

Risk Categorisation / Description	Supporting & Related Risks (the Triggers for the Strategic Risks)	Lhood 1-5	Impact 1-5	Inherent RAG Status	Proposed Mitigations	CLT Owner	Key contact	Residual Risk Lhood 1-5	Residual Risk Impact 1-5	Residual RAG Status	Reputational Impact	Financial Band 0-8	Trending Improving ↘ Worsening ↗ ↔ Stable
Financial Resilience of Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running down reserves / a rapid decline in reserves. A failure to plan and deliver savings in service provision to ensure the council lives within its resources. Shortening medium term financial planning horizons, perhaps from three or four years to two or even one A lack of firm objectives for savings - greater 'still to be found' gaps in saving plans A growing tendency for directorates to have unplanned overspends and / or carry forward undelivered saving into the following year 	5	5	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong Financial Management owned throughout the organisation, which is being strengthened via a finance transformation programme. Benchmarking against other Local Authorities to ensure our services provide value for money. Clearer plans for Delivering Savings, and tracking these. Managing Reserves, only using these inline with the reserves policy and ensuring the transformation reserve commitments generate a Return on Investment. 	CB	Jill Evans Emma Riding	3	4	12	The risk here is likely to be High. However, this could become extremely high if the council entered into S151 territory and/or statutory services were not being provided, and indeed it could be moderate to low looking at some elements of this risk in isolation.	Band 5 £3 - £5 Million	↘
Emergency Resilience – Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited Resources with right skills / ability to deal with Emergencies across our workforce Under Resourced 'Emergency Planning Team' limiting ability to co-ordinate plans / training etc. This small team is in a shared service with Cambridgeshire leading to reduced PCC Focus and a limited ability to 'horizon scan' to mitigate future risk. 	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of shared service arrangements (core planning team). Review of partnership 'resilience forum' to ensure joined up approach to emergency response is robust Review of all Business Continuity plans Improved training / preparation for different scenarios (exercises etc). 	CLT	Rob Hill	3	4	12	The risk here depends on the incident which may occur. The risk could easily be extremely high, if a major incident was not effectively managed because of poor resource, planning or horizon scanning. Risk would reduce depending on the incident, but will always likely be Moderate.	Band 3 £100k - £1 Million	↘ Residual Risk Likelihood reduced to 3 so now Amber
Decoupling of Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to achieve efficient & effective decoupling due to lack of financial investment, change not managed, staffing capacity not adequate, lack of business support capacity for project. 	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget needed. Good planning to stop things falling through gaps 	JG / ST	Oliver Haywood	2	5	10	Low to Moderate - moderate being if mass staff exit and services cannot be provided.	Band 3 £100k - £1 Million	↘
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand not matched by Supply including for Refugees, Students, Residents. Increase in People Sleeping Rough. Increase in attempted Criminal Activity impacting on the Healthy & Safe Environment. Negative Affect on behaviours of (Peterborough) Sustainable Communities. Negative Impact on Peterborough as an affordable place to Live. 	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximise external funding. Housing Strategy Private sector leasing Empty properties – back in use Maximise voluntary sector support around rough sleeping Improvement of Private rental sector relationships Improved relationships with registered providers Acquisition of stock Weekly Governance Group managing down demand in Temporary accommodation. 	AC	Matt Oliver	4	4	16	Moderate to High. Most likely the reputational impact would be Moderate, but if some of these risks materialised and spiralled it could be High owing to the damage this could have on the city's reputation long term if it became known as an area where lots of people sleep rough and criminal activity is high.	Band 4 £1 - £3 Million	↘
Safeguarding - Adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe Negative Impact on Council Reputation & Publicity if Safeguarding not able to be fully Assured. Ability to effectively Resource the Safeguarding Team impaired due to the decoupling and recruitment to substantive roles. 	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-resourced Safeguarding Team - substantive posts recruited to and pending start dates. Effective recruitment and retention Strong effective partnership and governance arrangements 	ST	Debbie McQuade	4	4	16	Reputational risk would be Moderate to Extremely high, depending on what happens as a result of the safeguarding requirements not being met. There is the potential for the risk to be the highest level.	Band 5 £3 - £5 Million	↘

<p>Safeguarding - Children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe Negative Impact on Council Reputation & Publicity if Safeguarding not able to be fully Assured. Ability to effectively Resource impaired due to the Complexity of some Safeguarding Cases. Increase in attempted Criminal Activity through assumed greater opportunities. Peterborough Less Attractive Proposition. Reduced Transportation to Schools increasing safeguarding risks. Lack of appropriate training opportunities to ensure frontline practitioners and Managers have access to the level of training required for their role 	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-resourced children's services Effective recruitment and retention Strong effective partnership and governance arrangements Appropriate Training commissioned from external resources. 	JG	Alison Bennett	5	4	20	<p>Reputational risk would be Moderate to Extremely high, depending on what happens as a result of the safeguarding requirements not being met. There is the potential for the risk to be the highest level.</p>	<p>Band 6 £5 - £10 Million</p>	↔
<p>The Council is a victim of Cyber Crime, & Technological Change,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data loss Denial of IT services Malware attack Phishing attack Ransomware attack Telephone Toll Fraud Major vulnerability DR for IT Services Data mishandling/breach Training arrangements fail 11. Password attack 12. SQL injection attack 13. Monitoring does not identify threats 14. In-house expertise/resource is stretched/reduced 15. Outdated or unpatched systems 	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phishing detection and prevention controls Vulnerability detection and mitigation controls Disaster Recovery Testing Robust policies and procedures including the new IT Strategy and the existing Information Management & Governance policy framework. Staff training on the correct handling of private data, and to use technical controls available to the Council to enable this. Use multiple layer of anti-malware protection on Firewalls, email and end-points to prevent malware with frequent signature updates. Use technical controls to limit access to the Council VOIP system to the UK only. Use the automated denial of service mitigation service provided by our wide area network provider MLL. This will inform us of any denial of service attempts and mitigation activities. Cyber Security Board and Technical Group Information Governance Management Board ITDS Recruitment Campaigns IT Business Continuity Planning processes ICT Security Procurements Information Risk Owner role; Data Protection Officer role; Caldicott Guardians Communication strategy Limitations to FOI requests 	CLT Changed from CB as key contact feels everyone is responsible for Cyber Security	Julian Patmore	5	4	20	<p>The reputational risk could be anything from Extremely Low to High depending on the incident that occurs. The reputational risk has the potential to be High if an incident occurs, as a result of critical services not being delivered for a significant period of time or people's data being used by fraudsters.</p>	<p>Band 6 £5 - £10 Million</p>	↔
<p>Political Landscape</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in Council Policies. Change in Council Priorities. Change in Council Leadership leading to different levels of support / approval. 	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish appropriate working groups with defined roles and responsibilities, ensure support is available to all members ensuring they have a clear understanding and are kept up to date. Clear lines of communication between officers and all members particularly Cabinet members Ensure regular review and monitoring of the New Administration Ten Point Plan 	AO	Adesuwa Omoregie	4	3	12	<p>Risk here is low, but could move towards Moderate if the political landscape became so troublesome that it destabilised the council's improvement journey. This could lead to greater focus on us from DLUHC.</p>	<p>Band 5 £3 - £5 Million</p>	↓
<p>Health & Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H&S Audit commissioned in 2023 identified significant issues in the Council's ability to provide demonstrable H&S assurance. There are insufficient Policies, Training and Arrangements. The team need to align to the new Compliance Team in Estates and FM. The team also lack sufficient resource and mandate to properly fulfil the duties required. 	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of the team has moved to the Commercial, Property and Asset Management Team. Additional temporary resource has been recruited and approval to upskill the team and to recruit a new Head of H&S. Main H&S policy being re written and other recommended actions arising from the review are being prioritised. 	CB	Simon Lewis	3	4	12	<p>This risk has the potential to be anything from Extremely Low to Extremely High. The chances are that the impact would be low, but it could be higher if there was an incident involving staff or the public which was a result of poor Health and Safety procedures being in place.</p>	<p>Band 5 £3 - £5 Million</p>	↓

OFSTED Inspections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative outcomes from Inspections. Needed improvements not made in a timely manner. Ability to Prepare for Inspections adversely impacted through resource constraints. Adverse impact on Reputation of Council. Negative Impact on lives of children, young people, families and carers. Failure to meet Ofsted/DfE/NHS England requirements from inspection findings Significant increase in budget pressures for Council as a result of significant resources being required to address inspection failings Increased pressure on staff and on budgets as staff leave as a result of poor inspection outcomes and it becomes more difficult to recruit permanent high quality staff 	4	5	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality permanent Leadership CLT/Lead Member/Leader up to date with services positions (children's safeguarding, SEND, YOS, secure home) Resources in place to facilitate good inspections Resources in place to provide high quality good services High quality self assessment in place Frequent updating of data and analysis Dry runs for inspection Strong track record of external reviews 	JG	Alison Bennett Gary Jones Chris Baird	4	5	20	Likely reputational impact is High. It could be Extremely High if the outcome of an inspection was particularly poor and the council did not respond to the concerns and this led to children/adults being at risk or worse.	Band 6 £5 - £10 Million	↑
Workforce Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to recruit suitably qualified staff. Failure to identify & nurture talent. Failure to retain key staff. Over-reliance on Contractors or Temporary Staff with no long-term commitment to the Council. Recruitment campaigns ineffectual – Not Securing Required Resources. Lessons not Learnt. Dissatisfied/Demotivated Staff + Lowered Staff Resilience – Leading to Increase in Staff Absence/Sickness. 	4	5	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesign of HR currently underway which see a workforce planning team introduced to forward focus on staffing requirements; Recruitment to specialist SMEs; networking is key for SME's to build and to understand key external challenging factors. People & Culture Programme set up under the Sustainable Future Council Board which has a focus on Recruitment & Retention; Pay & Benefits for employees; Learning & Development Curriculum; Staff Engagement Survey; Policy content review to simplify for users. 	CB	Mandy Pullen	4	4	16	Reputational risk could be anything from Low to High. This would depend on how severe the risks became and the impact it was having on the provision of services.	Band 5 £3 - £5 Million	↓
Improvement Programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver transformation improvement programmes due to lack of financial & staffing resources, lack of buy-in from staff & external stakeholders. Need to deliver BAU bringing about pressures on delivering Transformation. 	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All portfolios, programmes over multiple directorates have plans, risk logs, follow appropriate methodology and are actively managed and reported on. Programme Charters Project Charters Recently developed dashboard Weekly update meetings 	MG	Mandy Pullen / Ray Hooke	3	4	12	High reputational risk as a result of the council being known nationally as failing.	Band 5 £3 - £5 Million	↔
Community Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City unrest / increased tension resulting from external factors: e.g War in Ukraine / Gaza / Israel. 	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective Community Safety Partnership to monitor tension and co-ordinate effective response Enhanced community resilience mechanisms to engage more effectively (faith groups / volunteer groups and community forums etc.) 	CLT	Ian Phillips	4	3	12	Moderate to high impact, dependant upon the level of unrest	Band 3 £100k - £1 Million	↔
Procurement, contracting & contract management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement & Commissioning Life Cycle not sufficiently robust through drive for & emphasis on making Savings. Evidence of ineffective Contract management and governance of supplier contracts leading to delivery requirements not being met Portfolio Outputs, Outcomes Objectives & Benefits not clearly defined, not measurable nor achieved. Supply/market is not there (e.g. example children's homes) 	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of procurement to corporate strategy Development and enhancement of the Procurement Pipeline and Annual Plan Effective engagement with Contract managers to better develop the market Governance and compliance analysis & controls. Enhanced ERP system recording performance of strategic contracts Engagement with DMTs to prioritise procurements that deliver greatest value Issue and acceptance of a Contract Management Standard 	CB	Richard McCarthy	2	2	4	Low to moderate. Biggest risk reputationally is us not meeting procurement rules leading to complaints from contractors, or contracts not being managed properly and this impacting service delivery - reputational impact of these occurring would be Moderate.	Band 4 £1 - £3 Million	↓ Move to BAU risk template

Collaborative working with Health & Social Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective collaboration takes longer than expected and does not support the Council's corporate priorities. Local Needs not met through ongoing collaborative work. Collective Partnership responsibilities not executed fully effectively. Security & Platform requirements not met (Information Governance). 	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure coordinated impact of the Councils Corporate Priorities across ICS partnership meeting from North Integrated Partnership Board level to Integrated Neighbourhood level. Alignment of data aspects of digital strategy with partnership requirements 	ST	Debbie McQuade	4	3	12	Low to moderate. Low is most likely, but could become moderate if residents felt they were receiving a poor service.	Band 4 £1 - £3 Million	↔
Station Quarter Transformation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline business case is not accepted by DLUHC / DFT. 	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in the council's growth and regeneration service. Establishment of a Growth and Regeneration Advisory Board. Building and maintaining strong partnerships with key anchor institutions. ARUP on Board. Expert Rail Project Manager on board Steering Group in place including representation from Network Rail and LNER 	AC	Nick Carter Karen Lockwood	3	4	12	Moderate to High - however I would assume such news would not be made public so would not impact our reputation. We would work with Government to amend so it is approved.	Band 5 £3 - £5 Million	↔
Towns Fund Transformation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spend profile and programme do not meet April 26 spend deadline. 	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in the council's growth and regeneration service. Establishment of a Growth and Regeneration Advisory Board. Building and maintaining strong partnerships with key anchor institutions. 	AC	Nick Carter Karen Lockwood	3	3	9	Moderate to high.	Band 4 £1 - £3 Million	↔
Waste Disposal/Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to comply with new Waste Legislation. Lack of Service Provision. Negative impact on Environment. Failure to reduce plastic pollution. Negative impact on Peterborough being a desirable place to Live/Work/Invest etc. 	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor national policy updates to ensure we are clear how this will impact Peterborough. Final statutory guidance expected shortly. Consultation response in October 2023 suggests minimal impact for Peterborough but does prevent changes to the frequency of residual waste collections. Develop plan for full roll-out of food waste collections to flats and HMO's. 	AC	Charlotte Palmer	2	2	4	Moderate if the risk spiralled and became an issue spanning months. More likely to be Low.	Band 3 £100k - £1 Million	↓ Move to BAU risk template
CQC Assurance (Inspection)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative outcomes from Assurance Inspection. Improvements not made in a timely manner. Inability to Prepare for Assurance (Inspection) adversely impacted through resource constraints. Adverse impact on Reputation of Adult Social Care and the Council. 	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competent Leadership Good preparation through completion of Self Assessment and Improvement Plan. Information sharing /CLT/members/Partners Early notification of Assurance (Inspection) Ownership of Key Themes/quality Statements by key officers Ensuring staff are knowledgeable and equipped to meet with Inspectors Robust evidence bank 	ST	Debbie McQuade	4	4	16	Likely reputational impact is High. It could be Extremely High if the outcome of an inspection was particularly poor and the council did not respond to the concerns and this led to adults being at risk or worse	Band 4 £1 - £3 Million	↔
Capital & Information Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to Maximise Value of Assets. Failure to Identify/Know & Record All Assets. Failure to Identify/Know & Record Capital Expenditure. Negative Impact on Revenue & Expenditure Accrued. 	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of all assets & disposal programme Detailed asset register & rescoping requirements/ outcomes for conditions surveys Governance – new Estates Team and AMP due for 2024 with clearer lines of responsibility and accountability Clear Disposal programme Plan in Place aligned to refreshed Capital Programme Board 	CB	Jill Evans Simon Lewis	2	2	4	Moderate most likely, but could move higher up the scale if this impacted the council's ability to balance its budget or to get its accounts signed off.	Band 3 £100k - £1 Million	↓ Move to BAU risk template

Reputational impact assessed as if the risk materialised

Extremely High - Lasting or permanent national/local brand damage resulting from adverse comments in national press and media. High chance of Councillors/PCC staff forced to resign.

High - National/local brand damage lasting up to two years from coverage in national, regional and/or local press/media. Councillors/PCC staff potentially forced to resign.

Moderate Temporary local brand damage lasting up to one year from extensive coverage in regional and / or local press/ media.

Low Temporary local brand damage lasting up to a few weeks may be possible from minor adverse comments in local press/social media.

Extremely Low Negligible local brand damage from limited adverse comments with minimal press/social media.

Financial impact assessment

Each risk is assessed for the potential range of capital and/or revenue loss to the Council if the risk materialised.

Band 8 Loss over £20 million

Band 7 Loss between £10 million and £20 million

Band 6 Loss between £5 million and £10 million

Band 5 Loss between £3 million and £5 million

Band 4 Loss between £1 million and £3 million

Band 3 Loss between £100,000 and £1 million

Band 2 Loss between £50,000 and £100,000

Band 1 Loss under £50,000

Band 0 No financial loss

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

IMPACT