

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director for Resources

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (SRR) Q3 2011/12 UPDATE

1. **REPORT PURPOSE**

- 1.1 This is the Q3 2011/12 (as at January) update of the Council's SRR presenting the progress made in reducing the threat level for each strategic risk from their original position.
- 1.2 At its 6 January meeting Audit Committee selected three strategic risks for more detailed scrutiny. Risk owners will be at the meeting to provide more information and respond to questions on these risks.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Audit Committee is recommended to:

- 2.1 Consider the following strategic risks for more detailed review following their selection by Audit Committee at its 6 January meeting:
- *SR8a - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, processes (Appendix 1 page 9);*
 - *SR11 - Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable (Appendix 2 page 12);*
 - *SR26 - Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms results in increased economic hardship and long term risks to the economy (Appendix 3 page 22).*
- 2.2 Consider and critically appraise the progress made on reducing the seriousness of the Council's strategic risks as reflected by their threat levels and Direction of Travel (DoT) for Q3 2011/12 (**Table 1** page 2 and **Appendix 4** page 26).
- 2.3 Note the results of the review of the SRR by CLT.
- 2.4 Select one or two strategic risks from **Appendix 4** (on page 26) for specific scrutiny as part of the SRR Q4 2011/12 update.

3. **REASONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 The Audit Committee's key risk management role is to provide assurance on the adequacy of the Council's Risk Management Framework and the associated control environment by reviewing the mechanisms for assessing and managing risk. Part of this responsibility is to ensure active risk management is undertaken by relevant managers. This report presents the latest CLT review of the strategic risks faced by the Council.

4. THREAT LEVEL REDUCTION PROGRESS

4.1 Progress in reducing the seriousness of our strategic risks is assessed by a combination of each risk's overall threat level and its Direction of Travel (DoT). This rounded assessment gives a clearer picture of progress in reducing the risk threat level. **Table 1** lists the risks in the SRR and presents for each the most recent change to the DoT and the overall threat level.

4.2 Overall progress continues in reducing the threat levels of the strategic risks we face, with several risks in the SRR assessed by risk owners as improving, stable or at target. However, **10** risks are red rated with one showing a deteriorating position reflecting range of delivery pressures and challenges the Council has to respond to.

4.3 For the **17** strategic risks within the SRR:

- **4** strategic risks are now at target;
- **3** strategic risks have shown a significant reduction in threat level, while a further **3** show an improved DoT;
- However, *SR2 - Of the reputation of the City*, shows a deteriorating DoT on Q2 though remaining amber rated.

4.4 **Table 1** shows the 17 strategic risks ranked in order of threat level and DoT (highest to lowest threat level):

TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level & DoT in rank order at Q3 2011/12			
SR No.	Strategic Risk Description	Threat Level	DoT (Q2–Q3)
Red rated strategic risks			
19	Failure to deliver Council Plan priorities	16	↔
26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms	16	↔
6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children	15	↓
11	Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way	12	↔
1	Failure to implement harmonised pay, grade & terms & conditions	12	↔
3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens	12	↓
10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance	12	↔
12a	Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and young people	12	↔

TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level & DoT in rank order at Q3 2011/12 (continued)			
SR No.	Strategic Risk Description	Threat Level	DoT (Q2-Q3)
Red rated strategic risks			
14	Failure to deliver culture change	12	↔
27	Failure of Workplace Parking Levy to raise sufficient income to meet NET Phase Two funding requirements	12	↓
Amber rated strategic risks			
2	Of the reputation of the City	9	↑
8a	Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, processes	12 to 9	↓
5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults	8 At target	↔
7	Failure of NCC's contribution to reduce crime and the fear of crime	8 At target	↔
25	Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the Commissioning Framework	8	↔
16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together	12 to 8 At target	↓
24	Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks	9 to 6 At target	↓
Green rated strategic risks – There are no green rated risks at Q3.			

DoT key: ↓ - Reducing threat level; ↔ - Stable threat level; ↑ - Increasing threat level.

Appendix 4 identifies individual risk owners, detailed risk threat level assessments between May 2011 (Q4 2010/11) and January 2012 (Q3 2011/12) and the projected dates when target threat levels will be achieved.

4.5 Review of new, emerging and existing SRR risks

SR2 - Of the reputation of the City shows a deteriorating DoT for Q3 reporting reflecting a change to the assessment of the constituent risk addressing budget pressures and the impact on the Council's workforce. The Council is currently consulting on proposals to reduce its budget by £20 million as a result of Government cuts and other pressures and to increase Council Tax. Clear communication with citizens and stakeholders explaining the reasons for the proposals and the actions the Council has undertaken to mitigate their impact will be vital.

xSR4 - Inadequate arrangements in place to respond to civil emergencies and / or catastrophic service delivery failure had been a long standing risk on the SRR. Initially assessed as 12, the risk was scoped around the threat posed to the City from both natural and malicious threats.

Since April 2008 considerable progress has been made with the development of relevant plans, training and exercises (in partnership with other agencies) to manage the risks. At the time of reporting the SRR Q3 Update, the risk had been at target of 9 for six consecutive quarters. CLT agreed to the delegation of this risk to the Resources Risk Register for ongoing monitoring with the understanding that evidence/information of increasing threat levels or the emergence of new risks will prompt consideration of the risk for re-escalation to the Strategic Risk Register.

SR7- Failure to reduce levels and the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) entered the SRR in December 2008 and was originally assessed as 12. When reported in the SRR Q2 Update the risk had been assessed at 8 for seven consecutive quarters. In response to revised Council Plan priorities, new manifesto commitments and emerging crime and disorder issues from the summer disturbances, the Corporate Director for Communities identified this for review.

A review workshop took place with colleagues from Community Protection and the Crime Drugs Partnership to establish the scope of risks to be managed. Key areas of risk/opportunity identified as having a potential impact on delivery of the strategic priorities for reducing Crime and Anti-social behaviour include:

- Government / Legislative / policy, namely:
 - Recent Changes to National Standard for Incident Reporting for ASB (streamlining the number of reporting categories). This had helped in identifying personal incidents, but is also seen as problematic in analysis and identification of type of ASB, where and why it happening and understanding severity;
 - Policy and Social Responsibility Act – appointment of an elected Police and Crime Commissioner for the County (Later this year) and the potential implications this may have to priorities and dedicated resources for the City;
- Service Demand - change in profile of crime, particularly around acquisitive crime;
- Reputation / marketing / communication - building on the significant work and positive reputation that Nottingham has established in addressing Crime and Fear of Crime both locally and nationally;
- Neighbourhood working - implementation of the 3 localities model for neighbourhood management and the aligning of working boundaries across the partners.

Work is underway to develop an updated RMAP to be presented as part of the SRR Q4 Update.

SR8a - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, process and controls. Previously this risk was scoped around specific Government Connect Secure Extranet (GCSX) requirements. In June 2011/12 the scope was extended to encompass our wider information management requirements with the overall threat level assessed as 12. Since then, progress has been made with a number of the constituent risks such that the overall threat assessment has improved to 9.

Improvements include:

- Appointment of a dedicated IT Security and Governance Officer;
- Improvements to network security following penetration testing undertaken in 2010/11;
- Improved monitoring arrangements to ensure compliance with IT/security policies;
- Implementation of USB stations and provision of encrypted USB storage devices.

Looking ahead, the existing mitigations should be sufficient to deliver substantial improvements over the next 12 months and reduce threat levels to an acceptable level by the target date of June 2014 (RMAP is included as **Appendix 1** page 9).

SR11 - Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way: Economic indicators continue to show volatility and the need for the Government to maintain austerity measures requiring a continuing decline in general grant levels for the medium term. Service demands are anticipated to increase in the medium term with adult social care and child care being areas of ongoing concern. Inflationary pressures in the economy continue to outstrip Government forecasts leading to additional costs of service delivery. To deliver a balanced Medium Term Financial Plan, the Council will need to reduce net expenditure beyond what had previously been forecast.

On a positive note the recent successful court action in relation to the deposits of many councils' deposits in Icelandic Banks has reduced the threat assessment for constituent risk 7 - *Potentially adverse impact of "locked in" investments* to target. However, the overall assessment at Q3 is stable at 12 (RMAP included as **Appendix 2** page 12).

SR16a - Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in the Nottingham Plan to 2020 shows significant improvement on Q2 with the overall threat level reducing from 12 to 8 reflecting improvement in two constituent risks in terms of their DoT:

- Work to align the Nottingham Plan and Council Plan priorities is making good progress. Although alignment of Council resources to the Nottingham Plan is only one element of the constituent risk, it is a significant one;
- Work to simplify performance reporting was approved in autumn 2011 and the simplified performance reporting arrangements are being embedded.

This risk should be seen within the overall context of the 10 year lifespan of the Nottingham Plan. Although the priorities and targets are ambitious, when considering year 1 performance, partners reaffirmed their commitment to retaining the level of ambition and commitment to citizens that these targets represent and despite the difficult economic climate, partners did not feel that this would justify a reduction in the ambitions of the plan.

SR26 – Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising any negative impact of welfare changes: Following CLT's August 2011 request for this risk to be reviewed, the scope of SR26 has been amended to reflect better the risk presented by the Government's welfare changes.

The radical welfare changes being introduced by the Government have the potential to bring negative impact to our citizens and communities because of the level of savings being made (£18bn over 4 years), the large number of our citizens who claim some sort of benefit and the concentrations of those citizens in particular areas of the City. The welfare changes largely fall into three separate areas:

- Changes to the current systems for benefits (e.g. Housing Benefit). These are changes that are happening now and for which there is a clear timetable of change. Where the Council is involved in the administration of these benefits, we are able to develop and target communications to households at risk of being affected, and provide as much information as possible about the changes and point them to advice services for further help;
- Details for the introduction of Universal Credit (UC) in 2013 are less clear in terms of the potential impacts on citizens (both negative and positive). As well as horizon scanning to keep abreast of emerging policy on UC, the Council is working closely with Rushcliffe BC to explore the possibility of being a pilot in the delivery of Universal Credit, which will help us prepare for the transition;
- Localisation of certain benefits (eg: support for council tax). The Council is working closely with the other Nottinghamshire councils to seek to develop a shared local response to this welfare change, although it is likely that there may well be some negative impact on some households as a direct result of the 10% reduction in funds available to provide this support.

Assessment of the reviewed risks has resulted in an overall threat level of 16 with a stable DoT. The updated RMAP is included as **Appendix 3** page 22 for appraisal by Audit Committee.

New risk "Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system is in place able to respond to the significant increase in demand for care and at the same time protects our most vulnerable citizens": A "Big Ticket" programme which will help ensure a financially sustainable adult social care is in place has been developed as part of the Council's Transformation Portfolio, bringing together all significant change activity across the area of adult social care. The programme will:

- Deliver a range of short and long-term savings as part of the Council's MTFP;
- Help ensure that a financially sustainable care system is in place which is able to respond to the significant increase in demand for care services, whilst at the same time ensuring that our most vulnerable citizens remain protected;
- Respond to national policy drivers around personalisation, greater citizen choice and the need for better, more integrated working, in particular with health.

The programme will run from December 2011 through to March 2014, comprising six key work streams, each owned at director level:

- Setting an appropriate budget to meet eligible needs;
- Driving efficiency, eliminating duplication and overlap, and maximising economies of scale;
- Remodelling internal provision;
- Increasing income;
- Increasing investment in early intervention and prevention;
- Creating capacity and self-sufficiency in communities.

Based on work completed to date, there is an overlap between the risks associated with this new programme and the strategic risks *SR22 - Failure to achieve the national policy requirement, milestones and targets for Putting People First* and *SR25 - Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the implementation and embedding of the Commissioning Framework*.

SR22 - Failure to achieve the national policy requirement, milestones and targets for Putting People First: Putting People First was a national policy requirement for the transformation of adult social care, aimed at improving independence and choice to citizens while ensuring financial sustainability. The strategic risk entered the SRR in Q2 of 2009/10 scoped around the establishment of the programme and delivery of initial key targets which has now been achieved. The programme is no longer part of the Transformation portfolio and the headline risk assessment as at the SRR Q3 Update is at the target of 9. Although significant constituent risks do remain for SR22, they do not in themselves warrant consideration as strategic risks.

SR25 - Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the implementation and embedding of the Commissioning Framework entered the SRR in Q1 of 2010/11 reflecting the absence of a consistent approach to commissioning services and the need for much clearer and rigorous processes. A range of key actions to address this risk have since been successfully delivered, resulting in a consistent and sustained reduction in the overall threat level for this risk (at amber for two consecutive quarters with an improved DoT). However, an important action of driving the wider embedding of commissioning remains outstanding which relates directly to the highest rated constituent risk in SR25.

CLT agreed as part of its review of the SRR Q3 Update that:

- The constituent risks to a “*Failure to ensure a long-term affordable and sustainable adult social care system*” be assessed and reported as part of the SRR Q4 Update for consideration by CLT for inclusion to the SRR;
- *SR22 - Failure to achieve the national policy requirement, milestones and targets for Putting People First* be closed and, as appropriate, remaining significant constituent risks be disaggregated to a new risk of “*Failure to ensure a long-term affordable and sustainable adult social care system*” and the Adult Assessment Directorate Risk Register;
- The future positioning within the risk register of *SR25 - Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the implementation and embedding of the Commissioning Framework* be considered alongside the developments and discussions referred to above and a recommended way forward be included in the SSR Q4 update.

5. FUTURE AUDIT COMMITTEE RISK REVIEWS

5.1 The provision to select strategic risks for review allows Audit Committee to direct attention to areas of risk considered potentially significant to the Committee's operations and remit. The Audit Committee is invited to select one or two strategic risks from **Appendix 4** (page 26) for more detailed examination in the SRR Q4 2011/12 Update.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Actions to mitigate identified constituent risks are contained within the RMAPs. These actions will be positioned within the Council's Corporate Directorate and Strategic Service Plans and, as appropriate, inform the medium term service and budget planning process.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

7.1 These are dealt with throughout the report.

8. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

8.1 Quarter 3 2011/12 strategic Risk Management Action Plans.

9. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

9.1 SRR Q2 Update reported to Audit Committee 6 January 2012.

APPENDICIES

Appendix	Description	Page No
1	RMAP SR8a - <i>Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes (strategic risk for review)</i>	9
2	RMAP SR11 - <i>Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable (strategic risk for review)</i>	12
3	RMAP SR26 - <i>Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms results in increased economic hardship and long term risks to the economy (strategic risk for review)</i>	22
4	Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary	26

Sponsoring Corporate Director

Carole Mills-Evans – Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director for Resources

Author:

Simon Burton – Corporate Risk Specialist

☎ 0115 87(63432)

✉ simon.burton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

SR8a - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, process and controls to support the council’s immediate and future regulatory, legal risk, environmental and operational requirements.

The former strategic risk xSR8 was scoped around GCSX requirements. The risk was delegated from the strategic Risk Register in the SRR Q1 2010/11 Update having been reported as an amber risk and at target threat level for 2 consecutive quarters. Developments since its delegation prompted a re-scoping and reappraisal of the risk in June 2011 to include the council’s wider information management arrangements.

		Impact				
		Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Catastrophic (5)
Likelihood	Remote (1)	1	2	3	4	5
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	Possible (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Likely (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Almost certain (5)	5	10	15	20	25

Owner:	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	Completed by:	M. Gannon Director IT S. Salmon Strategy & IT Security Head of Service	Date Completed:	Jan 2012	Next Review Date:	April 2012
RISK SUMMARY							
Opening (Dec 08)	Previous (November 2011)		Latest (January 2012)		Target (June 14)	Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)	
Threat level e.g. 2x4=8	Threat level e.g. 2x4=8 (LxI)	DoT (↔↓↑)	Threat level e.g. 2x4=8 (LxI)	DoT (↔↓↑)	Threat level 2x4=8 (LxI)		
3x4=12	3x4=12	↑	3x3=9	↓	1x3=3	Adequate	

CONSTITUENT RISKS TO BE RISK MANAGED							
Risk Ref:	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8	Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8	Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8	Direction of Travel (DoT) (Stable ↔ Improving ↓ Deteriorating ↑)	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8	
1	External theft by hacking: Unauthorized Data Access, Intrusion (by scanning techniques) and Hardware failure due to external cause.		2x5=10	2x3=6	↓	1x4=4	
2	Lack of compliance with IT and information security : Acceptable Use Policy and IT Services Information security Policy		4x4=16	3x4=12	↓	1x3=3	
3	Internal / external theft or loss of sensitive information: ensure laptop computers are encrypted and use of unencrypted USB memory devices is not allowed.		3x4=12	3x3=9	↓	1x3=3	

4	Virus attack corrupts storage		2x3=6	2x3=6	↔	1x2=2
5	Loss Hosting environments significantly impacts on Service Areas being able to carry out business as usual		2x4=8	2x4=8	↔	1x2=2
6	Poor security arrangements with partners using NCC data and information		4x4=16	3x3=9	↓	1x2=2
7	External theft of data due to poor physical access and site security		2x3=6	2x3=6	↔	2x2=4
8	Poor quality data resulting in significant financial and reputation risk	3x4=12 (16/6/2011)	3x4=12	3x3=9	↓	1x2=2
9	Fail to embed records management controls leading to significant adverse reputation or financial impact	4x4=16 (16/6/2011)	4x4=16	3x4=12	↓	1x2=2
10	A disaffected employee seeks to carry out significant damage to systems, network or storage.	2x4=8 (16/6/2011)	2x3=6	2x3=6	↔	1x2=2

	EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate identified risks	Person Accountable	Adequacy of those actions (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)	Description of additional actions to be put in place (mandatory where current adequacy rating is anything other than "adequate")	Person Accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1	Firewall reviewed and improved configuration applied.	SS	Adequate		SS	Completed	31.03.12
	Only non sensitive data within DMZ, web application security have been improved.	JP	Yet to secure improvement		JP	28.10.11	16.12.11
	Data protection policies & procedures; network security controls; system security controls	SS	Yet to secure improvement	Information security management system statement of applicability available now.(contributes to 2)	SS	30.06.12	31.03.12
2	Improved monitoring and detection tools being deployed, Action is now taken in respect of breach. Implementation of information security management system	SS	Yet to secure improvement	Information Security Management System GAP analysis review. Creation of draft information security management system core policies (contributes to 6 & 8).	SS	31.01.12	31.01.12
				HR Transformation team to introduce security responsibilities into the induction programme (contributes to 6).	SS	30.06.12	31.03.1
3	Domain access status reviewed, increased use of Citrix terminals and the roll out of the USB hubs with awareness campaign and the use of encrypted USB data storage devices.	JP	Adequate		JP	30.06.12	31.03.12

4	New processes in place to keep anti-virus software up to date. Managed incidents reviewed on monthly basis by IT Managers.	JP	Adequate		JP	25.11.11	31.03.12
5	Development of BC / DR Plan with the business including identification of the location of critical assets.	SS/JP	Adequate		SS	31.01.12	30.09.12
6	Implementation of information security management system.	SS	Adequate	An Information Sharing Agreement is now in place.	SS	31.03.12	30.06.12
	Deliver the identified action plan targets arising from external inspections and from O & S engagement.	SP	Yet to secure improvement	The ICO have just asked the Council to sign an undertaking and we have 6 months in which to improve performance.	SP	30.06.12	17.02.12
7	Access to data storage and desktop assets is restricted via secondary use security.	JP	Adequate		JP	30.06.12	11.05.12
	Increased CCTV and monitoring	GH	Adequate		GH	30.06.12	11.05.12
	Employees have been recently reminded of their responsibilities in this area	GH	Adequate		GH	30.06.12	11.05.12
8	Built-in integrity checks; routine procedures for checking & correcting data; ad hoc re-checks	SS/PM	Yet to secure improvement	Implementing CLT's agreed recommendations of the Policy, Research and Insight Functions across Nottingham City Council	SS/PM	30.06.12	31.03.13
9	Records management database, back records and controls the transfer	PM	Adequate		PM	30.06.12	17.02.12
	Konica printer / scanner upgrade successfully completed	JP	Adequate		JP	26.08.11	30.03.12
	Contract in place with 3 rd party and part of this is meeting and exceeding the data compliance requirements, undertaking CRB checks	PM	Adequate		PM	Complete	30.06.12
10	Action is now taken in respect of breach. Implementation of information security management system	SS	Adequate	Information security management system statement of applicability available now.	SS	30.06.12	31.03.12

SR11 - Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way

		Impact				
		Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Catastrophic (5)
Likelihood	Remote (1)	1	2	3	4	5
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	Possible (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Likely (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Almost certain (5)	5	10	15	20	25

Owner:	DCEX/CD for Resources	Completed by:	Dir Strategic Finance	Date Completed:	Feb 2012	Next Review Date:	Apr 2012
--------	-----------------------	---------------	-----------------------	-----------------	----------	-------------------	----------

Overall Risk Summary

Previous (Q2 2010/11)				Latest (Q3 2011/12)				Target (Mar 2011)			Overall Risk Mitigation Effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)
L'hood	Impact	L x I	DoT	L'hood	Impact	L x I	Dot	L'hood	Impact	Lxl	
3	4	12	↑	3	4	12	↔	3	2	6	YET TO SECURE IMPROVEMENT

Constituent risks under risk management:

Risk Ref:	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level (Lxl)	Previous Threat Level (Lxl)	Latest Threat			Direction of Travel (DoT) (Stable ↔ Improving ↓ Deteriorating ↑)	Target Threat Level (Lxl)
				L	I	Lxl		
1	General grant levels reduce and/or fail to rise in line with actual pressures		5x4=20	5	4	20	↔	3x3=9
2	Inflation increases are higher than anticipated in MTFP		4x4=16	4	4	16	↔	3x3=9
3	Income streams are lower than anticipated/budgeted		4x3=12	4	3	12	↔	2x2=4
4	Demand led services experience increases		4x3=12	4	3	12	↔	4x2=8
5	Grant is clawed back		2x3=6	2	3	6	↔	2x2=4
6	Interest rates impact adversely on borrowing and investment		4x4=16	4	4	16	↔	4x2=8

7	Potentially adverse impact of "locked in" investments		4x3=12	2	2	4	↓	2x2=4
8	Genuine pressures are not fully funded within the budget		2x4=8	2	3	6	↓	2x3=6
9	Arrangements for implementation of savings are not sufficiently robust		3x3=9	3	3	9	↔	1x2=2
10	Arrangements for delivery of services on time, to standard & within budget insufficient		3x4=12	3	4	12	↔	2x2=4
11	Financial reporting/forecasting is insufficiently prompt and/or accurate		3x3=9	3	3	9	↔	1x2=2
12	The budget process is not fully aligned with the service planning process		3x3=9	3	3	9	↔	1x 2=2

Current and new management actions acting on risk:								
Risk Ref.	Current management actions in place	Adequacy of action/control to mitigate risk (Effective, Yet to secure improvement, May not be enough)	Additional action / control to mitigations	Responsibility for additional action		Critical success factors of additional actions	Key Dates	
				Owner	Support		Additional action / complete	Progress review frequency
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full understanding of how the mechanism works • Engagement in national technical forums • Lobbying activity • Accurate forecasting of grant levels • Widespread awareness of key issues arising from recent presentations to CLT, DF, TN and exec panel • Budget process for 2011/12 progressing. • Provisional Settlement for 2012/13 received in December 2011. Specific grant announcements ongoing. • Future funding levels (including likely annual settlement has been reviewed in the light of the Coalition Government's announcements and global and national economy 	ADEQUATE	<p>Continue to review Coalition Government budget announcement and white papers to identify impact for Nottingham and its partners.</p> <p>Model emerging situation and await CSR and settlement announcements</p> <p>Ongoing lobbying of Government/ministers through Core Cities and SIGOMA in relation to changes to Government on Review of Resourcing.</p> <p>Formula Grant is a one year settlement which will only be impacted by changes in data. Monitor use of data.</p> <p>Ongoing identification and monitoring service pressures and fully cost impact on budget</p>	CME	TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant is in line with predictions or better • 2012/13 grant in line with expectations future estimates 'settlement' built into MTFP . • Review further announcements • Executive Board considering savings to deliver balanced budget (Jan-Feb) • Council to set budget in March 2012. • Work with SIGOMA and Core Cities into local Government Resource Review. • 5 year grant projections included in MTFP modelling • 30 year model for HRA demonstrates affordability within projected rental income. • 10 year model for capital. • Robust risk assessment as part of the budget setting process. 	31.3.12	<p>Annual as part of the MTFS</p> <p>Ongoing review of statements from the Government</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service pressures identified and where known these have been built into future years projections 							
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of detailed inflation trend data • Availability of forecasting data • Ability to cost impact • Built understanding of trends and actual pressures with key cllrs (see above) • Major focus on accurate funding of inflation pressures 	ADEQUATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure evolving issues are immediately reflected in budget papers and MTFO projections. 	CME	TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inflation continues to be understood and accurately reflected in the budget • Latest GDP inflator, Government estimates included in MTFO projections. • Specific areas identified where they are materially different to GDP inflator and estimates based upon best available market information. • Sensitivity analysis undertaken as part of the budget process 	Ongoing	Monthly in current climate
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of national funding mechanisms is sound • Budget process requires accurate budgeting and sensitivity analysis. • New process for reviewing fees and charges has been used. • All briefings to finance staff, managers and members have made this point very clear. • Quality control activities embedded within the budget process. 	ADEQUATE in many aspects but overall YET TO SECURE IMPROVE-MENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring new process for reviewing fees and charges is universally used • Learning used to inform updated MTFS and budget process for future years. • Income Generation focus within the Big Ticket transformation 'commercialisation' • Evaluation of impact of LGRR and other 	CME	TK GW GW GW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate sensitivity analysis to inform the financial risk assessment • Adequate general reserves and contingency to manage adverse cash flows. • Accurate 2011/12 base budget. • Sound projection for 2012/13onwards • Funding notifications from central Government are not materially different from evaluations and assumptions 	22.12.12 ongoing	Income streams reviewed as part of the Budget 2012 process. Income streams monitored as part of monthly financial monitoring.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process requires action plans to reduce cost in line with reduced income. • Sensitivity analysis is undertaken to identify the scale and scope of risks • Budget proposals to be presented to Executive Board January 2012. Budget approved by Full Council March 2012 • Focus on income generation in Budget 2011 		national changes in funding streams					
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring and forecasting reveals where demand led pressures arise. • Management action is being undertaken to mitigate the pressures. • The 2011/12 budget sought to understand and fund pressures and issues were considered for funding through the Strategic Choices process. • Monitoring considered by CLT with actions arising. • 2011/12 shows a level of overspend which has been significantly reduced through mgt action – building on previous track record. 	ADEQAUTE in many aspects but overall YET TO SECURE IMPROVE-MENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the new budget process is universally followed. • Risk assessments and sensitivity analysis is undertaken in all demand led areas before budget setting is finalised. • Forecasting is done on a monthly basis and reported within 2 – 4 weeks of month end. • Management action in response to 2011/12 is both robust and effective. • Long range demand forecasts need to be more robust.. 	JT CME CME JT > JK & IC IC & JK	CME TK TK All CDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget process is universally followed. • Risk assessment is accurate and robust and used to inform levels of contingencies and reserves. • Forecasting is accurate and prompt. • Robust mitigating action is undertaken immediately issues are identified. • MTFO projections include £6-7m pa (last 3 years average) for as yet 'unknown' pressures in future years. 	Ongoing	Monthly and in detail as part of the budget and service planning process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk assessments and sensitivity analysis undertaken on key budget areas • High visibility on financial management and variation. 							
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant instructions are used to administer grants • Qualified accountants and service experts are involved in spending and administering grants • Internal and external audit scrutiny 	ADEQUATE in many aspects but overall YET TO SECURE SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit outcomes and findings have identified areas for further improvement in some areas and an action plan is being developed to address system weaknesses • Response to any more in-year grant related announcements 	CME	TK Relevant Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current arrangements continue to be adopted. • Full understanding of impact of accountability body status by those involved. • Only very minor grant amendments produced as part of the annual accounts. • Review of Audit Commissions annual grant report and lesson learnt fed back to Audit Committee. • Considered as part of the budget risk assessment 	30.09.12	Annual as part of final accounts
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater focus on interest rates levels and trends • Ability to cost the impact of such changes • Clear TM strategy balancing risk with returns • Greater awareness and understanding of TM in the wake of global economic issues • Accurate figures are to be used in setting the 2012/13 budget 	ADEQUATE	<p>Review of TM strategy in the light of prevailing issues.</p> <p>NET business plan includes sensitivity analysis on impact of interest rates in relation to building line 2</p> <p>Council employs external advisors to provide support in decision making process.</p>	CME	TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to appropriately balance risk with opportunity and the organisation does not become unduly risk averse. • Monitor and respond to interest rate trends. • Considered as part of the budget risk assessment 	Jan Council ongoing	Review TM strategy quarterly in current economic situation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring and reporting in place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New TM strategy was approved by Exec Board and full council • Regularly updated to take into account market variations • Budget adjusted to take account of changed interest environment. • 2011/12 TM budgets proving to be robust. • New strategy is increasing interest achieved in 3rd and 4th quarters. 							
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful outcome of court action • Understanding of potential range of impact based on various scenarios. • Arrangements in place to mitigate on the MTFP. • Engagement with LGA and national government is seeking solutions • LGA approach to litigation. • CIPFA issued guidance on impairment. • Increasing values are being returned in 	ADEQUATE for 2011/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater certainty of likelihood of extent and timing of return • Access to supported borrowing 	CME	TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return of funds • Access to supported borrowing (or alternate mechanism of similar impact) • Success of actions of LGA and its agents in defence against appeal. • Securing reserves to meet any potential shortfall. • Considered as part of the budget risk assessment and in establishing the level of contingency. 	ONGOING	Positive outcome of court action

	<p>tranches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to work with LGA in relation to the litigation. 							
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget process enables easy identification of pressures. All briefings have made clear the importance of accurate budgeting Monitoring, forecasting and reporting arrangements in place going forward Budget process concludes with these key principles intact 	ADEQUATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embracing the process and accepting importance of accurate budgeting 2012/13 budget proposal includes updated risk assessed pressures. 	CME	TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget 2011 is as successful as previous years and further continuous improvement is evident Executive Board to consider pressures and provide appropriate resources within budget proposals, Council approve budget (March 2012) No unfunded emerging pressures emerge that cannot be accommodated from within mainstream council resources 	Ongoing	Monthly monitoring going forward
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every saving has been worked up in detail and evaluated Named individuals are aligned with each saving Accountability letters are despatched making accountabilities clear Regular monitoring and reporting to DLTs, CLT and Exec Board Performance management is now higher profile. Culture change and restructuring within the finance service Accountability letters issued to managers for 	ADEQUATE in part but overall YET TO SECURE IMPROVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The culture of delivering services on time, to standard and within budget is universally embraced. Mitigating action is taken promptly to address arising issues. The extent and nature of the savings package continue to be demanding Ensuring all managers + operate in the spirit of the requirements of the accountability letters. Robust challenge in 	JT/CME	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget process concludes with these principles intact Accountability letters returned in April 2012. Tracking forms despatched and completed quarterly and reported to CFO and CLT Regular and prompt mgt action takes place going forward 	<p>31.3.12</p> <p>20.04.12</p> <p>30.06.12</p> <p>ongoing</p>	<p>Quarterly</p> <p>Progress tracked quarterly (more frequent for high risk areas)</p> <p>ongoing</p>

	<p>2011/12 budget, pressures and savings etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving track record of savings delivery in areas where previously this was not the case. Remedial action is taken for any that are delayed/difficult to implement 		<p>relation to the deliverability of savings proposals as part of the budget process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the big ticket-themed approach to ensure a more holistic set of proposals. 					
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MTFS is very clear on the required standards Accountability letters to individual senior managers reiterate those responsibilities and notify the budgets Leadership of CLT on this requirement is clear 	<p>Overall ADEQUATE but in some areas YET TO SECURE IMPROVEMENT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emerging pressures in adults and children's successfully addressed Medium term trend forecasting is accurate and sensitivity tested. Service planning process. 	JT > All CDS	All Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be evidenced in the actual year end outturn 	30.06.12	Quarterly reports to board.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic council wide reports are quarterly and available to the CFO within 3 weeks of period end. Regular reports to CLT and Executive Board Reports go regularly to DLTs 	<p>Overall ADEQUATE But in some areas YET TO SECURE IMPROVEMENT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current year predicted overspends re brought back in line Further system improvements to enable more rapid reporting Culture of delivering within (or under) budget is widespread and embedded 	IC CME JT > all CDs	All Directors TK All Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting continues to be timely and accurate Action is taken to address identified issues Culture of delivery within budget is embedded Development of improved monitoring and forecasting tools as part of the new ERP system. 	Quarterly Annual ongoing	
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget process and service planning are embedded within the CIPPF Budget process is well planned and project 	ADEQUATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process goes to plan Full engagement of the various stakeholders 	CME	All Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget process is followed by all Engagement continues to be good Development of the 	Ongoing until 31.03.12	Weekly throughout the process

	<p>managed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant colleagues from the various disciplines work together to maintain the necessary connections. • “Resourcing Nottingham Future” group operational and effective. • New approach to delivering the Nottingham Plan taking account of the financial landscape in place 					<p>Leading Nottingham transformation programme.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

SR26 – Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising any negative impact of welfare changes.

The Coalition Government is implementing a series of reforms to the benefit system with the objective of saving £18 billion over the spending review period. Nottingham has a high level of exposure to the welfare reforms because of the large numbers of citizens who claim benefits but also because of concentrations in particular areas of the city. 40,600 people aged 16-64 in Nottingham City were claiming one or more Department for Work and Pensions benefit in August 2010 (nearly one in five of the City's working age population). One Nottingham has commissioned work to understand the likely impacts on citizens, communities and services, as claimants will have to navigate complex, cumulative changes to the benefits system which over time will reduce the value of benefits and erode disposal household income. This risk links to SR2 - Reputation of the City, SR11 - Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way and SR3 – Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on Nottingham City and its citizens.

		Impact				
		Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Catastrophic (5)
Likelihood	Remote (1)	1	2	3	4	5
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	Possible (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Likely (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Almost certain (5)	5	10	15	20	25

Owner:	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	Completed by:	P. Wakefield Director Policy	Date completed:	Jan 2012	Review date:	Apr 2012
RISK SUMMARY							
Opening (Oct 10)			Previous (July 2011)		Current (Dec 2011)		Target (April 14)
Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)		Threat level (LxI=??)		Threat level (LxI=??)
			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating		DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating		Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)
4	4	16	4	4	16	↔	3
							3
							9
							Adequate

CONSTITUENT RISKS TO BE MANAGED														
Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DU T ↓ Im ↔	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8		
		3	4	12	3	4	12	3	4	12		3	3	9
1	Failure to manage the impact on citizens of the transition to universal credit from 2013 to 2017. (added to RMAP July 2011)	3	4	12	3	4	12	3	4	12	↔	3	3	9
2	Failure to develop an effective and efficient local policy response to Government's localisation of welfare benefits (Localising Council Tax Support and Social Fund) could result in unnecessary economic hardship to citizens, an increased financial burden to the Council (beyond Government allocated spend) and reputational damage. (added to RMAP Oct 2011 and updated December 2011)	3	4	12	L	I		3	4	12		2	2	4
3	Regional variations in local policy response to the Government localisation of welfare benefit could result in migration (long term benefit dependent) into the city increasing the financial burden to the city, economic hardship for citizens and adverse impact on communities. (added to RMAP Oct 2011 and updated December 2011)	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	2	4
4	Failure to meet increased demand for services, particularly welfare advice, hardship funds and homelessness.	5	4	20	5	4	20	5	4	20	↔	3	3	9
5	Failure to provide effective information and advice for citizens likely to be affected by welfare changes relating to current benefits, eg Housing Benefit	5	4	20	5	4	20	5	4	20	↔	3	3	9

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	Adequacy of those actions (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)	Description of additional actions to put in place (mandatory where current risk mitigation effectiveness is "Inadequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
Advice in the Community							
4, 5	Advice services to be fully re-commissioned by November 2011.	LB	Adequate				Nov-11
4,5	Targeted communications to households at risk of being affected by Welfare Reform (LHA, single room rate and non-dependent deductions changes).	LB	Adequate				Nov-11
NCC support of external organisations to secure additional funding.							
1				Big Lottery funding series of bids being prepared by external partners to deliver resources to improve financial capability of citizens in social housing.	SC (working with Advice Agencies)	Sep-11	Sep-11
4				Explore options for faith sector/ voluntary sector support for debt advice/support for the most vulnerable.	CB	TBC	TBC
Housing Assistance.							
1, 4	Providing services to prevent and relieve homelessness (whether or not someone is owed a duty)	SC	Yet to secure improvement			Ongoing	??
1, 4, 5	Continued funding for frontline Specialist Debt Advisor.	SC	Yet to secure improvement			Ongoing	??
1,4,5	Working with private landlords to ensure continued provision of private rented accommodation as housing solutions for low income and vulnerable people and manage impact of housing benefit reform on private housing market.	SC	Yet to secure improvement	Implement programme of Landlord recruitment and retention within Housing Aid.	GH	Completed Q1 2012/13	Mar-13
				Review incentive schemes within Housing Aid to consider opportunities for efficiencies and improving access to PRS.	GH	TBC	TBC
				Negotiate options for shared housing within, decommissioned dispersed housing within voluntary sector management.	SC	Ongoing	Dec-13
Improve access to financial services in Nottingham including bank accounts, insurance and responsible credit.							
1,4	Promotion of Credit Union (CU) with NCC, Parent Support workers and schools and support CU with EU funding application..	LB	Yet to secure improvement	Build links with the regional Illegal Money Lending unit in order to coordinate activities.	LB	Sep-11	Sep-11
Preparing for impact of welfare reforms							

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	Adequacy of those actions (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)	Description of additional actions to put in place (mandatory where current risk mitigation effectiveness is "Inadequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1,2,3	Programme management of the localisation of benefits e.g. - Profile current support and likely impact on households as a result of the changes; work with Notts LAS to develop a shared local approach to council tax support; Communicating forthcoming changes to citizens and councillors	LJ	Adequate				
1,2,3	Explore possibility of pilot for delivery of Universal Credit with Rushcliffe Borough Council and other Notts LAs	LJ	Adequate	Review Revs/Bens operating model in readiness for implementation of Universal Credit	LB	Apr-12	Apr-13
Reducing unemployment to alleviate dependency on welfare support see SR3 – Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on Nottingham City and its citizens							
1,2	(see SR-3 for the detail on mitigating the economic downturn)	NJa					Oct-11

Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary

Ref.	Risk description	SR criteria							Estimated Threat Level / Seriousness / DoT					DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability	
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	2010/11		2011/12				Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague
										Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3				
SR19	Failure to deliver Council Plan priorities				✓				Date	May-11	Jul-11	Nov-11	Jan-12	↔	Sep-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Transformation
		Threat Level	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4)	9 (3x3)										
		DoT	Stable	Improving	Stable	Stable											
SR26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising any negative impact of welfare changes.		✓				✓		Date	May-11	Jul-11	Jul-11	Jan-12	↔	Apr-14	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	P. Wakefield Director Strategic Partnerships
		Threat Level	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4)	16 (4X4) R	9 (3x3)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable											
SR6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	↓	Oct-12	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	S. Gautam Director Specialist Services
		Threat Level	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5) R	15 (3x5)	10 (2x5)										
		DoT	Deteriorating	Improving	Improving	Improving											
SR11	Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way		✓		✓			✓	Date	May-11	May-11	Oct-11	Feb-12	↔	Mar-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance
		Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4) R	6 (3x2)										
		DoT	Improving	Improving	Deteriorating	Stable											
SR1	Failure to implement harmonised pay, grade & terms & conditions, that are fair to all colleagues & Equal Pay legislation compliant		✓	✓	✓			✓	Date	May-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	↔	May-13	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Transformation
		Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	6 (2x3)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable											
SR3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens				✓			✓	Date	May-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	↓	Apr-12	D. Bishop CD-Dev	J. Yarham Dir Economic Innovation & Employment
		Threat Level	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	9 (3x3)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Improving											
SR10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance		✓		✓			✓	Date	Mar-11	Mar-11	Mar-11	Jan-12	↔	Jul-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	G. O'Connell Director Legal & Democratic Services
		Threat Level	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	6 (2x3)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable											
SR12a	Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and opportunities for young people to access further education and skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City	✓	✓		✓				Date	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Dec-11	↔	Jul-12	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	G. Ellis Director Schools & Learning
		Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable											
SR14	Failure to deliver culture change		✓						Date	May-11	May-11	Nov-11	Jan-12	↔	Apr-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Transformation
		Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)										
		DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable											
SR27	Failure of Workplace Parking Levy to raise sufficient income to meet NET Phase Two funding requirements (entered SRR August 2011/12)				✓			✓	Date		May-11	Oct-11	Dec-11	↓	Apr-12	D. Bishop CD-Dev	A. Hill Head of Comm & Trans Services
		Threat Level	New risk	12 (3x4) N	12 (3x4) R	12 (3x4)	6 (2x3)										
		DoT	New	Stable	Improving												

Ref.	Risk description	SR criteria							Estimated Threat Level / Seriousness / DoT				DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability		
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	2010/11		2011/12			Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague	
										Q4	Q1	Q2					Q3
SR2	Of the reputation of the City		✓		✓			✓	Date	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	↑	Mar-11	J. Todd Chief Exec.	R. Bhattal Head of Corp Marketing P. Choudhury Head of Corp Comms
								Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	8 (2x4)				
								DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Deteriorating					
SR8a	Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes		✓	✓	✓			✓	Date	Jun-11	Jul-11	Oct	Jan-12	↓	Jun-14	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	M. Gannon Director IT
								Threat Level	12 (3x4) N	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3) R	9 (3x3)				
								DoT	N/A	Deteriorating	Stable	Improving					
SR5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults		✓	✓	✓			✓	Date	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Dec-12	↔	Apr-11	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	H. Jones Dir Comm Inclusion E. Yardley Dir Access &
								Threat Level	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8	8 (2x4)				
								DoT	Improving AT TARGET	Improving AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET					
SR7	Failure of NCC's contribution to reduce crime and the fear of crime	✓	✓		✓			✓	Date	Apr-11	Apr-11	Oct-11	Oct-11	↔	Apr-11	J. Kelly CD-Comm	E. Orrock Comm Safety Exec. Coordinator
								Threat Level	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)				
								DoT	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET					
SR25	Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the implementation and embedding of the Commissioning Framework within the directorate, the council and with partners				✓			✓	Date	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	↔	Apr-12	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	C. Brudenell Director Quality & Commissioning
								Threat Level	12 (3x4) R	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	6 (2x3)				
								DoT	Improving	Improving	Improving	Stable					
SR16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in the Nottingham Plan to 2020		✓		✓			✓	Date	Apr-11	Aug-11	Oct-11	Nov-11	↓	2014	J. Todd Chief Exec.	P. Wakefield Director Strategic Partnerships
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4) R	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)				
								DoT	Deteriorating	Stable	Stable	Improving					
SR24	Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks (entered to the register May 2010)			✓	✓	✓		✓	Date	May-11	Jul-11	Nov-11	Jan-12	↔	Jul-12	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	P. Millward Head of Service Emergency Planning
								Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)				
								DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Improving AT TARGET					

DIRECTION OF TRAVEL (DoT):

Improving (reducing) threat level



Stable threat level



Deteriorating (increasing) threat level

