

Appendix D
Strategic Risk Register
February 2017 – Draft



Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR25 - Increase in cost of managing homelessness (January 2013) Potential impacts of combined welfare benefit changes, <i>leading to</i> an increase in the number of homelessness acceptances, <i>resulting in</i> significant increase in costs to the Council to meet its statutory obligations.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: B ii, B v, B vi</p>	<p>Cllr Lynda Harford Stephen Hills</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>25</p>	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 5; LIKELIHOOD: 5</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Close working partnership with King Street Housing who provide private sector leasing options has been very effective to date. Use of Rent Deposit Scheme has also been effective until recently alongside Empty Homes Initiative, other homelessness prevention measures and a New Build Programme. Council prepares detailed analysis of the potential impacts of any welfare changes on the homelessness in advance of the changes taking place, this allows planning for and mitigation of the impact</p> <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> King St are not taking on any more PSL landlords and are shifting the current portfolio to market rents above LHA level. The 1% HRA rent cut has reduced our new build programme; New affordable housing coming through the system from RPs will slow down and Starter Homes are unusable for our homeless cases; The rent deposit scheme is essentially redundant as PRS rents are so high compared with the LHA rate; Forced council house sales will reduce our stock further – possibly 40% of all relets each year; The proposed introduction of LHA rate for supported housing risks the closure of our newly built hostel (it would revert to general needs tenancies). <p>The Council is left with a stretched DHP and the ability to use our new relets only for homeless households but this will impact on our ability to house others from the housing register, which in turn may have an impact on some of our preventative work. A review of temporary accommodation portfolio now underway to rationalise the supply held The Council has also approved a project to try and secure PSL properties through a Council led offer managed by Shire Homes. Shire Homes are currently the key partner in the drive to prevent homelessness.</p> <p>The authority needs to prepare for a possible increase in homeless applications with the potential risk of paying out £500k to £1m in Temporary Accommodation / B&B costs.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: The mitigation work will be closely monitored throughout the year. The success of the new PSL project will be known within 6 months.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR05 - Lack of land supply (June 2007) Delays in adoption of the local plan and delivery from Northstowe and the Cambridge fringe sites has led to slow down in rate of progress against trajectory, <i>leading to</i> the authority being unable to demonstrate adequate housing land supply, <i>resulting in</i> the Council receiving speculative applications and appeals not consistent with the submitted Local Plan.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: B i, B iii</p>	<p>Cllr Robert Turner</p> <p>Stephen Kelly</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 5</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Local Plan when adopted will provide a five-year supply. Risk is the period before the Local Plan is adopted and then to ensure delivery remains on track to avoid falling back into a lack of five-year supply. Public examination hearings started November 2014. Memorandum of Understanding on Five Year Land Supply agreed with Cambridge City Council on 9 September 2014 that there be a joint housing trajectory across Greater Cambridge that reflects the phasing of housing delivery, particularly on the fringe sites. Being considered through the Local Plan examination. Inspector has advised that unlikely to be able to give early view as linked to overall development strategy, but will keep it under review. A review is being undertaken to consider ways to minimise the risk of the shortfall widening through slippage of the housing trajectory and potential to reduce the shortfall by improving delivery of suitable schemes. Planning Policy produce an Annual Monitoring Report (forecasts housebuilding levels). An update note on the 5-year supply position is prepared monthly to monitor the situation, including identifying outstanding appeals and applications that could add to housing supply if approved. The A14 improvements under way for completion. Progress being made on Northstowe Phase 1 – first phase under construction - reserved matters housing applications – risk that delivery in line with trajectory may not be achieved. Committee resolved to grant Northstowe Phase 2 Planning Application approval in July 2015. Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee resolved to grant Wing (land north of Newmarket Road, Cambridge) planning permission in April 2016. S106 close to completion. Permission to be issued October 2016. Planning Committee resolved to grant Outline permission for Cambourne West development. Discussions commenced on means of provide an appropriate planning framework for Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield new settlements to inform subsequent planning applications. Construction of Cambourne 950 underway. Management of major applications benefits from Site Delivery Fund award of £50,000 over two years.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Local Plan Hearings commenced on 4 November 2014. Examination hearings recommenced in June 2016 after additional work to address inspectors' letter. Next part of programme published summer 2016 with remainder of programme still awaited. Adoption anticipated around the end of 2017. Review of approach to addressing 5-year supply in hand, to be completed by autumn 2016. Northstowe Phase 2 planning permission was due to be issued by December 2015, but will now be Autumn 2016.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR28 – Recruitment & Retention (September 2015) Reduced staffing capacity due to difficulties in recruitment and retention, especially in some professions, <i>leading to</i> loss of resources / experience / expertise in key services, increased workload and pressure on remaining staff to deliver services, increased sickness absence and stress, increased costs (including of repeat recruitment) and additional cost of using the agency staff; <i>resulting in</i> lack of capacity to meet service delivery needs, loss of effectiveness/productivity, disruption to, or lower quality of, services provided, either internally or to the public, failure to comply with statutory processes or meet statutory deadlines; damage to the Council's reputation; legal challenge.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: All</p>	<p>Cllr Simon Edwards</p> <p>Susan Gardner Craig</p>	9	20	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 5.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Variety of actions in place, appropriate to service areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal development opportunities • Funded professional development & qualifications • Secondments, both internally and with partnering authorities • Shared services with partnering authorities • Market supplements on a fixed term basis • Use of temporary workers • Changes to recruitment approaches, new jobs page on website, use of different media • Keep under review marketplace pay levels using e-paycheck and other means • Increase in the number of apprenticeships on offer • Developing a career progression scheme • Offering trainee LGV Driver places <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Ongoing: Additional actions being considered in some service areas.</p>
<p>STR15 - Welfare Reform (December 2010) Radical changes to benefits, including localised council tax support scheme 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>Objectives, Actions: B i, B ii, B v, B vi</p> <p>Relevant PI(s): FS 112 – Days to process new HB and CTS claims FS 113 – Days to process HB and CTS change events</p>	<p>Cllr Simon Edwards</p> <p>Susan Gardner Craig</p>	10	16	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 4.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Scoping work currently being undertaken by the Benefits Manager to assess the impact of the latest changes to welfare announced as part of the Summer 2015 budget. Amended Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) policy for July 2015 Finance and Staff Portfolio Holder meeting. Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) have confirmed increased DHP budget for 2016/17 following the announcement of the reduction in the level of the Benefit Cap (£20k). Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) scoping being undertaken to work out impact of changes to Tax Credits in 2016, tax threshold changes and Living Wage on the level of estimated level of LCTS for 2016/17. Scoping complete; suggests impact of Tax Credit changes will not currently affect the financial viability of the scheme as current spend is less than estimate. LCTS workshop took place in July 2016, report for portfolio in August 2016 for the year 2017/18. Monthly ongoing monitoring of current LCTS scheme to assess current expenditure. Monitoring of roll out of Universal Credit (UC) to ensure lessons learnt are implemented at SCDC. Information currently available indicates the rollout of UC will be a slow process during this current parliament with all new working age claims processing not available until 2020-21. Regular meetings with colleagues in housing advice and housing to assess impact of pay to stay proposals as well as the introduction of the £20k cap for those on out of work benefits.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR24 - HRA Business Plan (March 2012) The HRA Business Plan has its own associated risk register.</p> <p>The score of the risk in this Strategic Risk Register is a composite score from the HRA Business Plan risk register, and reflects changes announced in the Government's July 2015 Budget on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1% rent reduction for 4 years, • loss of relets to fund the extension of the RTB scheme to Registered Providers, • tenants earning over £30k required to pay market rents. • Sale of estimated 50% of voids to fund extension of RTB to RPs <p>Objectives, Actions: B i, B ii, B v, B vi</p>	<p>Cllr Lynda Harford</p> <p>Stephen Hills</p>	8	16	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 4</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Capacity had been built into the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) business plan to absorb some future changes if they were required; however, the 1% rent cut announced in the Government's July 2015 Budget is the same as reopening the debt settlement - it takes £134m out of the HRA Business Plan and has a significant impact on the Council's build programme.</p> <p>The potential loss of properties through 'high value sales' further weakens the HRA Business Plan and creates further pressure on Risk STR25.</p> <p>Monitor Government policy including utilising our partnership arrangements with the Chartered Institute of Housing and respond to formal consultations.</p> <p>Detailed review of HRA business plan part of 2016 Service Plan.</p> <p>Potential to negotiate with Government for retention of high value sales receipts to fund a replacement programme.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Revised HRA Business Plan for approval February 2017.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR08 - Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) (June 2007)</p> <p>Risks concerning the financial projections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not achieving delivery of additional income / savings to meet targets, including from Business Improvement & Efficiency and Commercialisation Programmes projects (and see STR26), shared services initiatives and the housing company; inflation exceeds assumptions; interest rates do not meet forecasts; employer's pension contributions increases exceed projections; changes in demand for some service areas could lead to pressures in the related budgets, especially Housing; unforeseen restructuring costs; retained business rates scheme – volatility of outstanding valuation appeals, made worse by the 2017 revaluation; retained business rates scheme does not meet forecast; retained business rates scheme tariff adjustments continue from 2020/21; Business rates revaluation at April 2017 is not fiscally neutral for the Council; Changes in the business rates retention scheme to effect 100% retention are detrimental to the Council; Uncertainties following the June 2016 referendum vote to leave EU, particularly unpredictable volatility in economic factors, e.g. inflation, interest rates, employment, business confidence, etc. impact assumptions underlying the MTFS; major developments do not meet housing trajectory forecast; cost of supporting development and meeting demand from growth; impact of welfare reform (and see STR15); availability of budget for Cabinet priorities; council tax strategy (Government change rules); material error or omission in MTFS forecasts; outcome of New Homes Bonus scheme consultation leads to less resources than anticipated; increased uncertainty in budget setting due to commercial activities, exposure to market competition and commodity price trends, leads to reduced income / increased costs above those forecast in MTFS, <p>leading to the Council needing to take action to cut its budgets, resulting in cuts in services, public dissatisfaction, audit and inspection criticism.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: D i, D ii, D iii, D iv, D v</p>	<p>Cllr Simon Edwards</p> <p>Caroline Ryba</p>	10	15	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 5; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Updated MTFS approved by Cabinet in February 2016. Implement plans to deliver Council's programme in line with latest General Fund income and savings targets. Comparisons between MTFS, financial position statements and General Fund, HRA and Capital Programme estimates. Monitor inflation factors, effect of current economic climate on demand led services and budgets. Monthly financial report to Executive Management Team (EMT); EMT reviews progress in achieving budget targets. Treasury management reports to Finance & Staffing PFH. Monitoring of business rates income, collection rates and appeals. Monitoring of council tax base to identify financial implications of growth. Additional income/savings targets built in to Business Improvement & Efficiency and Commercialisation Programmes projects, shared services and other initiatives. Report to Cabinet on shared service principles and business cases in July 2015. Share Service governance process in place. Spending Review / Autumn Statement and provisional Local Government Finance Settlement: implications modelled for February 2016 Cabinet report (2016/17 figures confirmed in February 2016). Submission of an efficiency plan to government, thereby seeking to confirm significant elements of income for the next three years as a control/mitigation. Quarterly reports on commercial projects and market price trends to Cabinet. Use of reserves.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Identify further opportunities for commercial income and assess the risks associated with each commercial project. Separately identify commercial income in the Council's reports and projections.</p> <p>Relevant PI(s): FS 101 - % General Fund Budget variance FS 107 - % Capital variance FS 106 - % HRA variance</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR30 – Devolution Risk - Failure of implementation programme to deliver on scope, time, quality and cost (September 2016)</p> <p>Tight timescales, insufficient time and capacity to get structures in place, changes in the political and economic climate, failure of some or all partners to engage fully and/or of associated governance arrangements, <i>leading to;</i> delays to the receipt of, or complete loss of powers and funding allocated to the Combined Authority under the devolution deal, <i>resulting in:</i> Inability of SCDC to deliver its Corporate Plan, financially unviable services, reputational damage for SCDC, wider loss of credibility for Cambridgeshire authorities, reducing the prospect of successful future devolution deals with government.</p>	<p>Cllr Peter Topping</p> <p>Alex Colyer</p>	8	12	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 3</p> <p>Draft legislation in relation to Devolution was published by the Government in November 2016 and approved by authorities. It was then moved through the Parliament and became a Parliamentary Order.</p> <p>On 18 January 2017 the authorities gave their consent to the draft order of Parliament. Awareness of the timetable and ongoing preparations mitigate the risk of failure to deliver the deal in accordance with the specified milestones.</p> <p>The Shadow authority is in place at this time and is meeting regularly.</p>
<p>STR26 – Business Improvement & Efficiency, Development Control Improvement, Working Smarter and Commercialisation Programmes (November 2013)</p> <p>The Business Improvement Efficiency Programme (BIEP), Development Control Improvement Programme (DCIP), Planning Programme, Affordable Homes Programme, Working Smarter and Commercialisation Programmes have their own associated risk registers.</p> <p>The risks included are summarised as follows (only those scoring 12 and above are reflected in the summary):</p> <p>The Projects on the programmes are not completed in a timely fashion due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inadequate stakeholder engagement, conflicting operational, programme and project priorities, or long term unavailability of relevant and crucial staff, <p><i>leading to</i> inadequate programme and project resources and support, <i>resulting in</i> a delay or failure to deliver the outputs, associated benefits, and required income and savings targets.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: D i, D ii, D iii, D iv, D v</p>	<p>Cllr Nick Wright</p> <p>Phil Bird</p>	9	9	<p>SCORES – IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: The Programme Manager identified programme and project resource requirements before the start of the tranches. The level of resource required is continually monitored by the Programme Manager as projects progress, close and new ones commence. The Senior Responsible Owner is responsible for securing the required resources. Regular 1:1s with Executive Director (Senior Responsible Owner). Monthly Highlight Reports from each Project Manager to the Programme Manager. Monthly Highlight Reports to EMT from the Programme Manager. Regular update meetings with Project Managers & Project Sponsors used to assess required resource levels. A Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and detailed stakeholder analysis has been developed. Stakeholder engagement activities place regularly throughout the programme. Increasing emphasis on Lessons Learned from other projects will help the Sponsoring Group, Programme Manager and Project Managers mitigate this risk. Each project risk register is updated monthly and reviewed with project manager.</p> <p>The following training programmes are in place to support business development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of Commercial skills training Leadership Training <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Throughout 2012-2017.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR20 – Partnership working with Cambridgeshire County Council (September 2011) The failure of partnership arrangements (e.g. health & wellbeing, economic development, transport, City Deal) 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, together with potential reputational impact, <i>resulting in</i> adverse effects on the district's residents and businesses.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: C i, C ii, C iii</p>	<p>Cllr Peter Topping Alex Colyer</p>	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Active engagement of officers and Members in partnerships, to ensure the district's residents' and businesses' needs are articulated. Good relationships with County on: RECAP Waste Partnership (and with National Agencies), Children & Young People's Area Partnership, New Communities Project Board, Older People's Accommodation Strategy.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Progress being monitored via Corporate Plan. Dependent on the timeframe/milestones for each partnership.</p>
<p>STR03 – Illegal Traveller encampments or developments (June 2007) 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>Objectives, Actions: B iii</p>	<p>Cllr Robert Turner Stephen Kelly</p>	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Ongoing routine monitoring of all district development. New Government guidance issued in August 2015, resulting in significant changes to the definition of travellers for the purposes of planning. County wide needs assessment endorsed by PFH in 2012. A new needs assessment has been commissioned, for completion November 2016. Monthly report on position regarding temporary expiries and applications circulated to managers and key Members for coordination and oversight. Gypsy & Traveller planning policies included in draft Local Plan (will require modification to reflect the new government guidance and the outcome of the new Needs Assessment) In 2014 a total of 67 Gypsy and Traveller pitches gained permanent planning permission (three were granted on appeal). In 2015 six pitches have gained permanent planning permission and temporary planning permission for 1 pitch was granted on appeal at Wimpole. In August 2016 an appeal for a lawful development certificate for a site in Willingham was allowed. At August 2016 there are three other pitches (on 2 sites) with temporary planning permission, which expire between 2017 and 2018. There is one pending application at Rampton (to make one existing temporary pitch permanent and add two additional pitches). The Affordable Homes departmental risk register includes delivering HCA funded projects, to ensure the supply of Gypsy & Traveller pitches and sufficient investment in existing pitches.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: New applications – ongoing. Local Plan due for completion 2017. Gypsy & Traveller Area Needs Assessment to be updated, led by Housing Directorate, for completion in Summer 2016.</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR19 – Demands on services from an ageing population (September 2011)</p> <p>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>Objectives, Actions: A I, A ii, A iii, A v, A vi, B i, B ii, C iv</p>	<p>Cllr Mark Howell</p> <p>Mike Hill / Stephen Hills</p>	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Following "Ageing Well" workshops, Cabinet agreed an "Ageing Well" plan in July 2014 following a Joint Portfolio Holder Task & Finish Group. SCDC Housing leading on development of sub-regional Older People's Housing Strategy and refresh of County Older People Strategy. SCDC Housing staff contributing to Cambridgeshire Executive Partnership Board projects including Data Sharing, 7-Day Working, Person-Centre System, and Ageing Healthily & Prevention. Issue and impact discussed by Cabinet / EMT. Successful "Healthy New Towns" funding bid now being implemented to undertake research and project work into future housing needs in new communities, initial focus on Northstowe. NHS England now joined SCDC New Communities Project Board.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Take account of demographic change in the corporate and financial planning cycle. Redesign services to address demands.</p>
<p>STR29 – Access to Primary Care in Growth Areas (May 2016)</p> <p>Failure of health partners to provide increased capacity for primary care and mental health services for new and expanding communities, leading to inability of residents to access quality local health care increasing pressure on existing services, increased public health costs through higher A&E admissions, increased direct costs for SCDC in reacting to the detrimental impacts of ill-health and inability to effectively achieve Corporate Plan Living Well outcomes resulting in reduced quality of life and increased health acute and chronic health conditions for residents in affected communities, reduced capacity by public health agencies to contain viral outbreaks and inability of SCDC to maintain viable service levels.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: Living Well: A(i) - A(vi) Homes for our Future: B(i)</p>	<p>Cllr Mark Howell</p> <p>Mike Hill</p>	9	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Proactive negotiations with developers to ensure adequate health infrastructure provision in new communities within relevant legal agreements; Development Delivery Agreements in place/under negotiation to embed a partnership approach. Ongoing participation in robust county health scrutiny and Local Health Partnership. Delivery of Corporate Plan Living Well objectives around ill-health prevention.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS:</p>

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR27 – Shared Services initiatives with other authorities (November 2014)</p> <p>Shared services initiatives are not completed in a timely fashion due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inadequate stakeholder engagement, • conflicting priorities, • unavailability of key staff, or • Councils not adapting how they work to new arrangements, leading to inadequate resources and support, inefficient practices and unreasonable expectations on shared-staff, resulting in a delay or failure in delivering the outputs, required additional income and savings targets, and associated benefits for the district's residents and businesses, including possible dilution in service levels initially. <p>A further risk is that established partnership delivers worse than before in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outputs; • cost of service; • reputation (in particular among residents); • lack of agreed objectives. <p>Objectives, Actions: D ii, D iii, D iv</p>	<p>Cllr Peter Topping</p> <p>Mike Hill</p>	6	9	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 3; LIKELIHOOD: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Progress to be overseen by a joint steering group including Leaders and relevant portfolio holders.</p> <p>A Joint Committee has been established to oversee the delivery of shared services, to endorse shared business plans, to monitor performance and report through to Cabinet. For SCDC, reports to Cabinet in October 2014 (re ICT, Legal and Waste) November 2014 (re Building Control) and July 2015 (re Building Control, ICT and Legal). Strong programme and project management provided by an overall programme 3C Management Board comprising Directors from each authority, supported by the 3C Programme Manager, individual project boards of lead officers and relevant support services officers from each authority. Prioritisation of projects within workloads. Dedicated external resources obtained for each project, funded from Transformation Challenge Award grant, and additional resources allocated to ensure improved co-ordination and delivery. A dedicated risk register is overseen and monitored by the 3C Management Board and progress will be reported through Corporate Plan monitoring." Updated. Risk Control updated from "Progress to be overseen by a joint steering group including Leaders and relevant portfolio holders. A Joint Committee has been established to oversee the delivery of shared services, to endorse shared business plans, to monitor performance and report through to Cabinet.</p> <p>Clear KPIs are in place to track performance on a regular basis. These are reviewed by the Shared Services Board in accordance with the governance set up.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Work underway to align governance and financial management arrangements.</p>
<p>STR31 – Failure of Combined Authority to deliver Devolution effectively (September 2016)</p> <p>Change in local and national economic outlook and/or political priorities, ineffective governance and delivery structures and/or a lack of skills and capacity to deliver them, leading to:</p> <p>Real and perceived 'democratic deficit', lack of proper accountability, the diversion of human and financial resources away from SCDC strategic priorities and failure to deliver key service commitments within the Deal, resulting in inability of SCDC to deliver its Corporate Plan, financially unviable services, reputational damage for SCDC, wider loss of credibility for the Combined Authority and all partners within it, reducing the prospect of successful future devolution deals with government.</p>	<p>Cllr Peter Topping</p> <p>Alex Colyer</p>	8	8	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 2.</p> <p>The risk is that the parties involved in setting up the combined authority don't move quickly enough or coherently enough, however, by this time the progress is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appointed Interim officers for the 3 key positions, adverts for permanent recruitment will go out on the day 1 of the Authority being set up; - Advert for Combined Authority Chief Executive published; - Agreed a draft staffing structure; - A number of work streams are put together to work on objectives; - A Work Plan is set up which captures all the details.

Risk Reference, Title, (date first included) and Description, plus associated Aims, Objectives	Risk Owner	Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Current	
<p>STR02 – Consultation and Engagement (Previously Equalities; reviewed July 2016)</p> <p>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> decisions relating to service delivery being overturned and possible Commission for Human Rights and Equalities inspection, <i>resulting in</i> delays to the implementation of new service proposals causing detriment to customer service, preventing the timely delivery of policy and financial objectives, reduction in reserves available to support balanced MTFS, adverse publicity and effect on reputation.</p> <p>Objectives, Actions: All</p>	<p>Cllr Nick Wright</p> <p>Caroline Ryba</p>	8	8	<p>SCORES - IMPACT: 4; LIKELIHOOD: 2.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: The new Policy Development Officer (PDO)'s responsibilities will include ensuring continuing compliance with our statutory Public Sector Equality Duty, delivery of the Equality Scheme 2015-2020 and a review of corporate consultation and engagement to ensure consistency and quality across all service areas. The Council has met its legal requirements to publish equality information and equality objectives on an annual basis. This information is incorporated into a new Equality Scheme 2015-2020, which was agreed by the Portfolio Holder in Autumn 2015. The Council has embedded equality monitoring arrangements whereby new and revised policies and service delivery proposals are subject to screening for their likely equality implications. Where appropriate, timescales are agreed for full subsequent assessment prior to adoption of the new proposals, or as part of implementation, monitoring and review arrangements. The new PDO has begun to review the effectiveness of our current arrangements (see above).</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: The Policy Development Officer took up post in July 2016; she has begun to scope work to review the council's equalities policy and procedures.</p>

Red / **Amber** / **Green** shading in the Actual Column indicates the following movement in risk scores:

	Red	Amber	Green
for risks previously above the line:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has not changed, or has decreased but stays above the line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has decreased to below the line
for risks previously below the line:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has increased to above the line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has increased but stays below the line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the score has not changed, or has decreased

Notes

- The "Reference" is unique and retained by the risk throughout the period of its inclusion in the risk register.
- Risks are cross referenced to the relevant 2016/17 Objectives and Actions adopted by Council on 25 February 2016.
- Criteria and guidelines for assessing 'Impact' and 'Likelihood' are shown below.
- The "Actual" risk score is obtained by multiplying the Impact score by the Likelihood score.
- The dotted line (- - - - -) shows the Council's risk tolerance line.
- The "Timescale to progress" is the date by which it is planned that the risk will be mitigated to below the line.

Impact

- 5 Extreme
- 4 High
- 3 Medium
- 2 Low
- 1 Insignificant

Likelihood

- 5 Almost certain
- 4 Likely
- 3 Possible
- 2 Unlikely
- 1 Rare

Direction of Travel

- ↓ Priority reduced from last review
(give the previous Total score in the brackets)
- Priority equal to last review
- ↑ Priority increased from last review
(give the previous Total score in the brackets)
- new Risk included in the risk register for the first time

Impact

Giving rise to one or more of the following:

	Service disruption	People	Financial loss *	Environment	Statutory service/legal obligations	Management	Reputation	Score
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

	Guidelines	Score
Almost certain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is expected to occur in most circumstances (more than 90%), or • Could happen in the next year, 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 • Could happen in the next 2 years, 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 • Could happen in the next 3 years, 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 • Could happen in the next 10 years, 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 • Unlikely to happen in the next 10 years, or • Up to 10% likely to occur in the next 12 months 	1