

## KCR 0003 Waste management strategy partnership

Corporate Lead Bill Woolley

*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*

### City Strategy

### Waste Management Strategy Partnership

### Project delays

Risk Owner: Bill Woolley

**Risk Ref: 1005**

**High**

**20**

Cause *Failure to communicate to stakeholders regarding the benefits and requirement for a treatment site.  
Failure to secure and/or demonstrate adequate consultation.  
Stakeholder issues arise to do with planning and design, due to negative perception of treatment plants and technologies.*

Consequence *This could result in judicial review, objections of planning permission, protests, public enquiry and significant delays to the project and increase costs.*

#### Controls

Communication Strategy  
Public Consultation  
Communication Plan  
Work with Amey Cespa and NYCC planners  
Project programme includes time for planning debate  
Work to ensure the site is deliverable  
Early feasibility study to be carried out to identify possible areas of concern

#### Owner

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

#### Actions

Consultation to be completed as statutory consultation on planning

#### Target Date

31/08/2010

#### Revised Date

31/12/2011

## Failure to secure planning consent

Risk Owner: Bill Woolley

Risk Ref: 1010

High

19

Cause Failure to secure planning consent on any of the selected sites. If there is not enough 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  
Environment Impact Assessment  
Amey Cespa working closely with planning department re design and site plan  
Council engagement with statutory consultees  
Engagement with Government Office  
Requirement of Amey Cespa to demonstrate how they plan to ensure planning success  
Work closely with Amey Cespa through planning - communication process

### Owner

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

### Actions

Support provided to NYCC in terms of peer review of planning process

### Target Date

31/12/2010

### Revised Date

31/12/2011

## Solution is unaffordable

Risk Owner: Bill Woolley

Risk Ref: 1019

Medium

14

Cause The council has agreed to an affordability envelope for the project however this could be breached due to delays, changes in interest rates or exchange rates/ inflation.

Consequence The cost of continuing with the project could be greater than do - minimum in which case the project could be terminated (at a cost to the councils).

### Controls

Highlighted as a budget requirement as part of the MTFS.  
The Council has signed up to the additional budget requirement  
Regular monitoring of latest costs  
Review affordability gap  
Manage cost drift with contractor  
Possible need to request further budget

### Owner

Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley  
Bill Woolley

## Potential challenge of the procurement process

Risk Owner: Bill Woolley

Risk Ref: 1030

Low

6

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

Corporate Lead Bill Woolley

*Business Continuity: The Council has a statutory duty to have plans in place to ensure the delivery of its critical services continues throughout any disruption to itself or the community. Emergency Planning: The Council, as a Category 1 responder to critical incidents, has a duty to maintain both generic and specific plans to respond to the major risks facing its community.*

**City Strategy**

**Inability to respond to and assist in the recovery of city of York after a major incident**

Risk Owner: Richard Wood

**Risk Ref: 1718**

**High**

**18**

Cause Under the Civil Contingencies Act, as a local authority, it is the role of City of York Council to support the emergency services in the case of a major emergency and to provide aid and assistance and advice to the general public.

Consequence Emergency services may not be completely supported which could hinder the promptness of their response, the speed of recovery of the city, and vulnerable people within the city may be put at risk.

**Controls**

- Emergency Plans for the city
- Emergency manuals
- Exercising of the plans
- Officers on-call
- Plans and manuals updated twice (particularly contacts)
- CYC Emergency Handbook
- Engagement with regional partners via local resilience forum

**Owner**

- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- John Wray
- Richard Wood

**Inability to continue to deliver services following a business disruption event**

Risk Owner: Richard Wood

**Risk Ref: 0623**

**High**

**16**

Cause If group and directorate plans are not developed, adopted and embedded at both levels this could result in an inability to continue to deliver services following a business disruption event. the result could be further risk to customers and the community and resultant criticism.

Consequence Reputational and potentially litigation and breach of statutory duty leading to censure of Council.

**Controls**

- BC working group
- Progress reports to CMT
- Timetable for driving forward BC in the Council
- A BC Lead for every Directorate and Department has been put in place

**Owner**

- John Wray
- John Wray
- John Wray
- John Wray

## KCR 0015 Fairness & Inclusion

Corporate Lead Sally Burns

*The refreshed corporate Fairness and Inclusion Strategy and Single Equality Scheme were approved by the Executive in December 2009. This updates council fairness and inclusion commitment and action. It also ensures that we meet current statutory duties arising from equality legislation and provides the framework for the development of fair and inclusive service delivery and employment practice in the council.*

### Communities & Neighbourhoods

#### Councillor's vision and expectations of a fair inclusive and customer-focused organisation will not be realised

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

**Risk Ref: 1796**

**High**

**20**

Cause *The action plan in the corporate Single Equality Scheme is not implemented because of lack of prioritisation, adequate resources and understanding of the issues.*

Consequence *Customers receive poor quality unfair, and possibly discriminatory, services and staff satisfaction declines due to poor quality employment practices. The council's reputation as a service deliverer and employer declines. We do not meet recognised standards of excellence in services and employment.*

#### Controls

Corporate Fairness and Inclusion Strategy and Single Equality Scheme  
Directorate Single Equality Schemes  
Equality Framework for Local Government self-assessment and peer assessment

#### Owner

Evie Chandler  
Evie Chandler  
Evie Chandler

#### Actions

Ensure staff & member training in equality and Human Rights takes place  
Officers understand and follow the corporate equality system and standards  
Implementation of directorate equality schemes and monitoring by Directorate Management Teams every quarter  
Equality Impact Assessments are undertaken and resulting actions are implemented and monitored

#### Target Date

31/03/2011  
31/03/2011  
31/03/2011  
31/03/2011

#### Revised Date

30/04/2011  
30/04/2011  
30/04/2011  
30/04/2011

#### Vulnerable people cannot access our services and employment opportunities

Risk Owner: Pauline Stuchfield

**Risk Ref: 1797**

**High**

**20**

Cause *Lack of understanding of the needs of vulnerable people and the barriers they face when they try to access our services and employment opportunities.*

Consequence *Vulnerable customers are excluded from council services and employment opportunities we provide. We can face legal challenges.*

#### Controls

CBSS directorate Single Equality Scheme

#### Owner

Pauline Stuchfield

#### Actions

Complete Equality Impact Assessments of access to services and employment and implement resulting action plans

#### Target Date

31/03/2011

#### Revised Date

30/04/2011

## We do not provide fair and inclusive customer-focused services

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 1798

High

20

Cause Lack of understanding of the needs of vulnerable customers resulting in lack of remedial action to meet their needs.

Consequence Vulnerable customers are excluded from services we provide. Our reputation as a quality service provider is reduced. We can face legal challenges.

### Controls

Directorate Single Equality Schemes

### Owner

Evie Chandler

### Actions

Complete and implement service Equality Impact Assessments and monitor remedial actions

### Target Date

31/03/2011

### Revised Date

30/04/2011

## Vulnerable staff are bullied, harassed and feel excluded

Risk Owner: Sally Burns

Risk Ref: 1799

High

20

Cause Lack of understanding of the needs of vulnerable staff resulting in lack of remedial action to meet their needs.

Consequence Staff survey results are poor. Vulnerable staff's health is affected negatively or/and they leave. Our reputation as a good employer is reduced. We can face legal challenges.

### Controls

Workforce Plan

### Owner

Pauline Stuchfield

### Actions

Implementation of Workforce Plan

31/03/2011

30/04/2011

Monitoring through service planning and PDRs

31/03/2011

30/04/2011

Equalities Impact Assessments undertaken for all Human Resources practices

31/03/2011

30/04/2011

Consultation with Staff Equalities Reference Group (SERG)

31/03/2011

30/04/2011

## KCR 0016 Capital Programme

Corporate Lead Bill Woolley & Pete Dwyer

*The Capital Programme delivers a number of capital schemes that directly contribute to the achievement of the Corporate Strategy. All capital schemes are included into the Capital Programme via the annual capital budget process which allocates resources to the projects that facilitate with service delivery and contribute toward the Corporate Strategy. Currently the Capital Programme contains 85 projects over a 5 year period with a budget of over £206m.*

### City Strategy

### Strategic Planning and Transport

### Transport Capital Programme

#### Failure to obtain funding for Access York Phase 1

Risk Owner: Tony Clarke

**Risk Ref: 1319**

**Critical**

**23**

Cause *If the DfT or CYC funding was not available*      Consequence *Project would not proceed*

#### Controls

Regional Funding Allocation confirmed available.  
Follow DfT procedures to obtain main funding.  
Follow CYC CRAM procedures for local contribution.

#### Owner

Tony Clarke  
Tony Clarke  
Tony Clarke

#### Actions

Confirm CYC funding through CRAM process  
Progress scheme through new bidding process. Submit Best and Final Funding Bid by 9 September 2011

#### Target Date

31/03/2009  
31/03/2011

#### Revised Date

31/08/2011  
09/09/2011

#### Failure to deliver objectives of LTP

Risk Owner: Tony Clarke

**Risk Ref: 1832**

**High**

**16**

Cause *Reduced funding from DfT*      Consequence *Congestion, air quality, safety levels will worsen.*

#### Controls

Obtain funding from alternative sources

#### Owner

Tony Clarke

#### Actions

Progress funding bid to Local Sustainable Transport Fund

#### Target Date

21/03/2011

#### Revised Date

18/04/2011

### Adults, Children & Education

## Failure to deliver ACE school modernisation strategy

Risk Owner: Kevin Hall

**Risk Ref: 0363**

**Medium**

**13**

Cause Late delivery or failure of significant capital projects include: Rawcliffe and Clifton Primary schools and English Martyrs and Our Lady's primary school merger. Other schemes now in development include: Clifton Green extension, Applefields school integrated provision, Huntington secondary construction project. Further projects are subject to DfE funding announcements.

Consequence Late delivery of large scale capital projects may lead to reputational damage, financial loss and difficulties with school admissions and accommodating children and young people.

### Controls

Extensive project management  
Regular reporting to Members

### Owner

Maggie Tansley  
Kevin Hall

## City Strategy

### Administration & Accommodation Review

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

Risk Owner: Ian Asher

**Risk Ref: 1315**

**High**

**18**

Cause Developers are unable to comply with the brief as outlined in the design brief, within the budget due to emerging historical building, archaeological or onerous conditions.

Consequence Reduction in scope.- eg. Building area or quality.  
Possibly less effective building due to an increase in staff density resulting in negative feedback and staff dis-satisfaction.  
Sustainability features put at risk.  
Potential for extended programme due to historic finds.  
Reputational damage to CYC.

### Controls

Realistic development brief  
Professional advice to ensure specification is achievable.

### Owner

Ian Asher  
Ian Asher

### Actions

Monitor design proposals and early site work

### Target Date

08/04/2010

### Revised Date

30/05/2011

## Failure to discharge planning conditions

Risk Owner: Ian Asher

Risk Ref: 1821

High

17

Cause The developer delays or is unable to comply with the planning conditions. This risk remains valid until the end of the project.

Consequence Completion of the construction work and the subsequent handover of the building to the council could be delayed. The council may not be entitled to occupy and/or use the building if planning conditions are not discharged.

### Controls

Planning policy  
Conditional Sale and Development agreement  
Staged design development meetings

### Owner

Ian Asher  
Ian Asher  
Ian Asher

### Actions

Monitor discharge of CSDA pre-conditions including developer's discharging of the planning conditions.

### Target Date

30/09/2010

### Revised Date

30/09/2011

## Dilapidation liabilities are higher than budgeted

Risk Owner: Philip Callow

Risk Ref: 0293

High

16

Cause Uncertain values of dilapidation liabilities.

Consequence Could result in an overspend of the project budget at the end of the project.

### Controls

Dilapidations budget  
Dilapidations surveys

### Owner

Tom Wilkinson  
John Urwin

### Actions

Negotiation with landlords

### Target Date

01/12/2010

### Revised Date

06/04/2011

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

Risk Owner: Ian Asher

Risk Ref: 0351

Medium

14

Cause The organisation does not effectively coordinate and implement the transformational change agenda.

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 the organisation is unable to use to its maximum potential.

### Controls

Integration with the More for York Programme

### Owner

Ian Asher

## City Strategy

## Community Stadium



### Commercial Development does not progress

Risk Owner: Tim Atkins

**Risk Ref: 1844**

High

18

Cause The developer has problems raising funds.

Consequence No enabling funds available resulting in a shortfall of capital. Scheme delayed and / or alternative developer required.

#### Controls

Financial protocols

#### Owner

Tim Atkins

#### Actions

Due diligence

#### Target Date

28/02/2011

#### Revised Date

28/04/2011

Soft market test another developer-partner

30/04/2011

### Capital Funding

Risk Owner: Tim Atkins

**Risk Ref: 1759**

Medium

14

Cause Insufficient funds to effectively fund capital for project.

Consequence Fail to meet vision for community benefit.

#### Controls

Planning Strategy

CYC capital programme

Other external funding sources

#### Owner

Tim Atkins

Tim Atkins

Tim Atkins

#### Actions

Undertake S106 discussions to assess available capital-finalise development appraisals.

#### Target Date

31/01/2011

#### Revised Date

31/05/2011

## KCR 0018 Impact of an Ageing Population

Corporate Lead Pete Dwyer

*This is a long term piece of work which has been initiated by a scoping report to CMT. The next stage is to set up agreed actions for 10/11 and beyond following a workshop with senior managers across the council and an appraisal of the key issues.*

### Adults, Children & Education

#### Increasing social care support costs

Risk Owner: Graham Terry

Risk Ref: 1715

High

20

Cause *If we do not involve older people in the design and delivery of services such as health, social care, housing and other services and deliver the changes required to manage demand and create efficiencies/savings.*

Consequence *The rising demographic for social care support projections show that the costs could increase by £12m by 2020. This would happen if the council does not respond and change the way it delivers its services. We will lose the opportunity to have an inclusive design that supports older people's quality of life in the city.*

#### Controls

Expected budget settlement to include growth of £1.5m for demographic pressures  
Additional central government funding in 2011-12 to come via PCT  
Executive considering proposals on Re-ablement service expansion in March and the EPH review in June 2011.

#### Owner

Graham Terry  
Graham Terry  
Graham Terry

#### Actions

Older Peoples Accommodation review

#### Target Date

30/06/2011

#### Revised Date

#### Inability to understand and respond to the demands of an Ageing Population

Risk Owner: Graham Terry

Risk Ref: 1714

High

18

Cause *If the Ageing Population Review fails to be given the necessary priority corporately, including required resources for it to be carried out during 2010.*

Consequence *We may not understand the extent and scale of the changes required to be made to our services to meet the ageing populations changing demands. This could lead to reputational damage and affect our CAA rating, especially if older people become disengaged with the council and broader social issues.*

#### Controls

Prioritisation of work following CLG and support from the Chief Executive  
Continue to engage stakeholders in key actions to deliver these.

#### Owner

Graham Terry  
Graham Terry

#### Actions

Finalise key actions and embed within Service Plans.

#### Target Date

31/10/2010

#### Revised Date

30/04/2011

## KCR 0019 Safeguarding

Corporate Lead Pete Dwyer

*Ensuring that our children and young people in the city are safe and protected has to be a key priority for any authority. This involves not simply ensuring effective interventions into family life but the creation of protective arenas of safety which for example include safe recruitment practice. The individual, organisational and reputational implications of ineffective safeguarding practice are acute*

### Adults, Children & Education

#### Serious injury or death occurs where there is or should have been some safeguarding involvement

Risk Owner: Eoin Rush

**Risk Ref: 1707**

**Critical**

**22**

Cause Evidence that multi agency procedures were not properly implemented

Consequence

Serious case review which would put into the public domain the short comings of any services that were involved

#### Controls

Monitoring of referral arrangements  
Safeguarding Children Board Professional Practice Monitoring Group established  
Implementation of comprehensive safeguarding children training programme  
Routine Case File Auditing

#### Owner

Eoin Rush  
Eoin Rush  
Eoin Rush  
Eoin Rush

#### Actions

Development of new Advice and Early Intervention service

#### Target Date

31/05/2011

#### Revised Date

# KCR 0021 Corporate Performance Management Framework

Corporate Lead Kersten England

*The council has a duty to provide value for money services to meet the needs of the citizens in York and to be accountable to local people where this is not achieved. Failure to effectively manage the council's performance could impact adversely on the council's reputation both at a local and national level. As such the council's corporate performance management framework must be robust and provide a level of assurance which enables both officers and Elected Members to make informed decisions*

## Office of the Chief Executive

### Ensuring we get commitment and support from Partnerships for a city-wide hub

Risk Owner: Ian Graham **Risk Ref: 1819** **Medium** **14**

Cause *The new performance framework needs to be city-wide to ensure it is effective at delivering joined up intelligence and supporting more integrated improvement.*

Consequence *Less data/information will be available in the intelligence hub and we may fail to properly integrate the big partners into the system (e.g. PCT & NY Police)*

#### Controls

Papers and regular updates to LSP & WoW-EDB  
Regular task & finish meetings with SCS refresh and business planning workstreams

#### Owner

Peter Lowe  
Peter Lowe

#### Actions

Review 'challenge' part of new PMF

#### Target Date

18/02/2011

#### Revised Date

13/05/2011

### Implementing a new PMF at the same time as restructures, blueprints & major changes to govt framework

Risk Owner: Peter Lowe **Risk Ref: 1859** **Medium** **13**

Cause *It can be difficult to consult on PMF requirements and data intelligence whilst key staff and stakeholders are going through restructures and blueprint exercises. The government are also drip-feeding changes to the performance framework and the replacement of the CAA with a sector-led self assessment framework.*

Consequence *It's similar to trying to bake a cake without knowing all the ingredients. If we do not keep up with government changes or fail to ensure that proposed PMF and intelligence hub changes feed into restructures and blueprints, the final result could be a disjointed or out-of-date city-wide PMF.*

#### Controls

Regular papers and updates to OCE DMT and directorate management team

#### Owner

Peter Lowe

## Geographic Information System (GIS)

Risk Owner: Peter Lowe

**Risk Ref: 1861**

**Medium**

**13**

Cause *The role of GIS across the council needs to be reviewed to understand what role the Business Intelligence Team will carry out compared to other operational and maintenance duties. Currently GIS could be seen as having 3 main functions (e.g. IT operational / data maintenance / business intelligence).*

*If this is not clarified, it will be difficult to incorporate GIS roles within the new corporate Business Intelligence Team (within the BCP team).*

Consequence *1. The business intelligence hub requires geo codes and mapping to ensure profiling and mash-ups are developed and accessible. Is the GIS support requirements are not properly delivered, this could cause problems.  
2. BI Officer training requirements may not be properly understood and met.  
3. GIS data management & ownership could become fragmented and uncoordinated.*

### Controls

GIS skills and support for BI hub

### Owner

Peter Lowe

### Actions

GIS Training and IT software requirements

### Target Date

16/12/2010

### Revised Date

22/04/2011

## KCR 0022 Financial Pressures

Corporate Lead Ian Floyd

*Reductions of approximately 25% in government department budgets are expected over the next 4 years. The Council needs a structured and strategic approach to deliver savings through the more for york programme to ensure that any change to service provision is aligned to the Council's key priorities.*

### Customer & Business Support Services

#### Requirement to reduce revenue budgets by approximately 28% and a 45% reduction in capital funding over the next 4 years

Risk Owner: Keith Best

**Risk Ref: 1806**

**Critical**

**23**

Cause *Reductions of approximately 28% in local government revenue funding and 45% capital funding over the next 4 years as announced in the CSR. The specific impact for York is yet to be determined.*

Consequence *The council will have to reduce or stop service provision for non statutory services or increase eligibility criteria for statutory services*

#### Controls

Long term financial planning to identify funding gaps  
Identify savings required  
Initiate targeted service reviews delivered through the More for York programme  
Promote a challenge system amongst officers to identify savings or areas for review

#### Owner

Keith Best  
Keith Best  
Keith Best  
Keith Best

#### Savings identified beyond 2011/12 are not achieved

Risk Owner: Keith Best

**Risk Ref: 1812**

**High**

**19**

Cause *Some service specific savings proposals may be politically sensitive and alternative savings may need to be identified or the savings are not achieved according to More for York programme timetable*

Consequence *This could result in an additional untargeted blanket % cut across all services if not properly planned as well as service provision which is not aligned to corporate priorities*

#### Controls

Regular communication and consultation  
Regular monitoring of progress by More for York programme  
Identify potential savings in excess of current target  
Structured and planned approach to budget planning

#### Owner

Keith Best  
Keith Best  
Keith Best  
Keith Best

### City Strategy

#### Strategic Planning and Transport

**Reduced levels of economic development due to less investment of national & regional transport infrastructure**

Risk Owner: Richard Wood

**Risk Ref: 1720**

**High**

**19**

Cause *The financial impact of the economic downturn will almost certainly result in a reduction in investment in regional and national air services, rail network and long distance buses.*

Consequence *This could mean that there is less investment available for supporting infrastructure affecting the future economic prosperity of the city.*

**Controls**

- Lobbying for sustainable levels of investment and funding
- Review policy setting
- Access York Phase 1 Dft Funding
- A19 Roundabout Extension
- Cycling City DfT funding through Cycle England
- Access York Phase 2 DaST Connectivity Study with Leeds City Region
- LTP 3 Consultation

**Owner**

- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood
- Richard Wood

**Actions**

Regularly review current status of several initiatives

**Target Date**

25/10/2011

**Revised Date**