

West of England
 Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Rapid Transit
 Risk Register - General Scheme Risks
 AS AT: February 2009

| No. | Description | Category | Risk Assessment | | | | | RAG | Proximity (date) | Approach Avoid, Accept, Reduce, Transfer | Mitigation Measures | Workstream | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DATE OF UPDATE | STATUS | Residual Risk | | | | | RAG | DATE OF CLOSURE | REASON FOR CLOSURE & COMMENTS |
|-----|---|---------------------------|-----------------|------|-------------|-------|--------|------------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|------|-------------|--------|-------|-----|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Impact | | | Prob. | Rating | | | | | | | | | Cost | Time | Performance | Rating | Prob. | | | |
| | | | Cost | Time | Performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Change of Central Government policy may remove support for scheme | Political / Policy | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | ongoing | Accept | Regular briefing of Members Strategy of communications with Govt | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 2 | Change of Regional Government policy may remove support for scheme | Political / Policy | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | ongoing | Accept | Regular briefing of Members Strategy of communications with Regnl Govt | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 3 | Change of Local Government policy may remove support for scheme | Political / Policy | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Regular briefing of Members Aim for cross party support | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 2 | Appropriate project governance not in place | Political / Policy | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | Sep-08 | Reduce | Determine governance and procurement structure for BRT Integration and contribution to discussion of wider major scheme governance structure | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | Reducing | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | | | | |
| 3 | Policy makers do not perceive benefits, believe adverse impacts not tolerable, or place scheme low priority on agenda | Political / Policy | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | current | Reduce | Regular briefing of Members Address incorrect information in public domain Scope in works to address concerns | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | Increasing | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | | | | |
| 4 | Overall required level of funding does not materialise/become available. | Political / Policy | H | H | M | M | 5.33 | April 08 (RFA refresh) | Reduce | Meet RFA programme deadlines Regular communication with GOSW Robust major scheme bid | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | No change | M | H | M | L | 2.33 | | | | |
| 5 | Scheme objectives and quality are overly compromised | Political / Policy | L | M | H | M | 4.00 | current | Reduce | Identify project champion Regular briefing of Members | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 25/01/2008 | No change | L | M | H | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 6 | Adverse press coverage creates negative feeling towards the scheme which impact on Members | Political / Policy | M | H | H | L | 2.67 | current | Reduce | Proactive media management Regular briefing of Members Adherence to communications strategy | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | reducing | M | H | H | M | 5.33 | | | | |
| 7 | Change of political balance in the sub-region | Political / Policy | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | ongoing | Accept | Regular briefing of Members Aim for cross party support | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 8 | Lack of high profile and marketing campaign results in poor information in the media and public perception (lack of real information on the scheme) | Communications | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | current | Reduce | Clear communications and key messages Use of high quality images Coherent overall PT marketing strategy Identification of communications resources engaging with supportive groups | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | reducing | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 9 | Developer contributions (matched funding) are not secured or sufficient | Funding | M | H | M | H | 7.00 | Oct-08 | Reduce | Identification of sources for funding Early agreement with developers on contributions Underwritten by LAs | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | H | M | L | 2.33 | | | | |
| 10 | Inability to continue scheme development work while awaiting DFT approval | Funding | H | H | L | M | 4.67 | Oct-08 | Reduce | Identification of sources for funding Early agreement with developers on contributions Underwritten by LAs | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | H | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 11 | Delay to complementary developer funded elements or funding | Funding | M | H | M | H | 7.00 | 2011 to 2014 | Reduce / Transfer | Identification of sources for funding Early agreement with developers on contributions Underwritten by LAs | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | H | M | L | 2.33 | | | | |
| 12 | Capital costs escalate resulting in failure to secure funding (DFT) | Funding | H | H | H | H | 9.00 | from Nov 08 | Reduce | Robust major scheme bid Strict change control processes independent review of costs | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | | | | |
| 13 | Compulsory Purchase Orders successfully resisted by land owners | Acceptability / Objection | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | 2009/2010 | Reduce | Clear communications with affected parties Robust technical case for need | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 14 | Opposition prevents introduction of new TROs | Acceptability / Objection | L | L | L | M | 2.00 | 2011 to 2014 | Reduce | Clear communications with affected parties Robust technical case for need | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | M | 2.00 | | | | |
| 15 | Objection to scheme from rail lobby (other modes) | Acceptability / Objection | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | current | Reduce | Clear communications and key messages Proactive engagement with objectors regular and clear Members briefings Robust technology appraisal | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | Reducing | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | | | | |
| 16 | Objection to scheme from residents groups | Acceptability / Objection | M | M | M | H | 6.00 | current | Reduce | Clear communications and key messages Proactive engagement with objectors regular and clear Members briefings | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | | | | |
| 17 | Objection to scheme from cyclists, environmental | Acceptability / Objection | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | current | Reduce | Clear communications and key messages Proactive engagement with objectors regular and clear Members briefings | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | | | | |
| 18 | Lack of support from local media | Acceptability / Objection | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | current | Reduce | Regular media briefings and proactive relationship management Media monitoring | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | reducing | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 19 | Opposition to on-street measures | Acceptability / Objection | L | M | H | M | 4.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Clear communications with affected parties Robust technical case for need TWA process | Communications | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | M | H | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 20 | Submission of non-compliant MSBC | Business Case | M | H | L | L | 2.00 | Oct-08 | Reduce | Sense checking of model results Regular engagement with DFT Application new guidance Project Team review of work (cross-consultancy) | Modelling/Appraisal | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | H | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 21 | Delay in DFT approval | Business Case | H | H | L | H | 7.00 | 2009 | Reduce | Involvement of GOSW with view on RFA programme deadlines Regular engagement with DFT Compliant and High Quality MSBC submission | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | L | M | 4.67 | | | | |
| 22 | Land costs higher than predictions escalate scheme costs or additional CPO costs. | Costs | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | from programme entry | Accept/Reduce | Ensure robust initial estimate Ensure estimate assesses likely future prices Early buy-out of required properties | Land | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 23 | Cost of statutory undertakers diversions escalates | Costs | M | M | L | H | 5.00 | from programme entry | Reduce | Early engagement of utility companies | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 24 | High ongoing maintenance costs for LAs | Costs/Funding | M | L | L | M | 2.67 | 2014 | Reduce/Transfer | Consider access charge pegged to maintenance costs Consider maintenance costs in design work Agree procurement regime | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | L | L | M | 2.67 | | | | |
| 25 | Construction inflation | Costs | H | M | M | M | 4.67 | from Nov 08 | Accept/Reduce | Ensure cost estimates include best up to date forecasts on construction inflation Include in QRA | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | M | M | 4.67 | | | | |
| 26 | Compensation claims (noise etc.) | Costs | H | M | L | M | 4.00 | from 2014 | Reduce | Minimise impacts on properties in design Fully assess impacts Ensure appropriate mitigation measures included in the scheme | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 27 | Ineffective procurement strategy | Delivery | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | from Nov 08 | Reduce | Ensure robust procurement strategy Discussion/test with private party providers/partners | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |

West of England
 Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Rapid Transit
 Risk Register - General Scheme Risks
 AS AT: February 2009

| No. | Description | Category | Risk Assessment | | | | | RAG | Proximity (date) | Approach Avoid, Accept, Reduce, Transfer | Mitigation Measures | Workstream | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DATE OF UPDATE | STATUS | Residual Risk | | | | | RAG | DATE OF CLOSURE | REASON FOR CLOSURE & COMMENTS |
|-----|--|---------------------------|-----------------|------|-------------|--------|------|-----------|------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------|--------|------|--|-----|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Cost | Time | Performance | Rating | Cost | | | | | | | | | Time | Performance | Rating | | | | | |
| 28 | Contractor experiences financial difficulties and cannot complete construction | Delivery | H | H | M | L | 2.67 | 2011 | Reduce/transfer | Contractual transfer of risk Reduce bespoke elements where possible Discussion/test with with private party providers/partners Robust procurement strategy | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | M | L | 2.67 | | | | |
| 29 | On-street bus lanes not properly enforced | Delivery | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure effective programme in pace with BCC and NS | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 30 | Delays in supply or ordering buses not ready for service on opening day | Delivery | L | M | L | L | 1.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure robust procurement strategy Discussion/test with with private party providers/partners Early agreement with partners re requirements | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | M | L | L | 1.33 | | | | |
| 31 | Insufficient space in city centre for stops | Delivery | L | L | H | M | 3.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure robust design and modelling of proposed stops | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 32 | Contaminated land identified | Environment | M | M | L | H | 5.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce/Accept | Ensure adequate ground investigations Specific site surveys of high-risk areas | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 33 | Noise pollution objections raised by local residents | Environment | L | L | L | H | 3.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Draft and implement SEMP Ensure contractor signed up to SEMP Ensure proper engagement with affected parties | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | M | 2.00 | | | | |
| 34 | Environmental legislation changes requiring significant design amendments | Environment | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Monitoring of relevant legislation during project Engagement of qualified consultants and contractors | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 35 | Potential of archaeological surveys (and finds), impacting on time, cost, route option | Environment | M | M | L | H | 5.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce/Accept | Ensure adequate ground investigations and ES scoping Specific site surveys of high-risk areas | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | Increasing | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 36 | Unforeseen ground conditions | Environment | H | L | L | H | 5.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ground investigations Specific site surveys of high-risk areas | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | L | L | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 37 | Heritage issues - Listed building impacts, settings etc. | Environment | L | L | L | M | 2.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ES scoping and assessment Ensure build in adequate mitigation measures Specific site surveys of high-risk areas | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | | | | |
| 38 | Prince Street Bridge - objection to impacts | Acceptability / Objection | L | L | M | H | 4.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate consultation with stakeholders Ensure appropriate design | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | M | H | 4.00 | | | | |
| 39 | Seasonal mitigation requirements impact on programme | Environment | M | H | L | L | 2.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure works undertaken early in programme | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | H | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 40 | Design does not satisfactorily achieve reduced visual and amenity impacts | Environment | H | M | L | H | 6.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ES scoping and assessment Ensure build in adequate mitigation measures Specific site surveys of high-risk areas Progress design in detail for sensitive sections | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 41 | Identification protected species | Environment | M | M | L | M | 3.33 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ES scoping and assessment Ensure build in adequate mitigation measures Specific site surveys of high-risk areas | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | L | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 42 | Water contamination | Environment | H | M | L | M | 4.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ES scoping and assessment Ensure build in adequate mitigation measures Specific site surveys of high-risk areas Progress design in detail for sensitive sections Draft and implement SEMP Ensure contractor signed up to SEMP | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 43 | Impact on habitats | Environment | H | M | L | M | 4.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure adequate ES scoping and assessment Ensure build in adequate mitigation measures Specific site surveys of high-risk areas Progress design in detail for sensitive sections | Environment | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 44 | Failure to provide services that are accessible for all | Operational | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | 2008/2009 | Reduce | Ensure appropriate design standards are adhered to Consult with disabled groups | Engineering / Consultation | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | | | | |
| 45 | Operating companies not interested in new services as commercial terms unattractive | Operational | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | 2014 | Reduce | Review service procurement options Continue engagement with potential operator(s) | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 46 | Negative response to Bristol BRT by competitor operators | Operational | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | 2014 | Reduce | Review service procurement options Continue engagement with potential operator(s) | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | M | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 47 | Failure to co-ordinate services and integrate timetables could dilute benefits | Operational | L | L | H | H | 5.00 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure delivery of integrated system (operationally) | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 48 | Unspecified operating regime - fares, frequencies, services, competition | Operational | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | current | Reduce | Ensure delivery of integrated system (operationally) | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 49 | Service operator does not maintain reliability or quality standards | Operational | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | 2014 | Reduce/Transfer | Contractual commitment with bus operator | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 50 | Market unable to supply required vehicles | Operational | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | 2014 | Reduce/Transfer | Contractual commitment with bus operator | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | | | | |
| 51 | Infrastructure not maintained to high standard | Operational | M | L | M | L | 1.67 | 2014 | Reduce/Transfer | Contractual commitment with bus operator | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | L | M | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 52 | Vandalism | Operational | M | L | M | H | 5.00 | 2014 | Accept/Reduce | Ensure sufficient commitment made to maintenance of the system (infrastructure and vehicles) | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | L | M | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 54 | Breakdowns on the guideway | Operational | L | L | H | M | 3.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Good maintenance arrangements Ensure adequate provision is made for recovery areas in design Ensure adequate provision is made for recovery in costs | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | M | 3.33 | | | | |
| 55 | Key decisions are delayed affecting programme and scheme confidence | Project Management | H | H | L | H | 7.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Regular reporting to decision makers Regular briefing of Members | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | L | M | 4.67 | | | | |
| 56 | Failure to meet RFA programme | Project Management | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Regular monitoring of programme Strict change control process Regular discussions with DfT Lessons learned from other schemes | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |
| 57 | Contractor fails to keep to programme leading to late completion | Project Management | H | H | M | M | 5.33 | 2011 | Reduce/Transfer | Contractual commitment with contractor and penalty clauses | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | M | M | 5.33 | | | | |
| 58 | On-street measures not in place when needed | Project Management | L | L | H | M | 3.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Early programme identification of measures and agreement with LAS | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | H | L | 1.67 | | | | |
| 59 | General industry shortage of resources | Project Management | H | H | L | M | 4.67 | 2011 | Accept/Reduce | Ensure programme takes resource issues in to account Consultation with potential contractors | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | L | M | 4.67 | | | | |
| 60 | Failure to secure powers and/or operating rights | Project Management | H | H | H | M | 6.00 | 2011 | Reduce | Ensure political support Ensure robust technical case Reduce opposition to the scheme as far as possible | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | H | L | 3.00 | | | | |

West of England
 Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Rapid Transit
 Risk Register - General Scheme Risks
 AS AT: February 2009

| No. | Description | Category | Risk Assessment | | | | | RAG | Proximity (date) | Approach Avoid, Accept, Reduce, Transfer | Mitigation Measures | Workstream | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DATE OF UPDATE | STATUS | Residual Risk | | | | | RAG | DATE OF CLOSURE | REASON FOR CLOSURE & COMMENTS |
|-----|---|--------------------|-----------------|------|-------------|-------|--------|---------|------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|------|-------------|--------|-----|-----|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Impact | | | Prob. | Rating | | | | | | | | | Cost | Time | Performance | Rating | RAG | | | |
| | | | Cost | Time | Performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | Lack of resources to progress the scheme | Project Management | L | M | L | M | 2.67 | current | Reduce | Agree resource commitments upfront in PID for different stages of work Agree budget commitments from Las Ensure robust project management and reportin processes | Project Management | Senior Responsible Owner | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | M | 2.00 | | | | |
| 62 | Additional risk to pedestrian/cyclist safety from bus lanes | Safety | L | L | M | L | 1.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure design meets safety standards | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | M | L | 1.33 | | | | |
| 63 | Safety legislation changes requiring significant design amendments | Safety | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | ongoing | Reduce | Monitoring of relevant legislation during project Engagement of qualified consultants and contractors | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | M | L | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 64 | Serious accidents on opening of the scheme | Safety | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure CDM requirements are adhered to Safety audits to be undertaken for scheme | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | L | L | L | L | 1.00 | | | | |
| 65 | Project requirements are not protected through development control and negotiations with developers | Project Management | H | H | M | M | 5.33 | ongoing | Reduce | Close engagement with LPAs | Project Management | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | M | L | 2.67 | | | | |
| 66 | Design cannot facilitate access for planned or emergency access | Technical | H | H | L | L | 2.33 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure appropriate design standards are applied. Site specific access plans Engagement with emergency services | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | L | L | 2.33 | | | | |
| 67 | Technical problems with structural / civil works come to light during design | Technical | H | H | M | H | 8.00 | 2013 | Reduce/Transfer | Ensure appropriate provision made in scheme cost estimate (QRA) Contractual transfer of risk to contractor Independent review of cost allowances Progress detailed design work on high risk items | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | H | H | M | M | 5.33 | | | | |
| 68 | Bus stop locations provide insufficient space for passengers and pedestrians | Design/Safety | M | L | H | L | 2.00 | 2014 | Reduce | Ensure appropriate design standards are applied. Site specific access plans | Engineering | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | L | H | L | 2.00 | | | | |
| 69 | Inappropriate number of spaces provided at P&R sites | Technical | M | M | H | M | 4.67 | 2014 | Reduce | Appropriate modelling of demand for P&R | Modelling/Appraisal | Project Manager | 28/05/2008 | No change | M | M | H | L | 2.33 | | | | |
| 70 | Technical problems with Temple Meads Interchange | Engineering | H | H | M | H | 8.00 | 2011 | Reduce | Advance survey and design work | Engineering | Project Manager | 19/01/2009 | Increasing | M | M | M | M | 4.00 | | | | |

Categories

- Political / Policy
- Environment
- Technical
- Operational
- Acceptability / Objection
- Quality
- Project Management
- Safety
- Cost
- Business Case
- Third parties

| | L | M | H |
|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Rating | <35% | 35-65% | >65% |
| descrip | Unlikely | Possible | Likely |
| Cost | 1% | 5% | 10% |
| Emillion | 0.8 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| Programme | 1-4 months | 4-6 months | >6 months |