BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Audit Committee

16th January 2015

Report of: Strategic Director Business Change

Report Title: Corporate Risk Register Six Month Review

Ward: Citywide

Officer presenting report: Alison Mullis, J/S Chief Internal Auditor.

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 92 22448

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee review and scrutinise the Corporate Risk Register which is attached to this report at Appendix 2.

SUMMARY

This report presents the first review of the revised Corporate Risk Register since it was redeveloped in July 2014. Going forward, it is anticipated that the register will be reviewed quarterly.

The significant issues in the report are:

- The process for reviewing the Corporate Risk Register (Paragraph 2)
- Significant amendments made to the Corporate Risk Register as a result of the review (Paragraph 3)
- A summary of the risk position for each risk (Appendix 1)

Policy

This report is submitted in accordance with the Audit Committee's Terms of Reference which requires the Committee to provide independent assurance to the Council regarding the effectiveness of its strategic risk management arrangements.

Consultation:

Internal: Extended (ELT) and Strategic Leadership Teams (SLT) / Officers/ Executive Board/ Deputy Mayor - Resources

External: None

1. Background

1.1. The Corporate Risk Register (CRR) is an integral element of the Council's Strategic Risk Management arrangements and aims to support the delivery of the Council's objectives by setting out the strategic high level risks facing the Council in delivering its plans and how they are ensuring these risks are effectively managed.

1.2. The CRR is used by the Strategic Leadership Team to monitor risk levels and take assurance that all necessary steps are being taken to ensure the risks are managed to a level acceptable to them.

1.3. The Audit Committee last received the CRR to review and scrutinise at their meeting on 11th July 2014. At that time, the CRR had been developed from scratch by the Extended Leadership Team using new methodologies and approaches, details of which were provided to the Committee. The newly styled CRR has now been reviewed and updated for further review and scrutiny by the Committee. This can be seen in Appendix 2 of this report.

1.4. As a reminder, also appended to this report are:

- The risk matrix (Appendix 3)
- Guidance parameters used to measure impact (Appendix 4)
- Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood (Appendix 5)

2. Corporate Risk Register – Review Process

2.1. In reviewing and updating the CRR, the following process has been undertaken:

ELT
- **22nd October 2014:**
- The Extended Leadership Team (ELT) overviewed the regiser to identify any new/emerging risks or any risks which needed refocussing/removing from the register
- Overviewed the positioning of the risks on the risk matrix to ensure these were still reflective of the levels of risk.

Officer Review
- **November/December 2014**
- Each officer named as a Responsible Officer has reviewed the entries to confirm , or other wise, that the current mitigations remain effective (on schedule) and provide a progress report for implementation of action plans previously agreed.

Risk Owner
- **December 2014**
- Each Risk Owner has overviewed their updated risk to ensure it accurately reflects the position and risk level.

SLT
- **16th December 2014**
- The Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) have reveiwed the register to ensure it is reflective of their views of the Councils Strategic Risks and ensures priority actions are in place to manage the risks.

Deputy Mayor
- **17th December 2014**
- The Deputy Mayor (Finance and Resources) has reviewed the Register

Exec Board
- **13th January 2014**
- The Executive Board will have reviewed the CRR to ensure it is reflective of risks and that risk levels are acceptable.

Audit Committee
- **16th January 2014**
- The Audit Committee will review and scrutinse the Corporate Risk Register

2.2   The review was facilitated and co-ordinated by Internal Audit staff who has also provided an element of independent verification and challenge concerning the status of mitigations and further actions included in the register.

3.   Results of the CRR Review Process

3.1   As a result of the above process, the following amendments have been made to the CRR.

   a) No new risks have been added and no risks have been removed from the CRR.
   b) Each risk has been updated in terms of current mitigation.
   c) Further actions have been revised to remove completed actions and add any further actions identified in the review and challenge process
   d) The current risk level for **Risk 4 – Infrastructure** has reduced**:** Since July 2014, investments and funding sources have been secured for many schemes that will support the City's infra-structure going forward and for this reason the level of risk has reduced. However, it is acknowledged that there are still significant gaps in the investment required to achieve the desired infrastructure and as such the level of risk is unlikely to reach the target risk for some considerable time. A discussion between senior officers and the Executive Board is planned to determine if the target level of risk is acceptable to the Council with regard to the infrastructure risk.

3.2   **Risk 1(Safeguarding) and risk 7 (Education Equalities):** have been amended to include the results of the recent OFSTED inspection. It is not felt that the inspection suggests the risk levels have increased.

3.3   **Risk 8** (**Commissioning)**: a negative direction of travel is recorded because planned actions had not progressed. This has reflective of a debate within ELT regarding the role of commissioning in the Council's improvement plans and ensuring commissioning practices improve appropriately and in line with national best practice being developed. Once this debate has concluded, further work will be done to better articulate the risk description, clarify responsibilities and determine further actions necessary for monitoring via the CRR. Good work has been demonstrated in terms of the Category Management programme and governance in the People Directorate.

3.4   **Risk 9 (Partnerships):** is considered in need of re-focussing to more accurately reflect that the Council is often in a position where levels of risk are disproportionate to the amount of control the Council has in managing them. Additionally, the risk of clarity over expectations of all partners/other joint working colleagues (e.g. arm's length organisations) needs more focus. Work to amend the CRR to reflect this is currently underway and should be completed in time for the next quarterly review.

3.5   The risks in the Corporate Risk Register are by their own nature, often medium to long term risks for the Council and as such it is not anticipated that each quarterly review will result in significantly different risk levels. However, further actions recorded in the risk registers should ensure the direction of travel to the target levels of risk is achieved over time and Appendix 1 of this report summarises the risk levels and direction of travel for each risk.

3.6   Further developments being made to the CRR review process include automation of part of the update process, although this needs to be balanced with the need for open and frank engagement in debate and discussions about risk to ensure the process is helpful and results in an accurate reflection of the Council's risks.

4.   Directorate Risk Registers:

4.1   As well as the CRR, there is an expectation that significant directorate risks are recorded and reviewed quarterly at DLT's. The registers are in the process of being reviewed in accordance with the new approach and methodologies and once complete, it is intended that the DRR reviews will be timed to ensure inform the CRR review process.

Other Options Considered

None necessary

Risk Assessment

Robust and effective strategic risk management arrangements are essential in helping the Council manage its business and deliver its priorities.

Equalities Impact Assessment

None necessary for this report

Environmental Impact Assessment

None necessary for this report

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal - none sought

Resource - None arising from this report

Appendices

- Appendix 1   Risk and Risk Movement Summary
- Appendix 2   Corporate Risk Register
- Appendix 3   Risk Matrix

- Appendix 4   Guidance parameters used to measure impact
- Appendix 5   Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Papers   None.

Summary of Corporate Risk Movement/Direction of Travel

	Risk Title	Risk Level July 2014	Risk Level December 2014 Direction of Travel	Target Risk Level (Risk Horizon)
1	Safeguarding	Possible/Critical (9)	Possible/Critical (9) ⟷	Unlikely/Critical (6) (Current and ongoing)
2	Organisation Achievement and Resilience	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/Critical (9) ↓	Possible/Significant (6) (1 – 3 Years)
3	Governance	Probable/Significant (8)	Probable/Significant (8) ↓	Possible/Significant (6) (Current and ongoing)
4	Infrastructure	Likely/Catastrophic (20)	Probable/Catastropic (16) ↓	Probable/Critical (12) (5-10 Years)
5	Resilience	Probable / Critical (12)	Probable / Critical (12) ↓	Possible /Critical (9) (5 – 10 Years)
6	Finance	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9) ↓	Possible/ Significant (6) (1 – 4 Years)
7	Education Attainment	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible / Critical (9) ↓	Unlikely/ Critical (6) (2 – 4 Years)
8	Commissioning	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible /Critical (9) ↑	Unlikely/Critical (6) (2 – 4 years)
9	Partnerships	Likely/Significant (10)	Likely/Significant (10) ⟷	Probable/Significant (8)

↓ Positive Progress – Risk Reducing   ↑ Negative progress – Risk Increasing   ⟷ Neutral – no change

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
1.	**Safeguarding:**								
Risk Description: The Council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable adult or child.	John Readman	Vulnerable Adults Safe recruitment processes / Disclosure and Barring Service checks for staff working with vulnerable adults and monitoring of commissioned services is robust. **RO = Mike Hennessey**	On schedule	**Possible/ Critical (9)**	**Unlikely/ Critical (6)**	Vulnerable Adults Implement the work plan to embed statutory processes and best practice outlined in the Care Act 2014. Monitor delivery via the Council's Change Programme.	31st Mar 2015	Mike Hennessey	Quarterly reporting to SLT, Cabinet as part of normal business.
Causes Lack of adherence to procedures, poor practice, lack of capacity.		Strong relationship with regional Quality Surveillance Group and Care Quality Commission. Six weekly meetings take place to collate intelligence to inform decision making around registered providers.	On schedule			Review and update our approach to Making Safeguarding Personal using the revised 2014 guidance.	31st Jan 2015	Mike Hennessey	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.
Consequences Culpable for harm or fatality of vulnerable person. Litigation. Financial costs. Reputational damage.		Provider accreditation and Quality assurance framework is in place for all providers.	On schedule			Implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework for adults to include proposals to publish quality assurance reports. Currently out for consultation. Considered by scrutiny on 3rd November 2014.	Slipped	Mel Rogers	
Horizon: Current and on-going		A Contracts and Quality Service Manager is in post and responsible for overseeing the quality of services delivered. **RO = Mike Hennessey**	On schedule			Children and Vulnerable Adults			
		Work with the Voluntary and Community Sector and Health watch to support our Quality Assurance function. **RO = Mike Hennessey**	On schedule			Implementation and development of Early Help and Intervention services – targeting resources to meet need early, reducing cost and alleviating pressure on social care. Triage case work progressing and effectiveness to be reviewed.	31st Mar 2015	Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey	
		Children and Vulnerable Adults Independently chaired Bristol Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Board maintain oversight; monitoring performance, quality and learning from serious incidents; delivers training and leads on key strategic priorities, providing scrutiny and challenge where required **RO = Jean Pollard/ Mike Hennessey**	On schedule			Children Remodelling Social Work – ensure capacity best equipped to meet changing demands.	31st Mar 2015	Jean Pollard	
		Thresholds guidance, accreditation and other key policies and Quality Assurance Frameworks implemented. **RO = Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey**	On schedule			Develop plan in response to Ofsted report and achieve Cabinet sign off to plan.	16th Jan 2015	Jean Pollard	
		Work with practitioners by effective use of continuing professional development, PMDS and supervision to ensure clarity of functions and understanding and implementation of best practice. Use professional capabilities framework to	On schedule			Implement plan following sign off by Cabinet.	On-going in accordance with plan timetable.	Jean Pollard	

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	evaluate practice. **RO = Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey**						Development and sign off of a city wide Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy.	31st Jan 2015	Jean Pollard	
			Children Comprehensive workforce development programme implemented **RO = Jean Pollard**	On schedule						
			Housing - Reducing Homelessness Working with private sector and voluntary and community sector providers to ensure an adequate supply of emergency accommodation for families. St Mungo's Broadway is commissioned to deliver outreach services to rough sleepers and there are contingency plans in place to support rough sleepers if there is severe weather.	On schedule						
			Housing Advice – Information, Advice and Guidance is being developed to improve homelessness prevention and our response to citizens through the CSP at 100 Temple Street from December 2014.	On schedule						
			Ongoing location of a Social Worker in Housing Advice to respond to 16/17 year olds affected by homelessness. . **RO = Gillian Douglas**	On schedule						
2.	**Organisational Achievement and Resilience**									
	Risk description: The Council fails to maximise opportunities afforded by the Single Change Programme to deliver and achieve the Mayoral and corporate objectives and maintain its resilience into the future. **Cause:** Costs outweigh benefits realisation. Pace of delivery is too slow. Insufficient resilience for continued delivery of services. **Consequences:** Opportunities not realised. Organisation remains unfit for purpose. Reputational	Max Wide	A Single Change Board, led by the Strategic Director – Business Change and supported by professional expertise in the Programme Management Office has been established to oversee the change programme. The Board meets weekly and is made up of senior management including all of SLT and Service Directors. The Board monitors progress and reviews the effectiveness of the change projects including monitoring the level of savings. Progress 'exceptions' are flagged and discussed for issues resolution. Key projects designed to ensure the Council has resilience going forward and is fit for purpose have been identified and the progress of each project is monitored monthly by the change board. Each project	On Schedule	**Possible/ Critical** **(9)**	**Possible/ Significant** **(6)**	Roll out of Applied Programme for Service Improvement to all servicer managers to ensure services better manage demand and maximise use of joint working in service delivery. Redesign of individual performance management framework. To include an online performance management system that will provide assurance management information on qualitative and quantitative performance management measures.	July 2015 April 2015	Max Wide R Billingham/ M Farmer	Reviewed weekly by Single Change Board. Regular progress reporting to Cabinet established ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
damage. Savings not realised in full. The Council is bankrupted. Interruptions to business continuity. Failure to meet statutory duties. **Horizon:** Short term – 1 – 3 years		has been assigned an accountable Service Director, supported by a project manager. Each change project is also assigned a member of the Enterprise Architecture and Design Team to ensure the use of new technologies supports service re-designs and maximises digital service delivery. Emerging risks are identified to the Change Board and decisions made/actions determined to address these risks. **RO = Max Wide/Paul Arrigoni** The Council has re-organised to achieve a structure that is affordable and fit for purpose into the future. A People Panel is in place to ensure the organisation structure remains affordable and that cost is only added back where service demand requires it. The Panel meet weekly to review and approve amendments to the organisation structure. HR staff will not process recruitments without a people panel approval. **RO = R Billingham** Fitness for purpose of the organisation in terms of outcomes and service delivery is monitored via key performance indicators at Strategic and Directorate level which are reported **quarterly. (Ref risk 3 governance also)** **RO = M Farmer** The Employee Assistance Programme offers a confidential support service to staff but also monitors the impact of the redesigned organisation structure on the workforce. Monitoring aims to identify demand pressures in the structure which may need review. Additionally, managers are required to ensure all staff completes a workplace pressure assessment which will highlight areas where the organisation structure needs review. The results of these reviews are reported quarterly to HR and H&S sections for appropriate action. **RO = R Billingham** The council has invested in new technology	On schedule On schedule Under development On schedule On schedule						

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			to facilitate digital delivery of services and improve efficiency of working practices/processes. The Applied Programme for Service Improvement is designed to build capacity and capability across the organisation going forward. The Programme aims to ensure that all key change projects result in service re-design that: • Maximises the opportunity for digital service delivery • Aligns to customer needs • Minimises costs of service provision . **RO = Paul Arrigoni/Gavin Beckett/S Johnston**	Under development						
3.	**Governance**									
	Risk description: The Council fails to comply with internal controls and to effectively meet the framework of obligations within the statutory Annual Governance Statement and the Code of Corporate Governance. **Cause:** Culture of non-compliance. Lack of adherence to financial/legal procedures. Conflicts between policy and key decisions. Insufficient business planning/ performance/risk management data and processes. **Consequence:** Legal or financial non-compliance. Reputational damage. Loss of political confidence. Outcomes are not delivered. Special measures are enforced. Processes result in inefficiency and officer time wasted in servicing a bureaucracy. **Horizon:** Current and on going	Max wide	The Council has a constitution which sets out how the council operates and its decision making processes. A full review of the constitution has been undertaken to reflect changes in legislation, the election of the Mayor and the findings of the Boundary Review. The Constitution is reviewed regularly and as necessary when issues requiring clarity are identified. **RO = S Prashar** The Senior Leadership Team is in post and providing strong leadership capacity. Statutory Officers have been appointed: • Monitoring Officer • Section 151 Officer • Director of Public Health • Children and Adult Services • Senior Information Risk Owner • Scrutiny Officer The officers meet approximately six weekly with the City Director to discuss and resolves issue of governance or non-compliance. A Policy, Strategy and Communications Team is in place to ensure the Mayor's and Council's ambitions are effectively translated into strategic plans and a policy framework and that there are measures in place to monitor progress in achievement of	On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule	**Probable/ Significant** **(8)**	**Possible/ Significant** **(6)**	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to review constitutional changes made to scrutiny to ensure they are operating as intended. . Complete current review of the policy framework within the constitution. Finalise top level measures to monitor achievement of strategic ambitions for overview and scrutiny. Develop and map a hierarchy of delivery and financial plans aimed at achieving the ambitions, ensuring risks are considered and achievement is monitored, reviewed and robustly challenged. Continue work to date to develop plans for each of the 9 themes contained in the corporate plan and ensure performance indicators are in place for each theme. Further develop annual scrutiny work plans into a 3 year rolling	January 2015 April 2015 December 2014 April 2015 February 2015 January 2015	M Farmer M Farmer M Farmer Farmer M Farmer M Farmer	DLT Quarterly

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		these ambitions. The Corporate Plan is publically available on the Council's web page.				plan for policy development and review by Scrutiny.			
		A Forward Plan is in place to regulate that decision reports are written in good time to enable appropriate legal and other advice to be obtained before consideration.	On Schedule			Develop Directorate Risk Registers and implement robust scrutiny of those registers: • Quarterly review by DLT's • 6 monthly submission for Directorate scrutiny and challenge • Annual submission to Audit Committee for assurances that Directorate risks are identified and managed.	February 2015 Position report to SLT. April 2015	Strategic Directors and Alison Mullis/ Melanie Henchy-McCarthy J Ditte/R Woollatt	
		RO S Prashar							
		Full Council and Cabinet meetings include provision for public and Councillor questions to be responded to at the start of each meeting. User guides are available to help those wishing to raise questions, file petitions etc.	On Schedule						
		RO = S Pashir				Strengthen Financial governance:	January 2015	P Gillet	
		An Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) oversees an annual work programme of four scrutiny commissions that mirror the Council's Directorate Structure. Each Directorate Scrutiny Commission meets 10 times a year with OSMB meeting 4 times each year.	On schedule			• Further refinement of budget holders and cost centres now that initial targets met. • Review of financial regulations and schemes of delegation. • Implement upgrade of main financial system	April 2015	P Gillett	
		RO= M Farmer							
		A team of Finance Managers are in place who are responsible to ensure compliance with Financial Regulations and that robust financial governance arrangement are in place. The S151 Officer oversees that the Finance Managers are carrying out this role effectively.	On schedule						
		RO – Peter Gillet							
		A non-pay panel is in place to ensure that expenditure incurred by the Council is necessary and provides value for money.	On-schedule						
		RO – Alison Comley							
		Internal Audit completes a programme of work to provide assurance around control and compliance. Where there is continued non-compliance, matters are escalated to Senior Management and the Audit Committee.	On schedule						
		RO = A Mullis/ M Hency-McCarthy							

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
4.	Infrastructure									
	Risk description: The Council fails to generate the investment necessary to maximise its influence upon the delivery and maintenance of a sustainable infrastructure which will support the City to grow and prosper. **Cause:** Lack of adequate strategic planning and resources. Lack of resilience to factors beyond Council's influence e.g. rapidly growing population, legal challenges, Climate change. Lack of political/community buy-in. Lack of joined up planning/decision making/effective project management. **Consequence:** The City is unable to grow and prosper. Impact on community. Reputational damage. Loss of confidence in the Council and the city. Future investors are not attracted to Bristol. Operational impacts e.g. transport problems. Long term uncertain revenue returns on finance borrowing for capital schemes. **Horizon:** Medium to long term	**Barra Mac Ruairí**	The Capital Programme Board, constituted of the Strategic Leadership Team, meets monthly to ensure capital investment is effectively prioritised to programmes and projects aimed at delivering and maintaining a sustainable infra-structure. The Board routinely reassess and challenge the capital commitment and project slippage.	On schedule	**Probable/ Catastrophic (16)**	**Probable / Critical (12)**				
			A number of strategic infrastructure projects are identified for delivery as part of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). This plan was published in July 2014 and major projects have achieved sign off. Uncertainties around funding continue. **RO: Barra Mac Ruairí**	Behind Schedule						
			A Programme Management Office within the Place Directorate has been established which secures the co-location of key teams delivering major projects.	On schedule						
			A Programme, Project and Performance Board has been established to have oversight of all programme and project work. The Board meets monthly and receives highlight reports in respect of each project. **4.1 Transport Infrastructure**	On schedule						
			i) Joint Local Transport plan in place providing a robust policy basis.	On Schedule			Joint Local Transport Plan is due to be refreshed for 2015/16. Study work is planned jointly with the four regional local authorities.	December 2016		Quarterly except where indicated
			ii) Funding for the Ashton Vale/Temple Meads project has been agreed by Government. Other project funding bids have been submitted. **RO: Peter Mann**	On schedule						
			iii) A Joint Transport Board is in place to oversee delivery of the plan. The board is representative of the four regional local authority's and the Local Enterprise Partnership. The board meets quarterly to review progress and resolve issues.	On Schedule						
			iv) The Board is supported by a Programme Assurance Board (PAB) of strategic officers and Members from	On schedule						

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		each of the four regional local authorities. The PAB reviews progress of the transport projects included in the programme.							
		v) Governance arrangements, including decision making guidance are set out in the Programme Manual.	On schedule						
		vi) Each Project in the programme has a project board with representatives from each local authority	On schedule						
		vii) Legal agreements with partner authorities are in place for Metro Bus programme.	On schedule						
		viii) Gateway Reviews are regularly conducted for each project and the programme overall. Actions arising from these reviews are built into project plans, **RO: Peter Mann**	On schedule						
		4.2 Housing							
		i) Assess and deliver to objectively assessed housing need via effective Local Plan policies. Production of the West of England Joint Planning Strategy, taking on board the outcomes of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) **RO: Zoe Willcox**	On schedule			Interim SHMA findings produced. Local Plan Strategic Policies review and revisions: consultation document produced October 2015 Joint Strategic Planning Strategy pre-commencement from January 2015 and Preferred Strategy consultation from December 2015	January 2015 January 2015 December 2015	Zoe Willcox Zoe Wilcox Zoe Wilcox	Six Monthly
		ii) Affordable Housing Programme Board and Bristol Retirement Living Board receive monthly exception reports to ensure that programmes are effectively implemented and annual delivery targets met**.**	On Schedule			Review of BCC Core Strategy housing provision by June 2016	June 2016	Zoe Wilcox	
		iii) An Affordable Housing Delivery Framework (AHDF) Action Plan which takes into account the Homes Commission recommendations is in place and approved by Cabinet. The Action Plan is to be reviewed by scrutiny in January 2015 **RO: Alistair Reid**	On schedule						
		4.3 Cultural / Education							

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		i) Service Manager for Culture has been appointed to post effective from January 2015	On schedule						
		ii) Resource planning for Economy Division is in place to assist current project delivery. **RO: Alistair Reid**	On Schedule			Need to map resource requirements for aspirational programme going forward. Section to be reviewed following appointment of Service Manager for Culture	January 2015 31 March 2015	Alistair Reid Laura Pye	
		iii) Developing a cultural infrastructure that promotes Bristol as a major European cultural destination will ensure inward investment. Funding secured for cultural infrastructure from Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), Arts Council and Association for Cultural Enterprises. (ACE). This has led to planned development of the city's key cultural venues including funded projects at the Arena and Bristol Old Vic. Proposed projects include amongst others Colston Hall refurbishment, Bristol Museum and Art Gallery refurbishment. **RO: Alistair Reid**	Behind Schedule			Decision on future direction of Colston Hall	Autumn 2015	Barra Mac Ruairí	
		iv) School Organisation Strategy to ensure meeting of statutory duty for pupil places. **RO: Alistair Reid**	On Schedule			Continue to monitor pupil projections/ estimates for unforeseen fluctuations in 'quality of life' factors. Develop a new Education and Capital Strategy. Capital funding to be identified to deliver this strategy.	On going	Paul Jacobs	
		v) Strategic forward allocation of sufficient budget to deliver school places across city. **RO: Alistair Reid**	On schedule						
		4.4 Energy The Council has an Energy service which manages the energy infrastructure for the City. The Service works to a programme of 5 key theme areas each with a programme manager: • Domestic Sector Energy efficiency;	On schedule			Feasibility study commissioned concerning the options for protecting a National Oil Pipeline from potential for wind turbine damage. Evaluate potential to create a	September 2015 January 2015	Bill Edrich Bill Edrich	

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		• Investments (e.g. in renewable energy and managing our own corporate energy demand) • Energy supply (purchase of energy, carbon reduction, energy consumption) • Environmental Performance • Infrastructure (heating and power networks, alternative power sources) Clear outcomes from each theme are measured and reported to the Programme, Project and performance Board on a monthly basis. Financial reports and forecasts are also prepared monthly. **RO: Bill Edrich**				separate energy company to enable strategic management of the City's energy, drive forward economic prosperity/ social equality and reduce environmental impact of energy consumption.			
		4.5 Environment i) The Council uses an Eco Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) to identify and drive environmental improvements, prevent pollution and ensure legal compliance. The scheme is British Standard 14001 compliant and is regularly inspected by external regulators. ii) Product supply chains have been identified but now require audit. **RO: Bill Edrich**	On Schedule			Environmental performance team to undertake audits of our supply chain concentrating on the services with the highest risk. Typically these are: • Products sourced from overseas developing countries • Products that have lots of supply chains / sub-contractors • Services that we procure from third parties rather than direct deliver. Report results to SLT Watching brief on the on-going crisis in Ukraine and Russian involvement.	On-going through 2015 October 2015 On going	Bill Edrich Bill Edrich Bill Edrich	
		4.6 Flooding i) Joint working with South Gloucestershire and other key agencies and stakeholders to identify preferred option for managing flood risk in the Avonmouth / Severnside Enterprise Area. Outline defence options study complete, Project Manager (joint S.Glos and BCC) currently identifying funding streams to deliver detailed designs and	Behind Schedule			Deliver phase 2 – development of detailed designs and business case.	June 2015	Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann	Annual

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		business case **ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann**							
		ii) Investment in maintenance of existing flood defence infrastructure in the city centre. Feasibility study for improved City Centre defences completed. Funding secured to develop business case for strategic scale flood defences. **ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann**	On Schedule			Develop business case for strategic scale flood defences.	June 2015	John Roy	Annual
		iii) Surface water management plan in place that provides information on infrastructure at risk of surface water flooding. Utilisation of data in conjunction with Met Office and Environment Agency forecast information. Local Flood Risk Management Strategy approved at Cabinet November 2014 detailing Action Plan for managing flood risk across City. LLFA Working Group established to embed LLFA actions within the authority. **RO: Peter Mann**	On Schedule			Align work programme and funding streams with adopted Local Flood Risk Management Strategy	November 2015	John Roy	
		iv) Flood Plan and Recovery Plan in place that details the Council's response to flooding **RO: Simon Creed**	On Schedule			Recovery Plan final consultation and adoption to be completed	January 2015	Simon Creed	Annual
		4.7 Employment							
		i) Under the West of England City Deal with government in 2012, the Council has worked with the other Local Authorities to enable the retention and pooling of income from business rates growth to create a £500m Economic Development Fund (EDF). This will finance new physical and economic infrastructure which will catalyse the creation and safeguarding of sustainable employment (circa 30,000 jobs) in Bristol Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone (BTQEZ), and the Avonmouth / Severnside and Filton Enterprise Areas over the next 25 years. **RO: Alistair Reid**	On Schedule			Negotiations complete with Local Authorities on the business rates pooling mechanism and the allocation to EDF projects, However now needs sign off.	December 2014	Barra Mac Ruairí	

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		ii) Other funds have been secured from EU and UK government for improving ICT infrastructure, adopting and/or scaling up renewable energy systems and other 'Smart / Future City' technologies for a more sustainable urban infrastructure. ELENA grant funding has been secured for investment projects. Monthly monitoring of the required ELENA leverage against grant spend is completed and spending of the grant is controlled and monitored, particularly around consultancy budget. **RO: Bill Edrich**	Behind schedule but direction of travel improved in last quarter.						
		iii) Secured a commitment from Government for £11.7m to improve access to super-fast broadband for businesses. **RO: Stephen Hilton**	On Schedule			Delivery Programme in Progress, funding to be utilised by end March 2015	March 2015	Stephen Hilton	
		iv) The Council has been active in shaping the economic strategy and plans of the West of England LEP as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and European Strategic Investment Framework (ESIF) for 2014-20 (prospective investment of £479 m). The SEP was published in June 2014 and major projects signed off by the LEP investment board in October 2014. **ROs: Alistair Reid / Michele Farmer**	Behind Schedule			Identify match funding for projects and work with project owners and partners on development of viable business cases and delivery plans.	On going	Alistair Reid / Michele Farmer	
		v) The Invest in Bristol and Bath (IBB) service, which promotes Bristol, its Enterprise Zones / Enterprise Areas and 5 key economic sectors to UK and overseas investors was established in 2012 with City Deal funding for 3 years to March 2015. **RO: Alistair Reid/Michele Farmer**	On schedule			Lead discussion within Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) on future strategy and funding of IBB and/or redesign of investor promotion services to secure Bristol's objectives. Need also to seek 5 years onward investment	December 2014	Alistair Reid/Michele Farmer	
5.	**Resilience**								
Risk description: Failure of the Council and the community at large to anticipate, sufficiently mitigate, respond to or recover quickly enough from a significant and	Alison Comley	**The Health Protection Committee** meets quarterly to monitor relevant public health outcomes and review preparedness for and responses to public health hazards. The Committee reports to the Health and Wellbeing Board.	Report to Health and Well Being Board in Feb 2015 Ref concerns.	**Probable/ Critical (12)**	**Possible/ Critical (9)**	New Director of Public Health to join in February 2015. Integration of existing strategies (ref infrastructure risk) to ensure our approaches	February 2015 October 2015	A Comley M Farmer	6 monthly reviews by SLT.

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
unexpectedly disruptive event. This risk is focused on how the Council and communities can adapt to significant changes in society over time rather than focussing on the Council's physical infrastructure that is in place to contribute when such an event occurs – this is considered in risk 4 – Infrastructure. **Cause:** Natural disasters, e.g flooding caused by climate change. Health hazards. Economic adjusters, e.g. the changing shape of local employment, welfare reform, poverty levels. A dependency culture resulting from strategies which fail to empower individuals/ communities to develop and support themselves and each other. A lack integration and cohesion in our people/community focussed recovery strategies. **Consequences:** Civil unrest. Social breakdown in Community cohesion. Individuals and communities may not reach their full potential and the inequalities gap may increase in terms of skills, health, wealth etc. Financial implications, e.g. investment negated. Reputation impacted. **Horizon:** Long term risk horizon – 5 to 10 years.		**RO = S Bhatti** A **Neighbourhoods network** is in place to build capacity in identified neighbourhoods. There is a need to build staff capacity and develop innovative strategies which are joined up. **RO = D Robinson** The **Good Food Policy Council** is in place to ensure Bristol residents and visitors have access to healthy food that is affordable and fairly available to all and where workers involved in the food system are fairly treated, and with production, distribution, retail and supply systems that are resilient to the impacts of projected climate change and fossil fuel depletion. **RO = S Hilton** Bristol delivers and commissions a range of employment and skills opportunities for individuals from less privileged communities e.g. On Site; Apprenticeships, Work Placements; Community Learning and Skills. These services help build social and economic inclusion through improved support and progression into work. The current infrastructure is largely dependent on external funding contracts that are not secure beyond July 2016. **RO = Paul Jacobs** Joint Local Transport plan is in place providing sound policy basis which seeks to ensure that the transport system for the sub-region now and in the future is designed in such a way that it enhances health, wellbeing and prosperity for all residents, and contributes to reducing health inequalities. (Ref risk 4 and refresh of Joint local transport plan) **RO – Peter Mann**	On schedule and in progress On schedule On schedule On schedule			provides a fully integrated and cohesive approach to people and community issues. Developing cross-council understanding of how disparate work plans can be aligned to create an effective approach to alleviating poverty in the city. (via the work of the Fairness Commission) Ensure emergency planning incorporates a robust health protection response. Work with key partners to refresh flu pandemic plan. Develop and execute plan to increase amount of data collected and how data can be used to enhance the quality of 'real' community intelligence we have. Recruitment of a Strategic Resilience Officer. Development of a cross-agency city resilience plan. The plan should be in place by June 2015. Continual identification of additional services and funding streams that can be co-located with Employment and Skills to strengthen the viability of critical local services.	June 2015 March 2015 April 2015 December 2014 June 2015 December 2015	D Robinson/ Max Wide S Bhatti S Hilton/ D Robinson S Hilton S Hilton P Jacobs	
6	**Finance**								
Risk description: Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan but particularly to deliver the £76m savings included in this plan.	Nicola Yates	A three year financial plan (2014 – 2017) has been developed, consulted on and approved. The three year financial plan is aligned to the Mayor's vision/objectives. Each year of the three year cycle, the	On schedule	**Possible/ Critical** **(9)**	**Possible/ Significant** **(6)**	Budgeting timetable to be reviewed and publicised to ensure maximum corporate and public buy in to the budget review process is achieved.	October 2014	Peter Gillet	Quarterly review and challenge by SLT via the quarterly

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
Cause: Failure to achieve required savings. Pension deficit not controlled/pensions investment benefit is not supportive of growth in Bristol. Inadequacy of cash resources. Unaffordable capital programme. Demographic pressures. Demand management strategies ineffective, **Consequence:** Savings not achieved. Budget not met. Financial shortfall. Unplanned reductions in services. Corporate objectives not met. Lack of organisational resilience **Horizon:** Short/Medium Term		underlying budget assumptions are reviewed for continuing relevance (see 13/10/14 Business Change Scrutiny Commission) and any required amendments resulting from factors affecting the original budget assumptions are re-approved by Council. **RO = P Gillett** There is strong corporate focus on delivering the savings in the financial plan by both SLT and the Change Programme. The programme is broadly on target to deliver with base budget savings of £21.2m achieved as planned with the remainder to be delivered via service re-design. Financial implications (savings and costs) of the Change Programme are monitored and reported to the Change Board monthly and will in future be reported to Cabinet quarterly. **RO = Max Wide/P Gillet** Quarterly budget monitors and monthly flash reports are provided to SLT, scrutiny and cabinet. These reports provide details of the revenue and capital budgets, treasury management activity, the reserves position and bad debt position. **RO = P Gillett** Sensible levels of financial reserves are maintained balancing service delivery priorities against the need to secure financial resilience for the Council. The level of reserves required is reviewed annually. **RO = P Gillett** In year changes to the budget or financial plan are centrally controlled and subject to Finance Director approval. **RO = P Gillett** Capital Programme Board routinely reassesses and challenges the capital commitment and project slippage. **RO = Barra Mac Ruairi**	On schedule Forecast spend within budget/ savings overall broadly as budgeted. On-going and on schedule. On-going and on schedule On-going and on schedule. On-going and on schedule.			Peer to peer challenge of Directorate budgets. Develop a financial calendar which sets out a detailed work programme of timetabled financial and corporate planning activity to ensure a cohesive and integrated approach to the setting and delivery of financial plans. Health and Social Care Transformation Project being designed to better manage service demand and associated costs and their effect on delivering the agreed budget. Implement enhanced module and latest release of financial system to enable interrogation of HR and Payroll data and better management around establishment costs. Seek to increase representation on the Local Government Pension Scheme Board to help shape Pension Investment Programme.	August 2015 February 2015 On going December 2015 March 2015	Peter Gillet Peter Gillett Mike Hennessey P Gillett/ R Billingham Peter Gillet.	budget monitors. 6 monthly reviews by ELT for update. Reserves position – annual review by SLT.

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
7.	**Educational Attainment**									
	Risk description: Failure to focus and prioritise resources to effect the changes necessary to ensure the equality of educational opportunities across all ages and all communities. **Cause:** Variation in needs of learners in different parts of the City. Variation in performance of City schools. Strong private education sector in adjacent environment. **Consequences**: Inequalities are not addressed. Schools do not improve fast enough in both GCSE and A levels. Impairment of life chances for Bristol citizens i.e. reduced earnings capacity/lifelong dependency on benefits. Divided City. Reputation tarnished. **Horizon:** Medium term	John Readman	The City Council has an Education and Skills Service which is structured to enable Bristol City Council to both fulfil its statutory role of education provision and to ensure it can play a key role in education systems leadership and development across the City. **RO = Paul Jacobs** The Trading with Schools Service is in place to provide support to schools in being self-improving and quality services. The service also provides a link between the Council and schools providing intelligence on schools performance and their contribution to achievement of the Council's statutory role of education delivery **RO = Paul Jacobs** Inclusion and equalities policies have been established but the need to develop a coherent Inclusion Strategy that will ensure robust focus on equality of access and outcomes has been established. **RO = Paul Jacobs** The Children and Families Board meet six times each year and focus on improving outcomes, with strategic oversight of priority areas and taking joint action accordingly. Membership of the Board is periodically refreshed and their terms of reference agreed. **RO = Paul Jacobs** A Learning City Board has been established to strengthen school to school partnerships, focussing on outcomes and will focus on implementation of the recommendations following both the Education and skills Commission launch and the 14 – 19 action plans. It will meet for the first time in January 2015. **RO = Paul Jacobs** All aspect of education performance is regularly reviewed by the Directorate scrutiny commission. Links between Directorate scrutiny and that provided by the Learning City Board have been	On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule	**Possible/ Critical (9)**	**Unlikely/ Critical (6)**	Review and determine the next phase of development of the Trading with Schools service and obtain SLT agreement. An action plan to implement recommendations from the 14 – 19 review to be developed and delivered. A coherent Inclusion Strategy to be developed to ensure equality of access and outcomes. A clear work plan for the Children and Families Board to be developed. An effective plan to secure better outcomes for children in care and care leavers to be developed.	February 2015 for SLT report 28/02/15 31/03/2015 31/03/2015 31/01/2015	Paul Jacobs/Jackie Turner Paul Jacobs Paul Jacobs Paul Jacobs/Jean Pollard. Paul Jacobs/Jean Pollard.	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			determined. **RO = Paul Jacobs**							
8.	**Commissioning**									
	Risk description: The Council fails to commission strategically, and services do not meet the needs of the users/communities. **Cause:** Inadequate joint commissioning arrangements. Mechanisms are not in place to shape the market, and to fully consult/engage and understand needs of service users and communities. Commissioning in silos. Require to rethink the way services can be provided. **Consequences:** Poor quality and inefficient services. Unable to re-design services. Damage to reputation. **Horizon:** Medium term	John Readman/ Max Wide	The City Council has recently reorganised, with renewed focus on commissioning in the largest directorate (People). There is also a key strategic programme (Category Management) which is part of the Council wide transformation programme and through this there is improved consistency and practice. **RO = Nick Hooper** Strengthened governance in the People Directorate for commissioning in partnership continues to be developed via the Children & Families Board which brings together all major commissioning partners with a focus on preventive and early help services. **RO = Netta Meadows** All commissioning activity should operate around the whole '*commissioning cycle*' ensuring a strong understanding of demand and user need, comprehensive market analysis and development, and rigorous management of contractual relationships with internal and external providers. **RO = Russell Ward** All contracts are regularly reviewed for both performance and value, and commissioners follows up complaints and where appropriate safeguarding issues promptly and with robust actions. The new structure in People includes dedicated quality assurance and business relationship posts to support these functions. **RO = Russell Ward**	On schedule On Schedule Behind Schedule - patchy compliance Behind schedule	**Possible/ Critical** **(9)**	**Unlikely/ Critical** **(6)**	An organisational review of commissioning and procurement Strengthen waivers process to ensure compliance. Enforce procurement regulations in this this area. Monitoring of this at strategic level is required.	2015 – to be confirmed 31/03/15	To be confirmed.	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
9.	**Partnerships**									
	Risk description: a) Failure to put in place effective partnership working to achieve cross-boundary ambitions and b) Failure to optimise joint working/ partnership working arrangements in pursuit of maximising achievement of the Council's objectives. **Cause:** Mismatch between culture, ambitions and priorities of different partners. Lack of full awareness as to potential partnership opportunities. No effective vehicle by which to evolve the partnerships. **Consequences** Lost opportunities – strategic and financial. Failure to deliver on budget, on time. Failure to agree sub-regional aims. **Horizon:** Medium Term	Nicola Yates	There is commitment from the leaders of the West of England Partnership to strengthen joint working arrangements for cross boundary working including establishment of a West of England Joint Leaders Board. The Constitution of each partner is being changed to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the Joint Leaders Board. Effective governance arrangements are being developed to ensure the West of England partnership objectives progress as planned. Informal briefing and information sharing sessions with the leaders of each partner are aimed at identifying and engaging shared ambitions across the region. **RO = Nicola Yates** A Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board has been established and is now appropriately resourced to support the work of this Board. **RO = Nicola Yates**	On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule On schedule	**Likely/ Significant (10)**	**Probable/ Significant (8)**	Further develop an effective accountability framework for wider partnership working to ensure it is clear what each partner is expected to contribute. Identify strategic and other partners and implement accountability framework. Gain understanding of differing priorities of each partner. Develop a stronger evidence base which demonstrates the benefits of partnership working Members and senior management to meet in informal settings to debate opportunities for partnership working and provide leadership which promotes a culture change towards delivering services jointly wherever possible and appropriate.	31/03/2015 31/03/2015 31/03/2015 On-going	M Farmer M Farmer M Farmer Nicola Yates	ELT to review 6 monthly. Possible focus session at ELT on whether we should be increasing partnership working.

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Risk Matrix – with corporate risks plotted (December 2014)

Likelihood			Marginal 1	Significant 2	Critical 3	Catastrophic 4
6	Almost Certain		6	12	18	24
5	Likely		5	10 **9**	15	20
4	Probable		4	8 **3**	12 **5,**	16 **4**
3	Possible		3	6	9 **1,2, 6,7, 8**	12
2	Unlikely		2	4	6	8
1	Almost Impossible		1	2	3	4

Impact

Risk 1   Safeguarding

Risk 2   Organisational Achievement and Resilience

Risk 3   Governance

Risk 4   Infrastructure

Risk 5   Resilience

Risk 6   Finance

Risk 7   Educational Attainment

Risk 8   Commissioning

Risk 9   Partnerships

Appendix 4: Severity of Impact Guidance

		Effect on service provision	Potential Financial loss/gain	Potential Fraud & Corruption loss	Reputation	Legal	Environmental	Communities	Personal safety
1	Marginal	Very limited effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Impact can be managed within normal working arrangements	Under £0.5m	Under £50k	Minimal and transient loss of public trust. Contained within the individual service	No significant legal implications or action is anticipated	No effect (positive/negative) on the environment/community	Minimal effect on community	Minor injury to citizens or staff may result or can be prevented.
2	Significant	Noticeable and significant effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Effect may require some additional resource, but manageable in a reasonable time frame.	Between £0.5m - £5m	Between £50k - £100k	Significant public interest although limited potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation. Dissatisfaction reported through Council Complaints procedure but contained within the Council Local MP involvement Some local media/social media interest.	Tribunal/ BCC legal team involvement required (potential for claim)	Short term effect (positive or negative) on the natural and or built environment.	Short term effect (positive or negative) on a small number of vulnerable groups/ individuals	Significant injury or ill health of citizens or staff may result or be prevented.

3	Critical	Severe effect on service provision or a corporate Plan priority area. Effect may require considerable additional resource but will not require a major strategy change.	Between £5m - £10m	Between £100k - £1m	Serious potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation. Dissatisfaction regularly reported through Council Complaints procedure. Higher levels of local or national interest. Higher levels of local media/social media interest.	Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation.	Serious local discharge of pollutant or source of community annoyance that requires remedial action.	Medium term effect (positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups/ individuals.	Major injury or ill health of citizens or staff may result or be prevented. Long term disability/absence from work.
4	Catastrophic	Extremely severe service disruption. Significant customer opposition. Legal action. Effect could not be managed within a reasonable time frame or by a short term allocation of resources and may require major strategy changes. The Council risks 'special measures' Officer/Member forced to resign.	More than £10m	More than £1m	Highly significant potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation. Intense local, national and potentially international media attention. 'Viral' on line social media. Public enquiry or poor external assessor report.	Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation (> 1 person)	Lasting effect on the natural and or built environment.	Lasting effect positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups/ individuals.	(Avoidable) Death of citizens or staff may result or be prevented. Long term disability/absence from work.

Assessment of the likelihood guidance

	Likelihood	Likelihood Descriptors	Numerical likelihood
1	Almost impossible	This will probably never happen	Less than 1%
2	Unlikely	Do not expect it to happen, but it is possible it may do so	Less than 25%
3	Possible	Might happen on rare occasions	Less than 50%
4	Probable	Probably will happen on rare occasions	50% or more
5	Likely	Probably will happen at regular intervals	75% or more
6	Almost certain	Surely will happen and possibly frequently	99% or more