

Adult Services

Failure to deliver the transformation programme effectively.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2003

High

19

Cause *Ineffective programme management
Failure to engage with the community on the changes required*

Consequence *Adverse impact on service delivery
Fail to meet the needs of vulnerable people
Unable to lower cost base
Opportunities missed
Criticism of the Council*

Insufficient budget to meet increased service demand

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2002

Not Yet Entered

0

Cause *• Increasing Customer Base (Aging population)
• Rising care costs
• Further budget cuts likely.
• Transformation programmes do not deliver required savings.*

Consequence *• Major distraction for delivering transformation.
• Significant adverse impact on Council's budget.
• Possibility of managers being suspended.
• Potential adverse impact on service delivery.
• Administration fails to be re-elected.*

Failure to deliver the requirements of the Care Act.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2004

Not Yet Entered

0

Cause *• Insufficient resources
• Budget constraints
• Lack of mid-long term planning*

Consequence *• Unable to meet new statutory responsibilities
• Potential legal implications
• Financial implications
• Potential criticism from central government*

Failure to deliver integrated workforce strategy.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2005

Not Yet Entered

0

Cause *Lack of skills and capacity
Recruitment and retention difficulties: council seen as less attractive option than private sector
Lack of succession planning*

Consequence *Impact on ability to meet the needs of vulnerable people
Impact on ability to deliver on safeguarding duties
Unable to deliver on objectives
Morale declines*

Risk of judicial review or legal challenge in adult social care

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2006

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause A legal challenge occurs and there is a lack of capacity to contest
The public, potential contractors etc. are more likely to pursue a legal challenge
Service processes (social care etc) are complex to understand and adjudicate
Increasing number of FOI requests to councils
Legal social care experts in the market place who are looking for test cases

Consequence Resources diverted
Potential for adverse decision
Financial implications
Reputational impact
Starts a trend for more legal challenges

Failure to effectively monitor and manage partnerships.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2007

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause Partnerships not adequately managed
Lack of risk assessment and understanding of risk ownership within arrangements
Ineffective communication
Not recognising early warning signals

Consequence Key partnerships fail to deliver / break down
Ability to deliver transformation priorities undermined
Adverse impact on service delivery
Funding implications
Reputational impact

Insufficient number or quality of care providers available.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2008

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause Fewer providers in the marketplace means fewer options
Value for money may take precedence over service quality
CQC over-administrative
Council processes may be off-putting for potential providers

Consequence Vulnerable people don't get the right services / end up in the wrong part of the system
Potential incident occurs
Criticism of the Council
Tensions in relationships between Council and providers
Lack of resilience (business continuity issue) if key provider fails.

Failure to deliver the EPH Modernisation Programme on time and within budget

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2009

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause Resource pressures
Tight deadlines

Consequence Adverse impact on service delivery / services fail to improve
Vulnerable people at risk
Financial implications
Reputational impact

Failure to deliver the Health and Wellbeing Strategy outcomes

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2010

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Outcomes may be difficult to evidence due to longevity
- Lack of usable intelligence and information
- Lack of resources: numbers and/or specialist skills
- Increasingly difficult to recruit
- PH budget may be used for other council services
- Political/management change may alter focus and priorities

Consequence

- Resources wasted
- Potential adverse impact on services
- Key objectives not delivered
- Criticism of the Council
- Health and wellbeing of the community adversely affected

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders in the decision making process.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2011

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Lack of long term planning
- Insufficient resources
- Ineffective communications with stakeholders
- Resistance to changes

Consequence

- Lack of buy-in / understanding from stakeholders
- Resources diverted dealing with challenges
- Reputational impact

Inability to find suitable accommodation for patients leaving hospital.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2012

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Insufficient funding
- Conflicting priorities with other programmes

Consequence

- Impact on service users
- Financial implications
- Criticism of the Council from central government
- Reputational impact
- Pressure on hospital beds

The council is not able to effectively evidence key decisions.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2013

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- The public, potential contractors etc. are more likely to pursue a legal challenge
- Service processes (social care etc) are complex to understand and adjudicate
- Increasing number of FOI requests to councils
- Legal social care experts in the market place who are looking for test cases

Consequence

- Litigation costs
- Serious case review
- Resource-intensive
- Reputational impact
- Adverse effect on morale
- Council placed under scrutiny

Transformation Programme & efficiencies may result in a failure to deliver a balanced budget.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2014

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- 14-15 budget currently showing a deficit
- Transformation Programme may not deliver required savings
- A high profile incident e.g. safeguarding incident would impact the budget further

Consequence

- Required savings will not be made
- Impact on resources and service delivery if further cuts have to be made

Failure to recognise and respond to demographic changes and community needs

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2015

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Baby boom coming through
- Inward migration
- Development and regeneration makes York more desirable and accessible

Consequence

- Increased service demand e.g. SEN, social care
- Impact on budget and resources
- Statutory school places have to be found

Insufficient resources (numbers or key skills) to support critical services.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2016

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Impact of budget cuts on resource (ongoing and not likely to improve)
- Council becomes less attractive place to work due to competing terms and conditions in private sector

Consequence

- Increased key person dependency and vulnerability

Breach of data protection leading to fine or investigation.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2017

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Human error
- Malicious or deliberate act or hacking
- Increased commissioning and partnering
- Lack of formal agreed data sharing agreements
- Increased remote working, shared folders, emails etc.
- Information is not deleted or disposed of appropriately

Consequence

- Breach of Data Protection Act and other non-compliance
- ICO fine
- Impact on end user (data subject)
- Reputational impact
- Adverse media coverage

Failure to respond adequately to legislative changes in the education sector.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2018

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Increased conversion from schools to academies
- Funding changes

Consequence

- Statutory education and contingency requirements and arrangements become less clear
- Financial impact affects the level of other service support available
- Loss of close partnerships and relationships with schools

Failure to robustly procure and manage contracts.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2019

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Lack of internal contract management experience and skills (historically not been required in local authority)
- More complex outsourcing and partnership arrangements
- Lack of robust supply chain understanding and risk management i.e. who owns the risks

Consequence

- The council is held responsible even where there is an SLA or contract in place
- Financial consequences
- Reputational damage
- Contract may fail
- Impact on service delivery

Failure by the council to prevent a breach of safeguarding

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse

Risk Ref: 2020

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Non-adherence to policies and procedures
- Not instigating lessons-learned

Consequence

- Harm (or fatality) to vulnerable person
- Reputational impact
- Potential litigation/compensation

Lack of capacity to deliver services

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2039

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Fixed short term funding
- Fixed term contracts and interims
- Increased sickness and absence (short and long term)
- Training budgets have been reduced
- Opportunities arising with Public Health England and the CCG
- Corporate resource capacity is being reduced generally
- Unable to spend allocated budget in certain areas e.g. Health Protection
- Carrying vacancies that are unlikely to be filled

Consequence

- Inability to succession plan effectively
- Leaner teams and processes
- Increased key person dependency and potential vulnerability in unplanned absence
- Additional workloads lead to more sickness and absence
- Impact on morale
- Staff may be attracted to more competitive offerings
- Loss of specialism and knowledge e.g. admin support moving to Hub
- Budget allocations may be cut if not fully utilised
- Challenge of managing change and expectations

Unable to fulfil the mandatory requirement to provide advice to Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) etc.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2040

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Lack of clarity around the role and resource to fulfil it
- Skilled staff are currently absent
- The allocated budget was not spent last year
- High level strategy has not been set

Consequence

- Lack of horizon scanning and anticipation of incidents
- Intelligence is not being provided to the CCG
- Increased risk of infection spread
- Potential for increased costs

Controls

Pilot scheme on obesity being undertaken

Owner

Lesley White

Links between Health & Wellbeing and other council departments may not be as effective as possible

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2041

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Local authority is not fully aware of the services and outcomes of the PH function
- Departments not aware of what each other is doing – poor communication and joined up effort.
- PH is not yet recognised as a directorate in its own right

Consequence

- Duplication of efforts across departments
- Potential gaps in service delivery
- Difficult to evidence PH outcomes
- Funds may not be allocated to PH outcomes
- PH has less influence over decisions such as finance allocation, resources etc.

The Health & Wellbeing team may not have access to necessary data and information.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2042

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- 'Admin' staff are being centralised corporately, including current PH data analysts.
- Unable to access information that was previously available to the NHS
- Department specific training budget lost - now centralised and relevant training no longer available

Consequence

- Loss of knowledge and specialist support
- Unable to identify needs and develop localised response to trends and problems
- Long term impact on Health and Wellbeing outcomes
- Governance issues around information going in and out of central Hub
- Resource intensive to process

Current ring-fenced budget and future allocation of funds uncertain.

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2043

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- PH budget is now a local authority fund
- When the PCT disbanded funding was split (75% North Yorks 25% City of York) based on population and is not reflective of the service demand e.g. York home to 2 universities so increased demand on sexual health services
- Local authority facing further budget cuts and savings

Consequence

- Funds may be allocated to other departments for "Public Health" outcomes and increased pressure to do so
- Demand-led services such as sexual health face overspend
- PH budget will be impacted by the wider local authority challenges
- Increased costs and/or transference of new services are not funded or included within the baseline for future budgets. For example the costs associated with prescriptions for NRT etc.

Commissioning processes and contract management may not be robust enough

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2044

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Providers are more able to make legal challenge
- Most major contracts will expire at the same time
- Temporary extensions and waivers being put into place
- Contracts not being individually performance monitored (e.g. GPs Healthchecks)
- Providers may be less willing to engage with local authority
- Market place not been fully tested

Consequence

- Potential for legal challenge (not yet happened)
- Potential for breach of contract e.g. School Nurses
- Resource-intensive to review and performance manage contracts especially as learning 'on the job'
- Compliance and/or service delivery may be compromised

Controls

Consultation events held with providers and potential providers
Assistance from Procurement Department

Owner

Paul Edmondson-Jones
Paul Edmondson-Jones

Clinical governance and assurance risks arising from lack of formalised /legal arrangements

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2045

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Potentially unable to deliver services such as emergency contraception
- Currently working with an expired document
- Lack of skillset/resource in the current team to manage the situation

Consequence

- Increased unwanted pregnancies, demand for terminations etc.
- Potential clinical governance issues
- Lack of assurance about services provided
- Unknown legal risks
- Potential cost of using CSU (c. £25k)

Failure to deliver the Health and Wellbeing Strategy outcomes

Risk Owner: Paul Edmondson-Jones

Risk Ref: 2066

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Outcomes may be difficult to evidence due to longevity
- Lack of usable intelligence and information
- Lack of resources: numbers and/or specialist skills
- Increasingly difficult to recruit
- PH budget may be used for other council services
- Political/management change may alter focus and priorities

Consequence

- Resources wasted
- Potential adverse impact on services
- Key objectives not delivered
- Criticism of the Council
- Health and wellbeing of the community adversely affected

Opposition to the Local Plan

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2046

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • *Complaints and questions raised re congestion etc.*
• *Limited resource capacity*

Consequence • *Increased scrutiny*
• *Reputational damage*
• *Resources required to deal with FOIs, complaints and other queries*
• *Processes and decision making slowed down – paralysis effect*
• *Lack of Member confidence*
• *Distrust between council and public and officer-member*
• *Democracy and progress affected*
• *Disclosure issues, insurance etc.*

Controls

Proactive communications, publications, engagement etc.
Information Governance Board

Owner

Sarah Tanburn
Sarah Tanburn

Disclosure of Information

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2047

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • *Information Commissioner forces transparency and publication*

Consequence • *Commercially sensitive information could be released*
• *Alarmism*
• *Increased public complaints, opposition to programmes etc.*
• *Insurance impacts – increased claims etc.*

Controls

A project based publication scheme could be initiated with risk assessments of each stage to identify stakeholder interest etc

Owner

Sarah Tanburn

Failure to Achieve the Local Plan

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2048

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Information Commissioner forces transparency and publication
- York historically lacking mid-wage pay scales
- High percentage part-time employment
- High percentage temporary and/or seasonal employment, e.g. students, tourism
- Dependency on a few large employees e.g. Aviva, Nestle
- Health and wellbeing outcomes are difficult to evidence
- Council does not own a lot of land so dependant on third parties for development.
- High cost of housing/living

Consequence

- Inequalities are not addressed, potential to become a mono culture
- Growth not achieved
- Reputational damage
- Loss of confidence
- Officer/Member relationship damaged
- York could become a dormitory city with a low-wage centre - high earners live elsewhere and commute so not spending in city
- Potential for fall in net jobs growth

Controls

Effective engagement with, and use of, strategic partners
Innovative approach to growth and investment
Appetite to achieve outcomes
Investment in supporting technologies and infrastructure

Owner

Sarah Tanburn
Sarah Tanburn
Sarah Tanburn
Sarah Tanburn

Risk to Life and Limb

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2049

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Limited resource to undertake inspections etc.
- Errors e.g. infrastructure design
- Shrinking budget
- Balance between investment and acceptable risk could change
- Legislative changes e.g. air quality affect requirements and regime

Consequence

- Council at risk of corporate manslaughter, litigation, fines etc.
- Public health impacts e.g. air quality, congestion.
- Implications for planning – restrictions etc.

Controls

Culture of health and safety inspections and reporting

Owner

Sarah Tanburn

Finance: Income Generation

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2050

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Pressure to find new income streams
- Budget reductions
- Unwillingness to stop delivering services where necessary
- “Gropupthink” mentality could prevent swift decision making
- Challenge of continuing to deliver statutory services
- Opposing priorities e.g. increased parking versus an attractive city centre

Consequence

- Reputational damage
- Potential for job losses
- Increased need for innovation and engagement with partners and stakeholders

Finance: Capital Spend

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2051

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Reliance on partners e.g. University of York, to deliver
• Need to get Member influence

Consequence • Reputational damage
• Loss of current and future investments
• Growth not realised

Failure to operate within the corporate policy framework e.g. deliver on Environmental Impact

Assessments (EIAs)

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2052

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Challenge of delivering the required statutory duties versus available resource (due diligence vs capacity)
• Relatively new management team in the Directorate
• Boundaries need to be communicated and understood

Consequence • EIAs etc. could be compromised
• Consistency and cultural understanding may not be fully developed

Controls

Good communications
Appropriate bureaucracy established

Owner

Sarah Tanburn
Sarah Tanburn

There may not be enough capacity and capability to deliver services robustly

Risk Owner: Sarah Tanburn

Risk Ref: 2053

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Increased focus on delivery and outcomes could overlook the effect on the infrastructure
• Increased expectations and workloads
• Terms and conditions may not be attractive in next 18-24 months
• The Transformation Agenda could cause misunderstanding/resentment

Consequence • Impact on morale, stress etc.
• Staff leave for other opportunities
• Harder to recruit especially to skilled or specialist roles

Controls

Organisational Development Group implemented

Owner

Sarah Tanburn

Breach of data protection leading to fine or investigation.

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2021

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Sensitive information is revealed
- Unauthorised access to systems
- Human error
- Malicious or deliberate breach
- Ineffective information sharing agreements

Consequence

- Public safety at risk
- Service delivery impacted
- Financial implications
- Further incidents occur
- Criticism of the Council
- Reputational impact
- Impact on data subject (person/end user)

A disruptive incident causes unacceptable levels of service disruption

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2022

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Insufficient/ineffective business continuity plans (not up to date, not comprehensive, not communicated etc.)

Consequence

- Failure to deliver critical services
- Potential health and safety risk to staff / service users
- Misinformation / confusion occurs
- Takes longer to recover from incident
- Legal implications
- Financial implications
- Staff morale declines
- Reputational impact

Failure to deliver financial sustainability

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2028

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Cuts in government grant
- Transformation savings not delivered
- Maintaining income (local taxes)
- External trading
- Demographic demand (Aging Population)

Consequence

Welfare benefit changes

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2029

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Care Bill
- CTS
- Spare bedroom subsidy
- Universal Credit

Consequence

York Central

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2030

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

Consequence

Staff well-being/workforce strategy/managing change

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2031

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Delivering the workforce strategy
• H&S Risk
• Staff retention
• Staff skills set

Consequence**Ability to deliver effective governance/member & officer relations/failure to comply with EU procurement legislation**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2032

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence**Health & safety incident/managing and maintaining assets**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2033

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence**Delivery of key statutory duties e.g. elections/completing accounts on time**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2034

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence**Fraud**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2035

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence**Failure to deliver the Capital Programme**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2036

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • York Central
• EPH's

Consequence**Impact on support services of externalisation - becoming a commissioning organisation**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2037

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence**Supporting and managing change - effective project and programme management**

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Risk Ref: 2038

Not Yet Entered 0

CauseConsequence

Transformation Programme & grant reductions may lead to a failure to balance budget.

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2054

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Reduction in government grants
- Financial environment is changing and likely to continue changing
- Not all areas have sound plans at the moment
- Changes to frontline services incur more public/Member scrutiny

Consequence

- Difficult to forward plan until targets and grants are known
- Necessary to find new ways of working and service delivery models, which brings about new risk areas
- Restructures and staff reductions
- Increased pressure on staff
- Increased scrutiny, official and non-official
- Unable to provide existing services in current way – unpopular decisions to be made

Controls

Plan in place for 2014-15

Owner

Sally Burns

Failure to implement new Delivery Models & work with Partnerships etc.

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2055

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Reliance on partners to deliver savings, services etc. (e.g. Museums Trust)
- Procurement of new arrangements e.g. Culture, City Centre and Tourism with focus on revenue and affordability

Consequence

- There may be limited numbers of suitable or willing providers
- Service quality may be compromised against value for money, or only having one bidder
- Risk environment changes
- Reputational damage

Controls

Good relationship management in place
City of York able to influence partners positively
Need to monitor future contract management as more changes occur

Owner

Sally Burns
Sally Burns
Sally Burns

Political risk

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2056

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Unavoidable elections in May
- Further budgets cuts likely after April 2015
- Reluctance to make politically unpopular decisions

Consequence

- Difficult to develop clear financial and business plans
- Increased potential for officer/member tensions
- Decisions not made swiftly leading to slower progress
- Reputational damage

Controls

Proactive approach in briefing Members about their choices in readiness for post-election
Officer proposals developed

Owner

Sally Burns
Sally Burns

Staff Wellbeing

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2057

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Staff wanting to continue to deliver the same, or more services, with fewer resources
- New service delivery models, changed ways of working
- Increased bureaucracy and process
- Higher number of FOI requests

Consequence

- Increased workloads
- Stress, anxiety and lower morale
- Potential for higher staff turnover
- More external and Member scrutiny

Community Engagement

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2058

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- The Community Engagement Plan does not properly reach the community by “telling the story” and relating to the people
- The whole Council is not fully behind the Plan
- Equalities Framework is not robustly implemented

Consequence

- Alienation and disengagement of community – “take residents with us” rather than leave behind
- Progress is impeded
- Budget and savings not delivered
- Reputational damage

Controls

Need for a very proactive resource to engage management across council

Owner

Sally Burns

Failure to deliver Safe Communities

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2059

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Changes in how funding is received
- Political differences in priority etc.
- Community Safety and Police & Crime Commissioner plan being reviewed

Consequence

- Reputational damage
- Relationships with strategic partners damaged
- Impact on community wellbeing
- Increased crime, anti-social behaviour etc.

Controls

New anti-social behaviour team with the Police

Need to invest in ongoing relationships with strategic partners

Owner

Sally Burns

Sally Burns

Health and Wellbeing Outcomes

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2060

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause

- Some linkages have been lost with the Public Health team
- Other priorities mean less focus on H&WB outcomes

Consequence

- Health and Wellbeing outcomes are not delivered
- Impact on community
- Reputational damage

Controls

Need to revisit Health and Wellbeing outcomes, and how they are delivered

Owner

Sally Burns

Legislative and Regulatory Changes

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2061

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Frequent and/or short notice changes to e.g. Housing Policy, Public Protection etc

Consequence • Keeping up with changes is resource intensive
• Potential for litigation, fines, non-compliance, injury etc.

Controls

Good controls in place

Owner

Sally Burns

Risk to Life and Limb

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 2062

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Falling tree branch
• Incident at event
• Incident in park or open space
• Etc.

Consequence • Injury or fatality
• Litigation, fine, corporate manslaughter etc.
• Reputational damage

Controls

Good controls in place and strong Health and Safety culture
Accident monitoring systems etc

Owner

Sally Burns
Sally Burns

Others

Failure to deliver the transformation programme and associated savings.

Risk Owner: Stewart Halliday

Risk Ref: 2063

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause • Ineffective programme management.
• Failure to engage with the community on the changes required.
• Supporting and managing change effectively
• Effective programme and project management

Consequence • Adverse impact on service delivery.
• Fail to meet the needs of vulnerable people.
• Unable to lower cost base.
• Opportunities missed.
• Criticism of the council.

Failure to effectively monitor and manage partnerships

Risk Owner: Stewart Halliday

Risk Ref: 2064

Not Yet Entered 0

Cause Partnerships are not adequately managed. lack of risk assessment and understanding of risk ownership within arrangements. Ineffective communication. Not recognising early warning signals.

Consequence Key partnerships fail to deliver or break down. Ability to deliver transformation priorities undermined. Adverse impact on service delivery. Funding implications. Reputational impact.