

## 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: Financial Pressures

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

- 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**

Efficiency Plan to Executive (June 16) and development of budget strategy for 2017-18

31/03/2017

**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:** Governance

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**

Electronic Communication Policy

IT security systems in place

Corporate Information Governance Group

Secure paper storage and confidential waste disposal available in office accommodation

Internal Audit reviewing information security

New Head of Health and Safety

Health and Safety monitoring by CMT and DMTs

Regular monitoring to Audit & Governance committee

New governance structure

**Owner**

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Pauline Stuchfield

Pauline Stuchfield

Ian Floyd

Andrew Docherty

**Net Risk Rating:** High 19

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Major

**Actions**

Health and Safety training programmes at all levels

**Target Date**

31/03/2016

**Revised Date**

31/03/2017

**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:** Inability to meet statutory duties due to changes in demographics

Risk Owner: Jon Stonehouse & Martin Farran

**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
- Increase in complexity of needs as people get older
- Increase in people living with dementia
- Demographic of workforce unable to meet demand

### 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
- Insufficient capacity for workload - need right people in the right place

### **Controls**

Analysis of need and work around options

Stakeholder and officer group

DfE returns

Inclusion review

Caseload monitoring

Early intervention initiatives and better self-care

Place planning strategy in place

School population reported every 6 months

### **Owner**

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

Michael Melvin

Jon Stonehouse

Jon Stonehouse

**Net Risk Rating:** High 19

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Major

### **Actions**

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

### **Target Date**

01/09/2015

### **Revised Date**

31/03/2017

### **Comments:**

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:** A vulnerable child or adult with care and support needs is not protected from harm

Risk Owner: Martin Farran & Jon Stonehouse

**Gross Risk Rating:** High 20

**Gross Risk Likelihood:** Probable

**Gross Risk Impact:** Major

Cause

- Failure to comply with statutory duty
- Radicalisation of young people

Consequence

- Vulnerable person not protected
- Children's serious case review or lessons learned exercise
- Safeguarding adults review
- Reputational damage
- Serious security risk

**Controls**

**Owner**

Safeguarding adults Board	Martin Farran
Safeguarding sub groups	Martin Farran
Multi agency policies and procedures	Martin Farran
Adults - Multi agency safeguarding hub (MASH)	Martin Farran
Specialist safeguarding cross sector training	Martin Farran
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	Michael 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
Effectively resourced and well managed service	Jon Stonehouse

**Net Risk Rating:** Medium 14

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Moderate

**Actions**

**Target Date**

**Revised Date**

Implementation of new multi-agency early help arrangements

01/11/2016

**Comments:**

## 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:** Workforce/capacity

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**

Workforce Strategy

Stress Risk Assessments

PDRs

Comprehensive Occupational Health provision including counselling

HR policies e.g. whistleblowing, dignity at work

**Owner**

Pauline Stuchfield

Pauline Stuchfield

Pauline Stuchfield

Pauline Stuchfield

Pauline Stuchfield

**Net Risk Rating:** Medium 14

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Moderate

**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: Health and Wellbeing

Risk Owner: Sharon Stoltz

**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**

Sharon Stoltz

**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**

31/03/2017

#### **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:** Local Plan

Risk Owner: Neil Ferris

**Gross Risk Rating:** High 20

**Gross Risk Likelihood:** Probable Annex A

**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**

**Owner**

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

**Net Risk Rating:** High 19

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Major

**Actions**

**Target Date**

**Revised Date**

Monitoring of controls	30/06/2015	31/03/2017
------------------------	------------	------------

**Comments:**

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

Local Development Scheme Document June 2016 has now been appended to this risk to provide further detail.



*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:** Failure to ensure we have resilient, cohesive communities who are empowered and able to shape and deliver services

Risk Owner: Charlie Croft

**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**

Charlie Croft

Charlie Croft

**Net Risk Rating:** High 19

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Major

**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:** Effective and strong partnerships

Risk Owner: Neil Ferris

**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 or break down
- Ability to deliver transformation priorities undermined
- Adverse impact on service delivery
- Funding implications
- Reputational impact

**Controls**

Partnership Code of Practice in place

**Owner**

Stewart Halliday

**Net Risk Rating:** Medium 14

**Net Risk Likelihood:** Possible

**Net Risk Impact:** Moderate

**Comments:**

<http://colin.york.gov.uk/besupported/hr/policies-and-procedures/>

Above is the link to the partnerships code of practice which has now been published

## 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: Capital Programme

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

Project boards and project plans

Regular monitoring of schemes

Capital programme reporting to Cabinet-Audit Committee

Strong financial, legal and procurement support included within the capital budget for specialist support skills

Revised Project Management Framework

#### Owner

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Ian Floyd

Net Risk Rating: **Medium** 14

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

#### Comments:

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