

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Audit Committee

25th September 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 second 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)
- The Corporate Risk Register (Appendix 2)

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 and Executive Board 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 16th January 2015. An update has now been completed and can be seen at Appendix 2 to this report. As a reminder, also appended to this report are:
 - The Council's corporate 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. The review was facilitated and co-ordinated by Internal Audit and Performance and Improvement Team staff who have also provided an element of independent verification and challenge concerning the status of mitigations and further actions included in the register. The timing of the CRR review was such that work done by Directorate Leadership Teams in respect of Directorate risk registers could inform the review of the CRR:



3. Summary of Significant Amendments Made to the Risk Register

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

- Three entirely new risks have been added to the risk register concerning:
 - Risk 10 – Devolution (being drafted)
 - Risk 11 – Delivering Democracy
 - Risk 12 - Trading Company Operations

- Risk 8 has been refocused to reflect the risks around demographic changes and service delivery pressures. Previously this was recorded as a risk purely around commissioning and procurement but it is felt that the wider context around understanding and managing demand should be reflected, with effective strategic commissioning as a key mitigation measure.
- Risk 9 – Partnerships - has been refocused to reflect the risk of clarity around expectations of all partners and ensuring we maximise the outcomes of joint working.
- Risk 6 – Finance – has been updated to extend the risk to include the further austerity measures faced by Local Government that were announced in the Queen’s speech.
- Risk 2 – Organisational Achievement and Resilience – has been updated to recognise the capacity pressures faced in parts of the organisation. Additionally, concerns that locally, the economic upturn together with the announcement of further austerity measures could lead to risks in respect of recruitment and retention of the right people to the Council in the future has been acknowledged.
- Risk 4 – Infrastructure - the current risk level has again reduced due to further improvements in delivering mitigations. The target risk level has been reviewed following concerns raised that it was too high. The impact rating has remained unchanged due to the scale and scope of the issues involved. However the target likelihood rating has been reduced as it was felt reasonable to expect further improvements in light of the controls that are being put in place.

3.2 The risks in the Corporate Risk Register are by their nature, often medium to long term risks for the Council and as such it is not anticipated that each review will result in significantly different risk levels. However, further actions recorded in the risk register should ensure the target levels of risk are achieved over time.

3.3 Appendix 1 of this report summarises the risk levels for each risk. It also provides a ‘direction of travel’ assessment for each risk in terms of whether the risk is increasing or decreasing (denoted by the arrow direction on Appendix 1). In general where current mitigations are mostly on schedule and further actions are progressing, the direction of travel has been assessed as reducing risk. However sometimes, whilst good progress has been made against

actions planned to reduce the risk, new issues relevant to that risk emerge which change/increase the risk levels. In these cases the direction of travel assessment may be assessed as neutral or increasing risk (For example in Risk 6 (Finance), whilst improvements have been made in how the Council manages delivery of its Medium Term Financial Strategy, likely further austerity measures announced in the Queens speech have widened the scope of the financial risk to the Council and potentially increases the longer term financial risk). A brief summary of the reasons for any such direction of travel assessment is included in appendix 1.

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 DLTs. Each directorate now has a risk register and these are currently being scheduled for scrutiny review. Once each risk register has been considered by the Directorate Scrutiny Committee, they will be passed to the Audit Committee for information and evidence that this element of the risk management process is in place.

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 Dec 2014	Risk Level July 2015	Target Risk Level (Risk Horizon)	Direction of travel
1	Safeguarding	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Unlikely/Critical (6) (Current and ongoing)	
2	Organisation Achievement and Resilience	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Significant (6) (1 – 3 Years)	 Slippage in delivering outcomes from the applied programme and new concerns regarding capacity/skills recruitment in several areas of the organisation currently and in the future. Additionally, the roll out of the complaints system has slipped.
3	Governance	Likely /Significant (8)	Likely / Significant (8)	Likely/ Significant (8)	Possible/ Significant (6) (Current and ongoing)	
4	Infrastructure	Likely/ Catastrophic (20)	Probable/ Catastrophic (16)	Probable/ Critical (12)	Possible /Critical (9) (5-10 Years)	
5	Resilience	Probable / Critical (12)	Probable / Critical (12)	Probable / Critical (12)	Possible /Critical (9) (5 – 10 Years)	 Further work needs to be undertaken to update emergency planning plans and develop a cross-agency city resilience plan. Two key staff appointments however have been made and it is anticipated this will have a positive impact going forwards.

6	Finance	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/ Significant (6) (1 – 5 Years)	 Improvements have been made reducing the risk but at the same time further austerity measures announced in the Queen’s speech have widened the scope and potentially increase the risk. Further work is needed to ensure budget pressures in 2016/17 are managed early and the impact of longer term austerity measures is addressed.
7	Educational Attainment	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible / Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Unlikely/ Critical (6) (2 – 4 Years)	
8	Demographic and Service Pressures	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible / Critical (9)	Possible/ Critical (9)	Unlikely/Critical (6) (2 – 4 years)	Due to change in focus direction of travel assessment not applicable
9	Partnerships	Likely/ Significant (10)	Likely/ Significant (10)	Likely/ Significant (10)	Probable/ Significant (8) (2 – 4 years)	 Staff changes in the Policy Scrutiny and Communications team have delayed progression of some areas of work. However, more recently, progress is being made.
10	Devolution	N/A	N/A	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	New risk therefore direction of travel assessment not applicable
11	Delivering Democracy	N/A	N/A	Likely / Critical (15)	Possible / Significant (6) (1 year)	New risk therefore direction of travel assessment not applicable
12	Trading Company Operations	N/A	N/A	Possible/ Critical (9)	Possible/Critical (9) (1 – 2 years)	New risk therefore direction of travel assessment not applicable



Positive Progress – Risk Reducing




Negative progress – Risk Increasing




Neutral – no change


Appendix 2 - CORPORATE RISK REGISTER – Version Jul 2015.4

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
1.	Safeguarding									
	<p>Risk Description: The Council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable adult or child.</p> <p>Causes Lack of adherence to procedures, poor practice, lack of capacity.</p> <p>Consequences Culpable for harm or fatality of vulnerable person. Litigation. Financial costs. Reputational damage.</p> <p>Horizon: Current and on-going</p>	John Readman	<p><u>Vulnerable Adults</u> Safe recruitment processes / Disclosure and Barring Service checks for staff working with vulnerable adults and monitoring of commissioned services is robust.</p> <p>Best practice outlined in the Care Act 2014 are embedded in processes which are monitored and refinements made to as needed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Provider accreditation and quality assurance framework is in place for all providers.</p> <p>A Contracts and Quality Service Manager is in post and responsible for overseeing the quality of services delivered.</p> <p>RO = Mike Hennessey</p> <p>Work with the Voluntary and Community Sector and Health watch to support our Quality Assurance function. RSVP have been commissioned to do this.</p> <p>RO = Mike Hennessey</p> <p><u>Children and Vulnerable Adults</u> Bristol Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Boards maintain oversight; monitoring performance, quality and learning from serious incidents; delivers training and leads on key strategic priorities, providing scrutiny and challenge where required Both are independently chaired.</p> <p>RO = Angela Clarke/ Mike Hennessey</p> <p>An Early Help Service is now in place for children's services using a triage process to ensure that needs are met early, costs are minimised and pressure on social care is</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>	<p>Possible/ Critical</p> <p>(9)</p> <p>reducing risk</p> 	<p>Unlikely/ Critical</p> <p>(6)</p>	<p><u>Vulnerable Adults</u></p> <p>Full roll out of updated approach to Making Safeguarding Personal to be completed following the successful recent pilot. This is now being utilised across a number of teams.</p> <p>The Quality Assurance Framework is in the process of being implemented and some aspects are being discussed with providers to ensure joined up working. Implementation is due to start Autumn 2015.</p> <p>Review Safeguarding Adults Board Business Plan and Terms of reference to include implementation and development of Early Help and Intervention services – targeting resources to meet need early, reducing cost and alleviating pressure on social care.</p>	<p>30th Nov 2015</p> <p>March 2016</p> <p>30th Sept 2015</p>	<p>Mike Hennessey</p> <p>Mel Rogers</p> <p>Mike Hennessey</p>	<p>Quarterly reporting to SLT, Cabinet as part of normal business.</p> <p>ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.</p>


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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>reduced.</p> <p>Thresholds guidance, accreditation and other key policies and Quality Assurance Frameworks are implemented. These are regularly reviewed in line with Care Assurance.</p> <p>RO = Angela Clarke/Mike Hennessey</p> <p>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 evaluate practice.</p> <p>RO = Angela Clarke/Mike Hennessey</p> <p><u>Children</u> Comprehensive workforce development programme has been implemented</p> <p>Children's Service Improvement plan is in place and focussed on key areas for improvement for safeguarding and children in care services. Implementation of the plan is overseen by an Improvement Board.</p> <p>A Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy led by the Bristol Safeguarding Children Board is in place and its effectiveness is being monitored.</p> <p>RO = Angela Clarke</p> <p><u>Housing - Reducing Homelessness</u></p> <p>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 a severe weather emergency protocol (SWEP) is in place to support rough sleepers if there is severe weather.</p> <p>Housing Advice – Website self service information is available for people affected by homelessness. Advice and guidance is also available to citizens through the CSP at 100 Temple Street.</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule but signs of service pressure.</p> <p>On schedule</p>			<p>Develop commissioning process for emergency accommodation needs in longer term</p>	<p>2016/17</p>	<p>Gillian Douglas</p>	

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		Ongoing location of a Social Worker in Housing Advice to respond to 16/17 year olds affected by homelessness. Joint working/training between Early Help and Housing Options is being monitored to ensure this interface is effective. RO = Gillian Douglas	On schedule						
2. Organisational Achievement and Resilience									
<p>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.</p> <p>Cause: Costs outweigh benefits realisation. Pace of delivery is too slow. Insufficient resilience for continued delivery of services.</p> <p>Consequences: Opportunities not realised. Organisation remains unfit for purpose. Reputational damage. Savings not realised in full. The Council is bankrupted. Interruptions to business continuity. Failure to meet statutory duties.</p> <p>Horizon: Short term – 1 – 3 years</p>	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 fortnightly 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.	On Schedule	<p>Possible/Critical (9)</p> <p>Risk Direction Neutral</p> 	<p>Possible/Significant (6)</p>	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.	October 2015	Max Wide	Reviewed weekly by Single Change Board.
		Progress 'exceptions' are flagged and discussed for issues resolution.	On schedule			Full roll out of redesigned individual performance management framework. Includes an online performance management system that will provide assurance management information on qualitative and quantitative performance management measures.	2015/16	R Billingham	Regular progress reporting to Cabinet established
		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 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.	On schedule			Analyse the impact on recruitment and retention of the upturn in the local economy at the same time as further austerity measures are implemented across Local Government. Determine the current and likely future impact that will have on the Council's capacity and expertise to deliver services across the Council.	Oct 2015	R Billingham	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.
		Emerging risks are identified to the Change Board in 'raid logs' and decisions made/actions determined to address these risks.	On schedule						
		RO = Max Wide/Paul Arrigoni							
		The Council has re-organised to achieve a structure that is affordable. 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	There are several areas where capacity issues have arisen following restructure and difficulty in recruiting skills						

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>panel approval.</p> <p>RO = R Billingham</p> <p>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)</p> <p>RO = P Greer (Interim)</p> <p>A Corporate complaints system is in place to monitor areas where service delivery is not to standard for remedial action.</p> <p>RO = J Whiteman</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO = R Billingham</p> <p>The council has invested in new technology to facilitate digital delivery of services and improve efficiency of working practices/processes.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximises the opportunity for digital service delivery • Aligns to customer needs • Minimises costs of service provision <p>RO = Paul Arrigoni/Gavin Beckett/S Johnston</p>	<p>needed has been experienced.</p> <p>Behind schedule – Statutory module slipped to autumn</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>Under development – technology to be developed by Dec 15</p> <p>Programme roll out behind schedule</p>						

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
3. Governance									
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Horizon: Current and on going</p>	Max Wide	<p>The Council has a constitution which sets out how the council operates and its decision making processes. The Constitution is reviewed regularly and as necessary when issues requiring clarity are identified.</p> <p>RO = S Daya</p>	On schedule	<p>Probable/ Significant (8)</p> <p>Reducing risk</p> 	<p>Possible/ Significant (6)</p>	Action plan to address issues and recommendations raised following review by the Centre for Public Scrutiny to be implemented.	31 March 2016	Andrea Dell	DLT Quarterly
		<p>The Senior Leadership Team is in post and providing strong leadership capacity.</p>	On schedule			Complete current review of the policy framework within the constitution.	July 2015	P Greer	
		<p>Statutory Officers have been appointed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring Officer Section 151 Officer Director of Public Health Children and Adult Services Senior Information Risk Owner Scrutiny Officer 	On schedule except Monitoring Officer is currently interim			Review the role and function of the Policy Team	September 2015	K Russell	
		<p>The officers meet approximately six weekly with the City Director to discuss and resolves issue of governance or non-compliance.</p>	On schedule			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.	April 2016	P Greer	
		<p>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 these ambitions. The Corporate Plan is publically available on the Council's web page.</p>	On schedule			Further develop annual scrutiny work plans into a 3 year rolling plan for policy development and review by Scrutiny.	January 2016	A Dell	
		<p>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. The 'Decision Pathway' sets out clear guidance to officers of the required consultation that must take place for each type of decision required. This includes the whole process from inception of a new idea to full approval by Cabinet and Council.</p> <p>RO S Daya / A Dell</p>	On Schedule			Develop Directorate Risk Registers and implement robust scrutiny of those registers:	July – September 2015 Scrutiny review	Strategic Directors	
		<p>Full Council and Cabinet meetings include provision for public and Councillor questions to be responded to at the start of each</p>	On Schedule			Strengthen Financial governance:	August 2015	P Gillet	
			On Schedule			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of financial regulations and schemes of delegation. Upgrade of HR and 	December 2015	P Gillett	

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>meeting. User guides are available to help those wishing to raise questions, file petitions etc.</p> <p>RO = S Daya</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO= P Greer</p> <p>Overview and Scrutiny monitor achievement of strategic ambitions via reports detailing progress against top level performance measures.</p> <p>RO = M Wakefield</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO – Peter Gillet</p> <p>A non-pay panel is in place to ensure that expenditure incurred by the Council is necessary and provides value for money.</p> <p>RO – Alison Comley</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO = A Mullis/ M Henchy-McCarthy</p> <p>Plans for each of the 9 themes contained in the corporate plan are in place.</p> <p>RO = Patricia Greer</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>New development 2015/16.</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p> <p>On-schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>			Payroll systems			
4.	Infrastructure									

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period	
<p>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.</p> <p>Cause: Reduced public sector funding impacting on the resources available. Lack of adequate strategic planning and resources. Lack of resilience to external factors beyond Council's influence e.g. changes in demand, rapidly growing population, the age profile of the population, legal challenges, and climate change. Lack of political / community buy-in. Lack of joined up planning / decision making / effective project management.</p> <p>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. Risk of flooding.</p> <p>Horizon:</p>	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/ Critical (12)	Possible / Critical (9)					
		Additionally 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 for some of the projects, although there has been major success in securing funding for others (e.g. Metrobus, MetroWest, Terabit West and Avonmouth & Severnside).	On Schedule	risk reducing 						
		A major projects Unit within the Place Directorate has been established which secures the co-location of key teams delivering key infrastructure 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 programme area. RO: Barra Mac Ruairí	Achieved							
		4.1 Transport Infrastructure								
		i) Joint Local Transport plan in place providing a robust policy basis.	Achieved				Joint Local Transport Plan is due to be refreshed during 2016. Study work is under way jointly with the four regional local authorities. Consultation later in 2015.	December 2016		Quarterly except where indicated
		ii) Funding for each of the three MetroBus projects and integration programme has been agreed by Government. All three projects now in construction phase and due for completion by mid-2017.	On schedule				Delivery of infrastructure, through the £9.5 million of negotiated funding, that provides significant advantage to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users to reduce the car reliance of Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood and therefore	Governance Structure BCC & SGC December 2015 Delivery from 2016/17 onwards	Peter Mann	

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	Medium to long term						minimise the negative impacts of this development.			
			iii) A Joint Transport Board is in place to oversee delivery of the major scheme work programme (not just MetroBus). The board, comprising all four WoE authorities and LEP business reps, meets quarterly to review progress and resolve issues.	On Schedule						
			iv) The Board is supported by a MetroBus Programme Assurance Board (PAB) of strategic officers from each of the four sub-regional local authorities. The PAB reviews progress of the transport projects included in the programme.	On schedule						
			v) Governance arrangements for Metrobus, including decision making guidance, are set out in the Programme Manual.	On schedule						
			vi) Each Project in the Metrobus programme has a project board with representatives from each local authority. The boards meet together each month along with the Integration Board to make decisions and collaborate on progress.	On schedule						
			vii) Legal agreements with partner authorities are in place for the MetroBus programme.	On schedule						
			viii) Gateway Reviews are regularly conducted for the Metrobus programme overall, and for each of its constituent projects. Actions arising from these reviews are built into project plans,	On schedule						
			ix) Transport Further work to be programmed to assess the overall condition and cost of maintenance and renewal of existing transport assets including traffic signals, traffic control systems and structures including bridges, retaining walls and multi-storey car parks. RO: Peter Mann	Schedule to be set						

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		4.2 Housing							
		i) Assess and deliver to objectively assess 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						
						Joint Spatial Plan Strategy pre-commencement from January 2015 and Preferred Strategy consultation from September 2016.	September 2016	Zoe Wilcox	
						Review of BCC Core Strategy housing provision by June 2016.	June 2016	Zoe Wilcox	
		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.	Achieved						Six Monthly
		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 was reviewed by Scrutiny in January 2015 RO: Alistair Reid	Achieved			New framework and programme of delivery to publish from September 2015 Assessment on the impact of extending right to buy legislation to housing associations required.	September 2015 October 2015	Alistair Reid Alistair Reid	
		4.3 Cultural / Education							
		i) Service Manager for Culture has been appointed to post effective from January 2015	Achieved						
		ii) Resource planning for Economy Division is in place to assist current project delivery.	Achieved						
		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,	On Schedule			Decision on future direction of Colston Hall Planned developments are in place for the Arena, Old Vic and Colston Hall but a review of the other capital requirements is required.	Autumn 2015	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			Bristol Museum and Art Gallery refurbishment. RO: Alistair Reid							
			iv) School Organisation Strategy 2013 to 2016 to ensure meeting of statutory duty for pupil places.	On Schedule			Continue to monitor pupil projections / estimates for unforeseen fluctuations in 'quality of life' factors.	September 2016	Paul Jacobs	Sept. 2015
			v) Develop and implement the new Integrated Education and Capital Strategy 2016 to 2022. The Strategy will define the required works & be supported by data. This can be used to attract the correct level of funding. RO: Alistair Reid / Paul Jacobs	On schedule			There is a high risk that the current level of funding is insufficient to deliver the new Integrated Education & Capital Strategy 2016 to 2022. This would lead to a failure to deliver all required outcomes. The consequence would be that the Authority may be unable to deliver its statutory duty to deliver pupil places and Learning City aspirations. The development of a robust strategy is therefore of key importance.	July 2015	Alistair Reid and Paul Jacobs	Sept. 2015
			vi) Programme 3, delivering the outcomes of the new Integrated Education and Capital Strategy 2016 to 2022, may require realignment should future pupil projections change through birth rate, improved economy and/or changes in teaching standards, or other. RO: Alistair Reid	On Schedule			Continue to monitor pupil projections / estimates for unforeseen fluctuations in 'quality of life' factors. Changes to pupil numbers are likely to change the magnitude of spend and delivery programme. The consequences of any increase, or reduction, in spending commitment and possible failure of the Authority's statutory duty to provide sufficient pupil places - resulting in Judicial Review. Reputation to Bristol;	July 2015	Paul Jacobs	January 2016
			4.4 Energy							


	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic Sector Energy efficiency; • 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) <p>Clear outcomes from each theme are measured and reported to the Programme, Project and performance Board on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Financial reports and forecasts are also prepared monthly.</p> <p>RO: Bill Edrich</p>	On schedule			<p>Feasibility study commissioned concerning the options for protecting a National Oil Pipeline from potential for wind turbine damage.</p> <p>Expected results of detailed course of action to be completed by August 2015. A short assessment of risk to be completed by May 2015. £20m of insurance purchased to cover liability maybe amended after the short risk assessment.</p> <p>Evaluate potential to create a 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.</p> <p>Detailed business plan to be completed for the 5th May Change Board gateway, currently on-track for the July cabinet.</p>	<p>September 2015</p> <p>July 2015</p>	<p>Bill Edrich</p> <p>Bill Edrich</p>	
			4.5 Environment							
			<p>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.</p>	On Schedule			<p>External audits to revisit mid-May (15th) programme of audit inspections to be finalised week commencing 20th April and Services to be audited notified, Short up-date to Place DLT and if appropriate SLT. Key risk is the preparation of evidence that the Council is responding to the identified issue of awareness of Environment legal requirements as part of staff's job description and roles and responsibilities.</p>	On-going through 2015	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>iii) Lack of information on the condition and ownership / responsibility for existing flood assets in and along the River Avon. Need for a costed asset management plan to be developed and implemented.</p> <p>ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann</p>	Behind Schedule			Currently the situation is managed through responsive repairs rather than a through a planned provision. Joint briefing note between Docks, Flood and Highways Services to Place DLT to scope problem / challenge.	September 2015	John Roy	
		<p>iv) The City Docks and associate assets are critical to protecting the City Centre from flooding.</p> <p>ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann / Robert Orrett</p>	On Schedule			Partnership created with Transport to create a combined asset register and infrastructure risk report which are critical to protecting the City Centre from flooding, identifying the costs associated with any remedial works required. An action plan has been created.	September 2015	Scott Fortune	
		<p>v) 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.</p> <p>RO: Peter Mann</p>	On Schedule			Align work programme and funding streams with adopted Local Flood Risk Management Strategy	November 2015	John Roy	
		<p>vi) Flood Plan and Recovery Plan in place that details the Council's response to flooding</p> <p>RO: Simon Creed</p>	On Schedule			<p>The Flood Plan and Recovery Plan have both been through the Corporate Resilience Group (CRG) but have yet to go to the Strategic Leadership Team (SLT).</p> <p>A paper and presentation to SLT has recently been postponed, however both plans are considered fit for purpose and are currently in use.</p>	Date for consideration at SLT TBC	Simon Creed	Annual
		4.7 Employment							


	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			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,		Barra Mac Ruairí	
			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	Achieved						
			iii) Secured a commitment from Government to improve access to super-fast broadband for businesses. RO: Stephen Hilton	Behind Schedule			The original budget was £11.7m, however following negotiation with the funders (the Department for Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS)) it was agreed that spend would be repositioned and funding reduced on one of the sub-projects. The new total budget is £11,310m. Grant claims made to the end of March 2015 totalled £5,737m. Remaining budget for	June 2015	Stephen Hilton / Suzanne Wilson	

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
							2015/16 was £5,573m. We are on track to claim for all of the remaining spend in 2015/16 Q1 except for Connection Vouchers where the scheme has now ended. Committed vouchers can be claimed but any unspent is now rolled into the DCMS scheme for the following year. We are now in the 15/16 business broadband connection vouchers scheme, where we do not have a specific allocation but instead will compete with other authorities on a first come first served basis.			
			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	On 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	
			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. RO: Alistair Reid	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. Funding now secured for five years from the Economic Development Fund	Action now completed	Alistair Reid	


	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
5.	Resilience									
	<p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Horizon: Long term risk horizon – 5 to</p>	Alison Comley	<p>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.</p> <p>RO = B Pollard</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO = D Robinson</p> <p>The Good Food Policy Council is in place to coordinate efforts in improving access to healthy food that is affordable and fairly available to Bristol residents and visitors 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.</p> <p>RO = S Hilton</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO = Paul Jacobs</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Report to Health and Well Being Board in Feb 2015</p> <p>On schedule and in progress</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>	<p>Probable/Critical (12)</p> <p>Risk Direction Neutral</p> 	<p>Possible/Critical (9)</p>	<p>Development of a public health strategy to feed into the Health and Well Being Board Strategy.</p> <p>Project being run to ensure resilience and integration of existing strategies (ref infrastructure risk) to ensure our approaches provide a fully integrated and cohesive approach to people and community issues.</p> <p>Mapping exercise to identify all the streams of funding relating to hardship complete. Now being factored into the coordinated response to the greater number of citizens facing hardship due to the Welfare reform changes.</p> <p>Bristol Health Protection Committee in place and monitoring development and updating emergency planning plans. The LHRP Pandemic Flu plan will be completed by 31 August 2015 to support the table top exercise. Bristol City Council Civil Protection have Business Continuity plans in place to handle staff absenteeism, and are working with ASLRF partners on excess deaths planning. The planning for the Bristol City Council seasonal flu campaign for 2015/16 is underway, including vaccination for frontline health and social care workers. Public Health, Civil Protection and Environmental Health have established strong working arrangements to ensure health protection elements are included in any planning.</p> <p>Develop and execute plan to increase amount of data</p>	<p>December 2015</p> <p>December 2015</p> <p>December 2015</p> <p>December 2015</p> <p>November 2015</p>	<p>B Pollard</p> <p>P Greer/ K Russell</p> <p>P Mellor / Max Wide</p> <p>B Pollard</p> <p>S Hilton/ D Robinson</p>	<p>6 monthly reviews by SLT.</p>

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
10 years.		RO – Peter Mann				<p>collected and how data can be used to enhance the quality of 'real' community intelligence we have.</p> <p>Development of a cross-agency city resilience plan. The plan should be in place by June 2016. A Preliminary Resilience Assessment will be complete by October 2015.</p> <p>A Bristol Employment and Skills Strategy is under development to secure city wide support for increasing skills and employment opportunities for disadvantaged citizens.</p>	<p>June 2016.</p> <p>December 2015</p>	<p>S Hilton</p> <p>P Jacobs</p>	
6. Finance									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>a) Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan (2014 – 2017) but particularly to deliver the £76m savings included in this plan.</p> <p>b) Need to deliver further savings as a result of next Government Spending Review to be announced in Nov 2015. Initial modelling has indicated the City Council could face additional annual savings of £48m by 2020.</p> <p>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, government pressures on</p>	Nicola Yates	<p>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 underlying budget assumptions are reviewed for continuing relevance and any required amendments resulting from factors affecting the original budget assumptions are re-approved by Council.</p> <p>RO = P Gillett</p> <p>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, particularly through the applied programme. During 2014/15 financial pressures were experienced throughout the year for People Services resulting in a year end overspend.</p> <p>Financial implications (savings and costs) of the Change Programme are monitored and reported to the Change Board monthly and to Cabinet quarterly.</p> <p>RO = Max Wide/P Gillet</p>	<p>On schedule (MTFS was reviewed during 2014/15 and rolled forward for a further year.)</p> <p>On schedule for 2014/15 and 2015/16. However potential slippage in service redesign and property work-streams may impact 2016/17.</p> <p>On schedule Forecast spend within budget/savings overall broadly as budgeted.</p>	<p>Possible/Critical (9)</p> <p>Neutral risk direction</p> 	<p>Possible/Significant (6)</p>	<p>Develop an action plan to prioritise strategies for both managing demand, income generation and price management for delivering savings within the People Directorate.</p> <p>Implement enhanced module and latest release of financial system to enable interrogation of HR and Payroll data and better management around establishment costs.</p> <p>Close monitoring of the property/assets savings work streams of the change programme to assess the impact on the budget of savings that were less than those planned.</p> <p>Reflect latest central government funding implications in budget for 2016/17 and the MTFS for 2016/17 to 2018/19:</p> <p>Complete evidence based further analysis of the base budget position across the Council:</p>	<p>October 2015</p> <p>March 2016 and ongoing review.</p> <p>December 2015 and throughout MTFS period</p> <p>September 2015</p> <p>December 2015</p>	<p>J Readman/M Hennessey</p> <p>Peter Gillett/ R Billingham</p> <p>P Gillett/ R Orrett</p> <p>P Gillett</p> <p>P Gillett</p>	<p>Quarterly review and challenge by SLT via the quarterly budget monitors.</p> <p>6 monthly reviews by ELT for update.</p> <p>Reserves position – annual review by SLT.</p>

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>Welfare Benefit funding. PFI funding shortfall.</p> <p>Consequence: Savings not achieved. Budget not met. Financial shortfall. Unplanned reductions in services. Corporate objectives not met. Lack of organisational resilience. Impact on services of welfare reform.</p> <p>Horizon: Medium Term</p>		<p>Budgeting timetable is in place and publicised to ensure maximum corporate and public buy in to the budget review process is achieved.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A financial calendar is in place 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.</p> <p>RO = P Gillett</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RO = P Gillett</p> <p>In year changes to the budget or financial plan are centrally controlled and subject to Finance Director approval.</p> <p>RO = P Gillett</p> <p>Capital Programme Board routinely reassesses and challenges the capital commitment and project slippage.</p> <p>RO = Barra Mac Ruairi</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On-going and on schedule.</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On-going and on schedule</p> <p>On-going and on schedule.</p> <p>On-going and broadly on schedule although Capital budget was underspent by £24m last year.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit activity based costing exercise Carry out a priority based budget exercise Revisit spans and layers work to inform any future restructure activity Develop a greater understanding of the financial opportunities open to the Council including income generation. <p>Ongoing review of schools capital programme and funding linked to PFI arrangements for both education and leisure services.</p> <p>Targeted work with managers to improve transparency of in year budget position, particularly focussing on better forecasting of budget out-turns at service level.</p> <p>Ongoing improvements to capital programme monitoring and support to the Capital Programme Board</p> <p>Further develop timetabling to ensure closer integration with corporate planning process.</p> <p>Seek to increase representation on the Local Government Pension Scheme Board to help shape Pension Investment Programme.</p>	<p>December 2015</p> <p>January 2016</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On going</p> <p>October 2015</p>	<p>J Readman P Gillett/ R Billingham</p> <p>J Ditte</p> <p>K Buckerfield</p> <p>P Gillett</p> <p>P Gillett/ M Wakefield</p>	
7 Educational Attainment									
<p>Risk description: Failure to focus and prioritise resources to effect the changes necessary to ensure the equality of educational</p>	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	On schedule	Possible/ Critical (9)	Unlikely/ Critical (6)	Income generation strategy to be progressed.	September 2015	Paul Jacobs/Jackie Turner	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>opportunities across all ages and all communities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. Further schools are required to become academies as "coasting schools".</p> <p>Horizon: Medium term</p>		<p>leadership and development across the City. RO = Paul Jacobs</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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. Work Programme being agreed. RO = Paul Jacobs</p> <p>An effective plan to secure better outcomes for children in care and care leavers is in place and monitored by the Board. RO = Paul Jacobs</p> <p>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 met for the first time in February 2015. Challenging groups are being set up. RO = Paul Jacobs</p> <p>All aspect of education performance is regularly reviewed by the Directorate scrutiny commission. Links between Directorate scrutiny and that provided by the</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule.</p>			<p>A coherent Inclusion Strategy to be developed to ensure equality of access and outcomes.</p> <p>A clear work plan for the Children and Families Board to be developed.</p>	<p>31 July 2015</p> <p>31 July 2015</p>	<p>Paul Jacobs</p> <p>Paul Jacobs/Jean Pollard.</p>	<p>review.</p>

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>population data is systematically updated with every new data set released by the Office of National Statistics. A Quality of Life Survey is regularly undertaken to understand Citizens views of our services and this informs our understanding of service needs across the City.</p> <p>Bespoke demand models are developed in response to individual project and programme requirements, taking into account both demographic and service data.</p> <p>RO = M Wakefield</p> <p><u>Engagement</u></p> <p>As part of contract management and commissioning we undertake consultation and engagement with service users, citizens, providers and stakeholders. This enables us to explore gaps in provision, quality and to co-produce where appropriate.</p> <p>RO = Service Managers</p> <p><u>Care Management</u></p> <p>Increased provision in front door and triaging of all Safeguarding referrals.</p> <p>Review of Hospital Social Work teams to ensure timely discharge through proportionate assessment and ability to respond to Winter pressures.</p> <p>RO = Stephen Beet / Jane Stiddard</p> <p>Budget Managers undertake regular reviews and forecasting.</p> <p>RO = Stephen Beet / Phoebe Whishaw / Sue Waring</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>			<p>Embedding the work to review our customer journey to help ensure an efficient and proportionate response to the extra demand for care and support including:</p> <p>Using the Three tier model for promoting independence and managing demand.</p> <p>Establishing online tools for self-assessment and support planning.</p> <p>Shifting the emphasis of practitioner work to support those who need help to complete their self-assessments and support plans, providing help to enable them to move on.</p> <p>Preventative approach supported by accessible Information, Advice and Guidance.</p> <p>Recalibration of the Resource Allocation System and embed consistent application.</p> <p>Support and training for practitioners to ensure a risk-enabled and proportionate approach to support people needing help.</p>	<p>To pilot in October 2015 with full roll out by April 2016</p> <p>April 2016</p>	<p>Stephen Beet / Phoebe Whishaw / Sue Waring</p> <p>Lorna Laing</p>	

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
9.	Partnerships									
	<p>Risk description:</p> <p>a) Failure to put in place effective partnership working to achieve cross-boundary ambitions and</p> <p>b) Failure to optimise joint working/ partnership working arrangements in pursuit of maximising achievement of the Council's objectives.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Consequences Lost opportunities – strategic and financial. Failure to deliver on budget, on time. Failure to agree sub-regional aims.</p> <p>Horizon: Medium Term</p>	Nicola Yates	<p>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.</p> <p>The Constitution of each partner is being changed to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the Joint Leaders Board.</p> <p>Effective governance arrangements are being developed to ensure the West of England partnership objectives progress as planned.</p> <p>Informal briefing and information sharing sessions with the leaders of each partner are aimed at identifying and engaging shared ambitions across the region.</p> <p>RO = Nicola Yates</p> <p>A Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board has been established and is now appropriately resourced to support the work of this Board.</p> <p>RO = Nicola Yates</p> <p>Mapping of all of the local partnerships and partnership boards which the Council is a member of is underway including those which are statutory, non-statutory and distinguishing between those which are aiming for 'system change' to ensure that there is complete visibility on the partnerships that the Council has entered into and the commitments or decision making route for each. This will also provide the opportunity for the Council to review its membership of partnerships to ensure that resources are focused effectively. This work is clarifying the resources required to run partnerships and the decision making route into the 'top tier' of partnerships which are aiming for system change.</p> <p>A process for staff to follow before the Council can be committed to a new partnership is being drawn up.</p> <p>All ongoing partnerships will in future be</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>	<p>Likely/ Significant (10)</p> <p>Neutral risk direction </p>	<p>Probable/ Significant (8)</p>	<p>Agreeing a shared suite of measurements with partners that capture both financial value and social value.</p> <p>Establishing a written agreement with local health partners on actions that will be taken if evaluation of joint projects shows a need for a shift in funding across the health and social care 'system'.</p> <p>Developing a Partnership Toolkit to be used in conjunction with a policy on Social Value."</p> <p>Develop a stronger evidence base which demonstrates the benefits of partnership working</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>31 March 2016</p> <p>31 March 2016</p> <p>31 March 2016</p> <p>31/03/2016</p> <p>On-going</p>	<p>P Greer</p> <p>John Readman (for Better Care Bristol)</p> <p>P Greer</p> <p>P Greer</p> <p>N Yates</p>	<p>ELT to review 6 monthly.</p> <p>Possible focus session at ELT on whether we should be increasing partnership working.</p>

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>required to develop an annual strategic action plan that demonstrates the links with the Council's Corporate Plan and show achievement against the priorities in the same.</p> <p>The Constitution of each partner is being changed to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the Joint Leaders Board.</p> <p>Effective governance arrangements are being developed to ensure the West of England partnership objectives progress as planned.</p> <p>Informal briefing and information sharing sessions with the leaders of each partner are aimed at identifying and engaging shared ambitions across the region.</p> <p>RO = P Greer</p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>						
10	Devolution – TO BE DRAFTED									
	<p>Risk description: Failure to maximise the benefits of the Government devolution agenda to best advantage of the people of Bristol.</p> <p>Current risk management arrangements: A potential devolution deal is being explored with West of England partners and the Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>									
11	Delivering Democracy									

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>Risk description: Failure to deliver statutory elections and comply with all legal requirements.</p> <p>Cause: Three elections taking place simultaneously: Police & Crime Commissioner, Mayoral, Whole Council elections for the first time. Possibility of European in / out referendum. The Council is not clear on what constitutes ultra vires acts in the use of Council resources by the Mayor and / or Councillors.</p> <p>Consequence: Disenfranchisement of the electorate. Financial implications of having to re-run elections. Reputational damage to the Council in terms of its operation and democratic legitimacy.</p> <p>Horizon: Short to Medium term with elections taking place on 5th May 2016 and the counts following.</p>	Nicola Yates	<p>Technical team of election specialists who are responsible for the electoral register and delivery of statutory elections and referenda.</p> <p>There is a returning officer and deputy returning officer and electoral registration officer and deputy electoral registration officer appointed by full Council.</p> <p>Board meetings held every 6 weeks and chaired by Nicola Yates with Section 151, Monitoring Officer and representatives from Communications & Marketing and Electoral Services attending.</p> <p>Recognition of whole Council responsibility for the elections, reinforced by the City Director being appointed as the returning officer.</p>	<p>In place but could be increased.</p> <p>Appointed</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	likely/critical (15)	Possible / significant (6)	<p>Clear policy on Councillor and officer conduct outside of the pre-election period to be drafted. Taking into consideration the Council's constitution and Code of Conduct for Members.</p> <p>Review of staffing resources to ensure adequate staffing levels.</p> <p>Ensure budgets reflect electoral activity in each financial year.</p> <p>Member / (Prospective) Candidate briefings covering election matters and general Council information via meetings and email.</p> <p>Electoral Services will attend Electoral Commission briefings and supply live data for them to evaluate progress.</p>	<p>End of September 2015</p> <p>End of September 2015</p> <p>End of September 2015</p> <p>September 2015 to May 2016</p> <p>November 2015 to May 2016</p>	<p>Shahzia Daya</p> <p>Yvonne Dawes</p> <p>Peter Gillett</p> <p>Andrea Dell / Stephanie Bowen</p> <p>Yvonne Dawes</p>	Quarterly
12	Trading Company Operations									
	<p>Risk description: Successfully managing the trading companies created by the Council to ensure they generate social value, income and budgetary resilience for the Council.</p> <p>Cause: Unsound business cases for this method of operation. Poorly managed tensions between commercial rigour and democratic accountability. Poor accountability between the company finances and the Council finances. Poor</p>	Max Wide	<p>The Council has agreed clear criteria / prevailing circumstance when it will consider market intervention as an option for service delivery and income generation activity.</p> <p>RO – N Yates/M Wide</p> <p>A business case for market intervention has been drawn up detailing the costs, benefits, outcomes and risks for the Council and the trading company. The business cases evidence that the agreed criteria for market intervention prevail and were approved by cabinet. The business cases have been externally validated for both Energy and Waste Companies.</p> <p>RO – Relevant Service Director</p>	<p>Agreed by SLT</p> <p>Completed for: Energy Waste Bristol is open</p>	Possible/Critical (9)	Unlikely/Critical (6)	<p>A high level analysis is carried out across all levels of the Council to determine which areas meet the agreed criteria for potential future market intervention.</p> <p>Developing the client side to capacity within the Council including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal - HR - Finance - IT - Etc. <p>Development of service level agreements between the</p>	<p>TBC</p> <p>November 2015</p> <p>November 2015</p>	<p>Peter Gillett</p> <p>Max Wide</p> <p>Max Wide</p>	<p>Quarterly during set up</p> <p>Half yearly thereafter</p>

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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>governance arrangements. Unclear accountability. Failure to monitor performance and whether shareholder expectations are being met. Poorly skilled workforce.</p> <p>Consequence: The companies fail as economic enterprises and fail to deliver social and policy goals. Breakdown of the relationship between the Company and the Council and its citizens. Legal or regulatory failure.</p> <p>Horizon: Medium – long term generally.</p>		<p>Each business case is independently validated by people who have relevant expertise and experience to do so. Following this validation they will make a recommendation to the Cabinet regarding the investment case.</p> <p>RO – N Yates/M Wide</p> <p>For each Start Up Proposal, the most appropriate legal entity and governance arrangements are considered and agreed Cabinet (or by delegation) as part of the business case.</p> <p>Governance arrangements for each Council trading company set out the intention of the Council in the relationship it has with the trading company. This agreement has been approved by Members</p> <p>RO = N Yates</p> <p>A business plan for each Council Trading Company is drawn up and submitted to the Council for review and approval annually. The business plan will set out the objectives set for the company by the council.</p> <p>The success of the trading company will be measured by its performance in delivering the business plan. The Council puts in proportionate means of validating and analysing accounting and performance information received from the Company. This will be included in the shareholder agreements or business plans.</p> <p>The Council appoints a named Council 'Client Side' Officer to validate and examine key performance information.</p> <p>RO – SLT</p> <p>External legal advice has been sought and an ongoing review of governance arrangements in place across all current trading companies. Insurance is in place.</p> <p>RO – Max Wide</p>	<p>Gateway review for Energy co completed.</p> <p>Approved</p> <p>Initial business plans and business case for Energy Co and Bristol is open.</p> <p>Future mitigation</p> <p>Future Mitigation</p> <p>On Schedule</p>			<p>Council side and the Trading Companies.</p> <p>Consider the need for a Council Code of Governance practice for companies.</p> <p>Shareholder agreements for Energy and Waste Companies to be set.</p>	<p>September 2015</p> <p>October 2015</p>	<p>SLT</p> <p>Max Wide</p>	

	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	Time frame for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>A 'model shareholder group' established to advise the Mayor as Shareholder representative going forward.</p> <p>Specialist legal officer and Service Director appointed to head up the client side of Company development.</p> <p>RO – Max Wide</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>						

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Risk Matrix – with corporate risks plotted (July 2015)

Likelihood	6	Almost Certain	6	12	18	24
	5	Likely	5	10 9	15 11	20
	4	Probable	4	8 3	12 5, 4	16
	3	Possible	3	6	9 1,2, 6,7, 8, 12	12
	2	Unlikely	2	4	6	8
	1	Almost Impossible	1	2	3	4
			Marginal 1	Significant 2	Critical 3	Catastrophic 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 Demographic and Service Pressures

Risk 9 Partnerships

Risk 10 Devolution (risk level to be advised)

Risk 11 Delivering Democracy

Risk 12 Trading Company Operations

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

3	Critical	<p>Severe effect on service provision or a corporate Plan priority area.</p> <p>Effect may require considerable additional resource but will not require a major strategy change.</p>	Between £5m - £10m	Between £100k - £1m	<p>Serious potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation.</p> <p>Dissatisfaction regularly reported through Council Complaints procedure.</p> <p>Higher levels of local or national interest.</p> <p>Higher levels of local media/social media interest.</p>	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	<p>Extremely severe service disruption. Significant customer opposition. Legal action.</p> <p>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.</p>	More than £10m	More than £1m	<p>Highly significant potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation</p> <p>Intense local, national and potentially international media attention.</p> <p>'Viral' on line social media</p> <p>Public enquiry or poor external assessor report.</p>	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