AUDIT COMMITTEE
26 July 2013

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Resources

Strategic Risk Register (SRR) – Q1 2013/14 Update
and 2012/13 Annual Review

1.   REPORT PURPOSE

1.1   This is the Q1 2013/14 (as at 30 June 2013) update of the Council's SRR 2013/14 and Annual Review of 2012/13 presenting the progress made in reducing the threat level for each strategic risk from their original position.

1.2   At the 26 April meeting Audit Committee selected for more detailed scrutiny *SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children*. This report presents information to enable that scrutiny to take place.

2.   RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit Committee is recommended to:

2.1   Consider the strategic risk *SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children* for more detailed review following selection by Audit Committee at the 26 April meeting (see RMAP included as **Appendix 1**).

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 Q1 2013/14 (**Table 1** and **Appendix 5**) and for the year 2012/13 (**Appendix 6**).

2.3   Note the results of the review of the SRR by CLT.

2.4   Select one or more strategic risks from **Appendix 5** for specific scrutiny as part of the SRR Q2 2013/14 Update. Selection might be based on the time elapsed since the risk was last reviewed, changes in the risk's threat level (or DoT) or relevance to current local or national matters of interest or concern.

3.   REASONS FOR CONSIDERATION

3.1   The Audit Committee's 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. This includes ensuring that 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 DoT. This rounded assessment gives a clearer picture of progress in reducing the risk threat level and is summarised in Table 1.

4.2 Several SRR risks have been assessed by risk owners as improving, stable or at target. **Ten** risks are red rated, reflecting a range of delivery pressures and challenges the Council has to respond to.

4.3 For the **16** strategic risks within the SRR:
- **Two** risks show a reduced threat level such that they are at target
- **Three** strategic risks are already at target
- A further **four** strategic risks show an improved DoT

4.4 **Table 1** shows the 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 Q1 2013/14			
SR No.	**Strategic Risk Description**	**Threat Level**	**DoT (Q4–Q1)**
Red rated strategic risks (10)			
26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes	16	⇔
6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children	15	⇩
8b	Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes and controls **(updated risk Q1 2013/14)**	12	N/A
11a	Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan **(updated risk Q1 2013/14)**	12	N/A
12a	Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and young people **(under review)**	12	⇔
28	Failure to ensure a financially sustainable ASC system to respond to significant increases in demand for care while protecting our most vulnerable citizens	12	⇔
29	Failure to establish an effective Public Health function with adverse impact on the citizen wellbeing and a failure to deliver the authority's statutory responsibilities **(under review)**	12	⇔
30	Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities **(new risk added Q1 2013/14)**	12	N/A

SR No.	Strategic Risk Description	Threat Level	DoT (Q4–Q1)
TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level & DoT in rank order at Q1 2013/14 *(continued)*			
7	a) Failure to reduce levels of crime and b) anti-social behaviour	12	⇩
25a	Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost	12	⇩
Amber rated strategic risks (6)			
3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on Nottingham City and its citizens	9 At target	⇔
16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together	8 At target	⇔
5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults	8	⇩
2a	Of the reputation of the City	6 At target	⇔
10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance	9 to 6 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 Q1.			

DoT key: ⇩ Reducing Threat Level ⇔ Stable Threat Level ⇧ Increasing Threat Level

Appendix 5 identifies individual risk owners, detailed risk threat level assessments between October 2012 (Q2 2012/13) and June 2013 (Q1 2013/14) and the projected dates when target threat levels will be achieved.

4.5   Review of new, emerging and existing SRR risks

4.5.1   *SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children* has remained one of the Council's highest risks for more than four years reflecting the potential significance of any failure on vulnerable children, the Council's reputation and the effectiveness of the safeguarding service. The risk was selected for review by Audit Committee because of the significance of the risk and the time elapsed since the risk was last reviewed (Q2 2011/12).

The risk is scoped around the council's duty to safeguard vulnerable children for which a number of constituent risks have been identified, the highest of which include effectiveness of early intervention, prompt completion of the Common Assessment Framework *and* Internal vacancy management processes.

A number of improvements have been made in terms of accessibility of the IT system improving recording and integration of information to safeguard children and evidence of a reduction in referrals to social care. However the number of children requiring safeguarding and accommodation continues to rise.

Overall the risk shows an improving DoT, however, significant change in the overall threat assessment will require further evidence of improvements around Early Intervention and timely completion of CAFs. The RMAP is included for review as **Appendix 1**.

4.5.2 _SR8a - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes_ has been on the SRR since quarter 4 of 2010/11. Significant progress has been made in terms of IT security, theft/loss of sensitive information, IT attacks/hacking such that the risk over the past two and half years has improved from 12 to 6. However, there remain significant risks which form the basis of a refocused RMAP attached as **Appendix 2**:

- _Fail to meet the Council's statutory Information Rights obligations and responsibilities_ (15) - As for many large public bodies, responding to information requests in accordance with demanding statutory deadlines has presented challenges. This has prompted changes in terms of resources for managing information request and a review of relevant policies and procedures
- _Challenging requirements, timescales, insufficient understanding/ engagement leaves the council non-compliant with N3 (by Feb 2014) preventing Public Health from operating as part of the Council_ (12) - The transition of the Public Health function requires access to NHS data for which the authority must be N3 accredited (compliant with NHS information governance requirements). N3 accreditation places requirements on the Council as a whole including:
  o Implementation of information life cycle management
  o Review the flow of sensitive data into and out of the organisation
  o Further training for colleagues on data protection and management
  o Privacy Notices - citizens and third parties made aware of how we hold and manage their data

  N3 accreditation has been secured, based on the delivery of an action plan during 2013/14 to meet the above requirements, which should deliver significant efficiency gains for the organisation
- _Corporate Transformation Programme, citizen focused change, performance management and other service improvements not deliverable as a consequence of poor information asset management_ (15) – Poor data quality undermines our ability to share information internally and externally and threatens the viability of key information driven programmes e.g. Channel Development

Given the change in the scope of the risks being managed and the emphasis on N3 compliance, CLT agreed that the re-scoped risk should be added to the SRR as SR8b in place of SR8a which is closed.

4.5.3 _SR10 - Failure to maintain good standards of governance_ shows an improving threat assessment (9-6) and is now at target reflecting an update to the constitution to provide delegations dealing with new public health functions. The challenge going forward is to maintain our strong reputation for sound governance whilst streamlining approaches and re-assessing the tight/loose balance with reduced resources.

4.5.4 _SR11 - Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way_ has been on the strategic risk register for over four years and has remained high risk (red) throughout. The time elapsed since the last review and the significance of the risk prompted work to re-scope the risk around the _Failure to accurately predict_

and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan. More specifically the ability of the Council to analyse trends and make predications/forecasts around grants, income and service demand to arrive at a stable financial environment that enables most effective delivery of Council Plan priorities.

The updated risk encompasses the internal processes and mechanisms to support alignment of resources to priorities and the means by which variations from the forecasted position are accommodated. Factors considered when identifying the risks:

- Grant - Government policy, formula grant/general, specific grants & other external funding
- Income - Local policy, economic drivers, Council Tax, Business Rates, fees/charges & investments (including Treasury Management, investments, assets & interest rates)
- Demand - National & local policy, demographics (adults/children), economic drivers (benefits), new/changes in duties e.g. Public Health

The highest constituent risk is the *failure of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to adequately support the delivery of the Council Plan priorities* assessed at 16 for which the mitigations are currently assessed as being adequate. Other constituent risks are assessed as amber (6-9) see RMAP attached as **Appendix 3**. Given this latest update CLT agreed to the re-scoped risk be added to the SRR as SR11a in place of SR11 which has been closed.

4.5.5   *SR26 - Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms:* Significant progress has been made with an improving position in terms of the implementation of the new Local Council Tax Support scheme, work with social housing landlords to reduce the impact of Housing Benefit under-occupancy rule changes and implementation of a Local Emergency Hardship Support Scheme. Despite these improvements, the significance of the remaining risks means that the overall level of risk is unchanged at 16.

The highest constituent risks include:
- *Failure to meet increased demand for services, particularly welfare advice, hardship funds and homelessness* (20) – Generally the mitigations identified in place are considered adequate to bring the level of risk target
- *HB under occupancy rules changes results in an increase in recovery action resulting in increased eviction rates and homelessness* (20) - NCH continue to review their housing stock in light of revised allocations and lettings policy and in light of changes to demand for property. Work is underway with NCH and other Registered Providers (RPs) to prepare for the implementation of their rent recovery process and to scope the possible impact on homelessness and housing advice services
- *Failure by DWP to successfully manage transition to UC minimising unnecessary hardship on Nottingham's citizens e.g. failure in planning, weekly to monthly payment in arrears* – this has increased from 9 to 16 as Universal Credit is due to go live from October. However, there is still no roll out plan from the DWP
- *Failure of the DWP (in conjunction with HMRC) to implement new IT system underpinning UC with potential for large scale non-payment of benefits* (15) – Efforts continue to be made to engage with the Minister for Welfare Reform and

the DWP to find ways to minimise the risk stemming from the implementation of the new IT system

4.5.6 *SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of council priorities* brings together and replaces two long standing strategic risks, *SR14 - Failure to deliver culture change* and *SR19 - Failure to deliver Council Plan priorities* providing a more coherent approach to the management of the risks and reflects management accountability (RMAP is included as **Appendix 4**). The highest constituent risks include:

- *Policies/systems/processes developed by corporate specialists focus on corporate requirements/governance not service delivery requirements e.g. slow, bureaucratic, loss of focus on core purpose* (16) – mitigation centres on reviewing corporate polices/process to understand where there is scope for flexibility and engaging stakeholders in updating polices/process to ensure they are best aligned with services' needs.
- *Managers lack the right skills to operate effectively in a more commercialised environment* (16) – the commercialisation programme is developing to raise expectation, skills, performance and effectiveness of managers

CLT agreed that this risk should be added to the SRR in place of SR14 and SR19 which are closed.

5. REVIEW OF PROGRESS MADE DURING 2012/13 IN MANAGING THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC RISKS

5.1 Significant progress was made during 2012/13 to manage and reduce the threat levels of the Council's strategic risks despite the financial and economic pressures. During 2012/13 work to manage the Council's strategic risks resulted in:
- **Two** new strategic risks (SR28 and SR29)
- **Two** strategic risk having threat levels reduced to such an extent that it was delegated Corporate Directorate Risk Registers (SR1, SR27)
- **Four** strategic risks having reduced threat levels or being at target by Q4 (SR3, SR16a, SR2a, SR8a)
- **Nine** strategic risks showing no improvement in terms of threat level (SR19, SR26, SR6, SR12a, SR11, SR14, SR28, SR7a/b, SR29)
- **One** strategic risks showed a deteriorating threat level at Q4 compared with Q1 (SR24)
- **Five** strategic risks reviewed/re-scoped, or work commenced (SR2a, SR12a, SR25, SR14/19).

Appendix 6 provides a summary of changes to the composition of the SRR during 2012/13 and the rationale for each and how the risk and its management have evolved since the change.

5.2 Audit Committee has an important role in ensuring the adequacy of the Council's Risk Management Framework (RMF) and the associated control environment. As part of the SRR Quarterly Updates, Audit Committee selected or received for review **seven** RMAPs covering the Council's most important strategic risks with risk owners attending meetings to provide a verbal briefing and answer questions:

- *SR3 - Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens* **(selected for review in Q1)**
- *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* **(selected for review in Q1 and Q2)**
- *SR24 - Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks* **(selected for review in Q3)**
- *SR25a - Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost* **(updated risk included for review Q4)**
- *SR26 - Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes* **(selected for review in Q2 and Q4)**
- *SR28 - Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system to respond to significant increases in demand for care while protecting our most vulnerable citizens* **(updated risk included for review in Q2)**
- *SR29 - Failure to establish an effective Public Health function impacting citizen wellbeing and a failure to deliver the authority's statutory responsibilities* **(updated risk included for review in Q2 and selected for review in Q3)**

In addition, Audit Committee reviewed and approved the updated Risk Management Framework at Q2 2012/13 including the Improvement Action Plan.

6. FUTURE AUDIT COMMITTEE RISK REVIEWS

6.1 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 two strategic risks from **Appendix 5** for more detailed examination in the SRR Q2 2013/14 Update.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 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.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

8.1 These are dealt with throughout the report.

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

9.1 Quarter 1 2013/14 Strategic Risk Management Action Plans

10. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

10.1 SRR Q4 Update reported to Audit Committee 26 April 2013

APPENDICIES

Appendix	Description
1	*SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children* **(RMAP selected for review by Audit Committee)**
2	*SR8b - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes* **(RMAP available for review by Audit Committee)**
3	*SR11a - Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan* **(RMAP available for review by Audit Committee)**
4	*SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of council priorities* **(RMAP available for review by Audit Committee)**
5	Nottingham City Council Strategic Risk Register - Report Summary
6	Changes to the composition of the Strategic Risk Register 2012/13

Sponsoring Corporate Director:
Carole Mills – Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Resources

Author:
Simon Burton – Corporate Risk Specialist
☎ 0115 87(63432)
✉ simon.burton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

SR6- Failure to safeguard vulnerable children
Section 11 of the Children Act 2004 places a statutory duty on key people and bodies to make arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

Impact					
	Negligible (1)	**Minor (2)**	**Moderate (3)**	**Major (4)**	**Catastrophic (5)**
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

(Likelihood — row label)

Owner:	Candida Brudenell (Helen Blackman)	Completed by:	Helen Blackman Tim O'Neill David Thompson	Date Completed:	March 2013	Next Review Date:	Q1 2013/14

Risk Summary					
Opening (Date)	**Previous** (Q3 2012/13-Jan' 13)		**Latest** (Q4 2012/13-Mar '13)		**Target** (Apr '13)
Threat level	Threat level (LxI)	DoT (⇔⇓⇑)	Threat level e.g. (LxI)	DoT (⇔⇓⇑)	Threat level (LxI)

Opening Threat level	Previous Threat level (LxI)	DoT	Latest Threat level e.g. (LxI)	DoT	Target Threat level (LxI)	Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)
3x5=15	3x5=15	⇓	3x5=15	⇓	2x5=10	Adequate

CONSTITUENT RISKS TO BE RISK MANAGED						
Risk Ref:	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level	Previous Threat Level	Latest Threat Level	Direction of Travel (DoT) (Stable ⇔ Improving ⇓ Deteriorating ⇑)	Target Threat Level
1	Shortage of Qualified Social Workers to deliver safeguarding practice impacted by internal (Single Status fallout) and external (market, increased demand) factors.	3x4=12	1x4=4	1x4=4	⇔	2x4=8
3	Inadequate supervision of front line practitioners leading to children being at risk of significant harm.	3x4=12	3x3=9	3x3=9	⇓	2x3=6
8	Lack of robust recording management information system to support safeguarding practice.	4x4=16	4x3=12	3x3=9	⇓	1x3=3
9	Compromisation of the security of sensitive/confidential details/data.	2x3=6	2x3=6	3x3=9	⇑	2x3=6
10 Q4 2011-12	Early intervention is not effective resulting in higher demand on safeguarding services that are then compromised.	3x4=12	4x4=16	3x4=12	⇓	2x4=8
11	CAFs not being completed promptly, as soon as needs are emerging, resulting in a	3x4=12	3x4=12	3x4=12	⇓	2x4=8

	deterioration of circumstances and an increasing number of children being referred for social care intervention inappropriately creating an increase demand on social care services.				
12 Q3 2011-12	Internal vacancy management processes are delaying timely recruitment compounded with the budget constraints.	4x4=16	4x4=16	3x4=12	⇩	2x4=8

	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 risk mitigation effectiveness is anything other than "adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1	The Recruitment and Retention Strategy for Qualified Social Workers in Neighbourhood Fieldwork has been very successful with rolling monthly panel. The recruitment of newly qualified colleagues is strong, based on positive link to student programmes.	HB	Adequate	Work in this area is robust with rolling recruitment, agreement to over recruit to avoid dependence on agency staff and strong processes to develop and retain key colleagues. Nottingham continues to be able to attract QSW to fill vacancies in contrast to the national picture.			Monthly
3	A systemic lead has been appointed to drive the supervision policy and Munro recommendations of reflective supervision. The workforce development project to improve supervision and strength based approach is continuing with a robust training programme Performance is scrutinized with the Quality assurance strategy implemented to include audits of adequate supervision of all frontline staff to be undertaken.	HB	Adequate	**Training in Supervision and Mentoring Skills for Social Work Managers** Team Managers within Children's Social Care have accessed a five day accredited graduate or post graduate module on Supervision delivered by Birmingham University. This has a focus on developing a critically reflective practitioner and the role of emotional intelligence in social work theory and practice. The supervision policy is to be revised for the next Trix policy update in September 13 to strengthen the reflective practice element and include Signs of Safety & strength based communications. The case discussion document has been revised to incorporate Signs of Safety to			Monthly

				strengthen reflective case supervision. A supervision audit on supervision provided by social care managers to their staff was undertaken by service managers on their respective service areas. The audit was completed looking at April/May 13. A meeting is planned in early July to analyse findings of the audit and areas of work to be taken forward. Any areas of poor performance are addressed immediately.			
8	Service Manager attends monthly ICT Strategy Board to drive improvements on behalf of service area. There is a plan for system improvement in light of Ofsted findings (Aug 11)	HB / ICT Strategy Board	adequate	Risk has reduced with the full roll out of updates to Carefirst between September 2012-March 2013. The presentation of the systems and functionality of the system has been improved with key updates to make it easier to navigate and to duplicate records to siblings. These changes make information clear, more accessible and saves user time, reducing delays for children. Further upgrades are due this year and there is to be a lean system review on the impact of recent statutory changes in Autumn 2013.	SBr		Nov-13
	Terms of reference and attendance of IT Strategy Board signed off at CFLT. New problem resolution process in place. Manual recording back-up system in place if Care First System goes down. HB informed if the duration is longer than a day.	HB	Adequate	Much less disruption to services and a more planned approach is taken allowing us to mitigate its impact. The increasing numbers of users on the network is impacting on the system speeds.			Monthly
	Manual recording back-up system in place if Care First System goes down. HB informed if the duration is longer than a day.	HB	Adequate				Monthly
9	Electronic security is good. IT Policies including the reporting of information security incidents, disposal of redundant equipment through Secure IT. Guardian Edge installed on	HB	Adequate	In light of ICO recommendations, further work is required on transporting documents for remote working to and from Court in Children and Adult Services.	HB		Nov13

	laptops. HB informed of all security breaches and action taken. Further work has been initiated to embed learning from ICO cases and rulings.			Measures to ensure confidentiality are being implemented including, lockable bags for transporting documents. Further data protection training will be delivered to NQSW's and new starters, with a second wave of full service refresher training in an E learning format			
10	• Work closely with Early Intervention Foundation to further develop the most effective interventions • CAF review programme • Revised FCT performance management framework • Deployment of key services at earlier point of need (e. g. in schools) • Review of 'social care' operating model to ensure earlier help • 'Monroe compliance' inspection readiness preparation • FCT management review (2012) to ensure greater case holding capacity, and 'specialist' quality assurance across the three localities • Development of specific edge of care services through Big Ticket transformation programme • Rigorous review and management of edge of care processes • Delivery of Priority Families programme • Children in Care team has been created to manage children in care cases, and speed up appropriate exit from care.	HB/CB	Adequate	Monthly review of progress through Children's Big Ticket	CP		Aug 13
11	• Better targeting of cases CAFs should be completed.	TO	Adequate				Apr-13
	• CAF Performance Management framework Implemented.	TO	Yet to Secure Improvement	Increasing focus on better and more frequent CAF completion as part of the operational roll out of the priority families			

	• Better utilise Health and Wellbeing Board statutory framework, and Local Safeguarding Children Board to better embed CAF across partnerships. • Development of framework for supporting the delivery of high quality CAFs, balancing partnership commitment with service delivery.			programme.			
	• Family Support Strategy and Pathway developed and published on Nottingham Children's Partnership website. Working group formed managing the implementation of the strategy and pathway.	TO	Yet to Secure Improvement	Overview and Scrutiny of Family Support Strategy (March 2013) completed. Development of 'Family CAF' within Priority Families Programme.			
12	Speeding up HR processes so that interested applicants receive information in a timely manner and shortlisting/interviews are completed efficiently. Agency staff sign off delegated to Director.	IC	Yet to Secure Improvement	There are current difficulties with re the introduction of Oracle, EMSS, and People Plus, resulting in late payments and poor budgetary information			Apr-13

SR8b - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and future regulatory, legal, and business requirements

Nottingham City Council

The former strategic risk xSR8a was scoped in June 2011 to include the IT security risks but also council's wider information management arrangements. Since the rescoping significant progress has been made in terms of managing IT security risk. However, the risks around effective information management have increased in significance and prominence prompting a further rescoping to reflect a greater emphasis placed on these aspects of the risk.

Threat Assessment Matrix

		Impact (I)				
		Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Extreme (5)
Likelihood (L)	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 Deputy Chief Executive / Corporate Director Resources	Completed by:	M. Gannon Director IT (supported by M Dunn & S Salmon)	Date completed:	Jun 2013	Review date:	Oct 2013

RISK SUMMARY

Opening (May 2013)			Previous (N/A)			Current (May 2013)			Target (April 14)			Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)
Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)		DoT ⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Threat level (LxI=??)		DoT ⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Threat level (LxI=??)			
4	3	12	L	I	N/A	4	3	12	2	3	6	Yet to secure improvement

SR8b - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and future regulatory, legal, and business requirements - Risk Register

03/07/2013 11:50

RISKS TO BE MANAGED

Risk Ref.	Risk Description (cause, risk & impact)	Date identified	Risk owner	Proximity (date when could impact)	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT (⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating)	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Proposed Mgt Action	Risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement,	Status (Raised, Open, Closed)
Y	**Information rights (EIR, FOI, DP Subject Access Request)**				L	I		L	I		L	I			L	I				
R1	Significant reputational, legal, financial impacts resulting from organisational failure to respond to citizen information requests, and meet the Councils statutory Information Rights obligations and responsibilities.	May 2013	MD	Now	3	4	12	L	I		3	4	12	⇓	2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
Y	**N3 information governance toolkit**				L	I		L	I		L	I			L	I				
R2	Challenging requirements, timescales, insufficient understanding/ engagement leaves the council non-compliant with N3 (by Feb 2014) preventing Public Health from operating as part of the Council	May 2013	SS / MD	Now	3	4	12	L	I		3	4	12	⇔	2	4	8	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
Y	**Data Management and Quality**				L	I		L	I		L	I			L	I				
R3	Corporate Transformation Programme, citizen focused change, performance management and other service improvements not delivered as efficiently and effectively as a consequence of poor quality information asset management.	May 2013	SS / MD	Now	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9	⇔	3	2	6	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open

SR8b - Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and
03/07/2013 11:50

Nottingham City Council

	EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
R1		Information Governance Team restructured, relocated and integrated within GIS Data and Information. **In progress**	MD	Establish baseline and position statement concerning the Councils compliance with the Freedom of Information Act Review policies, processes and system relevant to managing/coordinating information requests Develop action improvement plan	MD	July 2013 Dec 2013 Jan 2014	Aug 2013
R1		Dedicated team in place to manage and coordinate information requests and lead on the proactive publication of information **In place**	MD	Develop proposal to secure additional resources to address Information Rights Requests backlog	MD	Aug 2013	
R1			MD	Analyse FOI performance data to develop a targeted action improvement plan	MD	July 2013	
R1				Incorporate FOI performance as part of Corporate Health reporting to CDB	MD/CC	July 2013	
R1		Improve the visibility and availability of information available to citizens in the public domain **In place**	MD	Redesign and refresh of the Councils Publication scheme, and align with the corporate website developments, Open Data Nottingham and Nottingham Insight Redesign and refresh of the Councils Disclosure Log	MD	Nov 2013 Jan 2014	
R1		Information proactively made available through Nottingham Insight and Open Data Nottingham **Ongoing**	MD	Raise profile of Nottingham Insight and Open Data Nottingham with a view to increasing content and use	MD	Ongoing	
R1		Increase awareness of the obligations, benefits and challengers associated with Information Rights **Ongoing**	MD	Develop training targeting managers/key dept contacts. Aim to raise understand of responsibilities relating to Information Requests	SH	Jan-14	

	EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
R1				Build positive and ongoing relationship with the Information Commissioners Office	MD	Ongoing	
R1				Create a positive image of services associated with Information Rights	MD	Ongoing	
R2		Information Governance Toolkit Action Plan 2013/4 (approved by NHS subject to an undertaking to deliver during 2013/14)	SH	Establish resource to programme manage N3 Improvement Plan and 2014/15 N3 application.	MD	Jul-13	Sep-13
R2		Project Board and Team in place **In place**	SH	re-establish project team under Information Management Strategy Group (IMSG)	SH	Jul-13	Aug-13
R2				Agree Project Plan (IMSG)	SH	Sep-13	Sep-13
R2				Implement Improvement Plan including: - Audit of corporate records and implementation of information life cycle management (beyond social care records) - Map and understand the flow of sensitive data into and out of the organisation (electronic and hardcopy) - Comprehensive training of all colleagues on data protection and management appropriate to their role - Privacy Notices - citizens and third parties made aware of how we hold and manage their data - Ensure the commissioning and procurement arrangements meet all data protection requirements	SH	Dec-13	Sep-13
R2				NHS IG Toolkit Submission	SH	Feb-14	Sep-13
R2				Review NHS IG Toolkit feedback and response plan	SH	Apr-14	Apr-14
R3				Establish baseline for data quality and data management.	MD		Apr-14

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
R3				Review recommendations of the Policy, Research and Insight Functions associated with information management as agreed by CLT	MD	Mar-14	

SR11a - Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan	Nottingham City Council

The risk is scoped around the ability of the council to analyse trends and make predications/forecasts around grants, income and service demand to arrive at a stable financial environment that enables most effective delivery of Council Plan priorities. The risk also encompasses the internal processes and mechanisms to support alignment of resources to priorities and the means by which variations from the forecasted position are accommodated. Factors considered when identifying the risks:

Grant - Government policy, formula grant/general, specific grants & other external funding

Income - Local policy, economic drivers, Council Tax, Bus Rates, fees/charges & investments (including Treasury Management, investments, assets & interest rates)

Demand - National & local policy, demographics (adults/children), economic drivers (benefits), new/changes in duties e.g. Public Health

Threat Assessment Matrix

			Impact (I)				
			Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Extreme (5)
Likelihood (L)	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 Deputy Chief Executive/ Corporate Director Resources	Completed by:	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance Director G. Walker Head of Corporate Finance	Date completed:	Jun 2013	Review date:	Sep 2013

RISK SUMMARY												

Opening (May 13)			Previous (N/A)			DoT ⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Current (May 2013)			DoT ⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Target (???? ??)			Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)

Opening (May 13) — Threat level (LxI=??)
Previous (N/A) — Threat level (LxI=??)
Current (May 2013) — Threat level (LxI=??)
Target (???? ??) — Threat level (LxI=??)

3	4	12	L	I	N/A		3	4	12		2	3	6	Adequate

SR11a - Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan - Risk Register

05/07/2013 09:36

RISKS TO BE MANAGED

Risk Ref.	Risk Description (cause, risk & impact)	Date identified	Identified by	Risk owner	Proximity (date when could impact)	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT (⇓ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating)	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Proposed Mgt Action	Risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement,	Status (Raised, Open, Closed)
1 (new)	Failure of the MTFP to adequately support the delivery of the Council Plan priorities	26/04/13	TK	TK	Now	4	4	16	L	I		4	4	16		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
2 (new)	Fail to anticipate and respond to changes in grant levels e.g. general, specific grants etc	26/04/13	TK	TK	Now	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
3 (new)	Fail to anticipate and respond to changes in income stream e.g. Council Tax, Business Rates etc	26/04/13	TK	TK	Now	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
4 (new)	Failure to anticipate and respond to changes in service demand drivers e.g. demographics, economic outlook etc	26/04/13	TK	TK	Now	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
5 (new)	Fail to forecast the performance of the growth plan and understand its impact on the accuracy of the MTFP	23/05/13	TK	TK	Now	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	3	6	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
8	Genuine pressures are not fully funded within the budget	Q3 2009/10	CM	TK	Now	2	3	6	2	3	6	2	3	6	⇔	2	3	6	Tolerate	Adequate	Open
9	Arrangements for implementation of savings are not sufficiently robust	Q3 2009/10	CM	TK	Now	3	3	9	3	3	9	3	3	9	⇔	2	2	4	Treat	Adequate	Open
10	Arrangements for delivery of services on time, to standard & within budget ineffective	Q3 2009/10	CM	TK	Now	3	3	9	3	3	9	3	3	9	⇔	2	2	4	Treat	Adequate	Open
11	Financial reporting/forecasting is insufficiently prompt and/or accurate	Q3 2009/10	CM	TK	Now	3	3	9	3	3	9	3	3	9	⇔	1	2	2	Treat	Adequate	Open

SR11a - Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan - Risk & Issue Management

05/07/2013 09:36

Nottingham City Council

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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		**Failure to match resources to ambition**					
1		Develop a robust three year rolling MTFP in line with the agreed MTFS	TK				Annual
1		Active engagement of the Executive in the development of the Council Plan, MTFS and MTFP	TK				Annual
2		**Fail to anticipate and respond to changes in grant levels e.g. general, specific grants etc**					
2		Maintain understanding of grant mechanisms	TK				Ongoing
2		Ongoing engagement in national technical forums	TK				Ongoing
2		Maintain awareness of key issues arising through presentations to CLT, DF, TN and Executive	TK				Ongoing
2		Undertake analysis, forecasting, sensitivity analysis for NCC grant. Review variations to improve accuracy of forecasting	TK				Ongoing
2		Qualified accountants / service experts in place manage/administer grants	TK				N/A
2		Internal and external audit undertake assurance activity of function/processes	TK				Ongoing
3		**Fail to anticipate and respond to changes in other income streams e.g. Council Tax, Business Rates etc**					
3		Maintain thorough understanding of national funding mechanisms and models e.g. Business Rates	TK				Ongoing

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
3		Undertake analysis, forecasting, sensitivity analysis for NCC income streams. Review variations to improve accuracy of forecasting	to				Ongoing
3		Undertake regular and relevant benchmarking and market analysis informing fees and charging policy	DB, JK				Ongoing
3		Efficient and effective mechanisms for prompt income maximising collection	TK				Ongoing
4		**Failure to anticipate and respond to changes in service demand drivers e.g. demographics, economic outlook etc**					
4		Undertake ongoing monitoring / forecasting to identify / anticipate demand pressures	TK				Ongoing
4		Undertake risk assessment and sensitivity analysis for demand led areas prior to budget setting	TK				Ongoing
4		Maintain ongoing awareness / focus on demand pressures through reports to senior management and Executive Cllrs	TK				Ongoing
4		Ensure management actions are in place to mitigate identified / anticipated demand pressures, development of robust recovery plans where appropriate	CLT				Ongoing
5		**Fail to forecast the performance of the growth plan and understand its impact on the accuracy of the MTFP**					
5		Active monitoring, forecasting of outcomes for the Growth Plan in terms of business yield/employment	TK				Ongoing
8		**Genuine pressures are not fully funded within the budget**					

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
8		Budget process includes identification of demand pressures with modelling and sensitivity analysis	CLT, TK				Annual
8		Regular briefings on budget process stressing the importance of accurate budgeting	TK				Annual
8				Improve forecasting of service demand, specifically for Adult and Childrens services with full implementation of Care First financial module	CB	??	??
9		**Arrangements for implementation of savings are not sufficiently robust**					
9		Savings proposals worked up in detail and subject to robust challenge for deliverability as part of budget process	TK, CLT				Annual
9		Scope and ambition of Big Ticket themed approach providing thematic and holistic approach to identification/delivery of savings	CM				Ongoing
9, 10		Individuals accountable for identified savings. Supported by accountability letter stating responsibilities	CM				Annual
9		Ongoing review/reporting of savings implementation to DLTs, CLT and Exec. Board.	TK				Ongoing
9		Understand variations and ensure management actions in place to mitigate	Corporate Directors				Ongoing
9		Understand variations and review related processes/polices for improvements	CM				Ongoing
10		**Arrangements for delivery of services on time, to standard & within budget ineffective**					
10, 11		Ensure engagement of key stakeholders in processes financial/service planning	CM				Annual

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Issue Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
10		Ensure management actions are in place to mitigate identified / anticipated reductions in income	CLT				Ongoing
10		Clear standards developed and agreed for production of the MTFS	TK				Annual
10		Annual service planning process in place aligned to priorities and budget processes	CM				Annual
10		Medium term trend forecasting undertaken with sensitivity analysis	TK				Ongoing
10		Understand variations and review related processes/polices for improvements	TK				Ongoing
11		**Financial reporting/forecasting is insufficiently prompt and/or accurate**					
11		Strategic council wide position reviewed quarterly by the CFO	CM				Ongoing
11		Regular reports to DLTs, CLT and Exec. Board	TK				Ongoing
11		Undertake work to improve the timeliness of reporting	TK				Ongoing

SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities.

Nottingham City Council

This risk is scoped around creating a corporate "organisational environment" which supports frontline service delivery and delivery of the Council's priorities and replaces two long standing risks *SR14 - Failure to deliver culture change* and *SR19 - Failure to deliver Council Plan priorities* following a review undertaken in January - June 2012. The risk also has strong links to *SR10 - Failure to maintain good standards of governance.* Areas of risks considered within scope include:
- Corporate systems, financial, legal HR&T etc;
- Style, openness, the way we work with partners, best delivery openness/trust and commercialisation
- Structure/ways of working matched to purpose;
- Strategy, vision, leadership clarity of purpose;
- Skills, requirements, matching, placement;
- Values;
- Staff, agile, competitive, affordable.

		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:	I. Curryer Chief Executive	Completed by:	R. Henderson, Head of Service Change & Improvement	Date completed:	Jun 2013	Review date:	Sep 2013

RISK SUMMARY											

Opening (June 12)			Previous (N/A)			Current (June 2013)			Target (Mar 2014)			Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)
Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)		DoT ⇩ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Threat level (LxI=??)		DoT ⇩ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating	Threat level (LxI=??)			
3	4	12	L	I	N/A	3	4	12	2	4	8	Adequate

SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities.
03/07/2013 10:14

Nottingham City Council

RISKS TO BE MANAGED

Risk Ref.	Risk Description (cause, risk & impact)	Date identified	Risk owner	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8		Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT (⇩ Improving ⇔ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating)	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Proposed Mgt Action	Risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement,	Status (Raised, Open, Closed)
1a	Failure to ensure the long term vision for the city keeps pace with the changing financial environment	01/06/12	IC	3	4	12	L	I	3	4	12		2	3	6	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
1b	Failure to bring sufficient focus to determining/focusing on the priorities that have the biggest impact	28/03/13	IC	2	4	8	L	I	2	4	8		2	4	8	Tolerate	Adequate	Open
2a	Failure to ensure that goverance / policies / systems and processess add maximum value to the delivery of services to citizens	01/06/12	IC, CM, DB, JK	4	4	16	L	I	4	4	16		2	4	8	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
2b	Failure to secure appropriate attitiues and behaviues to support managers to be as efficinet and effective as possible	28/03/13	IC, CM, DB, JK	3	3	9	L	I	3	3	9		3	3	9	Tolerate	Adequate	Open
3	Lack of understanding of current and future skills base undermines ability to work in an agile way to deploy resources as and where they're required in support of efficacy & effective service delivery.	01/06/12	AP	2	4	8	L	I	2	4	8		2	4	8	Tolerate	Adequate	Open
4	Resistance from colleagues and managers to required changes arising from change fatigue/lack of support for 'difficult' decisions	01/06/12	CM	4	3	12	L	I	4	3	12		3	2	6	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
5	Managers lack the right skills to operate effectively in a more commercialised environment	01/06/12	TK & AV	4	4	16	L	I	4	4	16		2	4	8	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
6	Lack of programme and change management capacity to support delivery of the changes in the short and medium term.	01/06/12	CM	2	3	6	L	I	2	3	6		2	3	6	Tolerate	Adequate	Open

RISKS TO BE MANAGED																	
Risk Ref.	Risk Description (cause, risk & impact)	Date identified	Risk owner	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest				Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Proposed Mgt Action	Risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement,	Status (Raised, Open, Closed)
										Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT (⇩ Improving ⇦ Stable ⇧ Deteriorating)						
7	Failure to recognise/achieve the benefits of joined up approach, perception of threat/loss of control reinforce org structures preventing cross working compromising effectiveness, conflicting interests, duplication of effort, increased costs	28/03/13	CM	1	4	4	L	I		1	4	4		1	4	4	Tolerate	Adequate	Open
8	The Council fails to equip leaders with the right skills and attitudes (e.g. commercial approach, appropriate risk appetite) to enable colleagues to perform effectively and release discretionary effort	28/03/13	CM	4	3	12	L	I		4	3	12		3	3	9	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open

SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities.

03/07/2013 10:14

	EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable		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
1a	Changes to budget process and improvements including joint CLT/Executive Away Days, to assist with aligning commitments and financial projections	TK		Assist leadership to review Council Plan and manifesto priorities by identifying what has been achieved (mid term review of Council Plan). Revisit Nottingham Plan and Council Plan	IC	Sep-13	
1a				Implementation of commercialisation big ticket will encourage greater "business" focus and more appropriate/intelligent risk taking	TK & AV	Ongoing	Review Dec 2013
2a 4	Increasing stakeholder engagement in the development of policies and processes e.g. engage frontline services in the design changes to support services	CLT		Develop timetable for the review and updating of corporate polices and process to facilitate stakeholder engagement	Relevant Directors		
2a 4				Increase understanding of statutory/ mandatory requirements verses local bureaucracy and therefore areas for flexibility/of opportunity	Relevant Directors		
2a, 4				Build stronger links/understanding between corporate and frontline services e.g. frontline experience	Relevant Directors		
4	TSG provides longer term/coherent plan for change understanding impact on frontline services	CM		Understand interdependencies between change programmes / managing the impact on frontline services	CM	Ongoing	Review Oct 2013
4	Leading Nottingham Programme focuses on improving management behaviour in relation to engagement of colleagues	AP					Review Oct 2013
4				Moving from good to great - attitude shift to understanding culture of continuous improvement where change is not a threat but normal (PCATH)	IC	Sep-13	N/A

	EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS			ALL
Risk Ref.	Description of actions already in place to mitigate the identified risks	Person accountable	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
5 & 8	Commercialisation programme in place to challenge, raise expectation, skills and performance, developing appropriate risk appetites	TK & AV				
8	Leading Nottingham programme	AP			Ongoing	Oct 2013
8	Putting Citizens at the Heart of what we do	IC			Sept 2013	
8	Develop Employee Engagement Strategy	AP			July 2013	Dec 2013

Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary

Ref.	Risk description	Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	DoT	Target Threat Level	Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague
		SR criteria							Threat level (seriousness) & DoT	2012/13			2013/14			Managing Accountability	
SR26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes		✓				✓		Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⬄	Apr-14	C. Mills Deputy Chief Exec. / CD-Res	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance Director
									Threat Level	16 (4x4) **R**	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4) **R**	16 (4x4)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT	Deteriorating	Stable	Stable	Stable				
SR6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-12	Oct-12	March	Jun-13	⬇	Apr-13	C. Brudenell Interim CD-Ch & Fam	H. Blackman Director Safeguarding
									Threat Level	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)		10 (2x5)		
									DoT	Improving	Improving	Improving	Improving				
SR8b	Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, polices, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and future regulatory, legal, and business requirements **(updated Q1 2013/14)**				✓		✓		Date			Updated risk	Jun-13	N/A	Apr-14	C. Mills Deputy Chief Exec. / CD-Res	M. Gannon Director IT
									Threat Level				12 (3x4)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT				N/A				
SR11a	Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan **(updated Q1 2013/14)**		✓	✓				✓	Date			Updated risk	Jun-13	N/A	Mar-13	C. Mills Deputy Chief Exec. / CD-Res	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance Director
									Threat Level				12 (3x4)		6 (3x2)		
									DoT				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 **(updated Q4 2012/13)**	✓	✓		✓				Date	Oct-12	Oct-12	Mar-13	Mar-13	⬄	Apr-15	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	C. Brudenell Interim CD-Ch & Fam
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4) **R**	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)		
									DoT	Stable	Stable	Deteriorating	Stable				
SR28	Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system to respond to significant increases in demand for care while protecting our most vulnerable citizens				✓	✓		✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⬄	Mar-14	C. Brudenell Interim CD-Ch & Fam	H. Jones Dir for Adult Assessment
									Threat Level	12 (4x3) **C**	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)		6 (2x3)		
									DoT	N/A	Improving	Stable	Stable				
SR29	Failure to establish an effective Public Health function impacting citizen wellbeing and a failure to deliver the authority's statutory responsibilities				✓	✓		✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Mar-13	⬄	Apr-13	C. Kenny Dir Public Health	A. Hall Dir Health & Welbeing Transition
									Threat Level	12 (4x3) **C**	12 (4x3) **R**	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT	N/A	Improving	Improving	Stable				
SR30	Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities **(new risk added Q1 2013/14)**				✓			✓	Date			New risk	Jun-13	N/A	Dec-12	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	R. Henderson Head of Service Change & Improvement
									Threat Level				12 (3x4)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT				N/A				

Ref.	Risk description	Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	Q2 (2012/13)	Q3	Q4	Q1 (2013/14)	DoT	Target Threat Level	Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague
SR7a/b	Failure to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)	✓	✓		✓		✓		Date	Oct-11	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇩	Sep-13	J. Kelly CD-Comm	E. Orrock Comm Safety Exec. Coordinator
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)		
									DoT	N/A	Improving	Improving	Improving				
SR25a	Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost (updated Q4 2012/13)				✓		✓	✓	Date		Updated risk	Mar-13	Jun-12	⇩	Mar-14	C. Brudenell Interim CD-Ch & Fam	K. Banfield - Commissioning Change Programme Mgr
									Threat Level			12 (3x4) C	12 (3x4)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT			N/A	Improving				
SR3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens				✓		✓		Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇔	Apr-12	D. Bishop CD-Dev	N. Jenkins Head of Economic Development
									Threat Level	12 (4x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		9 (3x3)		
									DoT	Improving	Improving AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET				
SR16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in the Nottingham Plan to 2020		✓		✓		✓		Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇔	2014	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	C. Richmond Acting Dir Policy Partnerships & Comms
									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				
SR5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇩	Apr-13	C. Brudenell Interim CD-Ch & Fam	H. Jones Dir Comm Inclusion E. Yardley Dir Access & Reablement
									Threat Level	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)		4 (1x4)		
									DoT	Stable	Improving	Stable	Improving				
SR2a	Of the reputation of the City		✓		✓			✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇔	Oct-12	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	C. Richmond Acting Dir Policy Partnerships & Comms
									Threat Level	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)		6 (2x3)		
									DoT	N/A	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET				
SR10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance		✓		✓			✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-13	Jan-13	Jun-13	⇩	Mar-13	C. Mills Deputy Chief Exec. / CD-Res	G. O'Connell Director Legal & Democratic Services
									Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	6 (2x3)		6 (2x3)		
									DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Improving AT TARGET				
SR24	Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks			✓	✓	✓		✓	Date	Oct-12	Jan-12	Mar-13	Jun-13	⇩	Dec-13	C. Mills Deputy Chief Exec. / CD-Res	P. Millward Head of Service Emergency Planning
									Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3) R	9 (3x3)	6 (2x3)		6 (2x3)		
									DoT	Deteriorating	Stable	Stable	Improving AT TARGET				

DIRECTION OF TRAVEL (DoT):

Improving (reducing) threat level ⇩   Stable threat level ⇔   Deteriorating (increasing) threat level ⇧

Change & rationale for change	Current status
XSR1 - Failure to implement harmonised pay, grade & terms & conditions, that are fair to all colleagues & Equal Pay legislation compliant	
SR1 was a long standing strategic risk. Over time the risk was progressively managed down to target at Q3 of 2012/13. Although some constituent risks remained these were diminishing with adequate actions in place to manage the risks. At Q3 2012/13 Corporate Leadership Team agreed to the delegation of the risk to the Resources Departmental Risk Register for ongoing management.	At its delegation the main focus of attention was on non teaching staff and this work has now been completed. Further work remains harmonised pay, grades and terms of conditions for Royal Centre Staff for which actions/plans are place considered adequate to manage the risks. On completion of this work there will remain a residual low level of risk of equal pay claims forming part of the business as usual operations of Human Resources & Transformation Directorate. As a significance risk to the Council it is closed.
XSR2 – Of the reputation of the city	
The risk was focussed on management of reputational consequential risks stemming from potential failure to deliver on business priorities (principally other strategic risks. The risk was re-scoped to managing causal risks as they impact on the delivery of priorities/citizens, through working more widely in the city/region with the business sector, third sector, Chamber Of Commerce, neighbouring LAs, regional groups, influencing Government Departments/Government perception etc. At Q2 2012/13 Corporate Leadership agreed the re-scoped risk.	This is a current strategic risk with ongoing quarterly reporting through the Strategic Risk Register Updates. The risk after re-scoping has remained at 6 since Q2 2012/13 reporting.
XSR7- Failure to reduce levels and the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)	
SR7 was selected for review by the Corporate Director. The risk was re-scoped to focus on the relevant manifesto pledges and Corporate Leadership Team agreed the changes as part of the SRR Q2 Update.	This is a current strategic risk with ongoing quarterly reporting through the Strategic Risk Register Updates. The risk has remained at 12 but with an improving direction of travel since it was re-scoped in Q2 2012/13.
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	
This is a long standing risk which has been in the SRR since Q3 2010/11. Changes in the Children and Families Corporate Directorate, implementation of a new inspection framework for school improvement services and a more fragmented and commercially motivated "education market place" has prompted a review of the risk which will seeks to reinforce	Work is underway to update the strategic risk which should be ready for review as part of the SRR Q2 Update.

a strategic and joined up approach that looks at a citizen's journey from child to adulthood and the impact that education and learning has on their quality of life and long term economic wellbeing.	
XSR14 - Failure to deliver culture change <u>and</u> XSR19 - Failure to deliver Council Plan priorities	
SR14 and 19 are long standing risks entering the SRR in quarters 3 and 4 respectively of 2008/09. A review began in March 2012 to re-scoping the risks around a *Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of council priorities* to provide a more coherent approach to the management of both risks. Corporate Leadership Team asked that further work be undertaken to consider the risks and mitigations with a broader range of stakeholders.	The updated RMAP is included in the update as a newly scoped risk *SR30 - Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of council priorities* (**Appendix 4**) and SR14 and SR19 have been closed.
XSR25 - Failure to deliver improved outcomes through the implementation and embedding of the Commissioning Framework within the directorate, the council and with partners	
The risk was originally scoped around the development and implementation of a Commissioning Framework within Children and Families. On completion of this work, Corporate Leadership agreed in April 2013 to the re-scoping of the risk around the wider embedding of the developed Commissioning Framework across the organisation as *SR25a - Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost*	Current strategic risk with ongoing quarterly reporting through the Strategic Risk Register Updates. The risk has remained at 12 but showing an improved direction of travel since it was re-scoped in Q4 2012/13.
XSR27 - Failure of Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) to raise sufficient income to meet NET Phase Two funding requirements	
The risk entered the SRR at Q1 2011/12 focussed on the ability of WPL to raise revenue to meet the Council's contribution to the NET Phase Two, HUB and Link Buses projects. The scheme was introduced on 1st October 2011 and charging commenced in April 2012. The risk was delegated for ongoing monitoring at Q2 of so12/13 once the performance of WPL was better understood and the level of risk improved to 8.	Concern centred on the ability of WPL to meet funding requirements for Net Phase 2, with a significant issue being interest rates/changes and Net Phase 2 borrowing costs. This risk has been mitigated by borrowing at a new 'certainty rate' offered by the Public Works Loan Board which is considerably lower than the prevailing rate and has a beneficial impact on the overall financial model, substantially offsetting a reduction in the projected WPL income in Year 1 of the scheme. The WPL income projections are updated to reflect the latest information available as income collection is still in its infancy. In the event that over the 23 year life of the NET Phase 2 contract, insufficient WPL income is generated, decisions may be made in respect of the ongoing contributions to the Link Bus network and/or extending the WPL scheme beyond the life of the NET Phase 2 contract.

SR28 - Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system to respond to significant increases in demand for care while protecting our most vulnerable citizens	
Corporate Leadership Team agreed the addition of the risk to the SRR in Q2 of 2012/13. The risk is scoped around delivering short and long-term savings, ensuring a financially sustainable care system, and responding to national policy drivers around personalisation, greater citizen choice, and brings together all significant change activity across the area of adult social care.	Current strategic risk with ongoing quarterly reporting through the Strategic Risk Register Updates. The risk has remained at 12 since entering the SRR.
SR29 - Failure to establish an effective Public Health function impacting citizen wellbeing and a failure to deliver the authority's statutory responsibilities	
Corporate Leadership Team agreed the addition of the risk to the SRR in Q2 of 2012/13 scoped around the transition and delivery of the Public Health function and the council meeting its statutory duties. The risk entered the SRR at 12 and showed an improving direction of travel. .	The Public Health function transferred in April 2013 prompting work to rescope the risk around delivering the function and securing the benefits from improved integration of NCC services. The updated RMAP should be ready for review as part of the SRR Q2 Update.