

**KCR 0001 - Implementation of new pay & grading structure**

Implementation of the pay & grading review presents a whole raft of potential risks to the Council. These range from lawfulness issues (e.g. meeting statutory deadlines) and financial considerations (i.e. affordability) to employee relations problems (e.g. industrial action, demoralised workforce, recruitment and retention issues etc).

	RES	CS	NS	CE	LCCS	HASS
1. Inability to retain staff	20	19	N/a	15	N/a	14
2. Inability to recruit staff	18	19	12	10	N/a	14
3. Potential industrial action	N/a	14	N/a	N/a	N/a	6
4. Decline in customer service	6	14	N/a	10	N/a	9
5. Increase staff absence	6	14	6	15	N/a	9
6. Reduced staff productivity	13	15	N/a	15	N/a	14
7. Inability to contribute to corporate priorities	8	13	N/a	15	N/a	14
8. Reduced staff morale	15	14	N/a	15	N/a	15
9. Potential legal challenge	14	14	22	9	N/a	12
10. Financial costs to school budgets					20	
11. Significant budget overspend					14	

**Resources Risks Last Reviewed: 20/02/2009**

**1. Lack of continuity and increased demands on management within ITT 20**

Cause - This has been a problem in ITT

Consequence - and results in the need to use more consultants and in turn this increases costs.

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**2. Difficulties recruiting into professional posts 18**

Cause - A lack of clarity as to what the future pay will be

Consequence - This leads to difficulties recruiting into professional posts at lower levels

**Controls**

In-house training scheme

**Owner**

Pauline Stuchfield

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**City Strategy Risks Last Reviewed: 26/11/2008**

**1. Inability to retain staff 19**

Cause - Poor outcome for staff in pay & grading review

Consequence - Loss of staff will adversely affect service delivery. This has got business, financial and customer consequences.

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

Identify affected posts

**Due Date**

30/10/08

Review job descriptions

30/10/08

Consideration for market supplement for some posts

On hold

**2. Inability to recruit staff****19**

*Cause* - The uncertainty surrounding the future pay and grading of posts.

*Consequence* - In some cases this could adversely affect service delivery. This has got business, financial and customer consequences.

**Conclusion****Treat****Actions****Due Date**

Identify affected posts

30/10/08

Review job descriptions

30/10/08

Consideration for market supplement for some posts

On hold

**Neighbourhood Services****Risks Last Reviewed: 23/02/2009****9. Financial risk through potential legal challenges to the new pay structure****22**

*Cause* - The council may be exposed to challenges over its proposed new pay structure. It may be that some claims will be made that we will require sensitive and delicate discussions with staff, trade unions and solicitors. The council may be at risk from serious financial loss if some of the claims were to be pursued and upheld.

*Consequence* - If the new pay structure were to come under challenge from large numbers of staff, there will be serious financial implications to the directorate and the council. These are difficult to quantify until the scale of any challenge is known but would run into millions of pounds

**Controls****Owner**

Transparent and fair pay structure

Geoff Derham

**Conclusion****Tolerate****Learning, Culture & Children's Services****Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009****10. Financial costs to school budgets****20**

*Cause* - SEN allowance dispute/grading of Teaching Assistants in Special Schools

*Consequence* - Financial costs to school budgets/redundancies/industrial action/reputational damage

**Conclusion****Treat****Actions****Due Date**

Negotiations with trade unions/schools

Ongoing

**11. Significant budget overspend****14**

*Cause* - Unbudgeted allowances - Leisure and Library staff

*Consequence* - Significant budget overspend requiring corrective action

**Controls****Owner**

Application to Corporate Finance to meet additional costs arising

Charlie Croft

**Conclusion****Tolerate**

## KCR 0002 - Unsuccessful delivery of accommodation review project

Efficiencies and facilitation of cultural change through rationalisation to one-site operations. The project relies and has interdependencies with other programmes of work such as FMS replacement and Easy@york.

### Project Work Streams

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Land Assembly	8	8	14		
2. Design & Construction	19				
3. Design & Planning	23	8			
4. Change Management	19	14			
5. Financial	8				
6. Property Disposals	16	14	15	10	15
7. Marketing & Communications	14	19			
8. Procurement	22	21	19		

### Design & Construction

Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

#### 2.1 Onerous conditions on planning permission

19

*Cause* - Developers design does not fully reflect the local planning guidelines.

*Consequence* - Significant delay to programme resulting in increased costs due to re-negotiation and lease extensions. Developer terminates agreement. Recommencement of procurement process. Abort procurement process

#### Controls

Consultation and feedback from Planning

#### Owner

Ian Asher

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

Pre-planning consultation by developers

#### Due Date

30/04/09

### Design & Planning

Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

#### 3.1 Failure to achieve planning approval

23

*Cause* - Developer solution fails to take into consideration the local planning conditions for the site they have selected. (massing, height, access, materials etc.) Sufficient strength of feeling from third party objections.

*Consequence* - Delays and consequent costs incurred (lease extensions, re-negotiations) on the project if permission is refused. Developer terminates agreement. Recommencement or abolition of the procurement process.

#### Controls

Staged design development and approvals  
Clearly defined development brief  
Planning policy

#### Owner

Ian Asher  
Ian Asher  
Ian Asher

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

Awareness of planning policy  
Pre planning consultation by developers

#### Due Date

02/08/09  
08/05/09

**Change Management** Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

**4.1 Failure of the organisation to implement the corporate transformational change agenda reflected in the new HQ design brief** **23**

Cause - If the organisation does not effectively coordinate and implement the transformational change agenda, due to a lack of future vision, direction and robust implementation of a corporate transformational change programme.

Consequence - The Council will fail to achieve the operational efficiencies and improvements in customer service provision, anticipated in the business case. The project will deliver a new head quarters building that is ineffective and inefficient.

**Controls**  
Office of the future project

**Owner**  
Sandra Herbert

**Conclusion**  
Treat

**Property Disposals** Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

**6.1 Value of property capital receipts obtained are less than the values used in the projects budget.** **16**

Cause - Market conditions or planning restrictions.

Consequence - Increased prudential borrowing required to cover the deficit.

**Controls**  
Identify the mid value of property

**Owner**  
John Urwin

**Conclusion**  
Treat

**Actions**  
Maximise capital receipt

**Due Date**  
30/12/09

**Marketing & Communications** Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

**7.2 Leaks to the media** **19**

Cause - Lack of awareness of procurement rules amongst those involved or those informed of the outcome of the procurement process due to misinformation or for political gain or nuisance.

Consequence - Reputation damage to CYC and the project. Breach of procurement rules and confidence or commercial confidentiality potentially jepodising the procurement process, and requiring compensation to developers.

**Controls**  
Limit access to information and ensure confidentiality status of documents

**Owner**  
Sandra Herbert

**Conclusion**  
Treat

**Actions**  
Brief of members and senior officers on procurement rules

**Due Date**  
NYE

**Procurement** Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009

**8.1 Challenge to the procurement process** **22**

Cause - Actual or perceived breach of the procurement rules

Consequence - Significant delayIncrease in costs, requirement for specialist advice, compensation payments.Potential abort of the process.Damage to council reputation.

**Controls**  
EU Procurement rules and CYC process  
External legal advice  
Supplier contract management system (No, Yes)

**Owner**  
Ian Asher  
Ian Asher  
Ian Asher

**Conclusion**  
Treat

**Actions**  
Robust tender documents

**Due Date**  
22/05/09

### 8.2 Developers unable to meet the requirements of the development brief

21

Cause - Developers are unable to comply with the brief due to council aspirations, as outlined in the design brief, exceeding the budget.

Consequence - Reduction in scope.- size and/or quality.Less effective building due to increase in staff density resulting in negative feedback and staff dissatisfaction.Abort procurement process.Reputational damage to CYC.

#### Controls

Realistic development brief

#### Owner

Ian Asher

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

Arrange bidder days for dialogue

#### Due Date

30/04/09

### 8.3 Too many bidders withdraw from the procurement process

19

Cause - Bidders regard the development brief, heads of terms, or invitation to participate in dialogue unacceptable or unachievable.

Consequence - Significant delay to programme, increases in construction or developemnt costs caused by those delays,I cost and delays in seeking external legal advice, abort and recommence procurement process or negotiate with single bidder, go back to Hungate, compromise the project scope.

#### Controls

Professional advice to ensure specification is achievable  
Control negotiation during tender dialogue phase  
Dialogue with developers to understand their concerns

#### Owner

Ian Asher  
Ian Asher  
Ian Asher

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

Refine Specification during dialogue

#### Due Date

22/05/09

## KCR 0003 - Failure of waste management strategy partnership

Financial penalties of failing to manage satisfactory partnership solution to waste agenda. Partnership solution with NYCC introduces risks to the programme from CYC perspective (control, breakdown of effective working, governance etc). Project risks of the partnership have been identified and are being managed by NYCC as the lead body

### Project Work Streams

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Project Delivery	14	6	14	6	14	
2. Planning Consent	13	18	14	23		
3. Procurement	18	6	13	13		
4. Financial	23	17	6	21	19	20
5. Leadership & communication	13	20	12	22	19	
6. Partnership	19	11	13	14		

### Planning Consent

Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009

#### 2. Failure to secure and/or demonstrate adequate consultation 18

Cause - This is to be completed as part of the statutory consultation on planning.

Consequence - This could cause judicial review and objections.

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

#### 4. Failure to secure planning consent 23

Cause - Failure to secure planning consent on any of the selected sites. If there is not enough of preparation to ensure the site is the most appropriate and all the required testing has been complete. Environmental Impact assessments etc.

Consequence - This could result in non-delivery of project

**Controls**

Identification of suitable alternative sites

**Owner**

Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

Audit of the preparation process

**Due Date**

30/06/09

### Procurement

Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009

#### 1. Potential challenge of process 18

Cause - If the losing bidder deems the evaluation has been inappropriate

Consequence - The Council could be sued and incur costs and therefore may not be able to award the contract

**Controls**

Auditable trails of documentation

**Owner**

Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

### Financial

Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009

#### 1. Planning delays could lead to increased costs 23

Cause - Due to the cost of land filling being higher than the cost of the treatment facility any delay in the construction and operation of the facility will cause increased costs.

Consequence - This could lead to planning delays and increased costs.

**Controls**

Work with bidders and NYCC planners

**Owner**

Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**2. Solution is unaffordable** **17**

Cause - The Government have imposed penalties designed to reduce the amount of BMW going to landfill and these penalties are prohibitive and the Council cannot achieve the reduction in BMW to landfill without a disposal facility. The cost of this facility highly significant but lower than the penalties.

Consequence - The Council will be subject to penalties which will cost even more.

**Controls**

Highlight as a budget requirement in MTFS  
The Council has signed up to closing the affordability gap

**Owner**

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**4. Inability to fund the procurement** **21**

Cause - Insufficient budget in order to fund project requirements.

Consequence - The procurement will be delayed or might not occur or the contract could be inappropriate.

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

Application for growth bid

**Due Date**

20/01/10

**5. Possible enquiry would lead to increased costs** **19**

Cause - If there is a planning inquiry.

Consequence - Increased costs due to delay to the construction.

**Controls**

Project programme includes time for planning debate  
Work to ensure the site is deliverable

**Owner**

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**6. PFI funding becomes unavailable** **21**

Cause - Bidders are finding it difficult to secure the loans required to fund the investment, due to the current economic climate

Consequence - This could result in significant delays or even in the project having to be terminated.

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

Look into alternative ways of funding the project

**Due Date**

30/06/09

**Leadership & Communication** **Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009**

**2. Negative perception of treatment plants and technologies** **20**

Cause - Failure to communicate to stakeholders regarding the benefits and requirement for a treatment site.

Consequence - This could result in protests and lead to delays in project. This could lead to objections of planning permission.

**Controls**

Communication Strategy  
Communication Plan

**Owner**

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Tolerate**

**4. Project terminated** **22**

Cause - The project could be deemed unacceptable by Council Executives.

Consequence - This would leave the Council exposed to increasing landfill costs, including landfill

**Controls**

Communication Strategy

**Owner**

Bill Woolley

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

Contract negotiations with preferred bidder

**Due Date**

02/03/09

**5. Lack of continuity in the strategic leadership of the project**

**19**

*Cause - The Council does not react quickly enough to ensure continued strategic leadership and input into the project from City of York Council's perspective.*

*Consequence - This could result in the project being delivered to North Yorkshire County Council's requirements without City of York Council's requires being included and we will have to sustain the impact of this for the duration of the 25 year contract*

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

**Due Date**

Additional resource to be allocated to project (AD Corporate Finance)

02/03/09

**Partnership**

**Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009**

**1. Failure to agree back to back agreement**

**19**

*Cause - There are factors such as costs and political issues that could affect this risk.*

*Consequence - The Council will not have access to a disposal facility.*

**Conclusion**

**Treat**

**Actions**

**Due Date**

This will require strategic support

TBC

## KCR 0007 - Failure to deliver the Local Area Agreement

Increasing adverse risks associated with failure further to the expectations set out in the White Paper. Felt to be higher risk issue also due to lack of commitment/investment in LSP and other partnerships by the organisation in the past.

### Economic Development

Risks Last Reviewed: 26/11/2008

#### Limited awareness of LAA within Council and amongst stakeholders

18

*Cause* - If LAA's stakeholders do not buy-in to it and have a comprehensive understanding of its goals and aspirations  
*Consequence* - This could affect the Council's reputation and have a detrimental affect on the CPA score.

#### Controls

Agreed approach with the Partnership's Executive Delivery Board  
Communication with CMT  
Communication with Members

#### Owner

Roger Ranson  
Roger Ranson  
Roger Ranson

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

Partnership launch event

#### Due Date

24/09/08

#### Lack of agreement of ownership for performance information and management

18

*Cause* - An uncertainty between partners as to who was leading on certain indicators. A lack of action plans to achieve outcomes.  
*Consequence* - There will be financial penalties for not achieving targets and affects to our reputation in the eyes of the partners and central government. This could have greater repercussions in the future once we move to the CAA inspection regime..

#### Controls

Work programme  
Working relationships within the LSP  
Agreed process for distribution of LPSA2 monies

#### Owner

Roger Ranson  
Roger Ranson  
Roger Ranson

#### Conclusion

#### Tolerate

## **KCR 0009 - Failure to coordinate significant programmes of change**

Organisation fails to coordinate and manage a range of interlinked corporate initiatives that are designed to change the way in which the organisation operates and behaves. These include easy@york, Admin accom and a range of supporting projects. Failure to coordinate change activity will lead to difficulty in resourcing multiple strands of activity, may lead to actions being missed and ultimately not being able to occupy Hungate.

**Accommodation Project**

**Risks Last Reviewed: 17/02/2009**

### **1. Failure of the organisation to implement the corporate transformational change agenda reflected in the new HQ design brief**

*Cause - If the organisation does not effectively coordinate and implement the transformational change agenda, due to a lack of future vision, direction and robust implementation of a corporate transformational change programme.*

*Consequence - The Council will fail to achieve the operational efficiencies and improvements in customer service provision, anticipated in the business case. The project will deliver a new head quarters building that is ineffective and inefficient.*

## KCR 0011 - Failure to effectively govern and manage partnerships

Governance issues around the proper management of partnerships is not robust and leaves the Council open to a variety of potential problems and threats to the organisation. Implications for CPA UoR in 2006 and 2007 refresh exercises and knock on effect on the corporate CPA in 2008.

	WW	SYP	EP	LCY	Y@L	YE	IY	YOK	HC	FP	VY	SC	YPO
1. Unbudgeted financial liability to partnership	N/a	8	N/a	6	8	N/a	N/a	8	8	8	12	14	18
2. Inadequate governance arrangements	8	8	N/a	2	8	8	8	8	8	14	6	8	12
3. Failure to achieve stated outcomes	14	8	N/a	14	14	14	6	13	14	9	14	13	12
4. Failure to manage performance and add value	18	2	N/a	8	13	13	N/a	13	13	4	14	13	12
5. Inability to demonstrate stakeholder consultation	19	2	N/a	13	9	8	6	6	9	13	2	9	12
6. Inadequate medium term financial stability	N/a	14	N/a	19	N/a	N/a	N/a	13	14	13	15	20	14
7. Reputational impact of partnership activities	14	12	N/a	8	8	14	N/a	8	8	14	6	13	14
8. Ability to demonstrate Value for Money in use of funds	N/a	2	N/a	8	N/a	N/a	N/a	6	N/a	2	6	14	N/a

### Without Walls Risks Last Reviewed: 26/11/2008

#### 4. Failure to manage performance and add value

18

*Cause* - If the lead partner does not implement an appropriate way of working, such as joint commissioning or another effective way of working in partnership, with all partners who have an input towards any given target.

*Consequence* - This could mean we don't achieve the 60% required to receive the performance reward. This could also adversely affect the partners CAA score in the new inspection regime, if it is perceived we are not working in partnership effectively. This would also have a reputational impact.

#### Conclusion

#### Treat

#### Actions

#### Due Date

Review of Strategic Partnerships

31/03/09

### Without Walls Risks Last Reviewed: 26/11/2008

#### 5. Inability to demonstrate stakeholder consultation

19

*Cause* - This is a perception measure and can be very difficult to influence. Election turn out results are going down and in general, participation from the community is limited.

*Consequence* - With effect from April 2009 there is a statutory duty to involve the community in planning services. This is to be used as a success measure in the LAA. If we fail to do this, it could have a reputational

#### Conclusion

#### Tolerate

#### Actions

#### Due Date

Consideration of adopting the CYC Engagement Strategy by the LSP

31/03/09

WW = Without Walls

SYP = Safer York

EP = Economic Partnership

LCY = Learning City York

Y@L = York@Large

YE = York Environment

IY = Inclusive York

YOK = YorOK Board

HC = Healthy City

FP = Future Prospects

VY = Visit York

SC = Science City

CC = City Centre

YPO = Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation

**Learning City York Risks Last Reviewed**

**6. Inadequate medium term financial stability 19**

*Cause - Insecurity of funding streams, in particular from the LSC (Learning Skills Council).*      *Consequence - Loss of dedicated resource to service the partnership and this could result in an inability to progress the priorities of the board.*

**Controls**      **Owner**  
 2008/09 Budget in place      Pete Dwyer

**Conclusion**      **Tolerate**

**Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation Risks Last Reviewed: 18/02/2009**

**1. Financial liability to Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation 18**

*Cause - There is possibility that no dividend will be paid in any given year.*      *Consequence - This would result in budget shortfalls across departments (~£135K).*

**Controls**      **Owner**  
 Constitution controlling Governance of organisation      David Walker  
 Representation on the management committee      David Walker  
 Officer Group      David Walker

**Conclusion**      **Treat**

**Actions**      **Due Date**  
 CYC Cllr Members lobbying YPO in terms of some dividend being paid in 2008/09      31/03/09

**Science City York Risks Last Reviewed**

**6. Inadequate medium term financial stability 20**

*Cause - A lack of external funding to undertake core activities in Science City York. Funding ends in March 2009.*      *Consequence - Impact on the local economy and potential issues in terms of staff.*

**Controls**  
 Bid for European funding  
 Discuss with Yorkshire forward re continued funding

**Conclusion**      **Tolerate**

## KCR 0010 - Failure to ensure Business Continuity

The Council has a duty to ensure the continuity of its services to residents and customers. Business continuity plans should act as mitigating controls capable of reducing the impact of specific risks such as fire, flood or loss of staff. The lack of these plans reduces the Council's ability to respond and increases the level of exposure to associated legal, financial and reputational risk.

	RES	CS	NS	CE	LCCS	HASS
1. Inability to ensure staff welfare	13	18	13	9	N/a	14
2. Inability to contact staff	19	18	14	8	N/a	12
3. Inability to provide statutory services	19	9	19	13	N/a	12
4. Inability to deliver services	9	13	14	12	18	13
5. Inability to prioritise & allocate resources	9	18	19	13	13	12
6. Failure to recover most time critical IT application	9	13	14	13	13	13
7. Increased staff costs	9	14	14	4	N/a	8
8. Increased accommodation costs	9	14	14	4	N/a	8
9. Increased equipment costs	9	15	14	4	N/a	8
10. Loss of data (hard copy)	9	14	14	18	12	9

### Resources

Risks Last Reviewed: 26/11/2008

#### 2. Inability to contact staff

19

Cause - Lack of staff contact information held by some senior management and a failure to maintain those records we do have

Consequence - This could affect the business recovery and also attract negative press coverage

##### Controls

Death in service payment details

##### Owner

David Walker

##### Conclusion

##### Treat

##### Actions

Complete BCP's for all Divisions

##### Due Date

31/03/09

#### 3. Inability to provide statutory services

19

Cause - If there is a lack of leadership in regards to Business Continuity across the organisation as a whole and/or a lack of knowledge of corporate BCP and how divisional plans feed into it.

Consequence - Inability to pay vulnerable people welfare benefits.

##### Controls

BCP in place for Revenues and Benefits Services

##### Owner

David Walker

##### Conclusion

##### Treat

##### Actions

Identify the BCP co-ordinator for Revenues and Benefits Services

##### Due Date

30/09/08

**1. Inability to ensure staff welfare****18**

Cause - If the directorate does not have a system that informs them of who is at work on any given day and a major incident occurred they would not be able to ensure their staffs welfare because they would not know who is potentially affected by any given event.

Consequence - This may cause problems when trying to account for members of staff and in communicating with them.

**Controls**

Staff contact cards

**Owner**

Damon Copperthwaite

**Conclusion**

Treat

**2. Inability to contact staff****18**

Cause - This could be caused if the directorate does not have an up-to-date contact list of all its members of staff.

Consequence - This will have an effect on the directorate ability to recover and continue its business. This will also impact on general staff welfare issues.

**Controls**

Business Continuity Plans for some service areas

**Owner**

Damon Copperthwaite

**Conclusion**

Treat

**Actions**

Complete all service area BCP's

**Due Date**

30/09/08

**5. Inability to prioritise & allocate resources****18**

Cause - The directorate needs to consider the priority of services and how scarce resources could be allocated in the event of a major incident.

Consequence - This exercise, if undertaken after the event, could cause delays and affect the speed and cost at which the directorate recovers its business.

**Conclusion**

Treat

**Actions**

Complete all service area BCP's

**Due Date**

30/09/08

**Neighbourhood Services**

Risks Last Reviewed: 24/02/2009

**3. Inability to provide statutory services****19**

Cause - Service Areas do not currently have complete and updated BCPs

Consequence - Council would suffer reputational damage

**Conclusion**

Treat

**Actions**

Complete Business Continuity Plans

**Due Date**

31/03/09

**5. Inability to prioritise & allocate resources****19**

Cause - As Business Continuity plans are not complete and the business impact assessment

Consequence - Potential delays to recovering the service.

**Conclusion**

Treat

**Actions**

Complete BCP including analysis of staff resources required

**Due Date**

31/03/09

## 10. Loss of data (hard copy)

18

*Cause* - Most data held by the directorate is in hard copy only. A disaster could result in total loss of this information.

*Consequence* - Legal, HR and democratic services files could be lost and we would be unable to replicate the information and be unable to meet contractual or statutory deadlines and obligations.

**Controls**

Arrangements in place to receive copies from clients and archives etc

**Owner**

Quentin Baker

**Conclusion****Treat****Actions**

Procure a case management system

**Due Date**

01/08/09

Implement information governance system within directorate

01/08/09

## 4. Inability to deliver services

18

*Cause* - Key risk is potential loss of school through fire or asbestos.

*Consequence* - Short term loss of service whilst temporary provision is made on the site or students redirected to other schools.

**Controls**

DMT emergency response

**Owner**

Kevin Hall

**Conclusion****Tolerate**