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:	lan 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

Regular budget monitoring

Two year budget cycles and effective medium term planning and Ian Floyd

forecasting

Chief finance officer statutory assessment of balanced budget Ian Floyd

Regular communications on budget strategy and options with senior Ian Floyd

management and politicians

Skilled and resourced finance function, supported by managers with Ian Floyd

financial awareness

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 31/03/2017

strategy for 2017-18

KCR 02 Governance

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	d: Probable			
	Gross Risk Impact:	Major			
<u>Cause</u>	<u>Consequence</u>				
 Member/Officer relations may not be effective Increased interactions in relation to FOI and transparency Failure to comply with information security policy Failure to comply with information security policy 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		lan Floyd			
IT security systems in place		lan Floyd			
Corporate Information Governance Group		lan Floyd			
Secure paper storage and confidential waste disposal ava office accommodation	ailable in	lan Floyd			
Internal Audit reviewing information security		lan 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		lan Floyd			
New governance structure		Andrew Docherty			
Net Risk Rating: High 19	Net Risk Likelihood:	Possible			
	Net Risk Impact:	Major			
Actions		Target Date Revised Date			
Health and Safety training programmes at all levels		31/03/2016 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

Probable Annex A **Gross Risk Rating:** 20 Gross Risk Likelihood: High Major **Gross Risk Impact:** Consequence Cause · Baby boom coming through · Increased service demand; school placements, Inward migration SEN. emotional mental health · Development and regeneration makes York more · Impact on reducing budgets and resources desirable and accessible · Statutory school places have to be found · Rise in delayed discharges · An aging population requiring services from the council placing significant financial and delivery challenges · Impact on service users · Increased ethnicity Reputational impact · Growning SEN - in particular autism · Insufficient capacity for workload - need right · Popularity of universities people in the right place · Increase in complexity of needs as people get older · Increase in people living with dementia · Demographic of workforce unable to meet demand **Controls Owner** Analysis of need and work around options Jon Stonehouse Stakeholder and officer group Jon Stonehouse DfE returns Jon Stonehouse Inclusion review Jon Stonehouse Caseload monitoring Jon Stonehouse Early intervention initiatives and better self-care Michael Melvin Place planning strategy in place Jon Stonehouse School population reported every 6 months Jon Stonehouse Implementation of the Care Act 2014 Martin Farran Direct access to support and services Martin Farran Investment in support brokerage work with NHS integrated Martin Farran commissioning Possible **Net Risk Rating:** High 19 Net Risk Likelihood: Major **Net Risk Impact:**

Actions	Target Date	Revised Date	
Ensure adequate supply of schools places (CYC Place Planning Strategy, Governance Structure) Assessment and care management	01/09/2015 31/12/2016	31/03/2017	
Better signposting review of universal information and advice person appointed	31/12/2016		
Redesign and implement new arrangements for early intervention and prevention	31/12/2017		

KCR 05 Safeguarding

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 Stonehou	se	
Gross Risk Rating: High 20	Gross Risk Likelihoo	od: Probable
	Gross Risk Impact:	Major
<u>Cause</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	
Failure to comply with statutory duty	·	adults review amage
Controls		Owner
Safeguarding sub groups		Martin Farran
Multi agency policies and procedures		Martin Farran
Specialist safeguarding cross sector training		Martin Farran
Quantitative and qualitative performance management		Jon Stonehouse
Reporting and governance to lead Member, Chief Executi Scrutiny Annual self assessment, peer challenge and regulation	ve and	Jon Stonehouse
Audit by Veritau of Safeguarding Adults processes		Michael Melvin
Children's and Adults 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 Safeguarding Board action plan Restructure Childrens Social Care Services New Children's Social Care records system		Target Date Revised Date 31/03/2017 30/09/2017 30/09/2017

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

Dials Owners	lan Flavid			
Risk Owner:	lan Floyd			
Gross Risk Rating:	High	20	Gross Risk Likelihood	: Probable
			Gross Risk Impact:	Major
<u>Cause</u>			<u>Consequence</u>	
 The necessity to delive reduced workforce Recruitment and retested seen as a less attractive Lack of succession places of single points of failure 	ntion difficulties as we option than the planning	s the council is private sector	• Inability to mainta	and as a result, staff turnover nin service standards able customer groups
Controls			(Owner
Workforce Strategy			F	Pauline Stuchfield
Stress Risk Assessmen	its		F	Pauline Stuchfield
PDRs			F	Pauline Stuchfield
Comprehensive Occupa	ational Health prov	rision including co	ounselling F	Pauline Stuchfield
HR policies e.g. whistle	blowing, dignity at	work	F	Pauline Stuchfield
Net Risk Rating:	Medium	14	Net Risk Likelihood:	Possible

Net Risk Impact:

Comments:

Moderate

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 Sharon Stoltz

progress

Net Risk Rating: High 19 Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Major

Actions Target Date Revised Date

Review of strategy and policy under way including delivery 31/01/2016 31/03/2017

structure

KCR 08 Local Plan

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

	Гіан			
Controls	Owner			
Develop strategy for cross party working on long term strate	gic issues	Neil Ferris		
CMT and DMT to work closely with key Members on Local F	Plan issues	Neil Ferris	Neil Ferris	
Proactive communication strategy		Neil Ferris		
Effective programme and project management to ensure tin and milestones are met	nescales	Neil Ferris		
Effective project resourcing		Neil Ferris		
Continued close liason with neighbouring authorities		Neil Ferris		
Continued close liason with DCLG and Planning Inspectoral	te	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.

KCR 09 Communities

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
<u>Cause</u>	<u>Consequence</u>
 Failure to effectively engage with the commun serve Failure to contribute to the delivery of safe communities Failure to effectively engage stakeholders in the decision making process Failure to manage expectations 	stakeholders Alienation and disengagement of the communityRelationships with strategic partners damaged
Controls	Owner
Proactive resource to engage management acro	ss the council Charlie Croft
Communication and consultation Strategy	Charlie Croft
Net Risk Rating: High 19	Net Risk Likelihood: Possible
	Net Risk Impact: Major

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

Partnership Code of Practice in place

Risk Owner: **Neil Ferris** Gross Risk Likelihood: Probable **Gross Risk Rating:** High 20 **Gross Risk Impact:** Major Cause Consequence • Failure to effectively monitor and manage partnerships · Key partnerships fail to deliver of break down · Lack of centralised register of partnerships Ability to deliver transformation priorities undermined Adverse impact on service delivery • Funding implications Reputational impact Controls Owner

Stewart Halliday

Net Risk Likelihood: Possible

Net Risk Impact: Moderate

Comments:

Net Risk Rating:

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

14

Medium

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	d: Possible	
			Gross Risk Impact:	Major	
<u>Cause</u>			<u>Consequence</u>		
 Inadequate monitoring/project management in relation to large capital projects Complex projects with inherent risks Large capital programme being managed with less resource 			 Additional costs and delays to delivery of projects The benefits to the community are not realised Reputational Damage 		
Controls				Owner	
Project boards and project p	olans		1	lan Floyd	
Regular monitoring of scher	mes			lan Floyd	
Capital programme reportin	g to Cabinet-A	udit Committee	ı	lan Floyd	
Strong financial, legal and p		pport included w	thin the	lan Floyd	
capital budget for specialist Revised Project Manageme			1	lan Floyd	
Net Risk Rating:	Medium	14	Net Risk Likelihood:	Possible	

Net Risk Impact:

Moderate

Risk Matrix Annex A

	Catastrophic	17	22	23	24	25	
	Major	12	18	19	20	21	
Impact	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						