

KCR 01 Financial Pressures

Over the course of the last 4 years there has been a substantial reduction in government grants leading to significant financial savings delivered. The expectation is that £10million annually will be required in future years. The council needs a structured and strategic approach to deliver the savings in order to ensure that any change to service provision is aligned to the council's key priorities.

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Reduction in government grants leading to the necessity to make savings
- Increased service demand and costs (for example an aging population).

Consequence

- Major savings required to balance budget, with potential major implications on service delivery
- Impacts on vulnerable people
- Spending exceeds available budget

Controls

Owner

Regular budget monitoring

Two year budget cycles and effective medium term planning and forecasting

Ian Floyd

Chief finance officer statutory assessment of balanced budget

Ian Floyd

Regular communications on budget strategy and options with senior management and politicians

Ian Floyd

Skilled and resourced finance function, supported by managers with financial awareness

Ian Floyd

Net Risk Rating: Medium 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Actions

Target Date

Revised Date

Development of a new Medium term plan after May elections

31/03/2016

Comments:

With the current scale and pace of transformation taking place throughout the organisation, it is now more important than ever that the council ensures that its key governance frameworks are strong including those around information governance and transparency.

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Member/Officer relations may not be effective
- Increased interactions in relation to FOI and transparency
- Failure to comply with information security policy

Consequence

- Breach of Data Protection Act and other non compliance
- Fines levied by Information Commissioner
- Impact on the end user/customer
- Public safety may be put at risk
- Further incidents occur
- Adverse media coverage
- Reputational impact

Controls

Owner

Electronic Communication Policy

Ian Floyd

IT security systems in place

Ian Floyd

Corporate Information Governance Group

Ian Floyd

Secure paper storage and confidential waste disposal available in office accommodation

Ian Floyd

Internal Audit reviewing information security

Ian Floyd

New Head of Health and Safety

Pauline Stuchfield

Health and Safety monitoring by CMT and DMTs

Pauline Stuchfield

Regular monitoring to Audit & Governance committee

Ian Floyd

New governance structure

Andrew Docherty

Net Risk Rating: High 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Target Date

Revised Date

Review of Health and Safety governance frameworks

30/09/2015

Health and Safety training programmes at all levels

31/03/2016

Comments:

KCR 03 Transformation/rewiring

Delivering the objectives set for the transformation programme moving from the existing model to the desired outcome, will require looking at innovative ways of meeting business objectives and service delivery going forward whilst ensuring that services continue to be delivered effectively whilst the work is ongoing.

Risk Owner: Stewart Halliday

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Ineffective programme management
- Failure to engage with the community on the changes required
- Failure to support and manage change effectively

Consequence

- Adverse impact on service delivery
- Fail to meet the needs of vulnerable people
- Unable to lower the cost base
- Opportunities missed
- Reputational impact

Controls

Effective engagement activity

Detailed business cases

Programme governance

Owner

Stewart Halliday

Stewart Halliday

Stewart Halliday

Net Risk Rating: High 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Ongoing monitoring

Fuller consultation and engagement

Target Date

31/03/2016

31/03/2016

Revised Date

Comments:

KCR 04 Changing demographics

York has a rapidly changing demographic and this brings with it significant challenges particularly in the delivery of adult social care. On the converse, the results of the recent baby boom will have a future impact on school places and services not to mention social care. There has also been significant inward migration and as such the council needs to ensure that community impacts are planned for and resourced.

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse & Guy Van Dichele

Gross Risk Rating: **High** 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Baby boom coming through
- Inward migration
- Development and regeneration makes York more desirable and accessible
- An aging population requiring services from the council placing significant financial and delivery challenges
- Increased ethnicity
- Growing SEN - in particular autism
- Popularity of universities

Consequence

- Increased service demand; school placements, SEN, emotional mental health
- Impact on reducing budgets and resources
- Statutory school places have to be found
- Rise in delayed discharges
- Impact on service users
- Reputational impact

Controls

Analysis of need and work around options

Stakeholder and officer group

DfE returns

Inclusion review

Caseload monitoring

Owner

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Net Risk Rating: **High** 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Build more social and affordable housing

Annually refresh statistical projection of population change

Review KPIs to assess impact of population increase and project service resource needs reporting to CMT

Ensure adequate supply of schools places (CYC Place Planning Strategy, Governance Structure)

Target Date

30/04/2015

30/05/2015

01/09/2015

Revised Date

31/03/2016

31/03/2016

Comments:

Action dates have been revised following the risk session at CSES DMT on 9th July 2015, to reflect that the work is ongoing and has not yet been completed.

Ensuring that vulnerable adults and children in the city are safe and protected is a key priority for the council. The individual, organisational and reputational implications of ineffective safeguarding practice are acute.

Risk Owner: Guy Van Dichele & Jon Stonehouse

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Failure to comply with safeguarding policy and practice
- Radicalisation of young people

Consequence

- Vulnerable person not protected
- Serious case review or lessons learned exercise
- Reputational damage
- Serious security risk

Controls

Owner

Safeguarding adults Board	Guy Van Dichele
Safeguarding sub groups	Guy Van Dichele
Multi agency policies and procedures	Guy Van Dichele
Adults - Multi agency safeguarding hub (MASH)	Guy Van Dichele
Specialist safeguarding cross sector training	Guy Van Dichele
Quantitative and qualitative performance management	Jon Stonehouse
Reporting and governance to lead Member, Chief Executive and Scrutiny	Jon Stonehouse
Annual self assessment, peer challenge and regulation	Jon Stonehouse
Audit by Veritau of Safeguarding Adults processes	Michal Melvin
Children's Safeguarding Boards (LSCB & ASB)	Jon Stonehouse
Ongoing inspection preparation & peer challenge	Jon Stonehouse
National Prevent process	Jon Stonehouse
DBS checks and re-checks	Jon Stonehouse

Net Risk Rating: Medium 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Actions

Target Date

Revised Date

Regular monitoring of controls	31/03/2016	
Schools Prevent training	31/03/2016	

Comments:

Michael Melvin (04/06/2015) - Veritau Audit completed May 2015 reported that considerable amounts of work have been put into ensuring that Safeguarding Adults processes in York are robust and fit for purpose. Arrangements for managing risk were good with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation.

KCR 06 Workforce/Capacity

It is crucial that the council remains able to retain essential skills and also to be able to recruit to posts where necessary, during the current periods of uncertainty caused by the current financial climate and transformational change. The health, wellbeing and motivation of the workforce is therefore key in addition to skills and capacity to deliver.

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- The necessity to deliver savings has resulted in a reduced workforce
- Recruitment and retention difficulties as the council is seen as a less attractive option than the private sector
- Lack of succession planning
- Single points of failure throughout the business

Consequence

- Increased workloads for staff
- Impact on morale and as a result, staff turnover
- Inability to maintain service standards
- Impact on vulnerable customer groups
- Reputational damage

Controls

Owner

Workforce Strategy	Pauline Stuchfield
Stress Risk Assessments	Pauline Stuchfield
PDRs	Pauline Stuchfield
Comprehensive Occupational Health provision including counselling	Pauline Stuchfield
HR policies e.g. whistleblowing, dignity at work	Pauline Stuchfield

Net Risk Rating: Medium 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Actions

Target Date

Revised Date

Production of new workforce strategy	31/12/2015	
Ongoing Monitoring	01/01/2016	
Staff survey Sept 2015 and establish new action plans by 2016	01/01/2016	
Delivery of organisation development plan	31/03/2016	

Comments:

KCR 07 Health and Wellbeing

The council now has the responsibility for the provision of public health services and also for the formation of the Health & Wellbeing Board, which has the ambition to bring together local organisations to work in partnership to improve outcomes for the communities in which they work. Failure to adequately perform these functions could result in the health and wellbeing of communities being adversely affected.

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Outcomes may be difficult to evidence due to longevity
- Lack of resources: numbers and/or specialist skills
- Other priorities means less focus on Health and Wellbeing outcomes
- Failure to deliver Health and Wellbeing responsibilities
- Failure to integrate Public Health outcomes
- Reliance on partners outside of the council's control
- Failure to take on board the new responsibility

Consequence

- Health and wellbeing of the community adversely affected
- Key objectives are not delivered
- Reputational damage

Controls

Health and Wellbeing Board own the strategy and receives reports on progress

Owner

Sally Burns/Julie Hotchkiss

Net Risk Rating: High 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Review of strategy and policy under way including delivery structure

Target Date

31/01/2016

Revised Date

Comments:

The council has a statutory duty to develop a Local Plan, a citywide plan, which helps shape future development in York over the next 20-years. It sets out the opportunities and policies on what will or will not be permitted and where, inc. new homes and businesses. The Local Plan is a critical part of helping to grow York's economy, create more job opportunities and address our increasing population needs. Failure to develop a suitable Plan could result in York losing its power to make planning decisions.

Risk Owner: Interim CES Director

Gross Risk Rating: **High** 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Fail to adopt and agree a Local Plan
- Local Plan adoption process delayed
- Significant opposition to the plan that may impede its progression

Consequence

- Significant negative impact on the council's strategic economic goals
- Council continues to have no adopted development plan/framework
- Legal and probity issues
- Reputational damage
- Increased resources required to deal with likely significant increase in planning appeals
- Development processes and decision making is slowed down
- Widespread public concern and opposition
- Inability to maximise planning gain from investment
- Adverse impact on investment in the city
- Unplanned planning does not meet the authority's aspirations of the city
- Ongoing costs of the preparation of the Local Plan

Controls

- Develop strategy for cross party working on long term strategic issues
- CMT and DMT to work closely with key Members on Local Plan issues
- Proactive communication strategy
- Effective programme and project management to ensure timescales and milestones are met
- Effective project resourcing
- Continued close liason with neighbouring authorities
- Continued close liason with DCLG and Planning Inspectorate

Owner

- Interim CES Director

Net Risk Rating: **High** 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Monitoring of controls

Target Date

30/06/2015

Revised Date

31/03/2016

Comments:

Action date revised to reflect the ongoing nature of the activity.

The council needs to engage in meaningful consultation with communities to ensure decisions taken reflect the needs of the residents, whilst encouraging them to be empowered to deliver services that the council is no longer able to do. Failing to do this effectively would mean that services are not delivered to the benefit of those communities or in partnership.

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Gross Risk Rating: High 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Failure to effectively engage with the communities we serve
- Failure to contribute to the delivery of safe communities
- Failure to effectively engage stakeholders in the decision making process
- Failure to manage expectations

Consequence

- Lack of buy in and understanding from stakeholders
- Alienation and disengagement of the community
- Relationships with strategic partners damaged
- Impact on community wellbeing
- Services brought back under council provision
- Budget overspend
- Create inefficiencies
- Services not provided

Controls

Proactive resource to engage management across the council

Communication and consultation Strategy

Owner

Sally Burns

Sally Burns

Net Risk Rating: High 19

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions

Rewiring project will identify specific workstreams

Target Date

01/01/2016

Revised Date

Comments:

KCR 10 Effective and strong partnerships

In order to continue to deliver some services the council will have to enter into partnerships with a multitude of different organisations whether they are third sector or commercial entities. There needs to be robust, clear governance arrangements in place for these partnerships as well as performance monitoring arrangements to ensure delivery of the objectives.

Risk Owner: Stewart Halliday

Gross Risk Rating: **High** 20

Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Failure to effectively monitor and manage partnerships
- Lack of centralised register of partnerships

Consequence

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

Controls

Partnership code of practice

Owner

Stewart Halliday

Net Risk Rating: **Medium** 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Actions

Publish, publicise and implement the CYC Partnership Code of Practice corporately

Target Date

31/03/2015

Revised Date

31/12/2015

Comments:

Work to develop the CYC Partnership Code of Practice is currently underway and it is hoped that this may be delivered by the end of the calendar year, the action target date has been amended to reflect this.

KCR 11 Capital Programme

The capital programme currently has approximately 85 schemes with a budget of £203 million. The schemes range in size and complexity but are currently looking to deliver two very high profile projects, the Community Stadium and York Central, which are key developments for the city.

Risk Owner: Ian Floyd

Gross Risk Rating: High 19

Gross Risk Likelihood: Possible

Gross Risk Impact: Major

Cause

- Inadequate monitoring/project management in relation to large capital projects
- Complex projects with inherent risks
- Large capital programme being managed with less resource

Consequence

- Additional costs and delays to delivery of projects
- The benefits to the community are not realised
- Reputational Damage

Controls

Owner

Project boards and project plans	Ian Floyd
Regular monitoring of schemes	Ian Floyd
Capital programme reporting to Cabinet	Ian Floyd
Strong financial, legal and procurement support included within the capital budget for specialist support skills	Ian Floyd
Mazars review of the EPH project	Ian Floyd

Net Risk Rating: Medium 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Actions

Target Date

Revised Date

Quarterly reports on major projects-capital programme to executive to be put in place

Comments:

Impact	Catastrophic	17	22	23	24	25
	Major	12	18	19	20	21
	Moderate	6	13	14	15	16
	Minor	2	8	9	10	11
	Insignificant	1	3	4	5	7
		Remote	Unlikely	Possible	Probable	Highly Probable
Likelihood						