

| 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"> <li>A rapid decline in reserves- The council's reserves are forecast to reduce by 81%.</li> <li>Debt levels- Borrowing stands at around c£0.5bn, with every £10m borrowed putting an additional £1m strain on the revenue budget.</li> <li>A failure to plan and deliver savings- 40% of savings plans are rated amber.</li> <li>Ensuring the council provides services and lives within its budgeted resources- there are a number of key risks presented including demand for housing, ASC, CSC, H2sT and EHCPs in addition to the challenges around delivering savings and the impact of higher interest rates.</li> </ul>  | 5         | 5          | 25                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong financial management owned throughout the organisation. A self assessment of the council's compliance with the CIPFA FM Code has been completed and a detailed action plan is in the process of being implemented. This, together with the wider finance transformation programme, will strengthen organisational financial awareness and financial management.</li> <li>Ensuring clearer plans and mitigations are in place to deliver savings, and tracking these, with the continuation of the Capital and Invest to Save board- providing oversight, support and challenge.</li> <li>Managing reserves, only using these inline with the reserves policy and ensuring the transformation reserve commitments generate a return on investment.</li> <li>Capital programme to be monitored and borrowing to only be approved where a return on investment is expected (savings) or where it is absolutely necessary eg Health and Safety. Potential moratorium being considered to stop spend and reduce the cost of borrowing.</li> <li>Draft September BCR overspend is £8.9m. Spend and recruitment controls have been put in place.</li> </ul> | CB        | Jill Evans<br>Emma Riding | 4                       | 5                        | 20                  | The risk here is likely to be High. However, this could become extremely high if the council entered into S114 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 7 £10 - £20 Million                            | ↑   |
| Public Health Grant is insufficient to maintain public health service levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Public Health grant allocation (£12.3m) is not sufficient to meet the need for Public Health services impacting the health of Peterborough residents, other council and partner services.</li> <li>The total PH grant for Peterborough is approximately £20/head lower than comparators, leading to a funding gap of approximately £4m.</li> <li>Risk of future inflationary pressures reducing the real-terms value of the public health grant even further.</li> <li>Increasing demand on Public Health services due to growth of the population, (especially children), the level of need and poverty.</li> <li>Inability to fund, recruit and retain a sustainable PH workforce in a highly competitive job market. This has been exacerbated by the separation of the shared PH service with CCC and the subsequent restructure.</li> </ul> | 5         | 4          | 20                  | <p>The issue of underfunding has been raised with the Regional DPH, Chief Medical Officer, local MP and PH Minister.</p> <p>A review and prioritisation of all internal and external PH commissioned spend against impact on Public Health outcomes for Peterborough residents has been carried out, with ongoing review of value for money as requested by OHID.</p> <p>Ongoing discussion with OHID and DHSC regarding 25/26 and the potential for change in the next Spending Review.</p>   | ST        | Mike Robinson             | 5                       | 3                        | 15                  | The risk here could be low to moderate. It is likely to be low initially, but looking to the future the risk could increase significantly if there are much poorer health outcomes and Peterborough gains a reputation as being somewhere with much shorter life expectancy and very high rates of smoking etc. | Band 5 £3 - £5 Million. Based on the £4m shortfall. | ↔   |

|  |   |   |   |    |  |     |                |   |   |    |  |                              |   |
|--|---|---|---|----|--|-----|----------------|---|---|----|--|------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Emergency Resilience –</b> Improving councilwide preparedness . Insufficient skills across workforce to respond to emergency challenge</p>   | <p>• PCC's emergency planning team will be decoupled from Cambridgeshire County Council, enabling us to have a clear view on the number and skills of resources we need in order to respond to future emergency challenges.</p>   | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of shared service arrangements (core planning team). Business service plan completed to request core team strengthen establishment across both authorities.</li> <li>• Review of partnership 'resilience forum' (CPLRF) to ensure joined up approach to emergency response is robust. Our CEO now chairs the county resilience board and will assist with this review process. A proposal will be tabled in the March CPLRF to explore joining up core planning personnel across the system to improve resilience.</li> <li>• Review of all business continuity plans - this has been completed.</li> <li>• Improved training / preparation for different scenarios (exercises etc). An on call training date is arranged for all directors in April. Exec directors have undertaken MAGIC training (Gold Command planning). General awareness is being raised via CLT / ECLT and we have published a new Emergency Response Plan on our website and circulated to Senior managers to assist response. Website has been updated with all relevant tools to assist our workforce (emergency plans / contacts list / log book. Loggist training has been given to EAs to enhance support. A 1/2 day workshop with ECLT held 17th June to upskill staff.</li> <li>• We have now extended the director on call capability and all staff have been provided training. The CPLRF exercise training schedule is now obtained, and we are ensuring PCC representation at these.</li> <li>• A decision has been made to decouple emergency planning from County Council. A work programme will be established to develop an in house solution to go live March 2025. This will provide opportunity to further strengthen and tailor EMP support for the authority.</li> </ul> | CLT | Rob Hill       | 2 | 3 | 6  | <p>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.</p>  | Band 3<br>£100k - £1 Million | ↔ |
| <p><b>Possible service disruption due to decoupling of ITDS Services</b></p>   | <p>• Failure to achieve efficient &amp; effective decoupling due to lack of financial investment, change not managed, staffing capacity not adequate, lack of business support and capacity for project</p>   | 4 | 5 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget needed.</li> <li>• Appropriately managed project plan to implement decoupling.</li> <li>• Consultation paper issued to the organisation and Feedback received and acted upon.</li> </ul>   | CB  | Julian Patmore | 3 | 3 | 9  | Moderate to Low  | Band 4 - £1 - £3 Million     | ↓ |
| <p><b>Housing -</b> Increasing demand exceeding supply, leading to increased reliance on temporary accommodation, insufficient support for the homeless and significant financial pressure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand not matched by supply including for refugees, students and residents.</li> <li>• Increase in people sleeping rough.</li> <li>• Increase in attempted criminal activity impacting on the Healthy &amp; Safe Environment.</li> <li>• Negative affect on behaviours of (Peterborough) Sustainable Communities.</li> <li>• Negative Impact on Peterborough as an affordable place to live.</li> </ul> | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of service structures to achieve caseload reduction to ensure better decision making and demand management.</li> <li>• Analysis of front door data to better understand types of approaches to Housing Need service and focus collective resources in to prevention tools to meet need.</li> <li>• Weekly Governance Group to manage down B+B bookings and demand issues and stock management.</li> <li>• Maximise voluntary sector support around homelessness through Safer off the Streets Partnership and Strategy Group (review of strategy governance)</li> <li>• Homelessness adopted as a priority for Integrated Neighbourhoods and PIR board to bend resources of ICS to prevention tools.</li> <li>• Establish broader relationships with RPs as part of actions in Homelessness and Housing strategy - Particularly review funding to CKH to find alternative TA options.</li> <li>• Acquisition of TA through Hudson Homes (12 x 2/3 bed properties in 24/25)</li> </ul>  | AC  | Matt Oliver    | 5 | 4 | 20 | <p>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 - this type of reputational damage also impacts on the ability to be able to drawdown additional funding.</p> | Band 4 £1 - £3 Million       | ↔ |

|   |  |   |   |    |  |     |                |   |   |    |   |                                |   |
|---|--|---|---|----|--|-----|----------------|---|---|----|---|--------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Safeguarding - Adults</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Severe negative impact on council reputation and publicity if safeguarding not able to be fully assured.</li> <li>•Ability to effectively resource the safeguarding team impaired due to the decoupling and recruitment to substantive roles.</li> </ul>   | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Well-resourced safeguarding team - substantive posts being recruited to and pending start dates, current support via agency and secondment.</li> <li>•Effective recruitment and retention</li> <li>•Strong effective partnership and governance arrangements - Safeguarding Adults Board.</li> <li>• Partners in care and health have reviewed safeguarding procedures, workflow and delivery model. Revised safeguarding model implemented w/c 8th July.</li> </ul> | ST  | Debbie McQuade | 4 | 4 | 16 | <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 5 £3 - £5 Million</p>  | ↓ |
| <p><b>Safeguarding - Children</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Severe negative impact on council reputation and publicity if safeguarding not able to be fully assured.</li> <li>•Ability to effectively resource impaired due to the complexity of some safeguarding cases.</li> <li>•Increase in attempted criminal activity through assumed greater opportunities.</li> <li>•Reduced transportation to schools increasing safeguarding risks.</li> <li>• Lack of appropriate training opportunities to ensure frontline practitioners and managers have access to the level of training required for their role</li> </ul> | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Well-resourced children’s services</li> <li>•Effective recruitment and retention</li> <li>•Strong effective partnership and governance arrangements</li> <li>•Appropriate Training commissioned from external resources.</li> </ul>  | JG  | Sara Graves    | 4 | 4 | 16 | <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><b>The Council is a victim of Cyber Crime, &amp; Technological Change,</b> Cyber Crime - any criminal activity that involves a computer, network or networked device to generate profit or to directly damage or disable them.</p> | <p>Standard Cyber Crime risk areas captured.</p>   | 5 | 4 | 20 | <p>Controls reviewed monthly in line with industry standards.</p>  | CLT | 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><b>Political Landscape</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Change in council policies.</li> <li>• Change in council priorities.</li> <li>• Change in council leadership and administration leading to different levels of support / approval.</li> </ul>  | 5 | 3 | 15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•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.</li> <li>•Clear lines of communication between officers and all Political groups particularly Cabinet members</li> </ul>  | NM  | Neil McArthur  | 5 | 3 | 15 | <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>  | ↔ |

|   |  |   |   |    |  |    |                  |   |   |    |  |                         |   |
|---|--|---|---|----|--|----|------------------|---|---|----|--|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Security Assurance</b><br>Improving councilwide preparedness. Developing skills and tools to respond to a security issues.                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unauthorised access due to tailgating.</li> <li>• Potential Security incidents.</li> <li>• Inconsistent policies, training and staff arrangements.</li> <li>• Unclear escalation process for threats.</li> <li>• Intimidation of Staff, Visitors and Members</li> <li>• Need to respond in a timely manner to the new requirements contained under Martyns Law.</li> </ul>  | 5 | 4 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to develop the Security Assurance network, which brings all the key areas together, and includes an escalation process to CLT for significant risks and issues</li> <li>• Emergency Planning/Duty On Call Training being rolled out for ECLT members</li> <li>• Explore what training and mandatory training can be given to Staff and Members</li> <li>• Focus on key messages included new signage around ID badges and tailgating</li> <li>• CCTV remains in operation</li> <li>• Monitor Home Office recommendations and develop responses to Martyns Law.</li> <li>• Lone working devices issued to staff at risk.</li> </ul>               | CB | Felicity Paddick | 4 | 3 | 12 | 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 procedures being in place. If procedures in place are good then this risk is much reduced. | Band 4 £1 - £3 Million  | ↓ |
| <b>Health &amp; Safety</b> - Ability to reduce H&S risk, to respond in a timely manner to H&S issues and to mitigate any impact arising from incidents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H&amp;S Audit commissioned in 2023 identified significant issues in the council's ability to provide demonstrable H&amp;S assurance. There is now a plan in place to deliver greater assurance.</li> </ul>  | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Head of H&amp;S in role and the teams roles and responsibilities have been reviewed and updated</li> <li>• Team currently operating at reduced capacity.</li> <li>• Main H&amp;S policy has been signed by Leader and Chief Exec</li> <li>• H&amp;S issues now reported to PCLT on a monthly basis</li> <li>• Other recommended actions are being prioritised and a delivery plan is in place to address issues over a 2 year period.</li> </ul>  | CB | Felicity Paddick | 4 | 3 | 12 | 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.   | Band 5 £3 - £5 Million  | ↓ |
| <b>OFSTED Inspections</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative outcomes from Inspections.</li> <li>• Needed improvements not made in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Ability to Prepare for Inspections adversely impacted through resource constraints.</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Reputation of Council.</li> <li>• Negative Impact on lives of children, young people, families and carers.</li> <li>• Failure to meet Ofsted/DfE/NHS England requirements from inspection findings</li> <li>• Significant increase in budget pressures for Council as a result of significant resources being required to address inspection failings</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> | 4 | 5 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality permanent Leadership</li> <li>• CLT/Lead Member/Leader up to date with services positions (children's safeguarding, SEND, YOS, secure home)</li> <li>• Resources in place to facilitate good inspections</li> <li>• Resources in place to provide high quality good services</li> <li>• High quality self assessment in place</li> <li>• Frequent updating of data and analysis</li> <li>• Dry runs for inspection</li> <li>• Strong track record of external reviews</li> </ul>   | JG | Alison Bennett   | 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 | ↔ |
| <b>Workforce Planning</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to recruit suitably qualified staff.</li> <li>• Failure to identify &amp; nurture talent.</li> <li>• Failure to retain key staff.</li> <li>• Over-reliance on Contractors or Temporary Staff with no long-term commitment to the Council.</li> <li>• Recruitment campaigns ineffectual – Not Securing Required Resources. Lessons not Learnt.</li> <li>• Dissatisfied/Demotivated Staff + Lowered Staff Resilience – Leading to Increase in Staff Absence/Sickness.</li> </ul>  | 4 | 5 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The People structure redesign is now embedded with key priority work ongoing with the business on workforce development/planning &amp; recruitment</li> <li>• Focussed recruitment priority work ongoing with Childrens to reduce agency reliance and create sustainability with its permanent workforce.</li> <li>• People &amp; Culture Programme, actively monitored through the SFCC, with rigour and challenge provided by CDU. This programme has a focus on Recruitment &amp; Retention; Pay &amp; Benefits for employees; Learning &amp; Development Curriculum; Staff Engagement Survey; Policy content review to simplify for users.</li> </ul> | CB | Mandy Pullen     | 3 | 4 | 12 | 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  | ↓ |

|  |   |   |   |    |  |    |                |   |   |    |  |                         |   |
|--|---|---|---|----|--|----|----------------|---|---|----|--|-------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Failure to manage and collect outstanding debt</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At present debt levels stand at £16.2m (£6.9 of this not overdue) for sundry debt, £17.7m for Council tax and £4.7m for NNDR, and £4.1m for HBOP coming to a total of £50.8m.</li> <li>ASC Client debt creeping up.</li> <li>Housing Rent Deposit Scheme (RDS)- policy/framework and recovery issue</li> <li>specific cases</li> <li>NHS debt reaching over £6m collectively (including ICB the old CCG account and other NHS organisations), with historic resolved issues not being acted on by the CCG.</li> <li>The financial impact of this if it continues to increase impacts our balance sheet health, our cashflow and if not managed will result in income loss, additional costs, such as legal expenses and will be a distraction and drain on officer time to resolve.</li> </ul> | 5 | 4 | 20 | <p>A debt oversight group has now been established to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure debt is managed well and performance is reported at all levels- from Budget Manager to Cabinet. - raising the visibility of this.</li> <li>Training/guidance for budget managers</li> <li>Revised debt processes, policies, and strategies to suit each type of debt (eg, NHS, ASC client, NNDR, Council Tax Sundry)</li> <li>Issues are identified and tackled at a much earlier stage via this group.</li> <li>Single View of Debt is being developed</li> <li>strategy for NHS debt being worked on with CCC to tackle the historic issue and the CHC funding arrangements and process issues.</li> </ul>  | CB | Emma Riding    | 4 | 4 | 16 | <p>The risk here could be low to moderate. Low if it was a one off incident of poor debt collection, but moderate if there was a wider negative perception of our ability to collect debt owing</p>                        | Band 5 £3 - £5 Million  | ↓ |
| <p><b>The Councils ability to deliver City Regeneration</b></p>  | <p>Failure to deliver key growth and regeneration schemes, particularly those that are grant funded, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peterborough Station Quarter</li> <li>Towns Fund</li> <li>UK Shared Prosperity Fund</li> <li>North Westgate</li> <li>Other development sites set out in the growth prospectus.</li> </ul>   | 5 | 5 | 25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment to all posts across the Growth and Regeneration service directorate is partly underway and partly being reviewed.</li> <li>New Service Director for Growth and Regeneration now in post.</li> <li>Maintenance of effective cross-council management and delivery arrangements, reducing hand-offs</li> <li>Robust governance via the internal Growth and Regeneration Programme Board, reporting into the Economy and Inclusive Growth Portfolio Board</li> <li>Detailed project and programme management via working groups specific to each scheme</li> <li>Maintenance of excellent working relationships with funders (e.g. MHCLG and DfT), as well as with key partners (e.g. LNER, Network Rail, Homes England)</li> <li>Extensive collaboration with the Combined Authority, and proactive engagement with their governance arrangements.</li> </ul> | AC | Ingrid Hooley  | 4 | 4 | 16 | <p>Extremely high if the council is unable to deliver on its funded projects and programmes or to engage effectively with investors and developers to bring growth and regeneration forward.</p>                           | Band 8 over £20 Million | ↓ |
| <p><b>We fail to evidence we meet our statutory responsibilities which impacts delivery and quality of outcomes and interventions.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative outcomes from Assurance Inspection.</li> <li>Improvements not made in a timely manner.</li> <li>Ability to prepare for assurance (inspection) adversely impacted through resource constraints.</li> <li>Adverse impact on reputation of Adult Social Care and the council.</li> </ul>   | 4 | 4 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competent Leadership</li> <li>Good preparation through completion of Self Assessment and Improvement Plan, through monthly CQC assurance meetings.</li> <li>Information sharing /CLT/members/Partners</li> <li>Early notification of Assurance (Inspection)</li> <li>Ownership of Key Themes/quality Statements by key officers</li> <li>Ensuring staff are knowledgeable and equipped to meet with Inspectors</li> <li>Robust evidence bank mapped to the CQC information requirements with allocated senior management leads for each quality standard.</li> </ul>  | ST | Debbie McQuade | 4 | 4 | 16 | <p>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.</p> | Band 4 £1 - £3 Million  | ↔ |

This page is intentionally left blank