

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Business Change Directorate Scrutiny Report Committee

February 2015

Report of: Max Wide, Strategic Director – Business Change

Report Title: Directorate Risk Register Review

Ward: Citywide

Officer presenting report: Max Wide, Strategic Director

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 93574133

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee review and scrutinise the Directorate Risk Register which is attached to this report at Appendix 1.

SUMMARY

This report presents the Directorate Risk Register. Going forward, Directorate Risk Registers will be reviewed by Directorate Leadership Teams on a quarterly basis and will be provided for scrutiny at six monthly internals.

The significant issues in the report are:

- Corporate risk in the context of Directorate risk consideration. (Paragraph 1)
- Process for review of Directorate risks. (Paragraph 2.2)
- Issues arising from the Directorate Risk Register (paragraph 2.5)
- The full directorate risk register (Appendix 1)

Policy

The Audit Committee is responsible for providing independent assurance to the Council regarding the effectiveness of its strategic risk management arrangements. The Council has a Risk Management Policy which requires strategic risks to the Council, and details of how they are managed to be recorded in strategic risk registers – the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers. Whilst the Corporate Risk Register is scrutinised by the Audit Committee on a six monthly basis, it was agreed at Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, that the Directorate Risk Registers will be scrutinised by each Directorate scrutiny twice each year. They will however also be provided once each year to Audit Committee, for information (not scrutiny) to provide the Audit Committee with assurance that Directorate Risk Registers are in place and effectively scrutinised.

Consultation:

Internal: Directorate Leadership Team/ Risk Owners/Deputy Mayor

External: None

1. Background – Risk Management and the Corporate Risk Register

- 1.1 Risk is defined in the Risk Management Policy as ‘the chance of something happening that will impact (positively or negatively) on the achievement of the Council’s objectives’. Risk Management is the planned and systematic approach to the identification, evaluation, prioritisation and control of risks and opportunities facing the Council Management.
- 1.2 Risk Assessment is the measure of likelihood and impact on objectives of an uncertain action or event.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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.

1.5 The CRR is currently under review but at this time includes the following risks:

- **Safeguarding (Amber)** - The Council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable adult or child.
- **Organisational Achievement and Resilience (Amber)** - 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.
- **Governance (Amber)**- 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.
- **Infrastructure (red)** - 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.
- **Resilience (red)** - 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
- **Finance (Amber)**-Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan but particularly to deliver the £76m savings included in this plan. 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.
- **Educational Attainment (Amber)** - Failure to focus and prioritise resources to effect the changes necessary to ensure the equality of educational opportunities across all ages and all communities.
- **Demographic and Service Pressures (Amber)**- The Council fails to appropriately manage demand for its services and does not maximise all potential delivery methods to ensure that services are provided in the most cost effective way.
- **Partnerships (Red)** - Failure to put in place effective partnership working to achieve cross-boundary ambitions and failure to optimise joint working/ partnership working arrangements in pursuit of maximising achievement of the Council's objectives. *Elements of this risk are being moved under other headings to reflect that Partnerships are part of the solution as opposed to the risk.*

- **Devolution (under consideration)**- Failure to maximise the benefits of the Government devolution agenda to best advantage of the people of Bristol. A *newly identified risk area for which more detailed wording is being drafted.*
- **Delivering Democracy (Red)** - Failure to deliver statutory elections and comply with all legal requirements.
- **Trading Company Operations (Amber)** - Successfully managing the trading companies created by the Council to ensure they generate social value, income and budgetary resilience for the Council.

1.6 The extended leadership team have recently reviewed the Corporate Risk Register and a new risk relating to Welfare Reform is currently being documented for inclusion in the corporate risk register going forward.

2. The Directorate Risk Register

2.1 As well as Corporate Risks, Directorate Risks Registers (DRR) detail risks faced by each Directorate. The DRR is owned by the Strategic Director and is used by the Directorate Leadership Team to ensure and monitor that risks are effectively managed.

2.2 The Directorate Risk Register was developed following:

- DLT Risk identification and assignment of a risk owner who is responsible to ensure each risk is effectively managed
- Detailed work with the Risk Owner to determine key current mitigations and further actions to ensure the risk is properly managed
- Re-review by DLT to ensure risk levels are correctly identified and target risk levels are acceptable

2.3 The Business Change Directorate Risk register is attached at Appendix 1 for scrutiny. The register is presented in the standard format agreed by ELT/SLT and uses the risk management methodology in the risk management policy agreed by the SLT and the Audit Committee in November 2014. The following appendices provide helpful extracts from that policy to assist Members in understanding risk levels recorded in the register:

- The risk matrix (Appendix 2)
- Guidance parameters used to measure impact (Appendix 3)
- Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood (Appendix 4)

2.4 The timing of presentation of the Directorate Risk Register to Scrutiny is such that the committee are also receiving information concerning Directorate performance at this meeting. It is envisaged that both the risk and performance information provided to the Committee should be reviewed together to aide effective challenge to both sets of information.

2.5 The Directorate Scrutiny Commission last received the Directorate Risk Register on 20/07/2015. The following paragraphs summarise the key changes to the risk environment since then:

2.6 New risks identified and added to the register include:

- 2.6.1 Risk 1: Service Transition (Red)
- Risk 2: Recruitment and Retention (Red)

2.7 Previous risks which are no longer relevant and removed from the register include:

- 2.7.1 Finance system – ABW update
- New approach to Scrutiny
- A modernised workforce (pay and reward).
- Self-service risk
- Unqualified financial statements

2.8 Income Generation/Start-ups risk in the July Directorate Risk Register is now separated into two risks – Risks 11 & 12.

2.9 The following table demonstrates where risk levels have increased/decreased or stayed the same compared to the Risk Register reviewed in July.

Risk ref	Risk	July 2015 Previous risk level	December 2015 Current risk level
Risk 3:	Integration of new technology into business operations	Red	Red
Risk 4:	Deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)	Yellow	Red
Risk 5:	Leadership Development and Continuous Service Improvement	Red	Yellow
Risk 6:	Performance Management Framework	Red	Yellow
Risk 7:	Change Programme	Red	Yellow
Risk 8:	Democratic reform	Red	Yellow
Risk 9:	Bristol Workplace Programme	Red	Yellow
Risk 10:	A single ERP System (previously 'Integrated HR and Payroll System)	Yellow	Yellow
Risk 13:	PSC Service Redesign	Red	Yellow
Risk 14:	Redesigned Revenue and Benefit Service	Yellow	Green
Risk 15:	Citizens Services Redesign	Yellow	Green
Risk 16:	ICT Service Improvement	Yellow	Green
Risk 17:	Identity and Brand	Green	Green
Risk 18:	Corporate plan	Green	Green

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 Business Change Directorate Risk Register
- Appendix 2 Risk Matrix
- Appendix 3 Guidance parameters used to measure impact
- Appendix 4 Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Papers None.

Appendix 1

BUSINESS CHANGE RISK REGISTER

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation)	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.									
<p>Service Transition – there is a risk that the activity designed by BWP will not be effectively transitioned to the business to manage. Particular high risk areas being the operational blueprint for City Hall and new technology products and processes.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>New ways of working are not embedded, opportunities relating to new technology not being exploited and operational support function unable to support the business in an appropriate way.</p>	<p>Lucy Murray Brown</p> <p>Paul Arrigoni</p> <p>Robert Orrett</p>	<p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FM/BWP interface officer in post - Collaborative design for operational blueprint to embed changes into service as early as possible - ICT service Improvement Programme in place 	<p>Technology transition resources in place, operational blueprint for city hall being supported by ADAPT, some FM staff wokring in BWP to enable skills transfer</p>	<p>Critical/likely (15)</p>	<p>Significant/probable (8)</p>	<p>Potential further transition resources required.</p> <p>ADAPT to do Quality Assurance on City Hall operational blueprint</p> <p>Consideration to skills transfer from BWP resource to service resource through closer working.</p>		<p>Mark Halligan</p> <p>Steve Palmer</p>	<p>Quarterly</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	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
3.									
<p>Risk description: The integration of new technology into business operations, training and empowering users.</p> <p>Cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The workforce does not understand use or benefits - Introduction of new technology not signposted to potential users. - 'Technophobic' culture amongst a significant proportion of staff - difficulties embedding new technology within user communities and empowering users to exploit these tools <p>Consequence: Below optimal take up and exploitation of technology.</p>	Paul Arrigoni /Lucy Murray Brown	<p>Delivery through the technology workstream of the Bristol Workplace programme.</p> <p>Monitored through the BWP Steering group</p> <p>Mitigations: -New deployment training which 'brings technology opportunities to life'. -BWP discovery process now includes additional support on use of technology -Paperless environment more robustly encouraged through discovery -Reduced storage New behaviour challenge and communications approach being tested at Temple</p>	 <p>Resources have now been dedicated to business transition of new technology, ensuring clear support and guidance is in place.</p> <p>Formal transition documentation and processes have been established.</p>	Critical/probable (12)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement process for integrating technology into user communities for all new technologies planned for implementation • Integrated into council training & development and induction arrangements for new staff • Implement data dashboard to measure impact of BWP interventions, including use of technology and spaces associated with new ways of working 	<p>Delivery through the BWP programme – next major milestone reoccupation of City Hall middle part of 2016 where new approaches will be monitored.</p> <p>ICT Service improvement programme</p> <p>PMO</p>	<p>Steve Palmer (BWP tech)</p> <p>Robin Burton (BWP engagement)</p> <p>Ian Gale, Annabel Parfitt</p> <p>Service Director and Manager lead TBC</p>	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
4.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>-MTFP overall going well and has delivered the majority of the necessary changes, however ongoing political pressure represents a high risk.</p> <p>-Some savings being delayed by budget amendments, leading to a cumulative reduction in current delivery of savings</p> <p>New risk area identified relating to the Local Government Financial Settlement resulting in higher than forecast reductions in grant funding.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Potential overspends against budget and unplanned use of resources</p> <p>Horizon:</p>	Peter Gillett	<p>Regular financial monitoring to each DLT and to key corporate boards (Change Board, Capital Programme Board)</p> <p>Inclusive approach to budget setting within the three-year financial budget framework</p> <p>Clear approach to reviewing the existing 3 year budget and MTFP assumptions.</p> <p>Financial stocktake exercise to identify mitigating savings currently underway</p> <p>Review of People Services medium term financial pressures and potential mitigations underway,</p> <p>Engagement with Business Change and Resources Scrutiny Commission on reviewing changes to assumptions contained within the financial framework</p> <p>Budgeted contribution to reserves of £11.3m included in the proposals</p>		Critical /probable (12)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<p>Continued financial monitoring/reporting to boards. DLT's, SLT and cabinet to ensure savings and change programme workstreams are delivered on time and to best effect.</p> <p>Further improvements to capital programme monitoring and support to the capital programme board.</p> <p>Use of tools such as predictive analytics to maximise understanding of current and future financial position – support by EY on baseline issues for each directorate - to also support the development of the sustainable business plans</p> <p>Budgeted contribution to reserves of £11.3m included in the proposals for 2016/17 to act as a mitigation of a reduction in grant.</p> <p>Comprehensive review and establishment of a new 4-year medium term financial plan for the council. Informed by CSR and LG financial settlement</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Implemented. Ongoing during 2015/16 and beyond.</p> <p>November /December 2015</p> <p>August 2015 to February 2016</p> <p>May 2016</p>	<p>Janet Ditte</p> <p>Peter Gillett</p> <p>Peter Gillett / Janet Ditte, with colleagues from People Directorate</p> <p>Peter Gillett/Kevin Bucker field</p> <p>Peter Gillett</p>	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p>Monthly</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	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
Throughout the 3-5 year period of the budget/financial framework.		for 2016/17 to act as a mitigation of a reduction in grant and additional spending pressures.							
5.									
Risk description: Leadership Development and Continuous Service Improvement Cause: -Training planned but need to address ongoing support and roadmap for leadership and continuous improvement -Applied Programme has now begun -Focus must be on organisational development not solely individual development	Richard Billingham	Applied programme implemented and Cohort 4 moving into initial sprints with other Cohorts still ongoing. Interim evaluation of the AP completed. Realignment of HR Service in place to focus on organisational priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talent and resourcing • Professionalised HR Advice and Consultancy • HR Strategy and Policy (including pay and reward) OD and learning service to be subject to end-to-end process review and redesign as part of Cohort 4 priorities.		Critical / possible (9)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must firmly agree plan for delivering ongoing organisational development • Need to bottom out delivery issues and timescales • Need to address wider systems issue - not just deliver applied programme but link to performance management framework • Externally commissioned work to analyse wider leadership development now completed and being reviewed prior to an SLT paper. 			

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
6.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Performance Management Framework and System</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>Difficulty ensuring the new system is utilised to its full effect, fully embedded in the organisation and aids proper accountability -Difficulty linking individual performance with organisational and team objectives</p>	Richard Billingham	<p>'My Performance' system implemented in August and available to 4600 employees.</p> <p>Work currently underway to improve the use and uptake of the new system to ensure that all employees have performance objectives. Integration with Business World scheduled for post HRIS go live (Q2 2016)</p>		Critical possible / (9)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce peer challenge and focus on meeting specific targets – managers chunking their targets up for individuals • Ensure the business process is widely used and that all employees have recorded performance objectives. • Need to clearly set expectations around end of year performance reviews and the links to a talent grid. • 			

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.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Change Programme</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>-Large amount of savings still to be specifically identified)</p> <p>-Scope for some areas to target significantly more savings than have currently been identified</p> <p>-Income generation projects like the energy company will be beneficial in long term but in short term will require investment</p>	Max Wide	<p>Monitoring report presented to Cabinet on a 6 monthly basis.</p> <p>All projects are RAG rated and closely monitored.</p> <p>Action plans are in place to mitigate risks.</p> <p>Monthly briefing meetings held to update relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Sustainable plan now in place with 7 cross cutting themes.</p> <p>None of the current projects are in exception.</p>		Critical / Possible (9)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, achievable targets and plans should be put in place Clear approach to asset management Challenge to directorates on Applied Programme to ensure all possible savings are found Clear communication focusing on risks to organisation if Applied Programme (and Change Programme) fails 			

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
8.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Democratic Reform</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>-Haven't yet got a democratic model for the new mayoral structure</p> <p>-Need a way for members and citizens to engage positively</p> <p>-Not a modern organisation – don't have electronic papers and voting options in meetings</p> <p>-Possible constitutional changes in summer</p>	<p>Shahzia Daya</p>	<p>Following a review of the changes to the constitution made in 2014 and a review of the scrutiny provisions made, the following changes were agreed by full Council in May 2015;</p> <p>Improved speed of decision making when a decision made by Cabinet is called in for greater scrutiny. In particular, standing call in sub committees established.</p> <p>Questions at full Council no longer restricted to items on the full Council agenda</p> <p>Chair of OSM to decide which scrutiny commission to review an area of work where it could fall to more than one commission. This reduces unnecessary duplication and makes the best use of Officer time while ensuring that Scrutiny is member led.</p> <p>Principle of transparency in local government is paramount so Code of Conduct for Members to be</p>		<p>Critical / possible (9)</p>	<p>Critical / unlikely (6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with democratic services, consultation team and communications team to consider options for modernising current model, including options for greater direct engagement with citizens 			

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
		<p>reviewed by Audit committee to improve sharing of information with Members.</p> <p>Move to City hall will provide greater opportunity to modernise democratic engagement</p> <p>New committee management system will lead to greater efficiency, consistency and transparency Scrutiny exemplary and actions suggested by Centre for public Scrutiny suggested early 2015 have been adopted</p>							
9.									
<p>Bristol Workplace Programme governance and control mechanisms</p> <p><i>If programme delivery governance, decision making and control mechanisms are not maintained it will be difficult to monitor and accurately forecast budgets and benefit realisation.</i></p>	Lucy Murray-Brown	<p>a. Improved programme governance, financial and benefits forecasting, decision making and visibility of key programme artefacts; monitor through robust programme processes</p> <p>b. Operating with an agile need-based resourcing model moving forward</p> <p>c. integrated programme plan in place</p> <p>d. Gateway Review</p>	 Significant progress has been made and continues to be made in implementing and monitoring the agreed	Critical/Possible (9)	Significant / unlikely (4)	<p>Continue to review progress and make continuous improvements to programme delivery to ensure risks are minimised.</p> <p>Current priorities:</p> <p>City Hall re-occupation date is in place and plan being developed</p> <p>Brunel decommissioning on schedule but timeline tight</p>		Lucy Murray-Brown	Monthly

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
<p>Consequences: Issues arise during delivery of change, potentially adversely impacting the delivery of services and the programme has significant problems in delivering the expected benefits</p>		<p>completed and recommendations approved e. ADAPT partnership products recasted</p>	mitigations			<p>ADAPT monitoring strengthened and partnership output dramatically reduces from January 2016</p> <p>New, appropriate, programme artefacts in place – monitor effectiveness.</p>			
10.									
<p>Risk description: A single ERP system</p> <p>Cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to have a single ERP team rather than separate HR and Finance systems team leading to suboptimal exploitation and development of the corporate asset. - Failure to have effective governance structures in place. - Failure to have effective and documented change control 	Richard Billingham/ Peter Gillett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals in place for a phase 1 ERP team to be in place at the end of 4 weeks post ERP implementation • Target Operating Model developed for implementation by July 2016 		Critical / possible (9)	Critical / unlikely (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective oversight of the ERP system team creation by the HR&P Steering Group. • Transition arrangements agreed to ensure effective involvement of HR, Finance and ICT (Enterprise Architecture) • Need to set clear expectations on the purpose of the ERP Systems team and engage in a fundamental redesign including all roles with consequent selection into new roles. 		Jill Mikkelson and Kevin Buckerfield	

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
11.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Income Generation</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>A reduction in the potential additional income to be achieved as outlined in the 3-year budget</p> <p>Longer Term - Timescales for companies to achieve profits to support the council's income streams</p>	Peter Gillett	<p>Comparative statistics provision/ review by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy</p> <p>Minimum financial targets for 2015/16 and 2016/17 will be exceeded through a combination of Treasury Management / debt project and B-Net concessions.</p> <p>Debt Recovery Project ongoing – work extended to end of Jan 2016 to focus on recovery of in year debts.</p> <p>KPMG review of further income opportunities currently underway – the draft report has been provided.</p> <p>Bristol Energy/Bristol Waste and Holding company now established and cabinet approvals given. Updated business plans for all 3 companies are being finalised in November, with a report planned for Cabinet in November. Dedicated (interim) Finance and Legal resources appointed to support this process.</p>		Critical / possible (9)	Unlikely / significant (4)	<p>KPMG income review to be reported to Change board in <i>January 2016</i>.</p> <p>Action plan to be developed following KPMG report</p> <p>Debt Recovery Project to be monitored regularly</p> <p>Cabinet approvals required in December for updated business plans for companies</p> <p>Companies to provide regular management accounting information to Holding Co and to Council</p>	<p>January 2016</p> <p>January 2016</p> <p>December – January 2016</p> <p>December 2015</p> <p>January 2016</p>	<p><i>Max Wide</i></p> <p><i>Max Wide</i></p> <p>Janet Ditte</p> <p>Netta Meadows</p> <p>Netta Meadows</p>	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>Monthly</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	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
12.									
Risk Description: New Company Start Ups Cause: Information and Guidance required to support the delivery of new company start-ups can be complex and specialist		Bristol Energy/Bristol Waste and Holding company now established and cabinet approvals given. Updated business plans for all 3 companies are being finalised in November, with a report planned for Cabinet in November. Dedicated (interim) Finance and Legal resources appointed to support this process. Expert advice has been commissioned (PWC), and would be commissioned where appropriate for future start-ups. Cross learning to finance team from recent start-ups		Critical / possible (9)	Unlikely / significant (4)	Identify early any future proposed start-ups so that early Information and Guidance can be provided. Collate list of potential start-ups for early review	By March 2016	Finance Business Partners	Feb 2016
13.									
Risk description: PSC Service Redesign Cause: -No process in place to prevent potentially overwhelming workload now PSC centralised -Operational model not finalised, no decision on how to position team – are PSC going to be demand-led or strategic?	Patricia Greer	- Interim Service Director in post to enable the operational model for the PSC team to be finalised, bringing clarity about positioning the team and enabling effective planning of team resources. Develop, agree and implement plans to fully establish PSC and the BCC approach to policy and performance		Probable / significant (8)	Unlikely / significant (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree a defined operating model for Policy and Strategic Planning Develop proactive way of managing workload for all teams within PSC Ensure all policy staff are fully linked in to PSC, even if not placed directly in PSC 	February 2016	Patricia Greer	

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
			Equalities & Community Cohesion Team and Executive Office. Operational models for Policy and Strategic Planning teams prepared but not signed off						
14.									
Risk Description: Redesigned Revenue and Benefit Service Causes: Lack of resource to implement all opportunities identified Tactical changes to high demand services could lead to differing levels of citizen experience Agency staff have been used for the last nine	Patsy Mellor	Maximising opportunities from applied programme Support from PMO Working with PMO to maximise opportunities for self service Enabling self-service and automation to reduce demand and need for additional support		Possible / significant (6)	Unlikely / significant (4)	Applied Programme to identify possible opportunities Service restructure to be undertaken in 2016 Working with PMO and applied programme to ensure opportunities are maximised	2015/16 2016 Summer 2016	P Mellor P Mellor P Mellor	Quarterly Quarterly Monthly

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
<p>years to support current structure. Ability for service to achieve required levels of performance within structure is untested</p> <p>Retention of staff due to implementation of Universal credit and failure to recruit to vacancies</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Inability to achieve vision of digital channel being channel of choice Increased citizen demand and financial consequences Failure to meet citizen expectations Processing backlogs Reputational damage</p>						Rolling recruitment and training programme	Summer 2016		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
15.									
<p>Risk Description: Citizens Services Redesign</p> <p>Causes: -Short and medium term plans progressing well, but missing infrastructure for realising longer term vision of citizen platform -Lack of understanding of, and engagement with, ideas for future operating model</p> <p>Lack of resource to implement all opportunities identified</p> <p>Tactical changes to high demand services could lead to differing levels of citizen experience</p> <p>Consequences: Inability to achieve vision of digital channel being channel of choice Increased citizen demand and financial consequences Failure to meet citizen expectations</p>	Patsy Mellor	<p>Maximising Applied Programme opportunities</p> <p>Development of target operating model for Citizen Services</p> <p>Stepped approach to applied programme to ensure full digitalisation of all services to avoid two tier approach</p>	<p></p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	Possible / significant (6)	Unlikely / significant (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicate plans for future operating model to rest of BCC and members Take paper to members, using positive interactions with Business Change Scrutiny Committee to aid collaborative discussion Working with PMO to develop 2 stage applied programme work 	<p>Summer 2016 for full applied programme redesign</p> <p>Sept 2016</p> <p>Summer 2016</p>	<p>P Mellor</p> <p>P Mellor</p> <p>P Mellor</p>	<p>Quarterly</p> <p>quarterly</p> <p>Quarterly</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	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
Tom now developed and identifies efficiencies and channel shift opportunities									
16.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>ICT Service Improvement (tech implementation and roadmaps)</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>-Very large delivery agenda and linked to many other deliverables -Brand issue</p>	Paul Arrigoni	<p>The understanding of how our ICT services are changing and what improvements are planned is not well understood across the organisation. Hence, the benefits from the substantial investment being made in technology will not be fully exploited.</p> <p>A future delivery model for ICT now being considered with a view to implementation in early 2016</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p>A programme is in place bringing together all of the activities needed to address this risk.</p> <p>Communications and engagement with key business groups has started</p>	Significant/ possible (6)	Significant / unlikely (4)	<p>There are a substantial number of project deliveries and improvements planned through 2015/16 that need to be delivered to fully mitigate this risk. These are tracked on a fortnightly basis by the ICT Service Improvement Group and the work is led by a project manager.</p> <p>Future delivery model for ICT to be developed and implemented</p>	<p>Various deliveries thought 2015/16. Complete by March 2016. A detailed project plan is available.</p> <p>New model agreed by Jan 16. Implementation by June 16</p>	<p>Ian Gale</p> <p>Paul Arrigoni</p>	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
17.									
<p>Risk Description:</p> <p>Identity and Brand</p> <p>Causes:</p> <p>-Initial proposal not fully agreed by SLT so current focus is on minor 'quick wins'. However, the bigger picture is still an issue that needs resolving.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>No clear and recognisable organisational identity that reflects our ambitions and values and communicates progressive working. Harder to speak with a single 'voice'</p>	<p>Patricia Greer</p>	<p>Directorate communication forward plans developed and discussed at DLTs. This needs to be pulled together to a corporate communications plan</p> <p>City brand development underway</p> <p>Organisational values development paper produced, joint working group set up with OD colleagues. Paper due to DLT</p> <p>House style for media releases and publications being developed</p>		<p>Likely/ Marginal (5)</p>	<p>Probable/ Marginal (4)</p>	<p>Revisit initial proposal and identify what we can do, what we should be focusing on, and how this work can be progressed.</p> <p>Produce a corporate communication strategy – to include corporate narrative, brand and organisational values and visual identity. Consult on proposals via decision pathway.</p> <p>Take city brand proposal through decision pathway</p>	<p>February 2016</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	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
18.									
<p>Risk description:</p> <p>Corporate Plan</p> <p>Cause:</p> <p>-Initial plan issued but lack of monitoring to assess whether it is being adhered to -Not publicised extensively -Risk around current work on strategic plans</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Horizon:</p>	<p>Patricia Greer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance Team to produce business planning template - Strategic Planning team to engage with DLTs and ELT, for sake of speed, to enable production of strategic plans for 10 themes in Corporate Plan - Strategic Planning and Performance Team to link KPIs to activity listed in the 10 strategic plans for themes in Corporate Plan - Establish and clarify link between Corporate Plan, ten strategic plans for priority themes and business planning - Promotion of Corporate Plan, strategic plans for themes and business planning model simultaneously via Management Brief and Source - Develop service plans to link the corporate plan through the strategic themes to directorate, team and individual performance 		<p>Unlikely/ significant (4)</p>	<p>Almost impossible / significant (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corporate Plan and strategic plans for priority themes and business planning model to be promoted via Management Brief and Source following SLT (July '15) - Performance Team to promote business planning template to enable effective monitoring by managers of their team's adherence to Corporate Plan priorities - Service plans in place 	<p>Complete</p>	<p>Patricia Greer/Mark Wakefield/Kay Russell</p>	

Appendix 2

Risk Matrix

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

Appendix 3

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.

Appendix 4

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