# Strategic Risk Register

							Current	Previous		Reasons for					Review
Ref	Risk name of risk		arising		L Likelih ood 1 (L) - 5 (H)	I Impact 1 (L) - 5 (Н)	Score	Initial Score if new risk, score on assumption no controls are in place	Direction	change change in impact, likelihood, objective etc(ALT return to use bullet points etc)	Current Controls to measure success of controls. What is already in place to mitigate risk. (ALT return to use bullet points etc)	Actions further actions required to mitigate risk or maximise opportunity. (ALT Return to use bullet points etc)		When target date	Date all registers reviewed at least 3 monthly unless specified
	Failure to plan for/realise implications of	The city is seeking to continue with growth, however development viability and land prices make contributions to vital infrastructure e.g. roads and schools very difficult. There is a need to maintain focus on expansion and growth to ensure infrastructure has capacity to cope.	Inability to fulfil statutory obligations e.g. provision of roads and schools. Budget	CAD	2	3	e	6	◆		Robust viability discussions with developers. Focused Section 106 team.	Plan and manage potential opportunities for government funding	PP/BT/JR/ Leader		Aug-11
	Environment	A number of schemes within the Environment Capital area around transport, renewable energy, carbon emissions etc that require considerable funding to make any significant change.	Inability to fund leading to threat to the aspirations.	AC	3	2	e	6	◆		Stream of government funding e.g. Sustainable Travel and European funding schemes.	Possible creation of energy company producing energy from solar and wind sources	РР	Ongoing	Aug-11
	Impact of social demographic	Finite resources and increased demand on services as a result of ageing population, migration and	Impacts on market capacity, burden on social care homes and funding issues. Pressure on school admissions and school funding emergency from MENA.	в	4	4	16	) 12	•	Increased impact	Ongoing monitoring and review. Financial impact evaluation. Annual review informed by needs assessments.	Keep under review	SMT	Ongoing	Jun-11
	manslaughter/	serious injury (that could have	Impact on individuals concerned, potential for financial loss, litigation etc.	В	2	4	8	8 8	<b>↓</b>		Robust arrangements and training in place.	Keep under review. Because training is not yet widely available the risk factor (current score) does not reflect the current status. More resources are therefore required to ensure compliance; i.e. managers funding essential training courses externally until the e-learning package is sufficiently developed.	All	Ongoing	Aug-11
5	Homelessness	Increase of accepted homelessness presentations as a result of legislative and housing	Inability to meet demand for social/privately rented housing; increase in rough sleeping; significant increase in temporary	В	3	5	15		•		Review and transformation of Housing Services to ensure appropriate controls are in place; working closely with Registered Social Landlords s to assess and prepare for impacts of changes.	Complete review of Housing Options and launch new systems	Adrian Chapman	Apr-1	

A: Environment Capital B: Substantial Growth C: Strong Communities D: Opportunities Inequalities

## Date: March 2010

# Strategic Risk Register

Ref	Risk	Description	Consequences	Priority	L	I	Current Score	Previous /Initial Score	Direction	Reasons for change	Current Controls	Actions	Who	When	Review Date
		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.	в	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-11	I Aug-11
7	Safeguarding	Failure of whole safeguarding system to prevent a child or vulnerable adult's death or serious injury (that could have been prevented).	Very high impact for individuals concerned and on the reputation of PCC and relevant partners.	c	3	5	15	5 15	<▶		<ol> <li>Maintain effective workforce. 2) Implementation of quality assurance processes. 3) Continuous development of procedures and policy. 4) Routine performance management. 5) Developing safeguarding strategy.</li> <li>Ongoing audits established.</li> </ol>	1) Implement post-inspection action plan. 2) 6-month review with DfE undertaken with positive response received. 3) Strategic review of safeguarding structure in conjunction with the PSCB underway.		Ongoing	Jun-11
8		Failure to provide a suitable school estate for the future needs of the city and to improve performance in educational attainment.	most vulnerable children,	В	2	5	10	10	<b>4</b> ▶		<ol> <li>Ormiston Bushfield project secured and contracts signed 2)</li> <li>Orton Longueville School has been given Ministerial approval in principle to become an Academy in 2011 through its partnership with Swavesey Village College. 3)</li> <li>Demographic forecasts analysed and appropriate action taken where necessary. 4) Regular reviews undertaken to ensure maximum places are taken in schools where all building works are undertaken.</li> <li>Robust Section 106 discussion on all building land to ensure developer contribution can be invested into new places.</li> </ol>	1) Keep under review. 2) Local and national lobbying 3) Develop alternative strategies for the rebuilding or Orton Longueville and Stanground schools. 4) Hereward CC due to reopen September 2013 to deal with pressures on secondary places. 5) Building programme being developed to create an additional 8000 places over the city in the next 5 years. 6) Understand implications of the Sebastian James review of capital investment in schools.		Ongoing	Aug-11
	Governance arrangements for	Partnerships are playing an increasing role in delivering outcomes. Whilst there are strong governance arrangements in place for internal work, there is less formality in governance for partnership working. The risk is that governance arrangements will not be strong enough to ensure that outcomes are delivered in a way that is appropriate and legally compliant for the council.		DBC	4	4	16	12		Higher impact as more reliance on partnerships.	Risk assessment of key partnerships and governance arrangements. Partnership workshops run for CMT and HoS LAA targets established and ratified by GOEast Training undertaken	Baseline assessment of all partnerships. Establish clear checklist. Increase contact between Monitoring Officer and Governance Team, with key partnerships to encourage communication at an appropriate level	НЕ	Ongoing	Jun-11

- A: Environment Capital B: Substantial Growth C: Strong Communities D: Opportunities Inequalities

# Strategic Risk Register

Ref	Risk	Description	Consequences	Priority	L	I	Current Score	Previous /Initial Score	Direction	Reasons for change	Current Controls	Actions	Who	When	Review Date
	Scrutiny and Engagement	Scrutiny and Engagement processes need to be kept under review and refined where necessary to ensure effective scrutiny of executive decision making		DBC	4	4	16	6	•	Increased likelihood and impact.		Review of governance team will strengthen support from officers. Scrutiny & engagement process is being reviewed by legal team. After May elections training and other work will be done with scrutiny chairs to ensure they understand their role.	HE		Jun-11
11		year MTFS outlines balanced budget for 3 years, but deficits in	Council cannot overspend, so savings will have to be found elsewhere in the councils budget	ABCD	2	5	10	12		Main risk now is double dip	of plans being monitored by CMT in advance of the financial year.	Refresh of MTFS will have specific focus on planning for years 4-5 and		Ongoing monthly monitoring MTFS refresh to follow Autumn cycle as per constitution	Aug-11

A: Environment Capital B: Substantial Growth C: Strong Communities D: Opportunities Inequalities

#### 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

## **Review 12 month Review 6 months Review 3 months**

## **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?

#### 

	npact Descriptors:							
1: Negligible		Little likelihood of risk occurring except in exceptional circumstances						
	Service Interruption	None noticeable Insignificant slippage						
	Objectives/Projects							
	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						
1: 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						