

**Strategic Risk Register
September 2011**



Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR15 - Welfare Reform Proposed radical changes to benefits, including possibility of localised council tax benefits and introduction of a universal credit system, <i>leading to</i> possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased IT cost due to required system changes; implementation costs not fully reimbursed by Government grant; increased workload for Benefits and Homelessness teams, <p><i>resulting in</i> potential for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adverse effect on service provision due to the number of changes; increased dissatisfaction with the service due to reduced amounts of benefit payable; impact on Medium Term Financial Strategy; devastating effect on people with mental health problems; and dislocation of private sector housing market. <p>Aims: A iii, A iv, A v</p>	Alex Colyer		20	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 5. [Note: These scores have been assessed on the basis of the scale and perceived impact of the announced changes, and the timescale to implement them (although it appears there may be some changes to this) - when more information and clarity is available, the scores will be reassessed and targets set.]</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Discretionary Housing Payments policy completed and approved. Benefits and Housing Advice & Homelessness teams to provide initial training. Signpost residents who are in difficulty, advice / counselling / financial help / medical assistance etc. Consideration of possible criteria for own council tax benefit scheme. Respond to council tax benefit consultation (by October 2011). Consideration at a strategic level of possible implications on social housing allocations. Consultations with professional bodies, peer authorities and software suppliers. [More control measures / sources of assurance will be identified and put in place as further details of the changes are confirmed.]</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Bill now expected to progress through the House of Commons by the end of 2011. Government to publish plan in Autumn 2011, setting out scale and pace of transition for existing Housing Benefit customers to the new Universal Credit.</p>
<p>STR05 - Lack of Development Progress While there is good progress on the Cambridge fringe sites and at Cambourne, and work beginning on a refreshed planning application for Northstowe despite uncertainty about improvements to the A14, there is little likelihood of progress at Cambridge East in the immediate future, <i>leading to</i> the authority being unable to deliver its housing needs, <i>resulting in</i> the Council having to meet the shortfall in the short term from developments in existing villages and head off speculative major planning applications outside the strategy.</p> <p>Aims: C.i., C.ii.2., E.iii., E.iv.</p>	Jo Mills	10	16	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 4.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: A14 - Task Group due to be set up with Department for Transport. County has commissioned short-term study to identify ways of creating headroom to assist NW Cambridge or Northstowe developments. Deliverability/Viability work commenced with Northstowe joint promoters. Masterplan workshop held with joint promoters and their consultants, followed by session with local members at Parish Forum. Planning Policy produce an Annual Monitoring Report (forecasts housebuilding levels), annually review the Local Development Scheme (can address any shortfall) and have started a new Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Timetable for new Local Development Scheme has been agreed by New Communities Portfolio Holder (PFH) in March 2011 with new plan in place in 2014.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR14 - Implementation of National Job Evaluation Scheme (a) The Council and trade unions are not able to form a collective agreement for the implementation of a revised job evaluation scheme, <i>leading to</i> worsening industrial relations and equal pay challenges and poor publicity, <i>resulting in</i> public dissatisfaction with the Council's services.</p> <p>(b) Employee anxiety about Job Evaluation, <i>leading to</i> significant staff absence or reduced productivity, <i>resulting in</i> inability to provide full services.</p> <p>Aims: All</p>	Alex Colyer	10	16	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 4.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Exchange of information and discussions through the Job Evaluation (JE) Steering Group. Employment of specialist staff to manage the process. Implementation of an effective and timely communications plan. JE Steering Group met on 19 May 2011 and is continuing to work with the trade unions. All exchange of information etc has now been done and conclusions will be fed back to the JE Steering Group meeting on 29 September 2011.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Aim to gain agreement by September 2011.</p>
<p>STR12 - Supported Housing Reduction in Supporting People (SP) funding, <i>leading to</i> loss of staff and changes to delivery structure, <i>resulting in</i> dissatisfaction amongst residents and concerns over well being of vulnerable people</p> <p>Aims: A, C</p>	Stephen Hills	10	15	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 5.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Needs assessment of all tenants + Member task & finish group to identify best ways to meet tenants' needs.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Critical funding decisions to emerge during 2012. Possible need to competitively bid to provide the sheltered housing service, in time for April 2012.</p>
<p>STR03 - Illegal Traveller encampments or developments Failure to find required number of sites, or sites identified do not meet the needs of local Travellers, <i>leading to</i> illegal encampments or developments in the District, <i>resulting in</i> community tensions; cost and workload of enforcement action, including provision of alternative sites and/or housing; poor public perception and damage to reputation.</p> <p>Aims: E.i., C.iv.3.</p>	Jo Mills	10	12	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: The draft Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (G&T DPD) has been out for public consultation. Ongoing routine monitoring of all District development. Draft Government guidance issued, County needs assessment due to be completed in September 2011.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: G&T DPD timescale approved by New Communities PFH in March 2011, and due to be completed late 2013.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR08 - Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Risks concerning the financial projections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not achieving delivery of savings to meet targets; pay and inflation exceed assumptions; interest rates do not meet forecasts; employer's pension contributions increases exceed projections; impact of successful equal pay claims exceeds available reserves; changes in demand for some service areas could lead to pressures in the related budgets; unforeseen restructuring costs; local government resource review - localisation of business rates; major developments do not meet housing trajectory forecast; uncertainty re new homes bonus and formula grant from 2013/14; cost of supporting development and meeting demand from growth; impact of welfare reform (and see STR15 above); costs associated with the economic downturn; HRA self-financing post reform; availability of budget for Cabinet priorities; council tax strategy, <p><i>leading to the Council needing to take action to cut its budgets, resulting in cuts in services, public dissatisfaction, audit and inspection criticism.</i></p> <p>Aims: A.v.</p>	Alex Colyer	10	12	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Revised MTFS incorporates updated assumptions. Implement plans to deliver Council's programme in line with latest General Fund (GF) / Housing Revenue Account (HRA) savings targets. Executive Management Team (EMT) / Senior Management Team (SMT) review progress in achieving budget targets. Explore shared service opportunities. Treasury management reports to Finance & Staffing PFH. Monitor pay and inflation factors, pay and grading review, effect of current economic climate on demand led services and budgets. Integrated business monitoring process. Updated MTFS Forecast agreed at Council in February 2011.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Next integrated business monitoring report. MTFS update in September 2011.</p>
<p>STR16 – Depot size Failure to secure permanent alternative depot arrangements, <i>leading to</i> adverse health & safety implications, loss of operating licence, <i>resulting in</i> inability to provide full service, possible staff death or injury, service failure/disruption, legal action, reputational damage.</p> <p>Aims: A v, C ii, C iii, C iv</p>	Mike Hill	10	12	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Temporary alternative arrangements in place. Permanent arrangements identified; planning consent granted March 2011. SMT supported move and lease of 25 yrs on 4 May 2011; approved by Environmental Services PFH in May 2011. Implementation and additional costs included in 2011/12 budget. Discussions with landlord regarding lease "Heads of Terms" for permanent facilities. Project Initiation Document approved by EMT in August 2011.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: A project plan is currently being prepared to implement the move.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR17 – Major projects' impact on small teams The volume, scope and nature of public enquiries and/or requests for information regarding major projects requires greater capacity than is available in small teams which are directly or indirectly affected, <i>leading to</i> (a) inability either to provide a response or one in as much detail as desired; (b) inability to deliver key projects within agreed timescales and budget and/or diminished service delivery, <i>resulting in</i> (a) failure to provide adequate service to our customers and consequent customer dissatisfaction and reputational damage; (b) detrimental impact on other services in terms of performance and morale.</p> <p>Aims: All</p>	Paul Howes	10	12	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 4.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Effective service plans identifying (where possible) forthcoming major projects and realistic plans to deliver them. Effective contingency plans to enable the Council to deal with major issues or projects which could not be anticipated. Effective communications strategies for each major project (joint with other partners/agencies, where appropriate). Regular internal briefings. Publish relevant SCDC and other partner/agency information etc on website. Involvement of communications team as necessary. Update reports to relevant portfolio holder at every PFH meeting. Participation by other partners/agencies in supporting SCDC communications. Review of MTFS.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Dependent on the timeframe/milestones for each major project.</p>
<p>STR13 - Potential risk once HRA reform is implemented. Council fails to prepare for taking on £200M debt, <i>leading to</i> significant shortfall in funds or mismanagement of finances, <i>resulting in</i> potential of regulatory intervention.</p> <p>Aims: A, C</p>	Stephen Hills	8	10	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 5; LIKELIHOOD: 2.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Standard budget setting and financial controls. Project team set up to manage implementation process. Consultancy support procured (stock condition survey and draft business plan). Joint project team meeting with Cambridge City Council's project team; possible opportunities to rationalise common pieces of work, make best use of resources and information.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Outcome of initial consultation published February 2011, providing route map for implementation. More Government announcements expected over Autumn 2011. Anticipate new regime from April 2012.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR02 – Equalities The Council is successfully challenged over not complying with general equalities legislation or legislation specific to public and local authority bodies, <i>leading to</i> possible Commission for Human Rights and Equalities inspection, <i>resulting in</i> reduction in reserves available to support balanced MTFs, adverse publicity and effect on reputation.</p> <p>Aims: A.ii.3., B.iv.6., C.iv.3.</p>	Paul Howes	10	10	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 5; LIKELIHOOD: 2.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: 'Achieving' level of the Equality Framework for Local Government and the legal requirements of the new Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). However, the PSED is on hold, awaiting government changes designed to reduce the burden on LA's.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Cllr Howell agreed on 19 January 2011 to endorse a new Single Equality Scheme (SES) for consultation in response to the new Equality Act 2010. Consultation on this new SES finished on 24 June 2011. Where appropriate, the results of this consultation are being incorporated into the new scheme together with the changing government requirements. The final draft SES will be reported to a future portfolio holder meeting.</p>
<p>STR04 - Climate change 1. The Council fails to develop measures to safeguard its services against climate change, <i>leading to</i> unacceptable vulnerability to the impact of climate shifts and other weather-related events, <i>resulting in</i> a degradation or breakdown of service delivery and damage to property, increasing costs and impact on the Council's reputation.</p> <p>Aims: C.vii.</p> <p>2. The Council fails to achieve 10% reductions in the emission of CO₂ from its operations, <i>leading to</i> continued level of emissions, <i>resulting in</i> loss of reputation, reduced ability to require developers and businesses to reduce CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>Aims: 5</p>	Jo Mills	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: The Sustainability, Planning and Climate Change PFH approved the content of the draft Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2011-2013 on 9 September 2011 and recommended it for adoption at the next meeting of the Council on 22 September 2011.</p> <p>Specific actions in place within CCAP and New Communities Service Plan. New co-ordination body (Internal Sustainability Delivery Group - ISDG) assisting with implementation and monitoring. Regular EMT reporting and quarterly performance reports to PFH meetings.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Adoption of CCAP 2011-2013 by Council - 22 September 2011 CCAP actions undertaken over the period 2011 to 2013</p>
<p>STR20 – Partnership working with Cambridgeshire County Council The failure of partnership arrangements (e.g. health & wellbeing, economic development, transport) with the County Council, <i>leading to</i> the needs of district residents and businesses not being adequately met or reflected in County Council resource allocation decisions, <i>resulting in</i> adverse effects on the district's residents and businesses.</p> <p>Aims: All</p>	Paul Howes	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Active engagement of officers and Members in Cambridgeshire Leaders Meeting, Public Services Board, Local Enterprise Partnership, Community Wellbeing Partnership and Childrens Trust, to ensure the district's residents' and businesses' needs are articulated.</p> <p>The recent establishment of an officer liaison group which meets 6-monthly involving County Council and other significant partners to promote joint working to improve outcomes for local residents and businesses.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Dependent on the timeframe/milestones for each partnership.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR19 - Demands on services from an ageing population The district's demography changes, with significant growth in the over 65 year old population, <i>leading to</i> additional demands on health and social care services, including to the Council's sheltered housing and benefits services, <i>resulting in</i> adverse impact on service standards; increased customer dissatisfaction with services; increased levels of social isolation.</p> <p>Aims: A, C</p>	Steve Hampson	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Establishment of 'Ageing Well' workshops to build relations with statutory and voluntary partner agencies, and promote community based preventative measures (one held on 1st July 2011 – a multi-agency group is meeting in September 2011 to develop workstreams arising out of the workshop). Planning policy framework revision. Housing for older people Task & Finish review. Take account of demographic change in the MTFs. Incorporate age issues in Council Actions. Redesign services to address demands.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Multi agency group meeting in September 2011; actions will develop further over time as the effects of demographic change become clearer.</p>
<p>STR18 – South Cambs Hall, photovoltaic installation 1. The installation is not completed by 31 March 2012, <i>leading to</i> Feed in Tariff of less than 32.9p/kWh, <i>resulting in</i> impact on revenue and capital budgets, comparative feasibility of project and reputation.</p> <p>2. The Government reduces the Feed in Tariff during installation, <i>leading to</i> impact on revenue and capital budgets (as above), <i>resulting in</i> reduced comparative feasibility of project.</p> <p>Aims: E2</p>	Stephen Hills	6	6	<p>SCORES 1. IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 2. 2. IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 1.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Tight project management controls - a detailed Gantt chart has already been produced which identifies the key elements of the project.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: As per Gantt chart; project has to be completed by 31 March 2012.</p>
<p>STR21 – Keeping up with technology development The authority fails to maintain an awareness of technology opportunities and does not implement appropriate technology enhancements, <i>leading to</i> IT and communications systems not having capability / capacity to meet emerging standards and unable to deal with service requirements and improvements and deliver efficiencies, <i>resulting in</i> diminished standard of service, customer dissatisfaction, tarnished reputation and uncontrolled costs.</p> <p>Aims: All but especially A</p>	Alex Colyer	4	4	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 2; LIKELIHOOD: 2.</p> <p>ICT Strategy, ICT Security Policy and Usage Guidelines ICT IG Steering Group, Information Governance Working Group, IT Liaison Officers Group and the Website Officers Working Group. Assessment of service area needs in conjunction with the annual budget planning and Service Planning process. Externally – The exchange of information, ideas and opportunities via county wide and national user groups including the County and Districts ICT Group, Cambridgeshire Public Sector Network Partnership Board, Information Management Technology Partnership Board and ICT Shared Services Group. Membership of the Society of IT Managers (SocITM).</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: ICT Strategy and Policies are refreshed annually, next update due April 2012. Regular monthly or bi-monthly engagement with officers and public sector partners. Dependent on the timeframe/milestones for each major project.</p>

Notes

1. The "Reference" is unique and retained by the risk throughout the period of its inclusion in the risk register.
2. Criteria and guidelines for assessing "Impact" and "Likelihood" are shown below.
2. The "Actual" risk score is obtained by multiplying the Impact score by the Likelihood score.
3. The dotted line (-----) shows the Council's risk tolerance line.
4. The "Timescale to progress" is the date by which it is planned that the risk will be mitigated to below the line.

Aims

- Risks are cross referenced to the relevant:
- (a) Aims, Approaches and/or Actions adopted by Council on 27 November 2008 with effect from 1 April 2009 (e.g. A. v., or E. ii. 2, etc);
 - (b) 12 Council Actions for 2010/11 approved by Council on 26 November 2009;
 - (c) 17 Corporate Actions for 2011/12 approved by Council on 24 February 2011.

Impact *Giving rise to one or more of the following:*

	<i>Service disruption</i>	<i>People</i>	<i>Financial loss *</i>	<i>Environment</i>	<i>Statutory service/legal obligations</i>	<i>Management</i>	<i>Reputation</i>	<i>Score</i>
Extreme	Serious disruption to services (loss of services for more than 7 days)	Loss of life	Financial loss over £500k	Major regional / national environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central government intervention; or • Multiple civil or criminal suits 	Could lead to resignation of Leader or Chief Executive	Extensive adverse coverage in national press and/or television	5
High	Major disruption to services (loss of services for up to 7 days)	Extensive multiple injuries	Financial loss between £251k - £500k	Major local environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong regulatory sanctions; or • Litigation 	Could lead to resignation of Member or Executive Director	Adverse coverage in national press and/or television	4
Medium	Noticeable disruption to services (loss of services for up to 48 hours)	Serious injury (medical treatment required)	Financial loss between £51k - £250k	Moderate environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory sanctions, interventions, public interest reports; or • Litigation 	Disciplinary / capability procedures invoked	Extensive adverse front page local press coverage	3
Low	Some disruption to internal services; no impact on customers	Minor injury (first aid)	Financial loss of between £6k - £50k	Minor environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor regulatory consequences; or • Litigation 	Formal HR procedure invoked	Some local press coverage; or, adverse internal comment	2
Insignificant	Insignificant disruption to internal services; no impact on customers	No injuries	Financial loss of up to £5k	Insignificant environmental damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No regulatory consequences; or • Litigation 	Informal HR procedure invoked	No reputational damage	1

* including claim or fine

Likelihood

	<i>Guidelines</i>	<i>Score</i>
Almost certain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is expected to occur in most circumstances (more than 90%), or • More than 90% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	5
Likely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will probably occur at some time, or in some circumstances (66% - 90%), or • 66% to 90% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	4
Possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairly likely to occur at some time, or in some circumstances (36% - 65%), or • 36% to 65% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	3
Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is unlikely to occur, but could, at some time (11% - 35%), or • 11% to 35% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	2
Rare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May only occur in exceptional circumstances (up to 10%), or • Up to 10% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	1