff resourcing requirements. Councils pooling staff resource for delivery.</p>
R.05	Lack of market capacity to respond to tender/deliver	<p>Potentially half of all England's Tier 1 Councils will be looking to put out a major tender for EV infrastructure at a similar time, which poses significant risks for the market and for Councils competing for the best suppliers, and may mean that suppliers are underresourced to deliver the resulting large contracts, impacting on</p>	Medium	Medium	<p>Oxfordshire Councils intend to go to tender up to one month ahead of the OZEV proposal deadline and therefore potentially earlier than other local authorities. All sites in Oxfordshire will be in one joint tender exercise with</p>

		speed and quality of delivery			District Councils and should therefore be an appealing portfolio. Oxfordshire also has the highest EV uptake in the UK.
R.06	Lack of uptake of community micro-hubs scheme	A lack of uptake of the grant scheme for rural and deprived communities might lead to geographical gaps in provision, and some communities being disadvantaged in the transition to EV. And/or a need to deploy more on-street/roadside chargers in certain areas in order to meet need, which is more expensive and less preferable in terms of the OEVIS hierarchy of solutions.	Medium	Medium	A significant amount of research has been carried out with parish councils and village hall associations, as well as with other UK councils who have delivered community/rural schemes. A decision to fully fund with LEVI grant the installation of the chargers and potentially up to 3 years of software and maintenance contracts should mean the offer is very appealing to target stakeholders.