

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Board**

**16<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

**Report of:** Strategic Director Business Change

**Report Title:** Corporate Risk Register Development and Scrutiny

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer presenting report:** Alison Mullis, Melanie Henchy-McCarthy - J/S Chief Internal Auditor.

**Contact Telephone Number: 0117 92 22448**

**RECOMMENDATION**

To note the changes made in the methods and philosophies used to identify and review corporate risks.

To agree the routine scrutiny arrangements for the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers going forward.

To note that the next quarterly review of the Corporate Risk Register is now underway.

**SUMMARY**

The attached report presents an overview of the development work that has been undertaken to reshape and review the Corporate Risk Register. It provides a view of the Corporate Risk Register and details of how the register will be reviewed going forward. The report was considered by the Audit Committee at their meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2014 when they also reviewed the Corporate Risk Register.

**The significant issues in the report are:**

- The proposals for Member review of the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers (section 5)

**Policy**

1. Risk Management Policy and Audit Committee Terms of Reference.

## **Consultation:**

2. **Internal:** Extended Leadership Team/Strategic Leadership Team, Audit Committee
3. **External:** Zurich Municipal

## **4. Context**

- 4.1 The Audit Committee have responsibility for ensuring that the Council has effective risk management arrangements in place and has previously scrutinised both Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers to give them assurance that this was the case.
- 4.2 Following concerns that the Corporate Risk Register was not reflective of the Council's strategic risks and was not a useful tool to assist in managing the organisation, development work has taken place to review the methods and philosophies we use to identify, assess and review our corporate risks.
- 4.3 The attached report to Audit Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2014 details the development work which was done with the Extended Leadership Team. It includes:
  - The new 6x 4 risk matrix plotting the corporate risks together with a summary of the risks in order of current highest risk first (Appendix 1)\*
  - New Impact assessment guidance used in rating the risks(Appendix2) \*
  - Likelihood assessment guidance used (Appendix 3 – Table 1)\*
  - Proposed action required guidance to assist with when it is appropriate to escalate risks to the Corporate Risk Register (Appendix 3 – Table 2)\*
  - The resulting Corporate Risk Register that was reviewed by Audit Committee in July 2014. (Appendix 4)\*  
*(\*Appendices of the Audit Committee report)*
- 4.4 The Corporate Risk Register is now due for its next (quarterly) review and this work is now in progress. Additionally, each Strategic Director is currently developing their own Directorate Risk Register via their Directorate Leadership Teams using the same methods as those developed for the Corporate Risk Register.

## **5. Proposal**

5.1 The Member review and scrutiny arrangements for both the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers should be agreed. It is recommended that:

- A The Corporate Risk Register is formally reviewed and scrutinised every 6 months by the Audit Committee to ensure that Strategic risks are being properly identified and managed and give the Committee the assurances they require. It will also be reviewed 6 monthly by the Executive Board.
- B. The Directorate Risk Registers are reviewed and scrutinised quarterly by the Directorate Scrutiny Commissions. The Audit Committee will receive Directorate Risk Registers annually together with details of their review for information and assurance that his process is taking place.

## **6. Other Options Considered**

## **7. Risk Assessment**

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

## **8. Public Sector Equalities Duties**

Before making a decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

- i. Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
- ii. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic; take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities); encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- iii. Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice; and promote understanding.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

None necessary for this report

### **Legal and Resource Implications**

**Legal** – no advice sought

**Financial** – no advice sought

**Land** – no advice sought

**Personnel** – no advice sought

### **Appendices**

- Appendix A Audit Committee Report – Corporate Risk Register Development

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Background Papers

None.

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**

**Audit Committee**

**11<sup>th</sup> July 2014**

**Report of:** Strategic Director Business Change

**Report Title:** Corporate Risk Register Development

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer presenting report:** Alison Mullis, Melanie Henchy-McCarthy - J/S Chief Internal Auditor.

**Contact Telephone Number: 0117 92 22448**

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee review and comment upon the changes made in the methods and philosophies used to identify and review corporate risks.

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

**SUMMARY**

This report presents an overview of the development work that has been undertaken to reshape and review the Corporate Risk Register. It provides a view of the Corporate Risk Register and details of how the register will be reviewed going forward.

**The significant issues in the report are:**

- Changes in the approach to identifying and managing corporate risks (Section 2)
- Revised guidance for assessing risks (Appendices 1, 2 and 3)
- The Corporate Risk Register (Section 3 and Appendix 4)
- Directorate risk review arrangements (Section 4).

**Policy**

This report is submitted in accordance with the Audit Committee's Terms of Reference which requires the Committee to provide independence assurance to

the Council regarding the effectiveness of its strategic risk management arrangements.

**Consultation:**

**Internal:** Extended Leadership Team/Strategic Leadership Team

**External:** Zurich Municipal

**1. Background**

- 1.1. In 2013, it was identified that Strategic Risk Management Arrangements across the Council were not considered effective. A key concern was that whilst, at that time, the Council had a Corporate Risk Register (CRR), it was not reflective of the Council's strategic risks and did not focus senior management and Members' attention on the highest risks. The consensus was that there was a 'disconnect' between Directorate Risk Registers (DRR's) and the CRR and a lack of clarity regarding what makes a risk a corporate risk rather than one to be dealt with at Directorate level.
- 1.2. Work has been underway to review the approach to the identification of corporate risks and the Committee received an update on this at their meeting in April 2014. This work has now concluded and is detailed below. It has resulted in the full management team better understanding the corporate risks, and how they are being managed. The register focusses their attention on the highest risks and includes both mitigations and further actions required to manage the risks.

**2. Corporate Risk Register Development**

- 2.1. Risk management consultants, Zurich Municipal, were engaged to facilitate a series of workshops with the Council's Extended Leadership Team to review the Council's philosophies and approach to identifying and managing corporate risks.
- 2.2. Resulting from this, the Extended Leadership Team (ELT) have worked to develop a philosophy and approach to risk management that will better equip them to understand and effectively respond to the main risks the Council faces. This includes:
  - An agreed definition for what makes a risk a corporate risk:
    - One with an unacceptably high risk score on the risk matrix
    - One that could mean the Council will fail in achieving its key objectives
    - One which requires regular oversight by senior management and members (intervals depending on time horizon of risk)

- The introduction of cause and effect analysis to better understand and articulate the real risk
- Using a risk matrix which provides more granularity in measuring risk. A risk matrix using 4 impact and 6 likelihood measures will make it easier to see which risks are highest (the outliers) and is more transparent in enabling the effectiveness of mitigations to reduce risk to be seen.
- Being clear and consistent in the language that we use is important and the need for clear guidance on the impact and likelihood measures is required.
- The use of more meaningful, emotive and transparent terminology. This will be helpful in allowing management to better understand the risks and the importance of ensuring they are effectively managed
- The need to take a short and long term view of risk (risk Horizon) in terms of how frequently the risk needs to be reviewed by Senior Management and Members should be introduced
- Acknowledgement that effective risk management is not only about reducing levels of risk but should be about empowering management to take risks when opportunities arise and when formal risk assessment suggests the risks are worth taking;
- Use of the Extended Leadership Team to regularly review the Corporate Risk Register and provide focus where necessary .

2.3 Additionally, the workshops focussed on identification of the current corporate risks and work has since been completed with 'Risk Owners' to a) identify how these are being managed and b) determine any further risk management actions required. The full Corporate Risk Register has been reviewed by the Strategic Leadership Team.

2.4 Provided with this report is the full output from the work completed. It includes:

- The new risk matrix plotting the corporate risks together with a summary of the risks in order of current highest risk first (Appendix 1)
- Impact assessment guidance used in rating the risks(Appendix 2)
- Likelihood assessment guidance used (Appendix 3 – Table 1)

- Proposed action required guidance to assist with when it is appropriate to escalate risks to the CRR (Appendix 3 – Table 2)
- The Corporate Risk Register. (Appendix 4)

### **3. The Corporate Risk Register**

- 3.1 The CRR details 9 corporate risks, how they are currently managed and the current risk level based on risk assessment using the matrix and parameters attached to this report. Additionally, for each risk, a target risk (or risk appetite) has been set and where this is different than the current risk, an action plan, with timescales and responsible officers, has been identified for SLT to monitor progress. Appropriate risk review arrangements have also been identified for each risk.
- 3.2 The register, at its next review, will require further development to ensure it reflects the progress/direction of travel in the effectiveness of risk management arrangements for each risk.
- 3.3 Members will note that the CRR is not yet captured in the usual ‘Spar.net’ system reporting format and hence looks different than previous versions of the register. Now that the register development work has been completed, the use of Spar.net for capturing and reporting corporate risks will be resumed . This provides an automated means of assigning actions to individuals for update at appropriate dates to ensure the risk information is kept current.
- 3.4 Going forward, ELT will review and challenge the CRR quarterly. In doing so, key officers who may be in a position to challenge the effectiveness of mitigation/ further action will be invited to these meetings. ( egs include the Chief Internal Auditor, the Insurance Officer, the Performance Manager).
- 3.5 Additionally, three risks have identified a need for further ELT work in the form of a risk focus session:
- Risk 5 – Resilience – as many of the issues are cross cutting or public health related and would benefit from full ELT consideration
  - Risk 6 - Finance – predominantly for an update in 6 months time
  - Risk 9 – Partnerships – regarding whether and how increased partnership working could be beneficial going forward.
- 3.6 Each quarter, the CRR will be formally reviewed by SLT to monitor progress and for any intervention required. Every 6 months, the Audit Committee will review and scrutinise the CRR to ensure that Strategic risk is being effectively identified and managed. Additionally, the register will be reviewed 6 monthly by the Executive Board.



#### **4. Directorate Risk Registers:**

- 4.1 As well as the CRR, there is an expectation that significant directorate risks are recorded and reviewed quarterly at DLT's. This will include maintaining a Directorate Risk Register (DRR) that is updated and reviewed by the Directorate Scrutiny Commission on a quarterly basis. It is proposed that the Audit Committee continue receive these registers annually together with details of their review for information and assurance that this process is taking 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 matrix /Summary of risks
- Appendix 2 Impact assessment guidance
- Appendix 3 Table 1 - Likelihood assessment guidance  
Table 2 - Proposed action
- Appendix 4 Corporate Risk Register

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

#### **Background Papers**

None.

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Table 1: Risk Matrix – with corporate risks plotted

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
			Impact			

Summary of Risks in Current Risk Order

Ref	Risk	Current Risk	Target Risk
4	<b>Infrastructure</b> - 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.	20	12
5	<b>Resilience</b> - 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.	12	9
9	<b>Partnerships</b> - 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.	10	8
1	<b>Safeguarding</b> - The Council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable adult or child.	9	6
2	<b>Organisational Achievement and Resilience</b> - 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.	9	6
6	<b>Finance</b> - Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan but particularly to deliver the £76m savings included in this plan.	9	6
7	<b>Educational Attainment</b> - Failure to focus and prioritise resources to effect the changes necessary to ensure the equality of educational opportunities across all ages and all communities.	9	6
8	<b>Commissioning</b> - The Council fails to commission strategically, and services do not meet the needs of the users/communities.	9	6
3	<b>Governance</b> - 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.	8	6

## Appendix 2: 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	<b>Catastrophic</b>	<p>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.</p>	<p>More than £10m</p>	<p>More than £1m</p>	<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>	<p>Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation (&gt; 1 person)</p>	<p>Lasting effect on the natural and or built environment.</p>	<p>Lasting effect positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups/individuals.</p>	<p>(Avoidable) Death of citizens or staff may result or be prevented. Long term disability/absence from work.</p>
---	---------------------	---	-----------------------	----------------------	--	---	--	---	---

Table 1: Assessment of the likelihood

	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

Table 2: Assurance Requirements for risks with a 1 – 3 year risk horizon

Colour	Score	Action
Green	1-6	Owned, managed, and reviewed quarterly at Directorate Risk Register (and Directorate Leadership Team) level. Independent assurance to be provided to Director by Internal Audit as appropriate.
Amber	8-9	Escalate – to be owned and reviewed at least six monthly by ELT. Independent assurance to be provided to ELT as appropriate.
Red	10-16	Escalate – to be owned and reviewed at least quarterly by ELT. Independent assurance to be provided to ELT/SLT by Internal Audit as appropriate.
Violet	18-24	Escalate – for immediate ownership, management and review by SLT on a regular basis until resolved. Independent assurance to be provided by Internal Audit as appropriate.

## Appendix 4 - CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
1.	<b>Safeguarding:</b>									
	<p><b>Risk Description:</b> The Council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable adult or child.</p> <p><b>Causes</b> Lack of adherence to procedures, poor practice, lack of capacity.</p> <p><b>Consequences</b> Culpable for harm or fatality of vulnerable person. Litigation. Financial costs. Reputational damage.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> 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. <b>RO = Mike Hennessey</b></p> <p>Strong relationship with regional Quality Surveillance Group and Care Quality Commission, collating intelligence to inform decision making around registered providers. <b>RO = Mike Hennessey</b></p> <p>Work with the Voluntary and Community Sector and Healthwatch to support our Quality Assurance function. <b>RO = Mike Hennessey</b></p> <p><u>Children and Vulnerable Adults</u> Independently chaired Bristol Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Board maintain oversight; monitoring performance, quality and learning from serious incidents; delivers training and leads on key strategic priorities, providing scrutiny and challenge where required <b>RO = Jean Pollard/ Mike Hennessey</b></p> <p>Thresholds guidance, other key policies and Quality Assurance Frameworks implemented. <b>RO = Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey</b></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. <b>RO = Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey</b></p> <p><u>Children</u> Comprehensive workforce development programme implemented <b>RO = Jean Pollard</b></p> <p><u>Housing - Reducing Homelessness</u> Working in partnership with St Mungo's Outreach Team and others to provide an adequate supply of emergency</p>	On schedule  On schedule  On schedule  On schedule  On schedule	<b>Possible/ Critical  (9)</b>	<b>Unlikely/ Critical  (6)</b>	<p><u>Vulnerable Adults</u> Develop a work plan to embed statutory processes and best practice outlined in the Care Act 2014 and align services accordingly.</p> <p>Review and update our approach to Making Safeguarding Personal using the revised 2014 guidance.</p> <p>Implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework for adults to include proposals to publish quality assurance reports.</p> <p><u>Children and Vulnerable Adults</u> 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><u>Children</u> Remodelling Social Work – ensure capacity best equipped to meet changing demands</p>	31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2015  30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2014  12 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2014  31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2015  31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2015	Mike Hennessey  Mike Hennessey  Mel Rogers  Jean Pollard/Mike Hennessey  Jean Pollard	Quarterly reporting to SLT, Cabinet as part of normal business.  ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>accommodation. A working group has been established to deliver changes necessary to tackle rough sleeping. <b>RO = Gillian Douglas</b></p> <p>Review of housing advice, prevention &amp; homelessness services has resulted in restructuring. This gives us the flexibility to respond to demand more effectively across the different customer groups.</p> <p>Actively engaging with citizens to minimise impact of Local Housing Allowance and other Welfare Reform Change by enabling households to sustain their tenancies or find alternative solutions. <b>RO = Rob Risdale</b></p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>						
<b>2. Organisational Achievement and Resilience</b>									
<p><b>Risk description:</b> 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><b>Cause:</b> Costs outweigh benefits realisation. Pace of delivery is too slow. Insufficient resilience for continued delivery of services.</p> <p><b>Consequences:</b> 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><b>Horizon:</b> Short term – 1 – 3 years</p>	Max Wide	<p>A Single Change Board, led by the Strategic Director Business Change and supported by professional expertise in the Programme Management Office has been established to oversee the change programme. The Board meets weekly and is made up of senior management including all of SLT and Service Directors. The Board monitors progress and reviews the effectiveness of the change projects including monitoring the level of savings and other benefits from the change programme.</p> <p>Progress 'exceptions' are flagged and discussed for issues resolution. .</p> <p>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 .</p> <p>Emerging risks are identified to the Change Board and decisions made/actions determined to address these risks.</p> <p><b>RO = Max Wide/Paul Arrigoni</b></p> <p><b>The Corporate Restructure Project</b> is significant in delivering the required financial savings (Target £22m this year) and is progressing. The re-structure for BG10 and above is significantly complete and is broadly on target regarding savings</p>	<p>On Schedule</p> <p>Broadly on schedule</p>	Possible/ Critical  (9)	Possible/ Significant  (6)	<p>Change Programme business case to be submitted to 1<sup>st</sup> July Cabinet.</p> <p><b>Corporate Restructure Project:</b> External review of 'spans and layering' of structure to ensure BG 10 – 15 targeted savings achieved.</p> <p><b>Bristol Workplace Project</b> Phase 1 moves start in September 2014. This will need strong leadership by Strategic Directors and a period of sustained engagement to focus on the necessary business change.</p> <p><b>Digital Programme</b> - Need to determine a strategy to support service managers in understanding how technology can assist them in transforming and streamlining their service delivery.</p> <p>Needs to be underpinned by the development of a clear customer strategy.</p>	<p>July 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p>	<p>Max Wide</p> <p>Max Wide</p> <p>Max Wide</p> <p>Max Wide</p> <p>Max Wide</p>	<p>Reviewed weekly by Single Change Board.</p> <p>Regular progress reporting to Cabinet established</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 Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>identification at this stage ( £13m savings made to date) but subject to further work to ensure targeted savings are met in BG10 – BG15 review.</p> <p>The BG9 and below review has commenced</p> <p><b>RO = R Billingham</b></p> <p>The <b>Bristol Workplace</b> project has been established to rationalise (and reduce the costs of) the Council's property portfolio and create a modern working environment . Service Directors are briefed on key tasks for completion regularly and are responsible for engaging their service teams in reviewing methods of working. Current focus is on building moves and streamlining storage requirements.</p> <p><b>RO = R Billingham/Merlin Jones</b></p> <p>The council is investing heavily in new technology to make many of its services deliverable digitally and to automate its administrative processes.</p> <p>To exploit this investment it is essential there is strong business engagement both in the design of new digital services and also to ensure the opportunities are exploited.</p> <p><b>RO = Paul Arrigoni/Gavin Beckett</b></p> <p>The <b>Category Management Project</b> has been established to reduce the cost of our external spend through targeted activities to reduce existing contract costs and renegotiate new contracts on a council wide basis. Overall savings target is £13.8m and plans are in place to achieve the first tranche of this for 2014/15.</p> <p><b>RO= Nick Hooper</b></p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule. New digital platform in place. First services to go live in July.</p> <p>On schedule</p>						
<b>3. Governance</b>									
<p><b>Risk description:</b> The Council fails to comply with internal controls and to effectively meet the framework of obligations within the statutory Annual Governance Statement and</p>	Max wide	The Council has a constitution which sets out how the council operates and its decision making processes. A full review of the constitution has been undertaken to reflect changes in legislation, the election of the Mayor and the findings of the Boundary Review.	Complete	<p><b>Probable/ Significant</b></p> <p><b>(8)</b></p>	<p><b>Possible/ Significant</b></p> <p><b>(6)</b></p>	<p>Increase understanding of the Constitution and decision making process across management team.</p> <p>Implement the improvements</p>	July 2014	Service Director Legal	DLT Quarterly



Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>the Code of Corporate Governance.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> 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><b>Consequence:</b> 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><b>Horizon:</b> Current and on going</p>		<p><b>RO = Service Director - Legal</b></p> <p>The Senior Leadership Team have now been appointed and are in post providing strengthened leadership capacity.</p> <p>Statutory Officers have been appointed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring Officer</li> <li>• Section 151 Officer</li> <li>• Director of Public Health</li> <li>• Children and Adult services</li> <li>• Senior Information Risk Owner</li> </ul> <p>The officers meet approximately six weekly with the City Director to discuss and resolves issue of governance or non compliance.</p> <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.</p> <p><b>RO = Service Director - Legal</b></p> <p>A Finance Accounting Board is in place and meets fortnightly to monitor financial governance and compliance and to tackle emerging meetings.</p> <p><b>RO = Max Wide</b></p> <p>Internal Audit complete 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><b>RO = A Mullis/ M Hency-McCarthy</b></p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>			<p>identified following the review of the scrutiny commissions following approval by Cabinet of the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scrutiny commissions to mirror Directorate structure</li> <li>• Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to focus on policy development developing a 3 year rolling plan for policy development and review.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of scrutiny meetings annually to 44 meetings.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of planning committees from 4 to 2.</li> </ul> <p>Separate formal Council business from questions to allow ample opportunity for both Member and public question forums.</p> <p>Undertake a detailed review of policies and strategy to ensure they are in line with the Mayor's priorities and ensure performance indicators are more closely aligned to these priorities.</p> <p>Strengthen Financial governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationalise the number of budget holders to improve accountability</li> <li>• Rationalise the number of cost centres.</li> <li>• Review of financial regulations and schemes of delegation.</li> </ul> <p>Policy, Strategy and Communications review to be completed</p>	<p>June 2014</p> <p>June 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p> <p>July 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p>	<p>Service Director legal</p> <p>Service Director Legal</p> <p>M Farmer</p> <p>J Ditte/Rob Woolatt</p> <p>M Farmer / 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 Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
4.	<b>Infrastructure</b>									
	<p><b>Risk description:</b> 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><b>Cause:</b> Lack of adequate strategic planning and resources. Lack of resilience to factors beyond Council's influence e.g. rapidly growing population, legal challenges, Climate change. Lack of political/community buy-in. Lack of joined up planning/decision making/effective project management.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium to long term</p>	Barra Mac Ruairí	<p><b>4.1 Transport Infrastructure</b></p> <p>i) Joint Local Transport plan in place providing a robust policy basis. <b>RO: Peter Mann</b></p> <p>ii) Legal agreements with partner authorities are in place for MetroBus programme. <b>RO: Peter Mann</b></p> <p>iii) Capital programme under continuous review to ensure sufficient funding is allocated to deliver programme. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p> <p>iv) Strong track record of securing significant grant funding from Department for Transport (DfT) for transport programmes, e.g. Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF), Cycle Ambition Fund (CAF), and Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF). <b>RO: Peter Mann</b></p> <p>v) Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) contains comprehensive programme of interventions to ensure sustainable infrastructure is delivered – however there are uncertainties around government funding. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p> <p><b>4.2 Housing</b></p> <p>i) Assess and deliver to objectively assessed housing need via effective Local Plan policies. Production of the West of England Joint Planning Strategy, taking on board the outcomes of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) <b>RO: Zoe Willcox</b></p> <p>ii) Review of Affordable Housing Delivery Framework (AHDF) Action Plan to take account of the Homes Commission recommendations. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p>	<p>On Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p>	<p>Likely / Catastrophic (20)</p> <p>Collectively if all major projects / strategies fail, the impact would be catastrophic for the council</p>	<p>Probable / Critical (12)</p>	<p>Interim SHMA findings produced. Local Plan Strategic Policies review and revisions: consultation document produced October 2015</p> <p>Affordable Housing Programme Board and Bristol Retirement Living Board receive monthly exception reports from Tim Southall and Tim Wye respectively to ensure that programmes are effectively</p>	<p>January 2015</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p>Zoe Willcox</p> <p>Alistair Reid</p>	<p>Quarterly except where indicated</p> <p>Six Monthly</p>

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p><b>4.3 Cultural / Education</b></p> <p>i) Delivering a number of strategic infrastructure projects as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). Uncertainties around Government Funding. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairi</b></p> <p>ii) Develop a Project Management Office within Major Projects to improve project delivery. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p> <p>iii) Resource planning for Economy Division to assist project delivery. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p> <p>iv) Developing a cultural infrastructure that promotes Bristol as a major European cultural destination will ensure inward investment. Strong track record of securing funding for cultural infrastructure from Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and Association for Cultural Enterprises. (ACE). This has led to planned development of the city's key cultural venues including funded projects at the Arena and Bristol Old Vic. Proposed projects include amongst others Colston Hall refurbishment, Bristol Museum and Art Gallery refurbishment. Capital programme under continuous review. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p> <p>v) School Organisation Strategy to ensure meeting of statutory duty for pupil places. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p> <p>vi) Strategic forward allocation of sufficient budget to deliver school places across city. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p>	<p>Behind Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p>			<p>implemented and annual delivery targets met.</p> <p>Develop Project Management Office</p> <p>Resource Allocation Exercise</p> <p>Decision on future direction of Colston Hall</p> <p>Plan to address funding gap for educational infrastructure requirement to be developed and implemented.</p>	<p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p>Barra Mac Ruairi</p> <p>Alistair Reid</p> <p>Alistair Reid</p> <p>Barra Mac Ruairi</p> <p>Alistair Reid</p> <p>Alistair Reid</p>	

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p><b>4.4 Energy</b></p> <p>Risk associated with damage to the National oil pipeline from the construction of the wind turbines, such as the wind turbine head coming off and splitting the pipeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of Occurrence – Extremely Low</li> <li>• Reputational Damage – High</li> <li>• Financial Damage – Catastrophic</li> </ul> <p><b>RO: Bill Edrich</b></p> <p><b>4.5 Environment</b></p> <p>i) Reputational risk associated with European Green Capital 2015, specifically related to supply chain to everyday products from an environmental / ethical perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of Occurrence – High</li> <li>• Reputational damage – High</li> <li>• Financial damage – Low</li> </ul> <p><b>RO: Bill Edrich</b></p> <p>ii) Risk associated with on-going crisis in the Ukraine and purchase of gas from Gazprom and possible sanctions and the associated termination clauses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of Occurrence – Low</li> <li>• Reputational Damage – Low</li> <li>• Financial Damage – Medium</li> </ul> <p><b>RO: Bill Edrich</b></p> <p><b>4.6 Flooding</b></p> <p>i) Joint working with South Gloucestershire. and other key agencies and stakeholders to identify preferred option for managing flood risk in the Avonmouth / Severnside Enterprise Area</p> <p><b>ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann</b></p>	<p>On schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>On Schedule</p> <p>Behind Schedule</p>			<p>Will realign and/or protect the oil pipeline from damage associated with either the wind turbine or something from the wind turbine falling and splitting the oil pipeline. In addition a decision will be undertaken regarding obtaining insurance for clean-up cost. Paper being brought to CCPB 27/06/14</p> <p>Environmental performance team to undertake audit of our supply chain concentrating on the services with the highest risk. Typically these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Products sourced from overseas developing countries</li> <li>• Products that have lots of supply chains / sub-contractors</li> <li>• Services that we procure from third parties rather than direct deliver.</li> </ul> <p>Watching brief on the on-going crisis in Ukraine and Russian involvement. Cannot mitigate against the risk at the moment, however the next contract will re-look at the termination clauses associated with sanctions, war and conflicts.</p> <p>Identify and secure necessary funding arrangements to progress stage 2 study work – development of detailed designs</p>	<p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p>Bill Edrich</p> <p>Bill Edrich</p> <p>Bill Edrich</p> <p>Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>Annual</p>

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		<p>ii) Investment in maintenance of existing flood defence infrastructure in the city centre. Feasibility study for improved City Centre defences completed <b>ROs: Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann</b></p> <p>iii) Surface water management plan in place that provides information on infrastructure at risk of surface water flooding <b>RO: Peter Mann</b></p> <p>iv) Flood Plan and Recovery Plan in place that details the Council's response to flooding <b>RO: Simon Creed</b></p> <p><b>4.7 Employment</b></p> <p>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. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p> <p>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.</p>	On Schedule			<p>Secure funding to develop business case for strategic scale flood defences (Cabinet decision due 1st July 2014)</p> <p>Continue to utilise existing data in conjunction with Met Office and Environment Agency forecast information</p> <p>Recover Plan final consultation and adoption to be completed</p> <p>Complete negotiations with Local Authorities on the business rates pooling mechanism and the allocation to EDF projects, and secure specific Council priorities such as the Arena Island &amp; BTQEZ and flood defences.</p>	<p>Immediate</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p>Zoe Willcox / Peter Mann</p> <p>Peter Mann</p> <p>Simon Creed</p> <p>Barra Mac Ruairí / Alistair Reid</p>	<p>Annual</p> <p>Annual</p>



Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
		ii) Risk associated with not achieving the required ELENA leverage against grant spend and then the requirement to repay part of the grant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of Occurrence – Low +ve</li> <li>• Reputational damage – Low</li> <li>• Financial Damage – Low</li> </ul> <b>RO: Bill Edrich</b>	Behind schedule			Monthly monitoring of the leverage spend against the actual expenditure. Control of spend especially around consultancy budget	September 2014	Bill Edrich	
		iii) Secured a commitment from Government for £11.7m to improve access to super-fast broadband for businesses. <b>RO: Stephen Hilton</b>	On Schedule			Complete quality assurance process with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).	September 2014	Stephen Hilton	
		iv) The Council has been active in shaping the economic strategy and plans of the West of England LEP as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and European Strategic Investment Framework (ESIF) for 2014-20 (prospective investment of £479 m). It has prepared a draft Employment and Enterprise Strategy for Bristol. <b>ROs: Alistair Reid / Michele Farmer</b>	Behind Schedule			Influence final stages of approval of SEP and ESIF via Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) with EU and UK Government, identify match funding for projects, and work with project owners and partners on delivery plans.	September 2014	Alistair Reid / Michelle Farmer	
		v) The Invest in Bristol and Bath (IBB) service, which promotes Bristol, its Enterprise Zones / Enterprise Areas and 5 key economic sectors to UK and overseas investors was established in 2012 with City Deal funding for 3 years to March 2015. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b>	Behind 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.	September 2014	Alistair Reid	

**5. Resilience**

<b>Risk description:</b> 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	Alison Comley	<b>The Public Health Outcomes Framework</b> has been determined which sets out how the Council, working with communities and other partners, intends to tackle the differences in the health and well being of different communities across the City. <b>RO = S Bhatti</b>	On schedule	<b>Probable/ Critical</b>  <b>(12)</b>	<b>Possible/ Critical</b>  <b>(9)</b>	Integration of existing strategies (ref infrastructure risk) to ensure our approaches provide a fully integrated and cohesive approach to people and community issues.	October 2014	M Farmer/ S Bhatti	6 monthly review by SLT.
		<b>The Health Protection Committee</b> 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. On schedule	Developing cross-council understanding of how disparate work plans can be aligned to create an effective approach to alleviating poverty in the city.			June 2015	D Robinson	Focus a 'spotlight' session on this risk at ELT in September 2014.	
			Strengthen the understanding of roles and responsibilities for the Public Health Function.			March 2015	S Bhatti	Ensure ELT spotlight session	

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>infrastructure that is in place to contribute when such an event occurs – this is considered in risk 4 – Infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> 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><b>Consequences:</b> 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><b>Horizon:</b> Long term risk horizon – 5 to 10 years.</p>		<p><b>RO = S Bhatti</b></p> <p>A <b>Neighbourhoods network</b> 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><b>RO = D Robinson, Service Director, Neighbourhoods and Communities</b></p> <p>The <b>Bristol Food Policy Council</b> is in place to ensure Bristol residents and visitors have access to healthy food that is affordable and fairly available to all and where workers involved in the food system are fairly treated, and with production, distribution, retail and supply systems that are resilient to the impacts of projected climate change and fossil fuel depletion.</p> <p><b>RO = S Hilton</b></p> <p>Bristol supports and funds organisations such as 'Outset' and 'On-site' to provide self employment/employment opportunities for individuals from less privileged communities.</p> <p><b>RO = Paul Jacobs</b></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</p> <p><b>RO – Peter Mann</b></p>	<p>On schedule and in progress</p> <p>Amber – funding pressures have resulted in no BCC lead.</p> <p>On schedule</p>			<p>Review the capacity requirements of the public health function to ensure it is adequately resourced.</p> <p>Ensure emergency planning incorporates a robust health protection response.</p> <p>Development of a city open data platform to enable an intelligence-led approach and more targeted interventions</p> <p>Recruitment of a strategic resilience officer and development of a cross-agency city resilience plan. The plan should be in place by April 2015.</p> <p>Develop methods to enhance the quality of 'real' community intelligence we have.</p>	<p>March 2015</p> <p>March 2015</p> <p>April 2015</p> <p>April 2015</p> <p>April 2015</p>	<p>S Bhatti</p> <p>S Bhatti</p> <p>S Hilton</p> <p>S Hilton</p> <p>D Robinson</p>	<p>includes public health issues.</p>
<b>6 Finance</b>									
<p><b>Risk description:</b> Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan but particularly to deliver the £76m savings included in this plan.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Failure to achieve required savings. Pension deficit not controlled. Inadequacy of cash resources.</p>	Nicola Yates	<p>Three year financial plan has been developed, consulted on and approved. The three year financial plan is aligned to the Mayor's vision/objectives.</p> <p><b>RO = S151 Officer</b></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 this with £14m savings identified from corporate restructure to date with the aim of £22m by the end of the BG</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>On schedule</p>	Possible/ Critical  (9)	Possible/ Significant  (6)	<p>Re-examine/ refresh budget assumptions and review delivery of savings forecasts</p> <p>Budgeting timetable to be determined and agreed with SLT/Cabinet</p> <p>Peer to Peer Challenge of Directorate budgets.</p> <p>Increase general fund reserves to</p>	<p>July 2014</p> <p>June 2014</p> <p>August 2014</p> <p>April 2016</p>	<p>SLT/ s151 Officer</p> <p>S151 Officer</p> <p>N Yates/ SLT</p> <p>s151 Officer</p>	<p>Quarterly review and challenge by SLT via the quarterly budget monitors.</p> <p>6 monthly review by ELT for update and</p>

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<p>Unaffordable capital programme. Demographic pressures.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> Savings not achieved. Budget not met. Financial shortfall. Unplanned reductions in services. Corporate objectives not met. Lack of organisational resilience</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>		<p>0 – 9 review) <b>RO = Max Wide</b></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. <b>RO = s151 Officer</b></p> <p>Changes to the budget or financial plan are centrally controlled and subject to Finance Director approval. <b>RO = s151 Officer</b></p> <p>Capital Programme Board routinely reassesses and challenges the capital commitment and project slippage. <b>RO = Barra Mac Ruairi</b></p> <p>A financial calendar 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. Calendar reviewed by Resources Scrutiny Commission in April 2014. <b>RO = S151 Officer</b></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>			£15m by 2016/17 to improve financial resilience.			<p>focus session.</p> <p>Reserves position – annual review by SLT.</p>
<b>7. Educational Attainment</b>									
<p><b>Risk description:</b> Failure to focus and prioritise resources to effect the changes necessary to ensure the equality of educational opportunities across all ages and all communities.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Strong private education sector in adjacent environment. Failure to combat centralised political dogma.</p> <p><b>Consequences:</b> Inequalities are not addressed. Schools do not improve fast enough in both GCSE and A levels. Impairment of life chances for Bristol citizens, ie</p>	John Readman	<p>Revised structure – realigning capacity to enhance delivery of core functions <b>RO = Paul Jacobs</b></p> <p>Trading with Schools is strengthening links with schools and emphasis is on challenge and improvement <b>RO = Paul Jacobs</b></p> <p>Implementation of the revised Inclusion Strategy will ensure robust focus on equality of access. <b>RO = Paul Jacobs</b></p> <p>The Children and Families Board focus on improving outcomes, with strategic oversight of priority areas and taking joint action accordingly. <b>RO = Paul Jacobs</b></p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p> <p>On schedule</p>	<p><b>Possible/ Critical</b></p> <p><b>(9)</b></p>	<p><b>Unlikely/ Critical</b></p> <p><b>(6)</b></p>	<p>Development of Learning City Board, strengthening school to school partnerships, with focus on outcomes.</p> <p>Education &amp; Skills Commission launch and implementation of recommendations and 14-19 Review action plan</p> <p>Delivery of 'Review of LA' Scrutiny Commission recommendations – developing role of scrutiny and strengthening governance arrangements [</p>	<p>30/09/14</p> <p>30/09/14</p> <p>30/09/14</p>	<p>Paul Jacobs</p> <p>Paul Jacobs</p> <p>Paul Jacobs</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 Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
reduced earnings capacity/lifelong dependency on benefits. Divided City. Reputation tarnished.  <b>Horizon:</b> Medium term									
<b>8. Commissioning</b>									
<b>Risk description:</b> The Council fails to commission strategically, and services do not meet the needs of the users/communities.  <b>Cause:</b> Inadequate joint commissioning arrangements. Mechanisms are not in place to shape the market, and to fully consult/engage and understand needs of service users and communities. Commissioning in silos. Require to rethink the way services can be provided.  <b>Consequences:</b> Poor quality and inefficient services. Unable to re-design services. Damage to reputation.  <b>Horizon:</b> Medium term	John Readman	All commissioning activity operates around the whole ' <i>commissioning cycle</i> ' ensuring a strong understanding of demand and user need, comprehensive market analysis and development, and rigorous management of contractual relationships with internal and external providers. <b>RO = Russell Ward</b>	On schedule	Possible/ Critical  (9)	Unlikely/ Critical  (6)	Consideration will be given to restructuring to bring together expert commissioners from all areas of business. There may be potential for a single team to drive quality and consistency, and facilitate the seeking of opportunities for joint and combined outcomes in all commissioning, re-commissioning and decommissioning activity.  Work to clarify direction corporately, moving towards strengthened commissioner/ provider partnerships as a corporate body.	31/03/15	Netta Meadows	ELT to review quarterly as part of quarterly risk register review.
		All contracts are regularly reviewed for both performance and value, and commissioners follows up complaints and where appropriate safeguarding issues promptly and with robust actions. The new structure in People includes dedicated quality assurance and business relationship posts to support these functions. <b>RO = Russell Ward</b>	On schedule				31/03/15	Netta Meadows	
		The City Council has recently reorganised, with renewed focus on commissioning in the largest directorate (People). There is also a key strategic programme (Category Management) which is part of the Council wide transformation programme and through this there is improved consistency and practice. <b>RO = Nick Hooper</b>	On schedule						
		Strengthened governance in the People Directorate for commissioning in partnership continues to be developed via the Children & Families Board which brings together all major commissioning partners with a focus on preventive and early help services. <b>RO = Netta Meadows</b>	On schedule						
<b>9. Partnerships</b>									
<b>Risk description:</b> a) Failure to put in place effective partnership working to achieve cross-boundary ambitions and b) Failure to optimise joint	Nicola Yates	There is commitment from the leaders of the West of England Partnership to strengthen joint working arrangements for cross boundary working including establishment of a West of England Joint Leaders Board.	On schedule	Likely/ Significant  (10)	Probable/ Significant  (8)	Further develop an effective accountability framework for wider partnership working to ensure it is clear what each partner is expected to contribute.  Identify strategic and other partners	31/03/2015	M Farmer	ELT to review 6 monthly.  Possible focus session at ELT on
		The Constitution of each partner is being							

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Likelihood / Impact	Target Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>working/ partnership working arrangements in pursuit of maximising achievement of the Council's objectives.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> 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><b>Consequences</b> Lost opportunities – strategic and financial. Failure to deliver on budget, on time. Failure to agree sub-regional aims.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium Term</p>		<p>changed to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the Joint Leaders Board. Proposed changes being considered by Full Council in June 2014.</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><b>RO = Nicola Yates</b></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><b>RO = Nicola Yates</b></p>	Complete			<p>and implement accountability framework. Gain understanding of differing priorities of each partner.</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>31/03/2015</p> <p>31/03/2015</p> <p>On-going</p>	<p>M Farmer</p> <p>M Farmer</p> <p>Nicola Yates</p>	<p>whether we should be increasing partnership working.</p>