| - | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| | 4 | ω | N | لح | | Ref |
| incident | Corporate manslaughter/ health and safety | School Places | Impact of social demographic change | Failure to plan for/realise implications of Growth Agenda | | Risk |
| | i-railure of the health and sarety system to prevent a death or serious injury (that could have been preventable). | 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) Impact of further inward migration as EU borders open up increasing demand. | 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 | The city has an ambitious growth agenda and growth supports the Council's income through business rate growth and New Homes Bonus. However, there is also a significant cost to growth through the need to upgrade and provide new infrstructure. Funding for infrastructure is increasingly channeled through the Local Enterprise Partnership There is a need to maintain a focus and capacity to deliver growth. | | Description |
| | Impact on the organisation and individuals concerned, potential for financial loss, litigation etc. | 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. 3) Potential legal action from parents for failure to meet legal requirements | Significant additional financial costs to support need within the independent sector typically in and around the city. | Inability to fulfil statutory obligations eg provision of roads and schools. Budget implications. | rising | Consequences |
| | 0 | ≻ | ABCD | т Т | A Educ L B Cuit C d Safg D (Com E (Envt F Grow | Priority |
| | N | 4 | 4 | Ν | Likelih 1 ood 1 1 (L) - 5 { (H) | - |
| | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Impact 1 (L) - 5 (H) | - |
| | • | 16 | 16 | œ | | Current Score |
| | œ | 12 | 10 | ñ | if new risk, score on assumption no controls are in place | Previous /Initial Score |
| | \$ | • | \$ | 4 | | Direction |
| | | Updated demographic ongoing pressure especially with September 14 reception intake. Need version of School Organisation plan has identified focus areas and actions taken | | Currently unable to accurately predict future levels of business rate income. | change in impact, likelihood, objective etc(ALT return to use bullet points etc) | Reasons for change |
| Robust arrangements and training in place including regular internal auditing of policies and proceedures. | | Updated School Organisation plan has focussed where capital resources need to be targeted. Sufficent resources identified in MTFP to support known requirements in the next 3 years if forecasts remain accurate | Ongoing monitoring and review. Financial impact evaluation. Annual review informed by needs assessments. | Robust viability discussions with developers. Focused Section 106 team and programme to implement CIL in 2015. Syear residential land supply. residential land supply. | to measure success of controls. What is already in place to mitigate risk. (ALT return to use bullet points etc) | Current Controls |
| our own properties are occupied the appropriate testing and monitoring schedules are in place. | Focused auditing by dedicated team. Focused auditing by dedicated team. 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 contractural obligations are in place for each provider and that where | Keep under review. Local and national lobbying Continue to review options around reducing costs including modular technology, use of existing buildings and procurement savings Review potential options around further free schools in the city. Continue to monitor in year admissions and trends around numbers leaving the city. | | Development of system to forecast future levels of business rates. Co-ordinated approach between the Council and Opportunity Peterborough to influence LEP investment deciisons. Establishment of a Joint Venture company to deliver growth projects. Long term capital investment plan for new infrastructure. | further actions required to mitigate nsk or maximise opportunity. (ALT Return to use bullet points etc) | Actions |
| | CMT | Jon Lewis | DASS/DCS | S | e res off | Who |
| | | | | | 5 | |

| | 0/ | S | | |
|---------|---|---------|--------|--|
| Ongoing | Ongoing | Ongoing | | When target date |
| Jun-14 | ู่ มีมา-15 | Jun-14 | Jun-14 | Review Date all registers least 6 monthly unless red status specified, 3 monthly review then required. |
| | Review in line with allocation rounds (Secondary end of March, Primary mid April) | | | Remarks any other comments etc |

| 7 | Ø | сл | Ref |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| 7 Information governance | Safeguarding | Crime and ASB Reduction /Cohesion | f Risk |
| - 15- | | | |
| The council's management of information data on a day to day basis | Failure of safeguarding functions to prevent a child or vulnerable adult's being placed at significant risk of harm. | Increase in several crime types and ASB as a result of broader social changes, financial pressures etc. | Description |
| Lack of controls could subject the council to significant risk from litigation, financial penalties and loss of reputation . | Signficant risk to council both in terms of potential intervention from the government and media attention. | Increased costs across the public sector; increased fear of crime; reduced confidence in public sector. | Consequences |
| BCD | O | D | Priority |
| ω | ω | N | L |
| 4 | Ch | 4 | - |
| 12 | ö | œ | Current Score |
| 16 | 5 | 12 | Previous /Initial Score |
| • | \$ | • | Direction |
| New risk | | | Reasons for change |
| Strategic Governance Board oversees and monitors the correct handling of information data Dedicated team set up to oversee correct handling of information data. Cross PCC data protection group set up to monitor and introduce measures to aid compliance Cross PCC Information Risk Group set up | New systems and processes ensuring effective front door Effective recruitment campaign in place for SW Accountability to EIB, CMT & Scrutiny Performance management and Quality Assurance function strengthened New Joint Commissioning board New Joint Commissioning board Workforce Development training programme. Revised policy covering children's and adults safeguardign is in place. Robust multi-agency procedures in place for both Peterborough Local Safeguarding Childrens Board and Peterborough Safeguardign Adults Board, with supporting guidelines and protocols being developed. | Restruc Service Police (continu Safer P develop prograr crime; (crime; o crime; a lintegra approa | Current Controls |
| New polices introduced re- Information governance, Data Protection, FOI and handling emails. Mandatory training and awareness sessions held for all staff Corporate Induction raises awareness to all new staff. Corporate Induction raises awareness to all new staff. Information governance risk registers being finalised with individual departments | Sustain current improvement plan journey and adhere to EIB improvement plan Recruit team managers and development of succession planning Developing work around key areas of weakeness e.g. domestic violence, sexual exploitation, reflect supervision Adults: Revised procedures developed 2) Strengthened board arrangements Consultant practiioners in frontline teams | Launch full IOM model; launch new combined SPP team; continue to enhance partnership structures d | Actions |
| 3 | SWITR | 0 | Who |

| | | | Remarks |
|---|---------|--------|----------------|
| Jun-14 | Jun-14 | Aug-14 | Review Date |
| Ongoing and quarterly review by CMT (data security).Ov ersight by SGB. | Ongoing | Apr-14 | When |
| | | Э | (金) (金) (金) |

| S |
|---|
| Ŧ |
| a |
| ē |
| g |
| 0 |
| Л |
| |
| ¥ |
| - |
| 2 |
| ő |
| - |
| ÷ |
| œ |
| |

| | | | Ref |
|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| са Се е се | ۵ ۲ | ∞ | đ |
| Strategic Partnerships (Amey, Serco, Skanska, Opportunity Peterborough and Vivacity) fail to deliver as per expectations, prejudicing the Authority's ability to secure the desired outcomes on behalf of citizens | NHS funding and organisation | Financial Position | Risk |
| 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. | 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. | 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 2014 | Description |
| 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 and the Director of Growth and Regeneration - 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. | 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 | Council carnot overspend, so savings will have to be found elsewhere in the councils budget | Consequences |
| DBC | A C D | » вс г о | Priority |
| Ν | ω | 4 | F |
| ω | σ | σ | - |
| Ø | ä | 8 | Current Score |
| 0 | 10 | 12 | Previous /Initial Score |
| \$ | • | • | Direction |
| New risk | | | Reasons for change |
| There are strategic partnership boards in place for Amey, Skanska and Serco (and boards for Opportunity Peterborough and Vivacity), but more of an infrastructure is required at an operational level to set priorities 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. | Close monitoring of situation and regular engagement with PSFHT senior management. Close partnership working with LCG LCG | Plans for implementation of savings proposals development term financial strategy. RAG status of plans will be monitored by CMT. Budget position will be monitored through monthly budgetary control process in year. Financial papers published and in public domain prior to approval to enable full consultation | Current Controls |
| Day-to-day relationships and issues are managed between ssues are managed between strategic Client Services (SCS) & the Director of Growth and Regeneration and the 5 Partners; 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 invitationsfor first meetings to be done in the first quarter of 13/14 by SCS. Strategic oversight is provided by the existing Strategic Partnership Boards for Amey, Opportunity Peterbprough, Skanska and Sercc; 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. | | See current controls. | Actions |
| r RFuller/JH/ SM | с | 노 | Who |
| | Ongoing | Ongoing monitoring MTFS refresh to follow Autumn cycle as per constitution, but consider earlier plans depending on Spending Round | When |
| Jun-14 | Jun-14 | a a p n n - 14 | Review Date |
| | | | Remarks |

This page is intentionally left blank