

**Appendix A
Strategic Risk Register
March 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 possible:</i></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 potential for:</i></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; and dislocation of private sector housing market. <p>Aims: A iii, A iv, A v</p>	Alex Colyer		20	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 4. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 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: Benefits and Housing Advice & Homelessness teams working on a proposed DHP policy and to provide initial training. More control measures/sources of assurance will be identified and actioned once the details of the changes are confirmed.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: This will be determined in line with the timeframe required to implement the control measures.</p>
<p>STR14 - Implementation of National Job Evaluation Scheme 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 worsening industrial relations and equal pay challenges and poor publicity,</i> <i>resulting in public dissatisfaction with the Council's services.</i></p> <p>Aims: All</p>	Alex Colyer	10	16	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 4. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 4.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Exchange of information and discussions through the Job Evaluation Steering Group. Employment of specialist staff to manage the process. Implementation of an effective and timely communications plan.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Aim to gain agreement in early 2011.</p>
<p>STR12 - Supported Housing Reduction in Supporting People (SP) funding, <i>leading to loss of staff and changes to delivery structure,</i> <i>resulting in dissatisfaction amongst residents and concerns over well being of vulnerable people</i></p> <p>Aims: A, C</p>	Stephen Hills	10	15	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 3. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 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: Secured place on SP framework April 2010. Critical funding decisions to emerge during 2011. Potential for cut in funding of up to 50% by April 2012.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR05 - Lack of Development Progress While there has been progress on Cambridge fringe sites, there is no progress yet at Northstowe and 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	15	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 3. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 5.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: A14 - Task Group due to be set up with DfT. County to commission short-term study to identify ways of creating headroom to assist NW Cambridge or Northstowe developments. Deliverability/Viability work commenced with Northstowe joint promoters. Planning Policy produce an Annual Monitoring Report (forecasts housebuilding levels), annually review the Local Development Scheme (can address any shortfall) and are about to start a new Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Government white paper issued but the authority is waiting to learn more about targets.</p>
<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; 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; New Homes Bonus (NHB) – either, receivable at a different rate from that assumed; or, Formula Grant is reduced by more than the NHB receivable; local government resource review - localisation of business rates, <p><i>leading to</i> the Council needing to take action to cut its budgets, <i>resulting in</i> cuts in services, public dissatisfaction, audit and inspection criticism.</p> <p>Aims: A.v.</p>	Alex Colyer	10	12	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 4. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Revised MTFS incorporates updated assumptions. Implement plans to deliver Council's programme in line with latest GF/HRA savings targets. EMT/SMT review progress in achieving budget targets. Explore shared service opportunities. Treasury management reports to 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 June/July 2011.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<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>IMPACT SCORE: 4. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: The draft Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (GTDPD) has been out for public consultation. Ongoing routine monitoring of all District development. Government guidance not yet issued, but County needs assessment due to be completed, and second report to go to PFH.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Report to PFH March 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>	Paul Quigley	10	12	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 4. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Temporary alternative arrangements in place. Permanent arrangements identified; "In Principle" agreement reached with landlord to secure permanent facilities. Regular discussions with landlord (awaiting outcome of planning application). Discussions with neighbouring authorities re alternative joint facilities. Implementation and additional costs included in 2011/12 budget.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Dependent on planning application submitted to SCDC.</p>
<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>IMPACT SCORE: 3. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 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.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: Dependent on the timeframe/milestones for each major project.</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>IMPACT SCORE: 5. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 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.</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.</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>IMPACT SCORE: 5. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 2.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Standard budget setting and financial controls. Project team set up to manage implementation process. About to procure consultancy support (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. Anticipate new regime from April 2012.</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; failure to achieve Level 2 of NI 188 and LAA target, <i>resulting in</i> a degradation or breakdown of service delivery and damage to property, increasing costs and impact on the Council's reputation; possible loss of reward grant.</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>IMPACT SCORE: 3. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Draft Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) approved for consultation by New Communities PFH. Specific actions in place within CCAP and New Communities SP. New co-ordination body (Internal Sustainability Delivery Group - ISDG) will assist with implementation and monitoring. Action plan being developed by ISDG chaired by Team Leader (Communities). Regular EMT reporting and quarterly performance reports to PFH meetings.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: March 2011.</p>

Risk Reference, Title and Description, plus associated Aims	Risk Owner	Current Risk Score		Risk Owner's Comments
		Target	Actual	
<p>STR06 - Productive employee time Restructuring exercises and threat of redundancy cause staff uncertainty, anxiety or stress, leading to significant staff absence or reduced productivity, resulting in inability to provide full services.</p> <p>Aims: All</p>	Susan Gardner-Craig	9	9	<p>IMPACT SCORE: 3. LIKELIHOOD SCORE: 3.</p> <p>CONTROL MEASURES / SOURCES OF ASSURANCE: Management of Sickness Absence Policy (refreshed following audit review). Employee Assistance Programme. Redeployment support. Redundancy and Reorganisation Policy and Procedure. Stress Management Policy. EMT monthly review of sickness absence. Employee Engagement Strategy. Staff Forum.</p> <p>TIMESCALE TO PROGRESS: In line with timetables.</p>

3 A's (Aims, Approaches, Actions)

Risks should be 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 (e.g. 1, 3, etc).

Impact

5 Extreme
4 High
3 Medium
2 Low
1 Insignificant

Likelihood

5 Almost certain
4 Likely
3 Possible
2 Unlikely
1 Rare

Notes

1. The "Reference" is a unique risk reference, retained by the risk throughout the period of its inclusion in the risk register.
2. Criteria and guidelines for assessing "Impact" and "Likelihood" are available on the next page.
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 (Month Year) by which it is planned that the risk will be mitigated to below the line.

Criteria and guidelines for assessing Impact and likelihood

Impact	Giving rise to one or more of the following:							Score
	Service disruption	People	Financial loss (including claim or fine)	Environment	Statutory service/legal obligations	Management	Reputation	
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

Likelihood	Guidelines	Score
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