

Risk Management Report for Glasgow Science Centre Tower Project

Posted on September 2, 2019

Background and Scope Risks of the Glasgow Tower

The idea behind the Glasgow Science Centre project was to project Glasgow as a significant high-tech centre. The first element of the risk was constant changes in the scope of the project during the implementation phase, which resulted in the postponement of the opening date a number of times. One of the examples of scope is that it was assessed that the glass pod on the top of the building would get extremely hot under the sun and would be hard to clean (Anbari, 2009). To resolve this issue, the project management team changed the scope of the project by including carbon fibre, a narrow-cut viewing window and a metal composite, which, too, did not last enough. The team also failed to take into account the risk of the weight of elevators with the raw materials. That is why the elevators were very heavy when operating within the tower.

Project Delays Costs and Risk Consequences

All such delays and scope changes took more than ten years for the Glasgow Science Centre Tower project to complete at an unexpected cost of US \$ 15 million (Kwak, n.d.). Therefore, schedule risk was not addressed properly in the starting phase. Also, the allocation of funding was made too early for the project before the costs were understood thoroughly. The allocation of insufficient funds had an adverse effect on other parts of this project. Therefore, the schedule was termed “loose”. When proper funds were allocated, nothing was mentioned regarding the date of completion and the opening dates during the initial stages of the project (Mishra et al.). However, the project team performed a risk analysis to manage risk, but from a strategic point of view, no attempt was made to manage the risk. For example, there is a common practice to construct the tower to 6-7 times the width of its base, but the design of this tower was ten times taller, which is why technical risk arose (Sousa, A. I. F, 2017). As a result of the complexity of the design of this tower, the construction had to wait until several wind tunnel tests were conducted. The tall calendars of the building were likely to cause turbulence to the visitors, which would turn into an unpleasant experience for them. Also, the test that was carried out to demonstrate that the design would work actually showed that the final cost would exceed well beyond the allocated budget and all that was revealed before the actual start of the project (Sousa, A. I. F, 2017). These were the major loopholes in this project. The overall planning for the project was poor, and as a result of issues related to cost and scope, the work couldn't begin after two years of the project assignment. Through proper planning and evaluation, the three aspects, communication management, cost management and scope management, could have

been improved (Senouci et al.).

Risk Identification and Management Failures

Although these areas were identified at the start of the project, the project management never addressed them properly (Bartoli et al.). Another failure of the team was the mismanagement of the communication plan; they didn't devise a strategy for effective communication with contracting firms, and also there was a communication gap between them and the public, which caused problems for them (Serpell et al.). As technical problems started arising, the public started questioning the overall budget of the project and its completion, and the project management team didn't have satisfactory answers to these concerns of the public. As for the communication with the contracting firm, the project management team improved this part during the closeout phase (Liu et al.). The careful consideration of all these elements, especially in the initial phase of the project, couldn't have been avoided (Dahiru, A., & Bashir, A. M., 2015). There were many lessons for the project management team in this particular project, especially in terms of risks that were discussed.

Project Risk Assessment Summary

	Impact			
Probability		High	Moderate	Low
	High	Financial Risk Scope Management	Schedule Risk	
	Moderate	Technical Risk	Communication Gap	
	Low			

References

Bartoli, G., Betti, M., & Vignoli, A. (2016). A numerical study on seismic risk assessment of historic masonry towers: a case study in San Gimignano. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 14(6), 1475-1518.

Dahiru, A., & Bashir, A. M. (2015). Risk Factors Influencing Construction Procurement Performance in Nigeria. *Arid Zone Journal of Engineering, Technology and Environment*, 11, 77-88.

Glasgow-Tower-Science-Centre.pdf

Liu, F., Zhao, S., Weng, M., & Liu, Y. (2017). Fire risk assessment for large-scale commercial buildings based on structure entropy weight method. *Safety Science*, 94, 26-40.

Mishra, S., & Mishra, B. (2016). A Study on Risk Factors Involved in the Construction Projects. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*, ISSN, 2347-6710.

Serpell, A., Ferrada, X., Rubio, L., & Arauzo, S. (2015). Evaluating risk management practices in construction organizations. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 194, 201-210.

Senouci, A., Al-Abbadi, I., & Eldin, N. (2015). Safety improvement on building construction sites in Qatar. *Procedia Engineering*, 123, 504-509.

Schmidt, P., Von Arx, U., Schrimpf, A., Wagner, A., & Ziegler, A. (2017). On the construction of common size, value and momentum factors in international stock markets: A guide with applications.

Sousa, A. I. F. (2017). *Exhibit Development in a Science Centre-Internship at the Glasgow Science Centre* (Doctoral dissertation).