

Strategic Risk Register

Date: 19 March 2013

Ref	Risk	Description	Consequences	Priority	L	I	Current Score	Previous /Initial Score	Direction	Reasons for change	Current Controls	Actions	Who	When	Review Date	Remarks
	<i>name of risk</i>	<i>brief description of risk event</i>	<i>threats & opportunities arising</i>	<i>A Env B Com C Grow D Opps</i>	<i>L 1 (L) - 5 (H)</i>	<i>I 1 (L) - 5 (H)</i>		<i>if new risk, score on assumption no controls are in place</i>		<i>change in impact, likelihood, objective etc(ALT return to use bullet points etc)</i>	<i>to measure success of controls. What is already in place to mitigate risk. (ALT return to use bullet points etc)</i>	<i>further actions required to mitigate risk or maximise opportunity. (ALT Return to use bullet points etc)</i>	<i>officer(s) responsible</i>	<i>target date</i>	<i>all registers reviewed at least 6 monthly unless red status specified, 3 monthly review then required.</i>	<i>any other comments etc</i>
1	Failure to plan for/realise implications of Growth Agenda	The city is seeking to continue with growth, however development viability and land prices make contributions to vital infrastructure eg roads and schools very difficult. Changes to the local government finance system, with an element of business rates being retained locally, mean that the Council could lose grant if growth targets for business rates are not hit. There is a need to maintain focus on expansion and growth to ensure infrastructure has capacity to cope.	Inability to fulfil statutory obligations eg provision of roads and schools. Budget implications.	C A D	4	4	16	6	▲	Currently unable to accurately predict future levels of business rate income.	Robust viability discussions with developers. Focused Section 106 team.	Development of system to forecast future levels of business rates and assigning this role to develop such a system. We are developing funding applications through the LEP in the form of Pinchpoint Funding applications and Winter Damage applications. This will support not only further growth but additional finance for maintenance of our existing infrastructure.	GB/ND		Jun-13	
2	Impact of social demographic change	Insufficient capacity to support increased demand on specialist services as a result of ageing population, increased birth rate, migration and disability. Services include foster carers, adoption placements, special school places	Significant additional financial costs to support need within the independent sector typically in and around the city.	B	4	4	16	16	◀▶		Ongoing monitoring and review. Financial impact evaluation. Annual review informed by needs assessments.	Delivery of workstreams within early intervention and prevention strategy. SEN strategy	DASS/DCS	Ongoing	Apr-13	
3	School Places	Failure to provide our legal requirement for every child of statutory school age to access a place and within a 'reasonable' distance from their home (less than 2 miles for 4 to 8 year olds and up to 3 miles for 9 to 16 year olds)	1) Significant additional costs incurred in terms of transport, 2) impact on schools in terms of attendance, less engagement from parents and increased churn of pupils when places become available nearer to home - all having a significant impact on outcomes.	B	3	4	12	10	▲	Updated demographic information suggests ongoing pressure however capital investment and short term measures have mitigated some of the impact from the pressures.	1) New data on under 5's received from GP's which have helped pinpoint the pressure areas in the city and focus where capital resources need to be targeted. School Organisation Plan going to scrutiny panel in April for sign off. 2) Sufficient resources identified in MTFP to support known requirements in the next 3 years if forecasts remain accurate	1) Keep under review. 2) Local and national lobbying 3) Continue to review options around reducing costs including modular technology, use of existing buildings and procurement savings 4) Review potential options around further free schools in the city. 5) Continue to monitor in year admissions and trends around numbers leaving the city.	Jon Lewis	Ongoing	Apr-13	Review in line with allocation rounds (Secondary end of March, Primary mid April)

Strategic Risk Register

Date: 19 March 2013

Ref	Risk	Description	Consequences	Priority	L	I	Current Score	Previous /Initial Score	Direction	Reasons for change	Current Controls	Actions	Who	When	Review Date	Remarks
4	Corporate manslaughter/ health and safety incident	Failure of the health and safety system to prevent a death or serious injury (that could have been preventable).	Impact on the organisation and individuals concerned, potential for financial loss, litigation etc.	B	2	4	8	8	◀▶		Robust arrangements and training in place including regular internal auditing of policies and procedures.	1) Regular review of H7S Policy. 2) Focused auditing by dedicated team. 3) Training of senior management on H&S duties and responsibilities to be introduced. There is a full review taking place of all externalised contracts ensuring the appropriate contractual obligations are in place for each provider and that where our own properties are occupied the appropriate testing and monitoring schedules are in place.	CMT	Ongoing	Aug-13	
5	Crime and ASB Reduction /Cohesion	Increase in several crime types and ASB as a result of broader social changes, financial pressures etc.	Increased costs across the public sector; increased fear of crime; reduced confidence in public sector.	B	3	4	12	12	◀▶		Restructure of Neighbourhood Services to combine PCC and Police community safety teams; continual development of the Safer Peterborough Partnership; development of new projects and programmes to help reduce crime; development of Top 100 families project; launch of Integrated Offender Management approach.	Launch full IOM model; launch new combined SPP team; continue to enhance partnership structures	Adrian Chapman	Apr-13	Aug-13	
6	Safeguarding	Failure of safeguarding functions to prevent a child or vulnerable adult's being placed at significant risk of harm.	Significant risk to council both in terms of potential intervention from the government and media attention.	B	3	5	15	15	◀▶		1) New systems and processes ensuring effective front door 2) New senior leadership – DCS / AD / Service Managers 3) Effective recruitment campaign in place for SW 4) Accountability to EIB, CMT & Scrutiny 5) Performance management and Quality Assurance function strengthened 6) New Joint Commissioning board 7) Workforce Development training programme 8) Ofsted inspection Feb 2013	1) Sustain current improvement journey and adhere to EIB improvement plan 2) Recruit team managers and development of succession planning 3) Developing work around key areas of weakness e.g. domestic violence, sexual exploitation, reflect supervision 4) Appointment of new chair for PSCB Adults: 1) Revised procedures developed 2) Strengthened board arrangements 3) Consultant practitioners in frontline teams	SW/TR	Ongoing	Jun-13	
7	Information governance	The council's management of information data on a day to day basis	Lack of controls could subject the council to significant risk from litigation, financial penalties and loss of reputation	D B C	4	4	16	16	◀▶	New risk	1) Strategic Governance Board oversees and monitors the correct handling of information data 2) Dedicated team set up to oversee correct handling of information data. 3) Cross PCC data protection group set up to monitor and introduce measures to aid compliance	1) New policies introduced re-information governance, Data Protection, FOI and handling emails. 2) Mandatory training and awareness sessions held for all staff 3) Corporate Induction raises awareness to all new staff. 4) Comprehensive work plan being driven by dedicated group.	HE	Ongoing and quarterly review by CMT (data security). Oversight by SGB.	Jun-13	

Strategic Risk Register

Date: 19 March 2013

Ref	Risk	Description	Consequences	Priority	L	I	Current Score	Previous /Initial Score	Direction	Reasons for change	Current Controls	Actions	Who	When	Review Date	Remarks
8	Financial Position	The Council has plans to deliver £17m of savings in 2013-14. Risk that some items may not be deliverable, or that additional budget pressures emerge (e.g. due to risks 1 and 3 above, or prolonged economic downturn). Also the changes to council tax benefit place risk of increased cost with the council Over the medium term, the MTFS outlines deficits in future years that will need to be tackled. The next Spending Round is expected in the first half of 2013	Council cannot overspend, so savings will have to be found elsewhere in the councils budget	A B C D	3	4	12	12	◀▶		Plans for implementation of savings proposals developed during development of medium term financial strategy. RAG status of plans will be monitored by CMT. Budget position will be monitored through monthly budgetary control process in year.	See current controls.	JH	Ongoing monthly monitoring MTFS refresh to follow Autumn cycle as per constitution, but consider earlier plans depending on Spending Round	Sep-13	
9	NHS funding and organisation	Risk of loss of focus on health needs of Peterborough by a Cambridgeshire & Peterborough-wide CCG. Risk to hospital services in the light of continuing financial crisis facing City Hospital and PSFHT. Reliance on NHS/CCG to agree transfer of social care funds.	Lack of appropriate investment in key services and consequential pressures on both adult and children social care budgets. Deteriorating standards of health care with impact on overall health and well being of community. Additional pressures on stretched social care budgets	D B C	2	5	10	10	◀▶		Close monitoring of situation and regular engagement with PSFHT senior management. Close partnership working with LCG	Engagement with CCG and local management and emphasis on joint working through Health & Well Being Board	TR/AL	Ongoing	Sep-13	
10	Strategic Partnerships (Enterprise, Serco and Vivacity) fail to deliver as per expectations, prejudicing the Authority's ability to secure the desired outcomes on behalf of citizens	The Council has vested delivery of a number of key services in Strategic Partners; there are reputational and financial risks to PCC if delivery is not at either the price or to the quality envisaged at the time of the contracts being entered into; there are also external threats to the stability of the Partnerships, including the current expected acquisition of Enterprise by Ferrovial and planned subsequent integration with Amey	PCC needs to establish and secure firm governance arrangements (see separate entry) but these need to be integrated within a tighter framework - developed and managed by Strategic Client Services - that allows for on-going debate about delivery and priorities, rather than being seen as a stand-alone activity. Failure to take a whole-systems approach to the management of the Strategic Partnerships will increase the risk of underperformance and financial and reputational costs to the Council.	D B C	2	3	6	6	◀▶	New risk	There are strategic partnership boards in place for Enterprise and Serco, but more of an infrastructure is required at an operational level to set priorities and review performance - these will be introduced as part of a new approach to business planning with Strategic Partners. We have a mandate to establish a new governance regime for Vivacity but have yet to put this in place.	1) Day-to-day relationships and issues are managed between Strategic Client Services (SCS) and the three Partners; 2) Operational, delivery and financial issues are currently managed on a largely ad hoc basis but will be picked up from April 2013 onwards in a new set of 'performance management group' stock-takes; details of membership and terms of reference together with invitations for first meetings to be done in the first quarter of 13/14 by SCS. 3) Strategic oversight is provided by the existing Strategic Partnership Boards for Enterprise and Serco; a related high-level meeting with Vivacity has been agreed in principle by the Chief Executive and Deputy Leader - the action is with SCS to establish.	RFuller/JH	Ongoing	Sep-13	

6

Likelihood

5	5	10	15	20	25
4	4	8	12	16	20
3	3	6	9	12	15
2	2	4	6	8	10
1	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

Review 12 months
Review 6 months
Review 3 months

Impact

Likelihood & Impact Descriptors:		
1: Negligible		Little likelihood of risk occurring except in exceptional circumstances
	Service Interruption	None noticeable
	Objectives/Projects	Insignificant slippage
	Financial	up to £10k
	Compliance	Minor non-compliance
	Reputational	Internal PCC only
	Environmental	No noticeable impact
2: Low		Unlikely to occur in next 10 years
	Service Interruption	Minor disruption
	Objectives/Projects	Minor slippage
	Financial	£10k-£25k
	Compliance	Low-level non-compliance
	Reputational	Local media - short term coverage
	Environmental	Minor impact
3: Moderate		Reasonable chance of occurring in next 5 years
	Service Interruption	Some operations compromised
	Objectives/Projects	Reduction in scope or quality
	Financial	£25k-£100k
	Compliance	Non-compliance with core standards
	Reputational	Local media - long term coverage
	Environmental	Short term, medium impact
4: Significant		Likely to occur more than once in next 12 months
	Service Interruption	All or most operations compromised
	Objectives/Projects	Failure to meet secondary objectives
	Financial	£100k-£500k
	Compliance	Major non-compliance
	Reputational	Extensive local, short-term national coverage
	Environmental	Significant impact - possible long-term effects
5: Very High		More likely to occur than not at least once in next 12 months
	Service Interruption	sustained or permanent loss of core service
	Objectives/Projects	failure to meet primary objectives
	Financial	£500k +
	Compliance	serious breach of compliance - potential prosecution
	Reputational	Long-term national coverage
	Environmental	Long-term impact

Risk Categories

- Strategic:** Risks affecting medium-long term goals. Project risks, governance etc
- Operational:** Events affecting service provision. Staff shortage, physical damage, ICT etc
- Financial:** Events with a financial/budgetary impact
- Compliance:** Risks threatening compliance with standards, laws and regulations etc
- Reputation:** Affecting public perception about the organisation, staff morale, stakeholder interest etc.
- Environmental:** Events with an environmental impact.

What is a risk?

A risk is an event which can affect the achievement of objectives. Risks can have negative or positive outcomes.

The Risk Management Process:

Identify Objectives. What are we trying to achieve?

Identify risks: Use past history, near misses, emergent events etc which could impact upon the objective(s)

What is the likelihood of the event occurring?

What are the consequences of the event occurring? Potential threats and/or opportunities

What is the preferred response? One or more of the following:

Tolerate: If the current risk level is acceptable

Transfer: Outsource, Insure etc

Terminate: Cease the activity that gives rise to the risk (not usually practicable)

Treat: Actions and controls to mitigate the likelihood and/or impact

Take the Opportunity: How to maximise any potential benefits

Who is responsible?

What are the required actions?

Is there a target score or end date?

What is the date of next review?

