

SWP Strategic Risk Register

SWP Strategic Risk Register												
Last Updated:		30th May 2018										
Ref	Business Plan Link	Cause	Description of risk	Consequence	Assess current risk		Risk rating	Change from last review	Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned	Target risk score		Target rating
					Likelihood	Impact				Likelihood	Impact	
Opportunities												
Op 1	Building Capability	We are a multi partner organisation working in a political environment	Opportunity to tackle new and emerging issues from an holistic and mutually supportive perspective	Economies of scale in analysis, planning and managing responses to new legislation or Govt policy or other changes in the operating environment.	4	4	16	↔	The Board is well established and well regarded with a good track record of financial management, value for money, innovation and a reputation for delivery. Maintain culture of innovation with support from Board. Seek / bid for external funding where possible. Develop Waste Minimisation Strategy.	5	4	20
Op 2			Opportunity to influence commercial waste and waste producers in Somerset	SWP, as a partnership, has a good reputation in the industry and could bring that to bear by creating links with local businesses and business groups.	3	3	9	↔	SWP will be considering opportunities as part of a recently initiated review of the Waste Minimisation Strategy. Opportunity will be developed through implementation of the new strategy.	3	3	9
Op 3		Financial Pressure on Partners	Opportunity to market experience internally & externally	Obtain income from marketing experience and advice	4	3	12	↔	SWP is open to secondment and consultancy opportunities, though focus on Somerset initiatives reduces capacity for this.	4	3	12
Op 4	Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery	Householder behaviour	Opportunity: Encourage householders to save money individually by waste reduction and wider community to recycle.	Waste reduction and improved participation and capture rates.	3	3	9	↔	Directed Communications campaign. Promotion using variety of media	4	4	16
Op 5			Opportunity to capitalise on the 'blue planet' effect and increased awareness of the impact of plastic consumption	Opportunity to encourage households to change their consumption behaviours and encourage local producers to change their choice of packaging materials	3	3	9	↔	Acceptance of plastic pots, tubs and trays at recycling centres. Introduction of the 'Pledge Against Preventable Plastic' and adoption of lead role in local Refill campaign. Increased and ongoing communication programme.	4	3	12
Op 6		Recycle More Implementation	Opportunity to align Core Service review (see Business Plan) with refreshment of kerbside services.	Opportunity to ensure all public facing services are aligned so the complement each other and are more easily understood and used by residents.	3	3	9	↔	Detailed consideration of opportunities presented as part of integrated approach to the review.	4	4	16
Risks												
1	Building Capability	Financial Pressure on Partners	Membership of the Partnership changes.	Governance and cost sharing arrangements are out of date. Services must be maintained.	5	3	15	↑	West Somerset/TDBC merger. Local Government Reorganisation discussion. SWP reviewing impacts on Inter Authority Agreement and cost-sharing arrangements to ensure all areas where change is required are identified and managed in the spirit of the agreements.	4	2	8
2			Due to ongoing financial pressures one or more partners requires savings that impacts on existing services	Reduced performance and /or transfer of costs to others. Increased whole system costs	4	4	16	↑	Well established budget management processes are effectively maintained. Dialogue between Board members & Cabinet/Executive Colleagues on future service/savings requirements (SWB)	3	3	9
3			SWP Team does not have sufficient capacity and capability to be sufficiently effective, or is too reactive	Impacts on recycling performance, contractor performance and customer call centres	3	3	9	↔	To date team reduced by natural wastage and one redundancy plus one officer on secondment. Redundancy agreed for two further members of staff and planning for review of the team structure is underway.	3	2	6
4	Building Capability	We are a multi partner organisation working in a political environment	Loss of shared vision and trust between partners	Difficulty agreeing priorities, impact on reputation of partners. Focus becomes on managing negative relationships, not the business	2	4	8	↔	Involve all partners in the business plan process and continue to promote early dialogue about issues via SMG group and with individual partners as appropriate. Maintain awareness of partner pressures and aspirations via the Somerset Waste Board, SMG and formal/informal contact with all partners	1	4	4
5			Lack of member engagement and/ or frequent member turnover.	Potential failure within partners to understand basis and benefits of SWP. Diversion of attention to managing relationships not the business	2	4	8	↔	SWP to work with SWB to refresh the SWP vision. Induction Training for new members, involve all partners in the business plan and strategy development process, monthly member briefings, continue to attend and inform scrutiny committees and other local bodies including TCs/PCs	1	4	4
6			Lack of resources within SWP mean issues arise during implementation of new SWP Customer Service system	Use of legacy system (Wisper) is extended, increasing risk of failure and creating demand on support resource.	2	3	6	↔	New system (My Council Services) has been procured and significant work completed on development. Anticipate working system, with full connection with Echo live in September 2018. It is clear this is a challenging programme for SWP and discussions are underway with partner authority IT teams to find better ways of collaboration as we move toward more sophisticated collection contractor systems in 2020.	2	2	4
7			Inefficiencies due to customer relations IT not being joined up	More staff required to do same job, slower response to customers	3	3	9	↔	New customer service systems being introduced adding flexibility and efficiency. Review IT strategy. Plan and schedule next generation IT, including collection service "in-cab" and tracking systems in tandem with Recycle More procurement process. Create engagement with partner IT teams.	2	3	6
8			External agencies fail to understand us and penalise effective joint working (e.g. loss of partial VAT exemption).	Unexpected costs and/or time consuming and otherwise pointless changes to our contractual & governance arrangements	3	3	9	↔	Joint approach to briefing and lobbying at appropriate level. Act quickly and in a concerted way to any new threats (SMG)	2	2	4
9			Planning authorities agree new developments without consideration of waste requirements	Poor developments may not fit standard collections model and require different arrangements leading to increased costs and frustration for householders.	3	3	9	↔	SWP working with partners to incorporate developer's guidance into planning. SWP have worked closely with SDC planning team to try to improve solutions in Bridgwater town centre and have agreed a secondment with SCC planning team to provide expertise and capacity.	2	3	6
10	on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery	Householder behaviour	Increase in material in refuse bins	Heavy material goes in kerbside bins not to Recycling Centres. Impacts on district recycling rate (not to Somerset overall).	4	3	12	↔	Waste composition analysis and participation monitoring. Directed Communications campaign, review messages to the public about how to use services sustainably. Promote cost effective disposal routes for business waste. Promotion using variety of media, encourage members to take ambassadorial role in promoting benefits of services (Comms Team, SWB Members)	4	2	8
11			Reduction in recycling materials	Loss of income while some costs remain fixed. Increase in disposal costs if put in refuse instead.	3	3	9	↔	Positive promotion of services. Promotion using variety of media as described in the Communication Plan (Comms Team)	2	2	4
12			Poor separation of materials by householder	Loss of income if material quality deteriorates. Reduced efficiencies due to increased sorting time.	3	3	9	↔	Review of waste composition and kerbside presentation analysis, with opportunity to develop targeted communication plan.	3	3	9

SWP Strategic Risk Register

SWP Strategic Risk Register												
Last Updated:		30th May 2018										
Ref	Business Plan Link	Cause	Description of risk	Consequence	Assess current risk		Risk rating	Change from last review	Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned	Target risk score		Target rating
					Likelihood	Impact				Likelihood	Impact	
13	Action		Reduction in existing or new garden waste customers	Loss of income while some costs remain fixed	2	3	6	↓	Positive promotion of services. Note that customer base has increased year on year in recent years. Promotion using variety of media Numbers holding strong, some service issues ongoing.	2	2	4
14	Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery	Procurement of new collection contract	Lack of interest from bidders, uncertainty about RM service model or similar procurements going to market during the same period.	Bidders drop out and we fail to have a competitive process and deliver best value.	3	4	12	↔	Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Liaise with other authorities procuring at the same time. Assessment of pre-procurement phase to gauge appetite of market for Somerset procurement. Go/No Go decision. Contingency plan is to establish a LAC	2	2	4
15			Bidders take a risk averse approach due to lack of experience with RM service	Bidders price high to mitigate risks.	3	4	12	↔	Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Risk sharing on materials values and yields is likely to reassure bidders. Amended procurement approach following pre-procurement	2	2	4
16			Failure to achieve economic and efficiency objectives through the procurement.	Failure to achieve economic and efficiency objectives would impact on partners MTFPs. Reputational damage to SWP. Cuts to services may be necessary.	3	4	12	↔	Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Assessment of pre-procurement phase to gauge likely outcomes of the procurement process. Contingency plan is to establish a LAC	2	3	6
17			Failure to achieve environmental and social objectives through the procurement.	Failure to achieve environmental and social objectives would impact on partners plans and strategies	2	2	4	↔	Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Learn from procurement processes elsewhere for examples of addition of effective social value.	1	2	2
18			Procurement process takes too long.	Failure to have a contract in place	2	5	10	↔	Close involvement in the process by T& F group and "managed dialogue" approach to procurement, with specialist support, ensures all parties are engaged and process is understood. Plan for contingency LAC solution to ensure service maintained regardless of outcome.	1	3	3
19			Cost of procurement and external support exceeds budget	Fail to achieve best value for partners	2	2	4	↔	Budget monitoring	1	3	3
20			Legal challenge to the procurement process.	Could delay contract award if challenge is received. This could put commencement at risk. High costs if damages are awarded against SWP	2	3	6	↔	Procurement assurance role is built into project structure. Also, experienced external advisors will be used and internal legal oversight.	1	3	3
21			Depot network does not allow for efficient delivery of RM	Costs of inefficiency adds to bid prices	4	4	16	↔	Secure option on new depot site. Establish bidders preferences and optimum network during pre-procurement/ dialogue. Develop clear timetable for depot infrastructure development.	2	3	6
22			Changing demographics of Somerset population - increasing aging population.	Increasing emphasis on care in the home and care in the community leads to additional demand for clinical and assisted services.	2	2	4	↔	Regular review of assisted collection service requirements (every three years). Diversion of sanitary and hygiene waste to additional refuse capacity. Predicting demand through ongoing monitoring of key demographic changes to ensure effective service planning.	2	2	4
23			Former SSDC employee pension transfer. (This is a known issue, though there is uncertainty regarding final settlement, so included as a risk)	Financial liability for partnership.	2	3	6	NEW	Ongoing negotiation, including taking legal advice, to agree settlement of issue.	2	2	4
24			New vehicles are not available in time due to supply chain problems. Vehicles do not achieve design levels of productivity	Unable to deliver service as planned.	2	4	8	↔	Ongoing dialogue with vehicle suppliers. Bidders to produce contingency plans utilising alternative vehicles if supply issues are identified.	2	2	4
25	Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery	Recycle More Implementation	Bidders are unable to find cost effective solution for pots tubs and trays (PTT inc black plastic) and cartons.	Reduction in quality of offering to customers.	3	3	9	↔	Current advice from WRAP is that black plastic should not be collected for recycling. There are possible technical solutions being developed. SWP to make clear ambitions in pre-procurement and dialogue and learn from market response	2	2	4
26			Transition between current service and RM takes longer than anticipated	Savings and diversion for residual waste/environmental benefits are delayed. Impact on partner MTFPs.	2	4	8	↔	Key area for dialogue and evaluation of bids. Effective pre-planning prior to service implementation	2	3	6
27			SWP capacity is insufficient to deliver transition to Recycle More	Transfer of resource to procurement may deplete support of current service. Increase in complaints. Sub-standard planning and implementation of new service.	2	3	6	↔	Ensure business case includes analysis of SWP resource requirements of new contract and transition. On-going review of SWP client team structure and priorities.	2	2	4
28			New vehicles for RM are inefficient for delivering current service prior to transition.	Low utilisation of vehicles, increase in 2nd tips and OT	1	2	2	↔	Pre-procurement and dialogue process will include fleet configuration and vehicle specification. Reduced fleet of RCVs to be maintained until after transition.	1	2	2
29			New packaging options (e.g. rigid compostable tubs) enter market without reprocessing route.	Public confusion and dissatisfaction. Complaints rise and reputational damage to SWP.	3	2	6	NEW	Work with current disposal contractor to ensure innovation. Lobby packaging industry to ensure "joined up" approach to packaging development.	2	1	2
30			Waste profile changes.	Vehicles/plant become inefficient. Materials value reduces	2	3	6	↑	Tracking of consultation processes and possible implementation to ensure vehicles specs are aligned with any changes.	1	2	2
31	Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery	New Waste Treatment Facility	Delays in development of Energy from waste infrastructure	An alternative route would be required for disposal of residual waste.	3	2	6	↔	Contractual risk is with the contractor, who are wholly responsible for finding alternative disposal routes at no additional cost to SWP. The residual risk would be reputational and environmental only. Ensure progress is monitored and communications plans in place in event of anticipated delay. Currently on schedule	3	1	3
32			Risk of fire at Waste Transfer Station of Disposal site.	Waste Transfer Stations temporarily out of action.	3	3	9	↔	Landfill is monitored and transfer to Waste Transfer Station will improve capacity to monitor potential fires. Removal of small electrical items and possibly household batteries will reduce key cause of fires.	2	2	4

SWP Strategic Risk Register												
Last Updated:		30th May 2018										
Ref	Business Plan Link	Cause	Description of risk	Consequence	Assess current risk		Risk rating	Change from last review	Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned	Target risk score		Target rating
					Likelihood	Impact				Likelihood	Impact	
33	Action on waste		Financial case for alternative to landfill is damaged and cost increases (e.g. due to legislative changes)	Tied into contract that is not best value in future due to changes in market costs.	4	3	12	↔	Break clauses in the contract provide opportunities to review options .Monitor market costs and technical developments to ensure effective planning through life of the contract. Some anecdotal feedback indicates it is a good deal.	3	2	6
34	Maintaining services and operational effectiveness	Contract management	Driver/loader shortages	Impact on service delivery if rounds not deployed. Quality of delivery suffers when inexperienced drivers are employed. This is an increasing risk due to impacts of Brexit (weak pound and uncertainty of future residency rights) and increasing competition from Hinckley C build.	4	4	16	↑	Work with contractors to ensure they maintain procedures for driver training and retention. Establish pay rates and identify areas of concern. Seek opportunities to collaborate on recruitment and improve role of drivers. Work with local colleges to promote driving as a career option.	4	3	12
35			Risk of under investment and deterioration of depot facilities if contractor loses interest as contract approaches end of term	Poor working conditions for staff, H&S risks, increased D/T on fixed plant. Backlog of R&M at contract end.	3	3	9	↑	Some evidence of service degradation. Currently being assessed at Senior Management level. Regular audits by ops staff. Development of action plans for essential works at each depot. Review contract management. Introduce quarterly strategic review meeting between senior SWP officers and senior contractor staff.	2	2	4
36			Aging sorting and baling plant becomes unreliable as contract approaches expiry.	Increased downtime on fixed plant, increased O/T, lack of storage space in yards possible impact on collections/unloading.	2	3	6	↔	Balers have been problematic. Regular updates on down time and remedial work at ops meetings. Deed of variation requires plant to be "safe and serviceable" in accordance with the contract. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board	2	2	4
37			Service degradation due to loss of interest as contract approaches expiry	Missed collections, container deliveries, complaints increase and are not dealt with.	4	4	16	↑	Regular monitoring (IT), KPI reviews at Ops meetings. Strategic partnering board established. Review contract management. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board. Framework for improvement presented to contractor and penalties to be imposed if improvements not forthcoming.	3	3	9
38			Aging fleet becomes unreliable as contract approaches expiry	Increased down time disrupts collection services - performance deteriorates	4	3	12	↑	Regular updates on down time and R & M at ops meetings. Deed of variation requires vehicles to be "safe and roadworthy" in accordance with the contract but also allows use of substitute vehicles from other contracts to improve resilience. Review contract management. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board	2	3	6
39			Maintaining services and operational effectiveness	Service impacts due to things outside of our direct control	Lack of preparedness or poor response to service disruption events e.g. weather	Lose control of situation resulting in high call loads; Loss of customer confidence and reputation; Loss of partner confidence in SWP.	2	4	8	↔	Business Continuity Plans (BCPs) in place for SWP and contractors. Draw on experience of cold weather events in 2008-11. Clear communications strategy approved by the Board's Severe Weather Sub Group. Further work intended to ensure that contractor and client side BCPs are joined up (MG & BC)	1
40	Drop in value of recyclate (e.g. due to changes in Chinese policies)	Impact on contractor bottom line and viability of contract; Loss of public confidence in recycling			4	3	12	↔	Monitor pricing index for mixed plastics. Maintain our emphasis on quality which provides the best buffer for this risk. Provide reassuring messages to the public in the event of further price drops	3	2	6
41	Legislation changes requiring different ways of handling materials (e.g. Hazardous wood)	Difficulties storing material separately, finding suitable reprocessors/implementing charges/refuse to accept			3	4	12	↔	Industry is lobbying the EA to clarify, work with contractor to ensure solutions found. Continue to monitor the situation	3	4	12
42	DCLG continues to challenge innovation in funding Recycling Centres (e.g. entry fees/material charges)	Potential to reduce services provided or lead to increased costs.			3	4	12	↔	Continue to base policy on performance, popularity, effectiveness and affordability. Work with members from all tiers of local government to seek flexibility to ensure continuity of services. Keep members, and particularly Board Members, informed especially following changes to administration or portfolio holders.	3	3	9
43	Increase in value of material or energy	Potential for income share with both contractors			3	3	9	↔	Continue to lobby govt for challenging packaging recovery targets and lobby industry for quality to be reflected in higher prices. Evaluate potential for risk/reward share in all future ventures including infrastructure development and addition of new materials	4	3	12
44	Thefts from depots	Services delayed or incompletd due to theft/vandalism			3	3	9	NEW	Improve security of depots. Liaise with landlord. Improve CCTV	2	2	4
45	Landfill site fires, primarily caused by hot ashes in waste, unwrapped broken glass acting as a magnifier, or lithium ion batteries in waste	Hazard for site staff, closure of landfill sites, operational delays for vehicles resulting in late kerbside collections			3	3	9	↔	Increase publicity relating to fire prevention, encouraging people to dispose of waste responsibly. Cease use of landfill sites for disposal of Somers's residual waste, transferring to disposal via Waste Transfer Stations.	2	3	6
46	Maintaining services and operational effectiveness	Issues inherent in working at roadside and/or with heavy vehicles manoeuvring in confined working areas.	Risk of serious injury or death to staff	Personal impacts; Potential fines, legal claims; intervention by HSE etc. Loss of reputation	4	5	20	↑	Health & Safety has a high profile within service and with contractors. Bi-annual reports to SMG and SWB on internal and contractor performance. H&S advisory Group meets quarterly. Collection activities were the subject of a routine HSE inspection in Nov 2011 and no major concerns were identified. On sites public separated from heavy plant movements. As a result of HSE recommendations, SWP are increasing frequency of crew monitoring by officers and resources to enable this to be done efficiently are being prepared. Level of accidents to public on sites are very low and generally self-inflicted. SWP to focus comms campaign on respecting safety of working crews. Work with contractor to seek closer liaison with police.	2	5	10
47			Risk of serious injury or death to member of the public	Personal impacts; Potential fines, legal claims; intervention by HSE etc. Loss of reputation	2	5	10	↔		1	5	5
48	Maintaining services and operational effectiveness	Financial pressure on Contractors	Qualitative and/or quantitative reduction in contractor's management team or front line staff	Deterioration in service, higher complaints, reduced satisfaction with service, more pressure on client, lack of capacity to innovate.	4	4	16	↑	Frequent programmed engagement with Senior Management Teams of both contractors. Direct engagement with front-line staff by SWP. Continued secondment of experienced SWP staff to Kier. Sign-off to significant changes. Develop improved regular liaison with new Kier Senior Mgmt. Team and attend staff meetings at depots. Maintain current arrangements with Viridor (MD and Chairman). Close monitoring of performance and implement contractual penalties if appropriate.	2	3	6
49			Contractor defaults or fails	Potential short term delivery implications, requirement for service review / procurement with associated costs of process and potential higher cost of delivering the service.	2	3	6	↔	Awareness of financial state of cos. through checks & regular contact with Senior Managers, networking within industry to get early warning of trends & pressures. Respond quickly to any relevant intelligence obtained, assess risks that ensue and act accordingly (MD and Team).	2	3	6

Risk Assessment Matrix

When assessing a risk you should assume that action plans/controls are currently in place, so be guided by the information you have on the day of the assessment. The assessor should assign values for the identified 'likelihood' of occurrence (A) and the severity of the 'impact' (B). By multiplying 'A' and 'B' together you get the rating score, which gives an indication of how important the risk is. Proximity of the risk, although not scored in its own right may impact on your likelihood, impact or both when scoring.

An opportunity follows the opposite scale to the risks. A high risk score = negative, a high opportunity score = positive. On both scales green is positive and red is negative.

Risk		Likelihood (A)					Impact (B)				
		Very Likely 5	Likely 4	Feasible 3	Slight 2	Very unlikely 1	Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Significant 3	Major 4	Critical 5
LIKELIHOOD (A)	Very Likely 5	5 Low Review at least annually	10 Low Review six months	15 Medium	20 Very High	25 Very High					
	Likely 4	4 Low Review at least annually	8 Low Review six months	12 Medium	16 Very High	20 Very High					
	Feasible 3	3 Low Review at least annually	6 Low Review six months	9 Medium	12 Medium	15 Medium					
	Slight 2	2 Low No need to record	4 Low Review six months	6 Low Review six months	8 Medium	10 Medium					
	Very unlikely 1	1 Low No need to record	2 Low No need to record	3 Low Review six months	4 Medium	5 Medium					
		Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Significant 3	Major 4	Critical 5					
		IMPACT (B)									

White/Green = Low risk
Yellow = Medium risk
Red = Very high risk

Opportunity		Likelihood (A)					Impact (B)				
		Very Likely 5	Likely 4	Feasible 3	Slight 2	Very unlikely 1	Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Significant 3	Major 4	Critical 5
LIKELIHOOD (A)	Very Likely 5	5 Low Review at least annually	10 Low Review six months	15 Medium	20 Very High	25 Very High					
	Likely 4	4 Low Review at least annually	8 Low Review six months	12 Medium	16 Very High	20 Very High					
	Feasible 3	3 Low Review at least annually	6 Low Review six months	9 Medium	12 Medium	15 Medium					
	Slight 2	2 Low No need to record	4 Low Review six months	6 Low Review six months	8 Medium	10 Medium					
	Very unlikely 1	1 Low No need to record	2 Low No need to record	3 Low Review six months	4 Medium	5 Medium					
		Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Significant 3	Major 4	Critical 5					
		IMPACT (B)									

Likelihood of Occurrence (A)	Severity
1 = Very unlikely (hasn't occurred before)	1 =
2 = Slight (rarely occurs)	2 = Minor
3 = Feasible (possible but not common)	3 =
4 = Likely (has before, will again)	4 = Major
5 = Very Likely (occurs frequently)	5 = Critical

Issue Assessment Matrix

Use the Issue Assessment Grid to identify the importance of a specific issue with regard to its priority and potential negative impact on the programme/project. An issue with high severity and critical priority is an urgent and critical issue; it may cause the programme/project to stop until the issue is resolved. In contrast if the issue is ranked as medium severity and medium priority, monitoring the issue management process should be sufficient. Low severity and priority issues should be handled outside the issue management process.

Issue severity will not change over the life of an issue, but the priority can be adjusted upward as time passes without a resolution. For example, an issue may have a high severity if not resolved, but its priority may be medium because there is enough time to resolve it. However, if the issue is not resolved in time, it may become a high priority.

SEVERITY ↑	May impact quality of a major deliverable or productivity of a large project staff segment	Low Priority High Severity	Medium Priority High Severity	High Priority High Severity
	May Impact quality of sub-components of deliverables or productivity of a smaller project staff segment	Low Priority Medium Severity	Medium Priority Medium Severity	High Priority Medium Severity
	Does not impact major deliverable. May affect smaller deliverables or productivity of small project staff segments.	Low Priority Low Severity	Medium Priority Low Severity	High Priority Low Severity
	Has no direct or immediate impact on deadlines. Resolutions may or may not be necessary (best efforts acceptable)	May impact future or less critical deadlines. Eventual resolution required.	Failure to resolve may result in critical deadlines being missed. Resolution required as soon as possible.	
	PRIORITY →			