

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**  
**Place Scrutiny Commission**  
**21<sup>st</sup> January 2016**

**Report of:** Strategic Director - Place

**Report Title:** Directorate Risk Register Review

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer presenting report:** Barra Mac Ruairi, Strategic Director - Place

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 352 5558

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission 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 / Assistant Mayor - Place

**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 Place 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. Appendix 2 provides helpful extracts from that policy to assist Members in understanding risk levels recorded in the register: The risk matrix, Guidance parameters used to measure impact and Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood.

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 Place directorate Scrutiny Commission last received the Directorate Risk Register on 13<sup>th</sup> July 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 Relocation of the Traffic Control Centre (Risk no 5)

A failure before, or during, the relocation of the Traffic control Centre from Wilder House, leading to a potential critical failure of the traffic management systems across the city.

In the longer term this move and upgrade will improve the stability of the existing traffic control systems, which are currently outdated and unsupported by the manufacturers.

2.6.2 Construction of the Hinkley Point Power Station (Risk no 6)

Hinkley Point is a significant construction project that will require a large number of staff and materials over an extended time period.

This will impact on available resources to undertake BCC capital works through;

- a) Recruitment and retention of projects and programmes staff; particularly Project Managers.
- b) Lack of labour (at all levels) and materials impacting on delivery of our capital programmes.

2.7 No risks have been removed from the register since the last review.

2.8 Risk levels have remained unchanged in the following areas:

2.8.1 Programme Delivery

2.8.2 Service Delivery (Staff Resources)

2.8.3 Service Delivery (Financial Resources)

2.8.4 Service Delivery (Governance)

### **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 Place Directorate Risk Register

Appendix 2 Risk Matrix, Guidance parameters used to measure impact and  
Guidance parameters used to measure likelihood

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

Background Papers          None.

# PLACE DIRECTORATE RISK REGISTER



## Situation as at Quarter 2: 2015/16

### Directorate Risks:

1. Programme Delivery
2. Service Delivery (Staff Resources)
3. Service Delivery (Financial Resources)
4. Service Delivery (Governance)
5. Traffic Control Centre
6. Construction of the Hinkley Point Power Station

**NB:** Place also inputs into three Corporate Risks (CRR 4 – Infrastructure; and parts of CRR 5 – Resilience (Joint Local Transport Plan); and CRR 6 – Finance (Capital Programme Board)).

A note summarising the Corporate Risk Matrix / Ratings is appended.

## Place Directorate Risk Register (DRR) - Quarter 2: 2015/16

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period	
<b>1</b>	<b>Programme Delivery</b>										
	<p><b>Risk description:</b> The Place Directorate is responsible for the delivery of a large range of Projects and Programmes, to support delivery of Corporate Strategies and Policies, and services across the City Council. Their successful delivery is dependent on a range of factors, and so each project / programme has its own risks many which are addressed by specific risk registers embodied within the management of the project / programme. However, there are some cross-cutting and generic issues which are addressed by this risk.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Lack of effective programme governance, inadequate strategic programme planning, management and resources. Need to ensure that the delivery of the programmes / projects and the mitigations identified are embedded within the relevant Service / Team plans and PMDS'.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> Failure to deliver programmes / projects on time and in accordance with the project specifications, could impact on service delivery across the organisation, and the failure to deliver essential infrastructure</p>	<b>Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>Programme Governance</b> Good governance is essential to ensure that a strategic overview is maintained over the wide range of programmes that the Directorate is responsible for, and to ensure that they are properly managed to ensure successful delivery of the programme and to ensure the identified benefits are realised.		<b>Probable / Critical</b> <b>12</b>	<b>Possible / Critical</b> <b>9</b>				
			a. A Place Programmes, Projects & Performance Board (PPP) has been established to manage the programmes being delivered by the Directorate, consisting of members of the Directorate Leadership Team and chaired by the Strategic Director.	Achieved					Meets Monthly	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
			b. The Corporate Capital Programme Board routinely reassesses and challenges the capital commitment and project slippage. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	On Schedule					Meets Monthly	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
			<b>1.2</b>	<b>Major Projects Unit</b> The PPP Board has identified the need for support to ensure that the directorate portfolio is managed at a strategic level; and to provide targeted additional support to individual projects and programmes as required. <b>RO: Alistair Reid</b>	On Schedule				The Service Manager is now in post; the agreed establishment of the Major Projects Unit will be taken forward in the context of the work on the Alternative Service Delivery Model (ASDM).	Mar 2016	Alistair Reid

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>projects could impact on the ability of the City 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.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium to long term</p>		<p><b>1.3 Programme Management</b></p> <p>Effective management is essential to the successful delivery of the programmes, to ensure the effective use of resources and to ensure compliance with best practice, and with due regard to corporate policies and practices.</p> <p>Each Programme will be managed have an identified Programme Manager, and Board, and will prepare regular Highlight reports identifying progress and issues.</p> <p><b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p>	On Schedule			Ongoing compliance	Monthly	Alistair Reid	Quarterly
			<p><b>1.5 Lack of Financial Resources</b></p> <p>The ranges of programmes are financed through a number of different finance streams, including fee income derived from clients.</p> <p>Any shortfall in income could impact the ability to deliver a project / programme on time.</p> <p>Budget over-runs could also endanger delivery of programmes if costs exceed the funds available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close management of budgets form part of the regular Highlight Reports.</li> <li>• Forecasting and escalation of concerns at early stage.</li> </ul> <p><b>RO: All Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao</b></p>	On Schedule			<p>Review is currently underway regarding the presentation of financial information on the Programme Highlight Report. Due to the complex nature of funding streams for each of the programme, funding and budget monitoring need to be understood and implemented on subprojects basis.</p> <p>TZH and RG have undertaken a deep dive exercise using the BTQEZ as an example programme, and are currently undertaking deep dive work across the Energy programmes, to be followed in due course by the other programmes within the Place Directorate's programmes portfolio.</p>	Monthly	All Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao	Quarterly

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<b>1.6 Risk Management</b> It is essential that the management of Projects and Programmes includes a robust and consistent approach to risk management to optimise successful delivery.  A corporate approach to risk management has been established that should be adopted at all levels of the organisation, and should be established with the current risk management used for projects and programmes.  <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	On Schedule			Ongoing Compliance	Ongoing	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
<b>2 Service Delivery (Staff Resources)</b>										
	<b>Risk description:</b> Lack of staff with the relevant skills to deliver the Directorate Work Programme / Corporate Plan Outcomes, and the ability to respond quickly to changing organisational needs.  <b>Cause:</b> The Council has gone through an unprecedented period of change, with has involved a complete restructuring, significant reductions in budgets and the loss of a large number of staff, a	Barra Mac Ruairí	<b>2.1 Workforce Planning</b> There is a need for a more strategic approach to resource management, ensuring the ability to move staff across the organisation to deal with work demands, and to take a longer term approach to staff training and development "growing" the skills that will be required in the future.  <b>RO: All Service Directors and Mark Williams</b>	On Schedule	<b>Probable / Critical</b>  <b>12</b>	<b>Possible / Critical</b>  <b>9</b>	Good progress has been made including the development of a set of solutions to address recruitment and retention issues in planning.  Further work being undertaken to develop a clear plan of CPD requirements for staff at all levels. This will be completed in December 2015.	December 2015.	Mark Williams	Quarterly
					No Change from Q1					

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>number of who had substantial experience and critical skills, and the re-focussing on the organisation in line with the new Corporate Plan.</p> <p>There is a lack of a strategic approach to workforce planning and development, designed to maximise staff mobility and the development of a longer term approach to staff training and development “growing” the skills that will be required in the future.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b></p> <p>The Directorate is less able to deal with peaks in demand / new or urgent work demands, which could lead to inability to deliver services on target, or to the required standard.</p> <p>The need to deliver some services through contractors can lead to less flexibility.</p> <p>Reduced pool of skilled staff to deliver specialised functions, and to work on programmes and projects.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b></p> <p>Medium to long term</p>		<p><b>2.2 Business Planning</b></p> <p>A robust and co-ordinated approach to Business Planning will support the development of service plans that prioritise service delivery in line with available resources and corporate priorities, and provide a mechanism to transfer resources, where required, to high priority areas of the business.</p> <p><b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p>	On Target			Strategic alignment between Corporate Plan and the Mayoral Vision through to My Performance target setting for individual members of staff.	Ongoing	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
			<p><b>2.3 Staff Supervision and Performance Management</b></p> <p>A robust and consistent approach to individual staff development and performance management will help deliver the work programme.</p> <p><b>RO: All Service Directors</b></p>	On Schedule			The implementation of a new corporate staff performance management system (My Performance) and the associated management training should help improve performance, identifying clear individual performance targets and staff training and development needs.	Ongoing	All Service Directors	Quarterly
			<p><b>2.4 Programmes, Projects and Performance (PPP) Board</b></p> <p>The PPP board provides a forum to pull together the full range of performance / programme management issues, aligned to requirements of the Corporate Plan. This should enable a strategic approach to resource management, identifying where resources are required, prioritising need and taking the appropriate action to address resource issues as they develop.</p> <p><b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p>	Ongoing			Good progress achieved	Monthly	Barra Mac Ruairí	Monthly

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<b>3</b>	<b>Service Delivery (Financial Resources)</b>									
	<p><b>Risk description:</b> The Council is going through an unprecedented period of change, with a need to make substantial savings as identified through the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Within the MTFP there are expectations in-built as regards to income from fees, charges and other sources – should this income not be achieved there is a likelihood of an impact on service provision, and the delivery of the Capital Programme.</p> <p>With the creation of new structures, and the loss of experienced staff, there may be a pressure to recruit additional resources, or employ consultants, to deliver - which could place pressure on the MTFP.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> With fewer resources and limited budgets the organisation is less able to deal with changing / additional without placing additional demands on the MTFP.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium to long term</p>	<b>Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	<p><b>3.1 Budget Management</b></p> <p>Strict budget management will be required, in parallel with performance and programme management, to ensure that an overview of these inter-related issues is maintained.</p> <p>Issues need to be identified early, so that that appropriate action can be taken to address any pressures developing, either by the re-allocation of resources or the reduction in service levels in lower priority areas.</p> <p>The Programmes, Projects &amp; Performance (PPP) Board provides a forum to pull together the full range of financial, performance and programme management issues, aligned to requirements of the Corporate Plan, enabling a strategic approach to financial management, prioritising need and taking early action to address financial issues as they develop.</p> <p><b>RO: All Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao</b></p>	On schedule / Improving	<b>Probable / Critical</b>  <b>12</b>	<b>Possible / Critical</b>  <b>9</b>	<p>Processes are now in place for Finance Support team to be more involved in the monthly monitoring for both Revenue and Capital Budgets.</p> <p>Monthly monitoring and forecast is being discussed at Divisional Management Team meetings and any issues will be escalated as early as possible.</p> <p>Budget adjustments process has identified £5.6m of in-year savings which as yet have not been resolved.</p> <p>From the programme perspective, deep dive work commenced with the BTQEZ programme, and is currently focussing on the Energy programmes, followed by the other Place programmes in due course. The deep dive work will ensure that there is a more robust approach re programme financial and performance management, and it will eventually be triangulated back to the regular monitoring on the revenue and capital budget reporting.</p>	Monthly	All Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao	Monthly
					<b>No Change from Q1</b>					

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<b>3.2 Business Planning</b> A robust and co-ordinated approach to Business Planning will support the development of service plans that prioritise service delivery in line with available resources and corporate priorities, and provide a mechanism to transfer resources, where required, to high priority areas of the business. <b>RO: All Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao</b>	On schedule / Improving			The Directorate as part of the corporate change plan process is undertaking the development of a Directorate Sustainable Business Plan.			
<b>4 Service Delivery (Governance)</b>										
	<b>Risk description:</b> The work programme within Place is reliant on a number of different governing / decision making bodies, including the Mayor, Full Council, Boards and Partnerships, and it is essential that a good working relationship and a consensus is maintained to ensure that the various work streams can be delivered. <b>Cause:</b> Different Stakeholders may have agendas / priorities that do not fully accord with those of the City Council; or the need to await decisions in a range of different forums may impose delays and affect established project / programme plans. <b>Consequence:</b>	Barra Mac Ruairí	<b>4.1 Political Leadership</b> Policies and decisions in a number of areas rest with the Mayor, the Cabinet and/or Full Council; with an established Scrutiny Function that provides challenge to decisions made. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	On Schedule	Possible / Significant 6	Possible / Significant 6		Ongoing	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
			<b>4.2 Corporate Plan</b> The work of Bristol City Council is focussed on delivering the Corporate Plan, which provides a strategic framework and priorities. The PPP Board has identified where Programmes support specific Corporate Priorities, or where they deliver on a wider, cross-cutting basis, and this can be used to help prioritise delivery of the overall work programme. <b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b>	On Schedule			This needs to be kept under review, and new programmes allocated as appropriate, to ensure that the overall portfolio remains relevant to the strategic aims of the City Council.	Ongoing	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>The inability to reach a decision could jeopardise delivery of a project, which could impact on the broader area beyond the boundaries of Bristol City Council, and potentially lead to additional or aborted costs, and bring the process / organisation into disrepute.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium to long term</p>		<p><b>4.3 Business Planning</b></p> <p>To support delivery of the Corporate plan, and to clarify the work programmes, budgets and resource management of the business a range of strategic and operational plans are required, to establish the strategic alignment from the overarching Corporate Plan to the work of the individual. These plans include Service, Team and Programme / Project plans.</p> <p><b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p>	On Schedule				Ongoing	Barra Mac Ruairí	Quarterly
			<p><b>4.4 Management Overview</b></p> <p>Management maintain an overview of performance and delivery across the organisation through a series of established meetings, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic leadership Team (SLT)</li> <li>• Directorate Leadership Team (DLT)</li> <li>• Divisional management Team (DMT)</li> <li>• Programme Boards</li> <li>• Project Boards</li> <li>• Team meetings</li> </ul> <p>In addition, Place has developed the Programmes, Projects &amp; Performance (PPP) Board to maintain a clear overview of Programmes, Projects and Performance issues.</p> <p><b>RO: Barra Mac Ruairí</b></p>	On Schedule			Ongoing – Weekly / Monthly Cycle of meetings.	Ongoing	All Service Directors	Quarterly

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period						
<b>5</b>	<b>Relocation of the Traffic Control Centre (<i>New Directorate Risk</i>)</b>															
	<p><b>Risk Description:</b> A failure before, or during, the relocation of the Traffic Control Centre from Wilder House, leading to a potential critical failure of the traffic management systems across the city.</p> <p>In the longer term this move and upgrade will improve the stability of the existing traffic control systems, which are currently outdated and unsupported by the manufacturers.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Current ageing systems are no longer supported by manufacturer's being relocated and updated, with two currently separate systems being consolidated in the same control centre, with the potential risks of a systems failure.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> Significant city wide congestion, potential for gridlock in city centre during busy periods</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Medium to long term</p>	<b>Peter Mann</b>	<p><b>5.1 Control Room Relocation Project</b></p> <p>Approval has been given for the Control Room Relocation project that will involve the construction of an Operations Centre at 100 Temple Street, built to achieve an "accredited" environment, and including the replacement of core systems to meet the current operational requirements of the City Council.</p> <p>The project will bring together staff from the Emergency Control Centre (Brunel House), Traffic Control Centre (Wilder House) and the CCTV Control staff (John Couzens House).</p>	Cabinet approval 6 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	<b>Probable / Critical</b>  <b>12</b>	<b>Possible / Critical</b>  <b>9</b>	Project managed with appropriate governance and risk management processes in place, including regular progress reports.	August 2016		Monthly through Project Board, quarterly to PPP.						
					<b>New Risk</b>											
				a) Specialist requirements - specification of control room accommodation and systems create internal capacity and capability risk.  <b>RO Steven Pendleton</b>	New								Appropriate engagement of expert consultants			
				b) Procurement process issues impacting on timescales.  <b>RO Steven Pendleton.</b>	New								Supplier competition and value confidence through use of standard procurement frameworks, dedicated procurement resource to manage supplier contract negotiations.			
		c) Overspend / cost uncertainty.  <b>RO Peter Mann</b>	New				Establishment of risk contingency within project budget to accommodate overspend.									

Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p><b>5.2 Failure During Migration</b></p> <p>Service downtime during migration period(s) resulting in failure against CCTV and Telecare standards. Significant risk a serious incident e.g. city wide congestion, potential for gridlock in city centre during busy periods.</p> <p><b>RO Peter Mann</b></p>	New			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of business owned migration strategy.</li> <li>Procure and implement 'core' systems directly into new environment</li> </ul>			
			<p><b>5.3 Current Systems Failure</b></p> <p>Current ageing systems no longer supported by manufacturer's resulting in potential critical failure of systems with no means of repair.</p> <p>Long term solution provided through the new Operations Centre.</p> <p><b>ROs: Adam Crowther / Jackie Davies</b></p>	Live / Ongoing			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spares for some key components are held on site, some others can be obtained within 24 hours. Not all parts can be replaced and parts are no longer manufactured / supported although there is a stock of spare equipment available</li> <li>Maintenance contract with Siemens in place for 24 hour response.</li> <li>Recent issues encountered with the servers, including their use of Microsoft 2003 they is no longer supported.</li> <li>It is no longer possible to wait to replace the UTC/SCOOT servers which are most critical, and quotes have been obtained for their replacement.</li> <li>Repairs carried out on the existing servers to prolong their life.</li> </ul>	January 2016		



Ref	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Likelihood / Impact	Target Risk Likelihood / Impact	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p><b>Consequence:</b></p> <p>This will lead to difficulties in recruiting and retaining experienced project managers, and other skilled professional in the construction industry.</p> <p>There is also likely to be a shortage of labour and materials available to undertake contract work for the City Council.</p> <p>In addition, this competition may lead to increased contract prices.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b></p> <p>Medium to long term</p>		<p><b>6.3 Impact on Costs</b></p> <p>To review the potential impact on increased costs in delivering the capital programme, and to develop revised budgets to account for these increases.</p> <p><b>RO: Alistair Reid and Tian Ze Hao</b></p>	New			<p>To undertake research to enable a more informed assessment of the potential for increased costs.</p> <p>To review the capital works programme budgets, to take account of any potential impact.</p>	TBC	All affected Service Directors and Tian Ze Hao	
			<p><b>6.4 Planning &amp; Co-ordination</b></p> <p>To examine potential for reviewing the timing of works on behalf of BCC to avoid the highest levels of demand of the Hinkley Point scheme, to identify the potential avoiding competing for resources at the same time as the scheme.</p> <p>To prioritise schemes, to ensure that the projects with the highest priority, and to consider re-scheduling lower priority schemes.</p> <p><b>RO: Alistair Reid</b></p>	New			<p>Establish a working relationship with the management of the Hinkley Point construction project, to gain information in regards to their project plan and the scale and impact of each phase of the pan.</p>	TBC	Alistair Reid and Abigail Stratford	

### Corporate Risk Matrix Ratings

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
<b>Overall Risk Rating = Likelihood x Impact</b>			<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Catastrophic</b>
			1	2	3	4
			<b>Impact</b>			

### Guidance on Assessing Likelihood

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

### Guidance on Assessing Impact

Rating	Effect on service provision Potential	Potential Financial Loss / Gain	Potential Fraud & Corruption loss	Reputation	Legal	Environmental	Communities	Personal safety	
1	<b>Marginal</b>	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 implication 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	<b>Significant</b>	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	<b>Critical</b>	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>	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.