

Strategic Risk Register

33

| Ref | Risk | Description | Consequences | Priority | L | I | Current Score | Previous /Initial Score | Direction | Reasons for change | Current Controls | Actions | Who | When | Review Date | Remarks |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---|-----------|---|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | Name of risk | Brief description of risk event | Threats & opportunities arising | A Educ B Cult C Safg D Com E Envt F Grow | Likelihood 1 (L) - 5 (H) | Impact 1 (L) - 5 (H) | | If new risk, score on assumption no controls are in place | | Change in impact, likelihood, objective etc(ALT return to use bullet points etc) | To measure success of controls. What is already in place to mitigate risk. (ALT return to use bullet points etc) | Further actions required to mitigate risk or maximise opportunity. (ALT Return to use bullet points etc) | Officer(s) responsible | Target date | All registers reviewed at least 6 monthly unless red status specified, 3 monthly review then required. | Any other comments etc |
| 1 | Failure to plan for/realise implications of Growth Agenda | 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 infrastructure. Funding for infrastructure is increasingly channeled through the Local Enterprise Partnership There is a need to maintain a focus and capacity to deliver growth. | Inability to fulfil statutory obligations eg provision of roads and schools. Budget implications. | E F | 2 | 4 | 8 | 12 | ▼ | Currently unable to accurately predict future levels of business rate income. | Robust viability discussions with developers. Focused Section 106 team and CIL to be implemented in April 2015 monitoring residential land supply. | Development of system to forecast future levels of business rates. Co-ordinated approach between the Council and Opportunity Peterborough to influence LEP investment decisions. Joint Venture company, Peterborough Investment Partnership, now established to deliver growth projects. Long term capital investment plan for new infrastructure. | Simon Machen | | Jul-15 | |
| 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, residential nursing places and domicillary care capacity. | Significant additional financial costs to support need within the independent sector typically in and around the city. | A B C D | 3 | 4 | 12 | 16 | ▼ | | Ongoing monitoring and review. Financial impact evaluation. | Finalisation and implementation of Prevention, Early Help and Demand Management Strategy including workforce reform, development of community capacity and resilience and Customer Experience Programme. SEN strategy. Adult Social Care enablement and prevention models to be implemented. CWD work programme includes a prevention work stream. | Wendi Ogle-Welbourn | Ongoing | Sep-15 | |
| 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) Impact of further inward migration as EU borders open up increasing demand. Cut in Government funding for school places | 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. 3) Potential legal action from parents for failure to meet legal requirements | A | 5 | 4 | 20 | 20 | ◀▶ | Latest new intake allocations (reception and year 7) suggest we will have less than 1% of school places surplus. Shortage of places in existing reception, year 1, y10 and y11. Government have announced no basic need funding - £4m gap in next 2 F/Y | 1) Updated School Organisation plan has focussed where capital resources need to be targeted. 2) Sufficient resources identified in MTFP to support known requirements in the next 3 years if forecasts remain accurate 3) Quality of relationship with schools means school have overadmitted to support the LA | 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) Plans for emergency places being developed including pulling forward schemes and additional mobiles 5) Continue to monitor in year admissions and trends around numbers leaving the city. | Jon Lewis | Ongoing | May-15 | Review in line with allocation rounds (Secondary end of March, Primary mid April) |
| 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. | C | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | ◀▶ | | Robust arrangements and training in place including regular internal auditing of policies and procedures. | 1) Regular review of H&S 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. | Corporate Management Team | Ongoing | Jun-15 | |

Strategic Risk Register

Date: 05 March 2015

| Ref | Risk | Description | Consequences | Priority | L | I | Current Score | Previous /Initial Score | Direction | Reasons for change | Current Controls | Actions | Who | When | Review Date | Remarks |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|----------|---|---|---------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|-------------|---------|
| 5 | Crime and ASB Reduction /Cohesion | Increase in several crime types including ASB, and an increase in community tensions as a result of broader social changes, financial pressures and national/international events. | Increased costs across the public sector; increased fear of crime; reduced confidence in public sector; community tensions and conflict. | D | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | ◀▶ | | 1) Community and Safety model in place including daily risk management profiling. 2) Community and Safety model co-locates staff from the council, Police, Fire service and Cross Keys Homes, all sharing data and intelligence. 3) Strategic Cohesion Strategy in place, supported by Cohesion Board, Tension Monitoring Group and Hate Crime Task and Finish Group. 4) Crime and community safety performance is scrutinised bi-monthly in detail at the Safer Peterborough Partnership. | 1) Maintain strong focus on daily risk management and longer term performance monitoring. 2) Employ Community Connectors from higher risk communities to act as a bridge between communities and the public sector. 3) Continue to develop the Community and Safety model incorporating more partners where relevant. | Adrian Chapman | Sep-15 | Sep-15 | |
| 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. | C | 3 | 5 | 15 | 15 | ◀▶ | | 1) Implementation and continuing development of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub 2) Recruitment of permanent managers and social workers in ASC and CSC 3) Accountability to Achieving Outstanding Board, CMT & Scrutiny 4) Performance management and Quality Assurance function strengthened 5) New Joint Commissioning board 6) Workforce Development training programme. 7) Development of Safeguarding Adults Board chaired by chair of PSCB resulting in robust multi-agency procedures in place for both Boards, with supporting guidelines and protocols being developed. | 1) Sustain current improvement journey and adhere to Achieving Outstanding improvement plan; 2) Permanent leadership team recruited to/in place - recruitment and retention package for social workers under review; 3) Continuing focus on high priority areas including domestic violence and child sexual exploitation; 4) Practice development emphasising continuing importance of evidencing management oversight and journey of child in work with families Adults: 1) Care Act brings significant changes to the role of the SAB and the nature of enquiries to be undertaken. Revised procedures under developmt 2) Strengthened board arrangements 3) Consultant practitioners in frontline teams | Wendi Ogle-Welbourn | Ongoing | Jun-15 | |
| 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 . | B C D | 3 | 4 | 12 | 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) Information Governance Group set up to monitor and introduce measures to aid compliance 4) Cross PCC Information Risk Group set up | 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. 5) Information governance risk registers being finalised with individual departments | Kim Sawyer | Ongoing and quarterly review by CMT (data security). Oversight by SGB. | Jun-15 | |

34

Strategic Risk Register

Date: 05 March 2015

35

| 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 £25m of savings in 2015-16. 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 and business rates 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. There may also be an emergency budget from an incoming government | Council cannot overspend, so savings will have to be found elsewhere in the councils budget | A B C D E F | 3 | 5 | 15 | 20 | ▼ | | 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. Financial papers published and in public domain prior to approval to enable full consultation | See current controls. | John Harrison | Ongoing monthly monitoring MTFS refresh to start post election | Jun-15 | |
| 9 | NHS funding and organisation | Challenged health economy. Risk to hospital services in the light of continuing financial crisis facing PSFHT. | Lack of appropriate investment in key services and consequential pressures on both adult and children social care budgets. Lack of hospital discharge provision and hospital beds. Insufficient investment in mental health services for adults and children. | A C D | 3 | 5 | 15 | 10 | ▲ | | Regular meetings set up with CCG and Health Providers - PSFHT, CSS, UCP and CPFT; alongside Cambridgeshire and Peterborough whole system transformation group. | BCF plan agreed and implementation plans in place. Negotiating additional capacity from CCG for CAMHS. | Wendi Ogle-Welbourn | Ongoing | Jun-15 | |
| 10 | 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 | 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. | PCC needs to ensure firm governance arrangements (see separate entry) managed by the Executive Director Resources and the Director of Growth and Regeneration - that allows for on-going debate about delivery and priorities. 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 Amey, Skanska and Serco (and boards for Opportunity Peterborough and Vivacity) | 1) Day-to-day relationships and issues are managed between the Executive Director Resources & the Director of Growth and Regeneration (with their respective teams) and the 5 Partners; 2) Strategic oversight is provided by the existing Strategic Partnership Boards for Amey, Opportunity Peterborough, Skanska and Serco 3) Reporting is also undertaken to the relevant scrutiny committees | John Harrison/ Simon Machen | Ongoing | Sep-15 | |

This page is intentionally left blank