| Subject: | RISK MANAGEMENT: Strategic Risk Register (SRR) Quarter 1 2014/15 Update and 2013/14 Annual Review | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Corporate Director(s)/ Director(s): | Glen O'Connell, Acting Corporate Director for Resources | | |
| Portfolio Holder(s): | Councillor Graham Chapman, Deputy Leader/Portfolio Holder for Resources and Neighbourhood Regeneration | | |
| Report author and contact details: | Jane O'Leary Insurance and Risk Manager Tel: 0115 8764158   jane.o'leary@nottinghamcity.gov.uk | | |
| Key Decision ☐ Yes ☒ No | | Subject to call-in ☒ Yes ☐ No | |
| Reasons: ☐ Expenditure ☐ Income ☐ Savings of £1,000,000 or more taking account of the overall impact of the decision | | ☐ Revenue ☐ Capital | |
| Significant impact on communities living or working in two or more wards in the City | | ☐ Yes ☐ No | |
| Total value of the decision: Nil | | | |
| Wards affected: All | | Date of consultation with Portfolio Holder(s): August 2014 | |
| Relevant Council Plan Strategic Priority: | | | |
| Cutting unemployment by a quarter | | | ☒ |
| Cut crime and anti-social behaviour | | | ☒ |
| Ensure more school leavers get a job, training or further education than any other City | | | ☒ |
| Your neighbourhood as clean as the City Centre | | | ☒ |
| Help keep your energy bills down | | | ☒ |
| Good access to public transport | | | ☒ |
| Nottingham has a good mix of housing | | | ☒ |
| Nottingham is a good place to do business, invest and create jobs | | | ☒ |
| Nottingham offers a wide range of leisure activities, parks and sporting events | | | ☒ |
| Support early intervention activities | | | ☒ |
| Deliver effective, value for money services to our citizens | | | ☒ |
| Summary of issues (including benefits to citizens/service users): This is the Quarter 1 2014/15 strategic risk management report, enabling Executive Councillors to exercise a strategic overview of the Council's SRR, Audit Committee having reviewed these issues at its meeting on 25 July 2014. The main focus is the progress made in reducing the threat levels for each strategic risk. | | | |
| Exempt information: None | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | | |
| 1     To note and comment on the risks contained in the strategic element of the SRR and the progress made in reducing their threat levels (Table 1 and Appendix 1) for Quarter 1 of 2014/15 and for the year 2013/14. | | | |

## 1.    REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1    The Council's approach to risk management, set out in the Risk Management Framework, requires regular review by senior management and councillors of the strategic element (the SRR) of the Council Risk Register.

1.2 This report sets out the results of the latest refresh of the SRR with a summary of progress during 2013/14, and was considered in detail by Audit Committee on 25 July. This facilitates Executive Board's awareness of the strategic risks being managed by Corporate Leadership Team (CLT), their prevailing threat levels and the progress in mitigating the risks.

## 2 BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

### Threat level reduction progress

2.1 Progress in reducing the seriousness of our strategic risks is assessed by a combination of each risk's overall threat level and direction of travel (DoT). This rounded assessment gives a clearer picture of progress in reducing the risk threat level. **Table 1** lists the **15** risks in the SRR and presents, for each, the most recent change to the DoT and the overall threat level.

2.2 Overall, progress is being made in reducing the threat levels of our strategic risks, with several SRR risks assessed as improving, stable or at target. **Six** risks are red rated reflecting the range of delivery pressures and challenges the Council is responding to. Of the **15** strategic risks within the SRR:
   o **Two** show an improved threat assessment;
   o **Eight** are at target;
   o *SR28 – Adult Social Care* shows a deteriorating threat assessment (9 to 12) and *SR11a – Financial sustainability* shows a deteriorating DoT;
   o There is **one** new red assessed risk *SR31 - Affordable and fit for purpose ICT*.

2.3 **Table 1** shows the 15 strategic risks at Quarter 1 of 2014/15 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 |

| 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)** | | | |
| 3 | Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on Nottingham City and its citizens | **9** **At target** | ⬌ |
| 30 | Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities | **9** | ⬌ |
| 8b | 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 | **12 to 9** **At target** | ⬇ |
| 7a/b | Failure to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) | **8** **At target** | ⬌ |
| 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

2.4 *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 three red constituent risks:

o *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 progress to develop proposals around pay, conditions and support to find longer term and sustainable responses to the risk;

o *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;

o *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 co-ordinating the completion of CAFs.

2.5 *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 risk 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 three year Medium Term Financial Plan (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.

2.6 *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:

o *R11 - The performance/reputation of schools may make them unattractive to teaching staff leading to problems recruiting and retaining high quality teaching staff;*

o *R7 - Lack of primary school capacity risks some children not receiving placement/early years foundation education impacting their long term education opportunities;*

o *R10 - A culture of undervaluing education/learning within some communities/families may lead to pupil absenteeism impacting attendance, behaviour and attainment;*

o *R13 - Poor communication and coordination of resources risks a lack of stable education placements for children in care resulting in poor attainment;*

- o *R14 - The quality of care contributes to absenteeism by children in care impacting attendance, behaviour and attainment;*

- o *R15 - Lack of a common education vision for the City agreed with Further Education (FE) partners raises a risk that qualifications offered by FE colleges are not aligned with local employment opportunities;*

- o *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 co-ordinated with the newly appointed Interim Principal Education Strategy Lead and should be available for consideration as part of the SRR Q2 Update.

2.7 *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 Department for Work and Pension (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.

2.8 *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:

- o General Local Authority (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;

o The processes for assessments, charging, establishing entitlements, care planning and the provision of care and support;

o National eligibility criteria to assess individuals' entitlements to care (including carers) (assessment can begin from October 2015 with implementation in April 2016);

o 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);

o 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 Adult Social Care RMAP:

o *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);

o *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);

o *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);

o *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, <u>but based on a different socioeconomic/demographic profile</u>. Until this has been completed, it is difficult to meaningfully assess the impacts.

In addition there is significant uncertainty whether the Government / Department 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.

2.9 <u>*SR31 - Failure to secure affordable and fit for purpose ICT arrangements aligned to current and future business productivity and effectiveness*</u>: 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 are assessed as adequate to bring the risk to target 6 by February 2016. The significance of the risk to the future operation of the Council resulted in agreement that the risk should be added to the SRR.

Review of progress made during 2012/13 in managing the council's strategic risks

2.10 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*)

2.11 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, polices, 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*

- o *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*
- o *SR30 – Failure to create an organisational environment that supports delivery of Council priorities*
- o *Public Health – Public health delivery and integration*

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

## 3    OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1    No other options were considered as the Risk Management Framework requires regular review of the strategic element of the SRR by senior management and Councillors.

## 4    FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY)

4.1    The actions to mitigate strategic risks have either been prioritised within existing plans or will be built into future plans and refreshes for 2014/15.  Any additional financial implications will be highlighted in these plans going forward.

## 5    RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS)

5.1    The SRR is a key part of the Council's overall approach to risk management.

## 6    SOCIAL VALUE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1    Not applicable.

## 7    REGARD TO THE NHS CONSTITUTION

7.1    Not applicable.

## 8    EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

8.1    Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)    ☑

No    ☐

Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached    ☐

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

9.1    None.

## 10    PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

10.1    SRR Quarter 1 Update reported to Audit Committee 25 July 2014.

## 11    OTHER COLLEAGUES WHO HAVE PROVIDED INPUT

11.1    Input has been provided by the following colleagues:
- o   Liz Jones, Head of Corporate Policy
  [Liz.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:Liz.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8763367
- o   Helen Blackman, Director of Childrens Social Care
  [Helen.blackman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:Helen.blackman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8764710
- o   Tim O'Neill, Director of Vulnerable Children and Families
  [tim.o'neill@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:tim.o'neill@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8762341
- o   Mick Dunn, GIS Data and Information Manager
  [mick.dunn@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:mick.dunn@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8764001
- o   Simon Salmon, Head of IT Strategy
  [simon.salmon@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:simon.salmon@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8762301
- o   Geoff Walker, Acting Strategic Finance Director
  [geoff.walker@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:geoff.walker@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8763740
- o   Helen Jones, Director Adult Social Care
  [helen.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:helen.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8763504
- o   Chris Hilliard, Interim Principal Education Strategy Lead
  [chris.hilliard@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:chris.hilliard@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)
  0115 8763461

# Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary

| Ref. | Risk description | Highest Pri | Corp Mit | Corp Impact | Legal | Reputation | H & S | Citizen well-being | Financial | Date threat level & DoT | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | DoT | Target Threat Level | Corporate Director (Risk Owner) | Lead Director or Senior Colleague |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | **2013/14** | | | **2014/15** | | | | |
| 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 | | | New risk | 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 | | | | 12 (3x4) **C** | | 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 | | | | | | | | Date threat level & DoT | Threat level (seriousness) & DoT | | | | DoT | Target Threat Level | Managing Accountability | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Highest Pri | Corp Mit | Corp Impact | Legal | Reputation | H & S | Citizen well-being | Financial | | 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 | Stable AT TARGET | Stable AT TARGET | Stable AT TARGET | Stable 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 | 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 | Stable AT TARGET | Stable 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 | Stable AT TARGET | Stable AT TARGET | Stable AT TARGET | Stable AT TARGET | | | | |

**DIRECTION OF TRAVEL (DoT):**

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