

AUDIT COMMITTEE – 25 JULY 2014

Title of paper:	Strategic Risk Register (SRR) – Quarter 1 (Q1) 2014/15 Update and 2013/14 Annual Review	
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Report of the Acting Corporate Director Resources Glen O’Connell	Wards affected: ALL
Report author(s) and contact details:	Simon Burton – Corporate Risk Specialist ☎ 0115 87(63432) ✉ simon.burton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk	
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Geoff Walker – Acting Director of Strategic Finance Tim O’Neill – Director of Vulnerable Children and Families Helen Blackman – Director of Children’s Social Care Mick Dunn – GIS Data and Information Manager Simon Salmon – Head of IT Strategy Liz Jones - Head of Corporate Policy Helen Jones – Director of Adult Social Care	
Recommendation(s):		
1	Review the selected risk: ○ <i>Failure to maintain good standards of governance</i> (see Appendix 1) - presentation by Glen O’Connell – Director Legal and Democratic Services.	
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 2014/15 (Table 1 and Appendix 5) and for the year 2013/14.	
3	Note the results of the review of the SRR by CLT.	
4	Select one or more strategic risks from Appendix 4 for specific scrutiny as part of the SRR Q1 2014/15 Update.	

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 The recommendations are intended to support Audit Committee’s risk management role in providing 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 report presents the latest CLT review of the strategic risks faced by the Council.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Threat level reduction progress

- 2.2 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**.

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

2.4 Of the **15** strategic risks within the SRR:

- **Two** show an improved threat assessment;
- **Eight** are at target;
- *SR28 – Adult Social Care* shows a deteriorating threat assessment (9 to 12) and *SR11a – Financial sustainability* shows a deteriorating DoT;
- There is **one** new red assessed risk *SR31 - Affordable and fit for purpose ICT*.

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 2014/15			
SR No.	Strategic Risk Description	Threat Level	DoT (Q4–Q1)
Red rated strategic risks (6)			
6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children	15	↔
11a	Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures to ensure delivery of the Council Plan priorities	12	↑
28	Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system that protect vulnerable adults and manage the impact of the Care Act	9 to 12	↑
12a	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 (under review)	12	↔
26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes	12	↔
31	Failure to secure affordable and fit for purpose ICT arrangements aligned to current and future business productivity and effectiveness	12	N/A
Amber rated strategic risks (9)			
3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens	9 At target	↔
30	Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities (new risk added Q1 2013/14)	9	↔
8b	Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and future regulatory, legal, and business requirements	12 to 9 At target	↓
7a/b	Failure to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)	8 At target	↔

TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level & DoT in rank order at Q1 2014/15 (continued)			
SR No.	Strategic Risk Description	Threat Level	DoT (Q4–Q1)
Amber rated strategic risks (9)			
25a	Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost	9 to 8 At target	↓
2a	Of the reputation of the City	6 At target	↔
5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults	6 At target	↔
10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance	6 At target	↔
24	Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks	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 4 identifies individual risk owners, detailed risk threat level assessments between October 2013 (Q4 2013/14) and June 2014 (Q1 2014/15) and the projected dates when target threat levels will be achieved.

2.5 Review of new, emerging and existing SRR risks

2.5.1 *SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children:* This update reflects the outcome of the latest Ofsted inspection. At Q3 of 2013/14 SR6 became the most serious risk and for Q1 the threat assessment remains unchanged at 15 with four red constituent risks:

- *R1 - Competitive external market place gives rise to difficulties recruiting and retaining qualified Social Workers impacting capacity and the quality of social provision (12).*

Identified mitigations and controls include rolling recruitment and over-recruitment to avoid dependence on agency staff. Agency staff are used to effectively manage demand, although this has financial implications. Managers have received supervisory training with a focus on developing a critically reflective practitioner and the role of emotional intelligence. Work is in train to develop proposals around pay, conditions and support to find longer term and sustainable responses to the risk;

- *R10 - Limited capacity and increasing demand for services risks early intervention not being effective resulting in higher demand on safeguarding services that are then compromised (16).*

Key mitigations and controls include improved deployment of resources to maximise case holding capacity and a focus on the quality/effectiveness of interventions. For example, improved preparation for assessments and the Priority Families programme, which targets help and support to those families who need it most maximising the effectiveness of interventions. Alternative models to access additional intervention resources are being considered, for example, voluntary models, along with alternative sources of funding for example City Care "*Small Steps Big Change*" with further integration with Public Health;

- *R11 - Lack of understanding/engagement by partners leads to a failure to complete accurate/timely CAFs (Common Assessment Framework) resulting in a deterioration of circumstances and an increasing number of children being referred for specialist intervention (12). Key controls and mitigations include the Children's Partnership Board as a means of building relationships and common understanding with partners alongside the revised Education Strategy providing a focus for partnership collaboration. Additional resources have been secured for coordinating the completion of CAFs;*

The updated RMAP is at **Appendix 2** for consideration by Audit Committee.

2.5.2 SR10 - Failure to maintain good standards of governance entered the strategic risk register in 2009/09 with a threat assessment of 12. For the last five consecutive quarters the risk has remained at target threat level. Constituent risks within the RMAP acknowledge the need to balance strong/rigorous governance arrangements designed to ensure legal, financial compliance and sound management, against a need for increased discretion/flexibility supporting new ways of working and a more commercial ethos.

- *R5 - Adverse impact on service delivery due to governance processes being overly bureaucratic and slow (6);*
- *R6 - Inability to modernise/change appropriately due to existing governance arrangements (9);*
- *R7 - Increased flexibility, management discretion seen as desirable in supporting a more commercial operating approach compromises governance arrangements/compliance with good practice in relation to governance arrangements and places increased pressure on limited assurance resources (9).*

On 25 April, Audit Committee selected SR10 for review and the RMAP is included at **Appendix 1**.

2.5.3 SR11 - Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures to ensure delivery of the Council Plan priorities: The overall threat level, has remained stable at 12, but with a deteriorating DoT for Q1. A key constituent risks which shows a deteriorating threat assessment (9 to 16) is *Arrangements insufficiently robust to deliver budgeted savings*. This reflects concern that savings/income generation targets accounted for in the 3 year MTFP are of a greater scale and complexity than in previous years, and that "easier" options have already been exploited/explored. This is against the back drop of anticipated further cuts in Government funding.

2.5.4 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. Recent changes to the school inspection regime have significantly impacted the regulatory view of the City's secondary provision. Inspections of seven secondary schools and academies in the City conducted in December 2013 under the new framework, deemed all schools to be inadequate and flagged a number of common issues and themes. The SR12a RMAP has been updated to ensure that key areas of focus arising from the inspections are reflected with the addition of a number of new risks and revisions to existing risk descriptions. Further work is required to assess the risks, identify controls and develop mitigations. Risks identified include:

- *R11 - The performance/reputation of schools may make them unattractive to teaching staff leading to problems recruiting and retaining high quality teaching staff;*
- *R7 - Lack of primary school capacity risks some children not receiving placement/early years foundation education impacting their long term education opportunities;*
- *R10 - A culture of undervaluing education/learning (poor parenting?) within some communities/families may lead to pupil absenteeism impacting attendance, behaviour and attainment;*
- *R13 - Poor communication and coordination of resources risks a lack of stable education placements for children in care resulting in poor attainment;*
- *R14 - The quality of care contributes to absenteeism by children in care impacting attendance, behaviour and attainment;*
- *R15 - Lack of a common education vision for the City agreed with FE partners raises a risk that qualifications offered by FE colleges are not aligned with local employment opportunities;*
- *R16 - Devaluation of vocational qualifications may encourage schools to move away from technical and vocational courses better aligned with the economic needs of the city;*

Remaining work to complete the RMAP will be coordinated with the newly appointed Interim Principal Education Strategy Lead. The updated RMAP needs to be available for consideration as part of the SRR Q2 update due to be reported in October.

2.5.5 SR26 - Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes remains stable at 12. Some of the most significant changes resulting from the Government's welfare reforms have now been in place for a year and progress has been made in managing the risks. The Council Tax Support Scheme for 2013/14 was put in place and worked reasonably well as it sought to mitigate, as far as possible, the effect of having to introduce a minimum contribution for all working age households of 8.5%. The Council Tax Support Scheme for 2014/15 is now in place and monitoring will take place to understand the impact of increasing minimum contributions from 8.5% to 20%.

The response to Housing Benefit under occupancy remains a key focus of work, although this has become 'business as usual' as the arrangements put into place for its introduction have bedded in. Key amongst these is the Eviction Prevention Protocol, the use of Discretionary Housing Payments and the use of more Private Rented Sector housing options for vulnerable citizens. Work is underway to re-commission advice services in 2015, building in learning from our work on the impacts from welfare changes over the last year.

A new risk has been added, *Failure by the DWP to effectively manage the delays in implementing UC in Nottingham resulting in uncertainty for citizens* which reflects concerns regarding delays to the transition to Universal Credit (UC). It is unclear whether all current claimants will be transferred to UC by 2017. The Government has made significant changes to the UC implementation timetable first in July 2013 and then again in December 2013. Mitigation focuses on providing advice and information to citizens and working with the DWP on the Local Support Framework to take a partnership approach in preparing for supporting citizens in the transition.

2.5.6 SR28 - Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system that protect vulnerable adults and manage the impact of the Care Act for this quarter has been updated to reflect the Care Act and its impact on Adult Social Care provision. The Care Act 2014 introduces major reforms to the legal framework for adult social care, to the funding system and to the duties of local authorities and rights of those in need of social care. The Act is divided into four parts, the first of these deals with the reform of the adult social care system which includes the following key components:

- General LA responsibilities in terms of care and support role towards the local community with an emphasis on prevention. Duties to consider physical, mental and emotional wellbeing and to provide information to those needing care;
- The processes for assessments, charging, establishing entitlements, care planning and the provision of care and support;
- National eligibility criteria to assess individuals' entitlements to care (including carers) (assessment can begin from October 2015 with implementation in April 2016);
- A cap of £72,000 as the maximum amount any individual will have to pay for their care. Young people with care needs prior to turning 18 will receive free adult care and support when they reach that age (from April 2016);
- Use of 'deferred payment agreements' intended to enable people to meet their care costs without having to sell their homes during their lifetime (from April 2015);

Duties under the Care Act have the potential for significant impact on the service and the Council in terms additional care cost, further IT requirements/costs and increased assessments/administrative burdens. Consequently, four new risks have been added to the ASC RMAP:

- *The government fails to set aside adequate funds to meet the council's additional costs arising from implementation of, and compliance with, the Care Act impacting the financial sustainability of the service and the MTFP (12);*

- *Care Act implementation significantly increases service workload processing cases to determine eligibility during the window for self-funders to register impacting timeliness of assessments, quality of service provision & increasing processing costs (16);*
- *Changes in the Act relating to deferred payments raises the risk that there will be a rise in requests with substantial upfront care costs which cannot be recovered in the short to medium term against assets that are not controlled by the Council (9);*
- *Existing software is inadequate to meet Care Act requirements risking insufficient time to procure IT/develop existing software/processes with a failure to comply with statutory requirements, increased procurement and development costs, compromised ICT implementation & service quality (12).*

Many provisions in the Act reinforce or formalise a number of current initiatives and ways of working. A Programme Board has examined the non-financial impact of the Care Act and the next steps are to formalise plans for implementation to meet the duties. The Programme Board has a lead representative for each of the key areas (including transition from childhood and 'portability' between LA areas), as well cross-cutting themes of finance, legal, IT, workforce, communications and equalities.

Modelling is underway to gain insight into the financial and other implications for the Council. Modelling undertaken by another LA in the region has projected an additional cost of £6m, but based on a different socioeconomic/demographic profile. Until this has been completed, it is difficult to meaningfully assess the impacts.

In addition there is significant uncertainty whether the Government / Dept of Health will make financial contribution to costs over and above the transition costs. Given the uncertainty, assessment of the risk is difficult but has been assessed at 12. A further update will be provided as part of the SRR Q2 Update.

2.5.7 SR31 - Failure to secure affordable and fit for purpose ICT arrangements aligned to current and future business productivity and effectiveness: ICT has a critical and expanding role in enabling the Council's ambition, providing both radically different ways for customers to access and use services, and encouraging new internal working practices to improve service quality and productivity whilst reducing overall operating costs.

This new risk reflects the importance of ensuring the ability of ICT to support existing and future business needs. Significant constituent risks have been identified resulting in an overall opening threat assessment of 12. Key themes reflected in the RMAP include:

- The tension between securing the best outcomes for the Council through corporately aligned platforms and processes and systems/processes adapted to meet specific service needs;
- The ability of aging infrastructure (services, networks, computers) to meet current needs and the increasing expectations/demands of ICT by the business and citizens to support new ways of working.
- Significant prevailing and future financial constraints.

Actions approved by CLT are already delivering improvements and mitigations identified in the RMAP (**Appendix 3**) are assessed as adequate to bring the risk to target 6 by February 2016. But the significance of the risk to the future operation of the Council resulted in agreement that the risk should be added to the SRR.

2.6 Review of progress made during 2013/14 in managing the Council's strategic risks

2.6.1 Significant progress was made during 2013/14 to manage and reduce the threat levels of the Council's strategic risks despite the financial and economic pressures. During 2013/14 work to manage the Council's strategic risks resulted in:

- **One** strategic risk with a the threat level reduced to such an extent that it was delegated from the SRR (*SR16a - Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in the Nottingham Plan to 2020*)
- **Ten** strategic risks having reduced threat levels or being at target by Q4 (SR2a, SR3, SR5a, SR7a/b, SR10, SR24, SR25a, SR26, SR28 and SR30)
- **Four** strategic risks showing no improvement terms of threat level (SR6, SR8b, SR11a and SR12a)
- **Five** strategic risks reviewed/re-scoped, or work commenced (SR6, SR8b, SR11a, SR12a and SR25a)
- **One** new strategic risk (*SR30 – Organisational environment*)

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

- *SR6 – Failure to safeguard vulnerable children*
- *SR8b – Failure to implement and embed effective information management structures, policies, procedures, processes and controls to support the council's immediate and future regulatory, legal, and business requirements*
- *SR11a – Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures supporting the development and delivery of the medium term financial plan*
- *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*
- *SR30 – Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities*
- *Public Health – Public health delivery and integration*

In addition, Audit Committee reviewed and approved the updated RMF at Q2 2013/14.

2.7 Future Audit Committee reviews

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 Committee is invited to select two strategic risks from **Appendix 4** for more detailed examination in the SRR Q2 2014/15 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. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

3.1 Q1 2014/15 Strategic Risk Management Action Plans.

4. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

4.1 SRR Q4 Update reported to Audit Committee 25 April 2014.

APPENDICIES

Appendix	Description
1	SR10 - Failure to maintain good standards of governance (RMAP selected for review by Audit Committee)
2	SR6 - Failure to safeguard vulnerable children (RMAP available for consideration by Audit Committee)
3	SR31 - <i>Failure to secure fit for purpose, value-for-money ICT aligned to current and future needs and business productivity and effectiveness</i> (RMAP available for consideration by Audit Committee)
4	Nottingham City Council Strategic Risk Register - Report Summary

SR10 – Failure to maintain good standards of governance.

This strategic risk is scoped around the Council's corporate governance arrangements including its policies, processes, customs and culture affecting the way the organisation is led, managed and controlled.

		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:	G. O'Connell Acting Corporate Director Resources		Completed by:	G. O'Connell Director Legal & Democratic Services		Date completed:	Jun 2014	Review date:	Sep 2014					
RISK SUMMARY														
Opening (Dec 08)			Previous (Mar 2014) Q4			Current (June 2014) Q1			Target (March 2013)	Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)				
Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)					
			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating								
3	4	12	2	3	6	↔	2	3	6	↔	2	3	6	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			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8		
		2	4	8	2	3	6	2	3	6		1	4	4
1	Poor governance arrangements resulting in poor decision making, financial and/or reputational loss.	2	4	8	2	3	6	2	3	6	↓	1	4	4
2	Possible lack of compliance due to no common understanding of governance.	3	4	12	2	3	6	2	3	6	↓	2	4	8
3	Deliberate lack of compliance.	3	4	12	3	4	12	3	3	9	↔	2	4	8
4	Inconsistent compliance due to departmentalised approach.	3	4	12	3	4	12	2	3	6	↔	2	3	6
5	Adverse impact on service delivery due to governance processes being overly bureaucratic and slow.	3	3	9	2	3	6	2	3	6	↔	2	3	6
6	Inability to modernise/change appropriately due to existing governance arrangements.	3	4	12	3	3	9	3	3	9	↔	2	4	8
7	Increased flexibility, management discretion seen as desirable in supporting a more commercial operating approach compromises governance arrangements/compliance with good practice in relation to governance arrangements and places increased pressure on limited assurance resources	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		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 anything other than "Adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1	Responsibility for governance formally vested in experienced and qualified s151 officer who attends CLT, Exec Board and other key forums and deputy in place.	CM (GW)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 7	Qualified and experienced Monitoring Officer in place who attends Council and other key forums and deputy in place. Succession planning and formal deputisation arrangements are in place.	GOC (MT/SM)	Adequate				Ongoing
1	Regular meeting of 3 key statutory officers continues and is successful.	CM (GOC)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 3, 4	Formal monitoring of safeguarding arrangements in place between DCS and Head of Paid Service (CEX). Written reports also reviewed at the Statutory Officers Meeting	IC (CM)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 3, 4, 7	Internal audit service in place with risk assessed audit plan.	CM (GW)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 3, 4, 7	Legal department in place and staffed with qualified and experienced lawyers.	GOC (MT/SM)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 3, 4, 7	Constitutional Services in place staffed with experienced employees.	GOC (DM)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 2, 3, 7	Structured Delegated Decision Making (DDM) process supported by software with workflow	GOC (DM)	Adequate	Consideration underway of alternative software with greater functionality with potential to link directly to financial systems as part of approved payments arrangements	GOC (DM)	Jun-15	Ongoing
1, 7	Audit Committee in place since May 2008 with programme of appropriate work, and having received training and working well.	CM (GW)	Adequate				Ongoing

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 anything other than "Adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1, 4	Annual Governance Statement process comprehensive and embedded. Action plan development and implementation process embedded.	CM (SS)	Adequate				Annual review
1	Regular financial and performance monitoring arrangements in place – including reports to EB, O&S, Audit Committee and mgt teams of various levels. Robust and prompt action to any arising issues	IC/CM/AP (All CDs and Dirs)	Adequate				Quarterly reporting
1	Realignment of financial and performance management arrangements in the light of the new operating model complete	CM (GW/RH)	Adequate	Normal continuous improvement activity through development of Nottingham Managers	CM (GW/BB) Who is BB - Bev Bull?	Ongoing	ongoing
1	Corporate Delivery Board operational and operating satisfactorily. Approach is reviewed and updated in the spirit of continuous improvement.	AP	Adequate				Quarterly reporting
1	Performance boards operating in corporate directorates and service directorates. Ongoing checks to ensure PBs operating and embedded in all directorates	AP	Adequate				Quarterly reporting
1, 3, 4, 7	HR and finance staff embedded in services	CM/AP	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 3, 4, 7	On site external audit team who undertake a programme of audits	CM (GW)	Adequate				Ongoing
1, 5, 6	Transformation portfolio reviewed and agreed by Transformation Delivery Group (TDG) with priority groupings targeting resources. Detailed consideration of benefits and & disbenefits with improved performance and financial forecasting and management	AP, (RH, GW)	Adequate				Ongoing

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 anything other than "Adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
1	AP function is under new management and showing clear signs of sustained improvement in both systems and outcomes	CM (GW/JA)	Yet to secure improvement	Further sustained improvement secured and embedded + EMSS structure action	CM (GW/JA)	Completed	Monthly review
1, 2, 4, 7	Clear constitution and scheme of delegations in place reviewed and approved by City Council (including Public Health)	IC/CM (Res CD)	Adequate	Training programmes delivered (overall constitution and financial aspects) and kept relevant. Phase 1 (Team Nottingham & Directors Forum) Phase 2 to include further training programmes	GOC	Completed	Annual review
1, 2, 4, 7	Clear financial regulations in place with training programme	CM (GW)	Adequate		CM (GW)	Ongoing	Annual review
2, 4	Head of profession role taken seriously by CFO with regular engagement with finance community.	CM (GW)	Adequate				Ongoing
2, 4	Internet provides access to current key governance documentation	CM (All)	Adequate				Monthly review
2, 3, 4	Annual survey for AGS confirms key responsibilities of individuals.	CM (GW)	Adequate				Annual review
2, 4	Internal audit reports include recommendations with checks to ensure key recommendations are promptly acted upon	CM (GW, SS)	Adequate				Quarterly review
3, 7	Whistle blowing policy updated and publicised	CM (GOC)	Adequate				Annual review
3	Reporting of actions taken under delegation in place	CM (GOC)	Adequate				Ongoing
3	Professional teams in place suitably led and trained/developed (e.g. : internal audit, finance, HR, IT, legal) in place and proactive	CM, AP (All Corp Services Dir)	Adequate				Ongoing
3	Strengthened procurement team in place with work integrated with wider commissioning activity	CM (GW, CB)	Adequate				Ongoing

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 anything other than "Adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
3	Training programmes delivered and kept relevant	CM (GOC, GW, AP)	Adequate				Annual review
3, 7	Various checks and balances in key processes (e.g. : payments, debt control) and division of duties	CM	Adequate				Annual review
4	Accountability letters sent to senior colleagues confirming requirement to deliver services on time, to standard and within budget	IC, CM, GW Corp/Strat Dirs	Adequate				Annual
4	Risk registers are reported at Audit Committee, CLT and DLTs	CM	Adequate				Quarterly reporting/ review
4	Project registers established and reported regularly to relevant mgt levels in accordance with Risk Management Framework	DB, CM, AP	Adequate				Ongoing
4	Performance Board approach takes place in all corporate directorates with common coverage (including finance, people, risk, project mgt) and is embedded	DB, CB, JK, CM	Adequate				Quarterly review
5, 6	Plain English is applied to key documents, letters and emails	IC (SB, All)	Adequate				Ongoing review
5, 6	MTFS agreed with key colleagues involved and awareness raised	CM (GW)	Adequate				Annual review
5, 6	Risk adversity addressed in part through Commercialism	CM, AP (GW)	Yet to secure improvement	Corporate Risk Specialist to development and promote a Risk Appetite Self Assessment and training for managers to develop understanding of risk appetite	SB	Sep-14	Ongoing
5, 6				New operating model implemented and supported by key programmes PCATH, Commercialism, Leading Nott'm - Improving Performance Reducing Bureaucracy	IC, AP (RH)	See programme plans	Ongoing

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 anything other than "Adequate")	Person accountable	Date action due to be completed	Review date
5, 6				New leadership in the top team/ new structure in place	IC	ongoing	Annual review
5, 6	CIPPF and new service planning approach embedded	CM, AP	Adequate				Annual review
5, 6	Temporary agency resources coordinated through Matrix SCM with improvements in efficiencies, costs and management information	CM (AP)	Adequate				Annual review



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)
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:	A. Michalska, Corporate Director Children & Adults		Completed by:	H. Blackman Dir Childrens Social Care T. O'Neill Dir Vulnerable Children & Families		Date completed:	Jul 2014	Review date:	Sep 2014					
RISK SUMMARY														
Opening (Q1 10/11)			Previous (N/A)			Current (July 2014)			Target (April 16)	Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)				
Threat level (Lxl=??)		DoT	Threat level (Lxl=??)		DoT	Threat level (Lxl=??)		Threat level (Lxl=??)						
3	5	15	3	5	15	↔	3	5	15	↔	2	4	8	Yet to secure improvement

Risk Register

17/07/2014 13:03



Nottingham
City Council

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)
R1	Competitive external market place gives rise to difficulties recruiting and retaining qualified Social Workers impacting capacity and the quality of social provision	2011/12	SG	HB	Immediate	3	4	12	1	4	4	3	4	12	↑	2	3	6	Treat	Inadequate	Open
R3	Operational capacity issues places additional demand on managers impacting on the quality of supervision of frontline practitioners.	2011/12	SG	HB	Immediate	3	4	12	3	3	9	3	3	9	↔	2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R8	Lack of robust recording management information system to support safeguarding practice	2011/12	SG	HB	Immediate	4	4	16	3	3	9	3	3	9	↔	1	3	3	Treat	Inadequate	Open
R9	Loss of/inappropriate access to records/information compromises the security of sensitive/confidential details/data	2011/12	SG	HB	Immediate	2	3	6	3	3	9	3	3	9	↔	2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R10	Limited capacity and increasing demand for services risks early intervention not being effective resulting in higher demand on safeguarding services that are then over stretched.	Q4 2011/12	SG	TON	Immediate	3	4	12	3	4	12	4	4	16	↑	2	4	8	Treat	Inadequate	Open
R11	Lack of understand/engagement by partners leads to a failure to complete accurate/timely CAFs resulting in a deterioration of circumstances and an increasing number of children being referred for specialist intervention	2011/12	SG	TON	Immediate	3	4	12	3	4	12	3	4	12	↓	2	4	8	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open
R14	Lack of capacity risks compromising the ability to deliver SMART care planning for Children In Care resulting in delays and adverse emotional and financial impacts	01/05/14	HB	HB	Immediate	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	4	8	Treat	Yet to secure improvement	Open

Risk, Issue & Opportunity Management Actions

17/07/2014 13:03



Nottingham
City Council

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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		Competitive external market place gives rise to difficulties recruiting and retaining qualified Social Workers impacting capacity and the quality of social provision	HB				
R1, R3		HR consultant appointed to work with Director & Heads of Service on recruitment and retention of Social Workers, IROs and Managers	HB	HR to develop proposals around pay, conditions and support	HB	Sep-14	01/09/14
R1				Initiate project to recruit and retain social workers. Invest in the recruitment and highlevel training of newly qualified SWs.	HB	May 14 / July 14	01/09/14
R1, R3		Rolling recruitment with agreement to over recruit to avoid dependence on agency staff	HB	Additional investment in social work posts.	HB	Jul-14	01/09/14
R1, R3		Use of agency staff to manage demand but with budget impacts	HB	HR consultant and Director meet fortnightly to review progress of recruitment to replace agency staff	HB	on going	01/09/14
R3		Operational capacity issues places additional demand on managers impacting on the quality of supervision of frontline practitioners.	HB				
R3				Review of supervision process to ensure social workers receive meaningful support and supervision which is sustainable for managers.	POB	Oct-14	
R3		Quality Assurance Strategy implemented to include audits of adequate supervision of all frontline staff to be undertaken in CSC	TN/ HF		TN	Oct-14	01/10/14

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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		A supervision policy is in place which ensures that all colleagues have meaningful supervision that is sustainable.	HB	The Supervision Policy is to be revised to strengthen the reflective practice element and include Signs of Safety & strength based communications	MG / POB	Sep-14	01/09/14
R8		Lack of robust recording management information system to support safeguarding practice					
R8		System to support safeguarding practice.	CM	Special project raised to review system and improvements possible.	CM		
R8		HOS attends monthly ICT Strategy Board to drive improvements on behalf of service area.	TN	Special project raised to review systems and improvements possible.			
R8		Manual recording back-up system in place if electronic system is unavailable.	HB	Special projects raised to review systems and improvements possible.	See above		
R9		Loss of information compromises the security of sensitive data.	CM / HB				
R9		Data protection and security policies and arrangement in place	AG	E training refresher for whole service. IT acceptable use policy.	AG	Jun-14	01/12/14
R9		Caldicott Guardian and Director ensure data is used carefully. Security bags in place to mitigate impact of loss and recovery of data.	HB / CM				
R9		Data protection training will be delivered to NQSW's and new starters	HB	NQSW programme to start in duty	TN / TB	Sep-14	01/12/14
R9		Disposal control arrangements in place for IT assets (e.g. laptops PCs)	IT				
R9		Measures to ensure confidentiality implemented including, lockable bags for transporting documents	HB	Regular review of effectiveness of measures to reduce risk of loss and impact.	TN / CS/ AG		01/09/15
R10		Limited capacity and increasing demand for services risks early intervention not being effective resulting in higher demand on safeguarding services that are then over stretched.	TON				

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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
R10		Service resources targeted to increase/maximise case holding capacity	TON	Review of Family Community Teams case holding capacity following on from Phase 2 consultation. Consideration of alternative models to access additional Early Intervention resources e.g. Joint commissioning with Voluntary Sector. Work to ensure Small Steps Big Changes brings additional Early Intervention benefits within the target wards.	ON	Mar-15	01/10/14
R10		Ongoing focus on the quality/effectiveness of interventions for example improved preparation for assessments	TON	Effective completion of relevant commissioning reviews	TON	Mar-15	01/10/14
R10		Work closely with Early Intervention Foundation to further develop the most effective interventions	CB				??
R10		Priority Families programme targets help and support to those families who need it most maximising effectiveness of intervention	TON	Expansion of programme in line with National Phase 2 line out	MA	Mar-16	01/03/15
R11		Lack of understand/engagement by partners leads to a failure to complete accurate/timely CAFs resulting in a deterioration of circumstances and an increasing number of children being referred for specialist intervention	TON				
R11		Childrens Partnership Board offers opportunity to strengthen engagement and build common understanding with partners	AM	Regular review at CPB and LSCB on performance and evidence of interagency work.		Mar-15	
R11		Revised Education Strategy provides a focus for partner collaboration	AM				Annually

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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
R11				<p>Improve partnership engagement in CAF via Children's Trust.</p> <p>Deployment of 3 Early Help Assessment Officers.</p> <p>Embed refreshed Family Support Pathway.</p> <p>Use of the Health and Wellbeing Board statutory framework, and Local Safeguarding Children Board to better embed CAF across partnerships.</p>	TON	Mar-15	01/10/14
R14		Lack of capacity risks compromising the ability to deliver SMART care planning for Children In Care resulting in delays and adverse emotional and financial impacts					
R14				Adoption Reform Grant is being used to drive improvement and speed up process to ensure appropriate support	HB	Aug-14	01/08/14
R14		Care plans are being redrafted in line with Ofsted recommendation	HB	External colleague engaged to complete careplan templated.	HB	Jul-14	



SR31 - Failure to secure affordable and fit for purpose ICT arrangements aligned to current and future business productivity and effectiveness

ICT has a critical and expanding role in enabling the Council’s ambition, providing both radically different ways for customers to access and use services, and encouraging new internal working practices which can improve service quality and staff productivity whilst reducing the overall operating costs. This new risk reflects concern regarding the ability of ICT to support existing a future business needs and benefits outlined above. Key themes reflected in the RMAP include:

- The tension between securing the best outcomes for the Council through corporately aligned platforms and processes and systems/processes adapted to meet specific service needs;
- Issues with the ability of aging infrastructure (services, networks, computers) to meet current needs and the increasing expectations/demands of ICT by the business and citizens to support new ways of working within significant financial constraints.

		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:	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Director Resources					Completed by:	S. Salmon Head of IT Strategy					Date completed:	Jun 2014		Review date:	Sep 2014				
RISK SUMMARY																				
Opening (Dec 10)			Previous (N/A)			Current (Dec 2010)			Target (Feb 2016)			Overall risk mitigation effectiveness (Adequate, Yet to secure improvement, Inadequate)								
Threat level (Lxl=??)			Threat level (Lxl=??)			Threat level (Lxl=??)			Threat level (Lxl=??)											
			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating						DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating											
3	4	12	L	I	N/A				3	4	12				2	3	6	Yet to secure improvement		

Risk Register

10/07/2014 12:29



Nottingham
City Council

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)
R1	An IT centric approach to ICT development, lack of engagement of Depts/Dirs risks ICT service provision misaligned to business and a failure to achieve expected business and financial value from ICT services (tight).	13/05/14	SS	MH	Immediate	3	4	12	L	I		3	4	12		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R2	Increasing dependency on/expectation for ICT in enabling new ways of working, reliance on legacy server equipment risk poor performance impacting on the ability of the Council to provide effective and efficient services to its staff and the public	13/05/14	SS	LJ	Immediate	4	4	16	L	I		4	4	16		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R3	Increasing dependency on/expectation for ICT in enabling new ways of working, reliance on legacy client equipment risk poor performance impacting on the ability of the Council to provide effective and efficient services to its staff and the public	13/05/14	SS	AW	Immediate	4	4	16	L	I		4	4	16		2	2	4	Treat	Adequate	Open
R4	Increasing dependency on/expectation for ICT in enabling new ways of working, aging and complex network configuration/ infrastructure poses a risk of poor performance having a detrimental effect on the ability of the Council to provide effective and efficient services to its staff and the public	13/05/14	SS	LJ	Immediate	4	4	16	L	I		4	4	16		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R5	Uncertainty/volatility within the economy e.g. Company, mergers, take overs and bankruptcy, unsuitable/poorly enforced SLAs, raises the risk that external ICT suppliers fail to deliver services according to contractually agreed SLA's with reputational damage and the interruption or loss of ICT services to Council staff and the Citizens	13/05/14	SS	JB	Immediate	3	3	9	L	I		3	3	9		2	2	4	Treat	Adequate	Open
R6	Evolving skills needs, difficulty in recruiting/retaining staff raises the risk that skills are not aligned to current and future requirements of the Council with poorly developed/implement solutions, delays, missed opportunities, increased costs	13/05/14	SS	MH	Immediate	4	3	12	L	I		3	4	12		3	3	9	Treat	Adequate	Open

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)
R7	With the drive for greater service flexibility/commercialism/innovation, there is the risk that operational based ICT decisions are made that are not aligned to longer term corporate needs of the organisation incurring additional costs, loss of broader benefits, incoherent approach to ICT development (lose)	13/05/14	SS	SS	Immediate	3	4	12	L	I		3	4	12		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open
R8	Inadequate ICT recovery arrangements leaves the risk that were there to be an incident, the authority would be unable to recover priority services in a timely manner with possible citizen wellbeing, cost and reputation implications	13/05/14	SS	LJ	Immediate	2	5	10	L	I		2	5	10		2	3	6	Treat	Adequate	Open

Risk, Issue & Opportunity Management Actions

10/07/2014 12:29



Nottingham
City Council

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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				Working with the business to formally agree a service offer and service standards	MH	Sep-14	
R1, R7		Business Engagement team created including Business Partner posts to secure appropriate engagement and account management to ensure that business needs are reflected in IT service planning.	JH				
R3				Number of major projects agreed and funded to address specific issues relating to legacy client equipment for example Unlocking Loxley & Windows 7 programme to ensure client devices are updated and able to run modern operating system and office suite	AW	Mar-15	
R3				Client update programme(s) underway. Have deployed more replacement client devices during May 2014 than in any calendar year over the last 10 years	AW	Mar-15	
R4				An independent review of the current network configuration and equipment has been commissioned	LJ	Sep-14	
R4				Equipment to replace legacy network links has been procured and will be installed to improve network speed / capacity	LJ	Sep-14	
R5		The approach to vendor management is in the process of being formalised, with tiered account meetings already in place	JB			Nov-14	

EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (CONTROLS)				ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS (MITIGATIONS)			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
R5				IT Service developing strategic relationships with a number of small/medium sized technology companies to provide additional capacity, support and resilience	JB	Mar-15	
R6				The IT Service have are recruiting a training development officer to support the co-ordination and delivery of training to colleagues	MH	July 2014 onwards	
R1, R7				IT service working with the business to introduce a formal governance framework. Principle components include regular engagement departmental IT strategies, departmental strategy boards and improved governance of the Corporate IT Strategy board	JH	April 2014 onwards	
R1, R7				A CLT IT Steering Group will be established ensure that the IT Service is appropriate resourced and guided in meeting the needs of the wider business	SS	Jul-14	
R8				Improved SAN capacity is being introduced to ensure that a copy of all corporate data will be available at the DR site	LJ	Oct-14	
R8				Reciprocal arrangements for data centre resilience are commissioned with a neighbouring authority to improve the quality of disaster recovery facilities and support	LJ	Feb-15	
R2		A proposal for upgrading all servers has been developed and is currently being reviewed.	LJ	Once agreed, the Server upgrade programme will systemically over 12 months seek to upgrade 90% of the existing Windows Server estate	LJ	Dec-15	

Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary

Ref.	Risk description	SR criteria							Threat level (seriousness) & DoT				DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability			
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Corp Impact	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	2013/14				2014/15	Corporate Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague	
											Q2	Q3			Q4			Q1
SR6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children		✓		✓	✓		✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Jan-14	Jun-14	↔	Apr-14	A. Michalska CD - Children & Families	H. Blackman Director Safeguarding	
									Threat Level	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5) C		10 (2x5)			
									DoT	Stable	Deteriorating	Stable	Stable					
SR11a	Failure to accurately predict and respond to financial pressures to ensure delivery of the Council Plan priorities		✓		✓			✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↑	6 (3x2)	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	G. Walker Strategic Finance Director	
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)					
									DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Deteriorating					
SR28	Failure to ensure a financially sustainable adult social care system that protect vulnerable adults and manage the impact of the Care Act				✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-13	Dec-13	Mar-14	Jun-14	↑	Mar-14	A. Michalska CD - Children & Families	H. Jones - Director of Adult Assessment	
									Threat Level	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	9 (3x3)	12 (3x4)		6 (2x3)			
									DoT	Stable	Improving	Improving	Deteriorating					
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 (under review)	✓	✓		✓				Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Jan-14	Jan-15	↔	Apr-15	A. Michalska CD - Children & Families	N. Lee Head of School Access & Imp Acting A. Conquer Head of Ed	
									Threat Level	12 (3x4) C	12 (3x4) R	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)			
									DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable					
SR26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities in minimising the negative impact of welfare changes		✓					✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Jan-14	Jun-14	↔	Apr-14	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	L. Jones Head of Corporate Policy	
									Threat Level	16 (4x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		9 (3x3)			
									DoT	Stable	Improving	Improving	Stable					
SR31	Failure to secure affordable and fit for purpose ICT arrangements aligned to current and future business productivity and effectiveness			✓	✓			✓	Date				Jun-14	N/A	Feb-16	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	S. Salmon Head of IT Strategy M. Heaton Head of IT Delivery	
									Threat level			New risk	12 (3x4)		6 (2x3)			
									DoT				N/A					
SR3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on Nottingham City and its citizens				✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Apr-12	D. Bishop CD - Dev	N. Jenkins Head of Economic Development	
									Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		9 (3x3)			
									DoT	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET					
SR30	Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities		✓		✓			✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Mar-14	↔	Mar-14	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	R. Henderson Head of Service Change & Improvement	
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		8 (2x4)			
									DoT	Stable	Stable	Improving	Stable					

Ref.	Risk description	SR criteria							Threat level (seriousness) & DoT					DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability		
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Corp Impact	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being	Financial	Date threat level & DoT	2013/14					2014/15	Corporate Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague
											Q2	Q3	Q4			Q1		
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									Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↓	Apr-14	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	M. Gannon Director IT
						✓		✓	Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	9 (3x4)	9 (3x3)				
										DoT	Stable	Stable	Improving	Improving AT TARGET				
SR7a/b	Failure to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)	✓	✓			✓		✓		Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Apr-14	J. Kelly CD-Comm	E. Orrock Comm Safety Exec. Coordinator
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)				
										DoT	Stable	Stable	Improving AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET				
SR25a	Failure to embed a corporate approach to commissioning, informed by citizen need, which drives delivery of improved services at significantly lower cost					✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↓	Jun-14	A. Michalska CD - Children & Families	C. Brudenell Director of Quality and Commissioning
									Threat Level	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)				
										DoT	Stable	Improving AT TARGET	Improving AT TARGET	Improving AT TARGET				
SR2a	Of the reputation of the City		✓			✓		✓		Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Oct-12	I. Curryer Chief Exec.	C. Richmond Dir Policy Partnerships & Comms
									Threat Level	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)				
										DoT	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	AT TARGET				
SR5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Oct 2014	A. Michalska CD - Children & Families	H. Jones Dir Comm Inclusion E. Yardley Dir Access &
									Threat Level	8 (2x4)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)				
										DoT	Improving	Improving AT TARGET	AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET		Stable AT TARGET		
SR10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance		✓			✓		✓		Date	Sep-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Mar-13	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	G. O'Connell Director Legal & Democratic Services
									Threat Level	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3) R	6 (2x3)				
										DoT	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET		Stable AT TARGET		
SR24	Failure to ensure effective systems are in place to manage health and safety risks				✓	✓	✓	✓		Date	Oct-13	Jan-14	Mar-14	Jun-14	↔	Dec-13	G. O'Connell Acting Corp Dir Resources	P. Millward Head of Service Emergency Planning
									Threat Level	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x4)	6 (2x3)				
										DoT	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET		Stable AT TARGET		

DIRECTION OF TRAVEL (DoT):

Improving (reducing) threat level



Stable threat level



Deteriorating (increasing) threat level

