People Scrutiny Commission
Supplementary Information

Date: Thursday, 22 October 2020
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting with Public Access via YouTube

10. Risk Report Q1

(Pages 2 - 13)

People Scrutiny Commission
22nd October 2020

Report of: **Executive Director People**

Title: **People Directorate Risk Report Update**

Ward: **Citywide**

Officer Presenting Report: Jacqui Jenson
Executive Director People

Contact Telephone Number:

Recommendation

The People Commission are asked to consider the quarter 1 2020-21 review of the People Directorate Risk Report and comment on any areas of interest.

Summary

The risks defined in this report are captured by service sections within the People Directorate:

The following represent the most the key risks for People as at June 2020:

<u>**Threats**</u>

1) Safeguarding Vulnerable Children
2) Safeguarding Adults at Risk with Care and support needs.
3) Adult and Social Care (ASC) Transformation programme 2020/21 – 2021/22
4) SEND

1. **Policy**

   1.1. 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 Assurance Policy which requires strategic risks to the Council, and details of how they are managed, to be recorded in the form of the Corporate Risk Report and Directorate Risk Report.

   1.2. The Corporate Risk Report is scrutinised by the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis, it was agreed at Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, that the Directorate Risk Registers will also be scrutinised by each Directorate scrutiny quarterly. The Directorate Risk Reports will also be available to the Audit Committee to provide the Audit Committee with assurance that Directorate Risk Reports are in place and effectively scrutinised.

2. **Risk Management and the Corporate Risk Report (CRR)**

   1.3. As part of good governance, the Council manages and maintains a register of its significant risks within the Service Risk Registers (SRR) assigning named individuals as responsible officers for ensuring the risks and their treatment measures are monitored and effectively managed.

   1.4. The Corporate Risk Report (CRR) is a critical tool for capturing and reporting on risk activity, the organisations risk profile and an integral element of the Council's internal governance and performance frameworks. The attached Directorate Risk Report sets out a summary from the Service Risk Registers (SRR) which are the working documents. The data within the SRRs is used to inform the business of the threats and opportunities it faces in delivering outcomes and services to the Council. It is used to ensure the organisation operates effectively and Leadership Teams take assurance that all necessary steps are being taken to ensure the risks are managed to a level acceptable to them. The Corporate Risk Report was last reported to Cabinet on 1st September 2020 and was reported to the Audit Committee on 28th September 2020.

3. **Consultation**

   a. **Internal -** First to fourth tier managers, Leadership Team, Corporate Leadership Team, Cabinet Member, Finance, Governance and Performance.
   b. **External -** None

4. **The People Directorate Risk Report (DRR)**

   4.1. The DRR informs the council on significant risks to the achievement of the People Directorate Objectives to ensure it is anticipating and managing key risks to optimise the achievement of the council's objectives and prioritise actions for managing those risks. The DRR provides assurance to management and Members that the People significant risks have been identified and arrangements are in place to manage those risks within the tolerance levels agreed.

   4.2. The DRR is an important tool in managing risk. It aims to provide an overview of the significant risks facing People and how they are being managed. The DRR attached to this report at Appendix A is the latest formal iteration following a review by members of the council's People Executive Directors Management Team (EDM) in June 2020. The risk review has included managers from across the Council.

   4.3. The DRR was reviewed by the People EDM in June 2020. The directorate reports quarterly to Members, ensuring that they are aware of the critical and high level risks facing the directorate and how the council are ensuring these are effectively managed.

4.4. As strategic planning, resource management and resilience processes are strengthened; the identification, management and communication of risk to the achievement of the Council's strategic priorities and objectives will continue to embed.

4.5. The DRR was developed following:
- Risk identification and assignment of a risk owner who is responsible to ensure each risk is effectively managed; current mitigations and further strategies to manage risk are in place to ensure the risk is identified and interventions planned,
- Review by EDM to ensure risk levels are correctly identified; and tolerance risk levels where stated are acceptable.

4.6. The People Directorate Risk Report is attached at Appendix A. The register is presented in the standard format agreed by CLB and uses the risk management methodology in the Risk Management Assurance Policy agreed by Cabinet in January 2019.

4.7. Appendix A the risk matrix, guidance parameters used to measure likelihood and impact and the supporting scoring criteria are set out on pages 14 and 15 and will assist Members in understanding risk levels recorded in the report.

4.8. The DRR sets out the critical and high rated risks. All other business risks reside on the People Service Risk Registers (SRR). The People Directorate Risk Report (DRR) as June 2020 contains:

Threat Risks
• 0 critical
• 2 high
• 2 new - medium
• 1 closed - replaced

4.9. The following paragraphs summarise the key changes to the People Risk Register since its last presentation:

High threat risks

There are two high threat risks:

- PDRR2: Safeguarding Vulnerable Children. The risk rating being 2x7 (14) high risk
- PDRR3: Safeguarding Adults at Risk with Care and support needs. The risk rating being 2x7 (14) high risk

New threat risks

There are two new threat risks:

- PDRR7: SEND. The risk rating being 2x5 (10) medium risk.
- PDRR1: Adult and Social Care (ASC) Transformation programme 2020/21 – 2021/22 (Previously Better Lives Programme). The risk rating being 2x5 (10) medium risk.

All identified risks were reviewed in light of the revised scoring and set the performance for future reviews. All risks on the People DRR have management actions in place. The DRR is currently subject to a refresh during 2020.

As with all risks, it is not possible to eliminate the potential of failure entirely without significant financial and social costs. The challenge is to make every reasonable effort to mitigate and manage risks effectively, and where failure occurs, to learn and improve.

Further details are contained in Appendix A: The summary of the risks are set out on pages 1 to 4 including controls and management actions, a summary of risk performance on page 5, the risk matrix on page 6 and the risk scoring criteria on page 7. A more in-depth risk register is available on request.

5. Public Sector Equality Duties

5a)   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.

5b)   No equalities assessment necessary for this report.

Appendices:

Appendix A – People Directorate Risk Report - The summary of the risks are set out on pages 1 to 4 including controls and management actions, a summary of risk performance on page 5, the risk matrix on page 6 and the risk scoring criteria on page 7.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985
Background Papers:

Risk Management Assurance Policy

Directorate Risk Register as at June 2020 – Threat Risks to the achievement of Bristol City Councils Objectives.										
Risk title and description	**What we have done**	**Performance**	**Current Risk Level**			**What we are doing**	**Tolerance Risk Level**		
			Likelihood	**Impact**	**Risk Rating**		**Likelihood**	**Impact**	**Risk Rating**
PDRR1: Adult and Social Care (ASC) Transformation programme 2020/21 – 2021/22 **(Previously Better Lives Programme)** Failure to deliver the required outcomes and savings from the new 2020/21 ASC transformation Programme: Key potential causes are: **Wider factors impacting on Demand** • Rapid increased demand and complexity due to COVID-19. • Increase of needs due to more health services being delivered in the community without appropriate funding following the patient. • Increased complex needs that must be met under the Care Act. **Wider factors impacting on Supply** • Financial pressures on an already vulnerable provider market during sustained changes forced on provider during COVID-19. • Time to commission an embed genuine alternatives to Tier 3, long term care provision (ECH, Supported living, shared lives). • Time to commission and develop genuine alternatives to Tier 3 long term care (Home first, I.SE, reablement for all). • Ability to joint fund this supply through the use of the BCF with our health partners working in an Integrated Care System model. **Corporate Support and understanding of the programme** • Lack of corporate support priority from business support services or access to appropriate corporate investment to deliver service redesign and transformation effectively. • Critical pressures on corporate budgets lead to immediate service 'cuts' being required rather than being able to make efficiencies through long term transformation programme • Support with workforce reform and restructures becomes intractable. • Support into ASC to build a knowledge function that can interrogate the data using POWERBI and is allowed to re-profile how departmental spend is viewed and understood using the Care Ladder.	The key areas of focus have been developed by the DASS and ASC transformation team and have been presented to EDM and CLB in July 2020, as well as to the CEO and Director of Finance during their 'Deep Dive' into the ASC budget. All parties have given their support to proceed and are championing the work as a priority part of the wider corporate savings plans. The Director Adult and Social Care is currently going out to Director Management Team / wider staff team meetings to take staff through the same slides that were presented to the CEO and Director of Finance to communicate the scale and priority of this work for the department. The green light for the initial 5 areas of work has been approved and ASC transformation are formalising an action plan built on SMART objectives: 5 areas: • Strength Based Practice and Reviews. • In house service reviews. • Commissioning and Market position. • Knowledge function. Monitoring and Grip (debt recovery).	New	2	5	10	The director of transformation has put in place the following: New transformation programme board to be chaired by Executive Director of People. Each work-stream will have a Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) to ensure ownership of progress. This will be at Deputy Director (DD) and Head of Service (HoS) level. Each area will have an Operations and Commissioning lead to ensure alignment and that quality commissioning activity is driven by Operational requirements. The ASC Transformation team will take an overview and be prepared to actively work with leads at the DASS' request when needed to inject pace, knowledge and provide solutions where there are blockers in the progress/outcomes. The ASC transformation team will oversee corporate business support services input (referred to as the 'crack' team), where their expertise in IT, HR, Finance and Legal is needed to assist us programme delivery. Governance will be stripped back and simple, with an action log to monitor progress including risks and issues. Each SRO / HOS will have to attend the programme board once a fortnight, to discuss progress. Progress to be monitored by People Executive Director Meeting and ASC transformation tem programme manager will do the highlight reports to satisfy the PMO demands for clearly reportable progress.	1	5	5
Risk Owner: Director Adult Social Care.	Action Owner: Director Adult Social Care.	Portfolio Flag: Adult Social Care.				Strategy Theme: Our Organisation, Empowering others and Caring, Fair and Inclusive, Well connected, Wellbeing.			

Page 6

Directorate Risk Register as at June 2020 – Threat Risks to the achievement of Bristol City Councils Objectives.									
Risk title and description	**What we have done**	**Performance**	**Current Risk Level**			**What we are doing**	**Tolerance Risk Level**		
			Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating		Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
PDRR2: Safeguarding Vulnerable Children. The council fails to ensure that adequate safeguarding measures are in place, resulting in harm or death to a vulnerable child. Key potential causes are: • Failure to meet the requirements of the Children Act and associated legislation. • Inadequate controls result in harm. • Demand for services exceeds its capacity and capability. • Increase in complex safeguarding risks, criminal exploitation, serious youth violence and gang affiliation. • During Covid-19, in line with Govt guidelines, there is a reduction in face to face visits to families. Risk assessments are required to assess whether a face to face visit is required but not all families will receive a face to face visit where there are worries for a child. • An increase in demand of up to 5% is anticipated as a result of Covid and economic downturn, with some children more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse as a result of lost safe, stable and nurturing relationships.	The Keeping Bristol Safe Board provides independent scrutiny of children's safeguarding arrangements in the city and holds BCC and partner agencies to account. This includes delivery of Safer Communities and the Prevent Duty. BCC works with partners to effectively identify victims and perpetrators of extra-familial abuse including Child Sexual exploitation, Criminal Exploitation and Serious Violence, taking action to disrupt and protect. Bristol's published policies and procedures, comprehensive training and development and monthly professional supervision help ensure safe practice and adequate control of risks. Bristol has invested in an integrated localities and team around the school and family approach aimed at meeting the needs of children and families at the earliest point. Children and Families' Services invests in its workforce and provides career progression opportunities. Bristol has established Violence Reduction Unit focussing on prevention, disruption and recovery from serious youth violence and is working with the University of Bedfordshire to develop its approach to contextual safeguarding in the city.	↔	2	7	14	Information sharing and analysis to improve our ability to understand and respond to children at risk of criminal exploitation and going missing. In response to identified and increasing risk of serious youth violence and criminal exploitation a multiagency plan is in place and will be monitored by the Serious Youth Violence Exec Group. Service Delivery Plans for 2020-21 have been reviewed and set out further actions to mitigate risks identified and deliver on our ambitions for children and families.	1	7	7
Risk Owner: Executive Director People, Director Children's and Families Services.	Action Owner: Director Children's and Families Services.		Portfolio Flag: Children and Young People.			Strategy Theme: Our Organisation, Empowering and Caring, Wellbeing.			

Directorate Risk Register as at June 2020 – Threat Risks to the achievement of Bristol City Councils Objectives.											
Risk title and description	**What we have done**	**Performance**	**Current Risk Level**			**What we are doing**	**Tolerance Risk Level**				
			Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating		Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating		
PRR3: Safeguarding Adults at Risk with Care and support needs. The council fails to ensure adequate safeguarding measures are in place, Adults at risk. Key potential causes are: • Adequacy of its controls. • Management and operational practices. • Demand for its services exceeded its capacity and capability. • Poor information sharing. • Lack of capacity or resources to deliver safe practice. • Failure to commission safe care for adults at risk. • Failure to meet the requirements of the "Prevent Duty" placed on Local Authorities.	The Adults Safeguarding Board has been reconstituted into the Keeping Bristol Safe Board which also includes responsibility for Children and Community Safety. The Board has senior executive representation and will ensure a strong focus on strategic matters of concern. The constitution for the Board has been confirmed and it will meet regularly and have oversight of safeguarding priorities. Safeguarding improvement plans are in place for Older People, Physical Disability and Disabled Children and the Capability framework for safeguarding and the Mental Capacity Act have been introduced. The Adult Change Programme 'Better Lives' Transforming Care Programme has been established to implement policy objectives of moving people into more suitable care settings. We have an active strategy in place to attract, recruit and retain social workers through a variety of routes with particular emphasis on experienced social workers. The Adult South West Recruitment and Retention Strategy has been drafted, the risks and costs identified. The strategy will be presented through the Decision Pathway. Regular strategies and campaigns support the recruitment and retention of high calibre social workers and managers, with competent agency social workers and managers used on temporary basis to fill vacancies. All key staff working with people directly at risk are trained in the essentials of safeguarding and BCC has an ongoing awareness-raising 'Prevent' training programme. Regular reporting on safeguarding is taking place quarterly for Directors and Cabinet Members, with an annual report for elected Members to allow for scrutiny of progress. The quality assurance framework and performance framework is routinely monitored and reported on. Focused work is being undertaken to address the backlog in safeguarding referrals and good progress has been made in bringing the number outstanding down to more manageable numbers. The Adults Delivery Group is up and running and a new Transitions theme has also been instituted.	↔	2	7	14	Social workers working with Multi-agency partners supporting Adults and elderly people to live safely within their families and communities. We are increasing capacity this year in the commissioning team to lead on monitoring quality in the care sector. Improving the quality services for those who need it and ensuring effective management oversight. It is planned to make a one off retention payment to all social workers as part of the council's retention policy. A wider review of the remuneration package for social workers is planned to improve recruitment and retention. Review of the Safeguarding Pathway. Transforming the Safeguarding Adults Board. Considering transformational approaches to home care recommissioning that may offer a more flexible employment offer. Planning placed based approaches to include working with micro providers. The Adults Delivery Group is up and running and a new Transitions theme has also been instituted. Whilst the Covid-19 'lockdown' situation has changed the complexion of adult safeguarding, it is anticipated that the likelihood and impact of incidence will be similar.'	1	7	7		
Risk Owner: Executive Director People, Director Adult Social Care.	Action Owner: Director Adult Social Care.	Portfolio Flag: Adult Social Care.				Strategy Theme: Our Organisation, Empowering others and Caring, Fair and Inclusive, Well connected, Wellbeing.					

Page 8

Directorate Risk Register as at June 2020 – Threat Risks to the achievement of Bristol City Councils Objectives.										
Risk title and description	**What we have done**	Performance	**Current Risk Level**			**What we are doing**	**Tolerance Risk Level**		
			Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating		Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating
PDRR7 : SEND Delivery of the recovery plan with agreed priorities and actions and clear milestones forming the Written Statement of Action (WSOA) following the SEND local area OFSTED inspection in October 2019. Key potential causes are: • Covid-19 delaying ability to complete actions • Increasing demands for services out weighing current capacity to clear the backlog on statutory assessments. • Judicial Review or similar legal actions causing attention to be diverted from BAU.	We are working in partnership with parent/carers, key partners including social care, health and schools to develop the Written Statement of Action, which is the comprehensive improvement plan for addressing the five priorities. Scrutiny SEND Deep dive (Evidence Day) 3 February 2020. WSOA was formally approved by Ofsted and CQC - April 2020. We have invested in priority areas - Appointed new staff in SEND and EP team. Refocussed the work of the team. We have developed an Accessible City team.	New	2	5	10	We are working with stakeholders and partners across the local area to improve services through the WSOA. The WSOA has a governance route and performance will be monitored by the SEND partnership group monthly and Children's Improvement Board bi-monthly. Following the July 2020 formal monitoring visit from the Department of Education and NHS England further visits are planned for November 2020 and March 2021. A re-inspection visit is scheduled for Autumn 2021.	1	5	5
Risk Owner: Executive Director People, Director Education and Skills.	Action Owner: Director Education and Skills	Portfolio Flag: Education and Skills.				Strategy Theme: Our Organisation, Empowering and Caring, Fair and Inclusive, Well Connected, Wellbeing			

Page 9

4

Threat Risk Performance Summary

Page	Risk ID	Risk	Risk Owner	Quarter 4 Jan – Mar 19/20		Quarter 1 Apr – Jun 20/21		Quarter 2 Jul - Sept 20/21		Quarter 3 Oct - Dec 20/21		Quarter 4 Jan - Apr 20/21	
				Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel
1	PDRR2	Safeguarding Vulnerable Children	Executive Director People, Director Children's and Families Services	2x7=14	⬌	2x7=14	⬌						
2	PDRR3	Safeguarding Adults at Risk with Care and support needs	Executive Director People, Director Adult Social Care	2x7=14	⬌	2x7=14	⬌						
3	PDRR7	SEND	Executive Director People and Director Education and Skills			2x5=10	New						
4	CRR1	Adult and Social Care (ASC) Transformation programme 2020/21 – 2021/22 (Previously Better Lives Programme)	Executive Director People and Director Adult Social Care			2x5=10	New						

Risk Performance Summary closed / replaced risks

Status	Risk ID	Risk	Risk Owner	Quarter 4 Jan – Mar 19/20		Quarter 1 Apr – Jun 20/21		Quarter 2 Jul - Sept 20/21		Quarter 3 Oct - Dec 20/21		Quarter 4 Jan - Apr 20/21	
				Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel	Rating	Travel
Replaced	PDRR1	Better Lives Programme	Executive Director People, Director Adult and Social Care	3x7=21	Closed	Risk revisited and replaced by Adult and Social Care (ASC) Transformation programme 2020/21 – 2021/22 page 12.							

Risk Scoring Matrix

		Threat Impact (Negative risks)				Opportunity Impact (Positive Risk)					
Threat Likelihood	Almost certain	4	4 (Low)	12 (Medium)	20 (High)	28 (Critical)	28 (Significant)	20 (High)	12 (Medium)	4 (Low)	4	Almost certain
	Likely	3	3 (Low)	9 (Medium)	15 (High)	21 (High)	21 (High)	15 (High)	9 (Medium)	3 (Low)	3	Likely
	Unlikely	2	2 (Low)	6 (Medium)	10 (Medium)	14 (High)	14 (High)	10 (Medium)	6 (Medium)	2 (Low)	2	Unlikely
	Rare	1	1 (Low)	3 (Low)	5 (Medium)	7 (Medium)	7 (Medium)	5 (Medium)	3 (Low)	1 (Low)	1	Rare
			1	3	5	7	7	5	3	1		Opportunity Likelihood
			Minor	Moderate	Major	Critical	Exceptional	Significant	Modest	Slight		

Threat Level	Opportunity Level	Level of Risk	Actions Required
1-4	1-4	Low	May not need any further action / monitor at the Service level.
5-12	5-12	Medium	Action required, manage and monitor at the Directorate level.
14-21	14-21	High	Must be addressed - if Directorate level consider escalating to the Corporate Risk Report, if Corporate consider escalating to the Cabinet Lead.
28	28	Critical / Significant	Action required - escalate if a Directorate level risk, escalate to the Corporate Level, if Corporate bring to the attention of the Cabinet Lead to confirm action to be taken.

Page 11

6

Page 12

Current and Tolerance risk ratings: The 'Current' risk rating for both threats and opportunities refer to the current level of risk taking into account any strategies to manage risk - management actions, controls and fall back plans already in place. The 'Tolerance' rating represents what is deemed to be a realistic level of risk to be achieved once additional actions have been put in place. On some occasions the aim will be to contain the level of the risk at the current level.

Positive Risks (Opportunities): Where the risk is an opportunity, a cost benefit analysis is required to determine whether the opportunity is worth pursuing, guided by the score for the matrix, e.g. an opportunity with a score of 28 would be pursued as it would offer considerable benefits for little risk.

LIKELIHOOD AND IMPACT RISK RATING SCORING

Likelihood Guidance

Likelihood	Likelihood Ratings 1 to 4			
	1	2	3	4
Description	Might happen on rare occasions.	Will possibly happen, possibly on several occasions.	Will probably happen, possibly at regular intervals.	Likely to happen, possibly frequently.
Numerical Likelihood	Less than 10%	Less than 50%	50% or more	75% or more

Severity of Impact Guidance (Risk to be assessed against <u>all</u> of the Categories, and the highest score used in the matrix).

Impact Category	Impact Levels 1 to 7			
	1	3	5	7
Service provision	Very limited effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Impact can be managed within normal working arrangements.	Noticeable and significant effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Effect may require some additional resource, but manageable in a reasonable time frame.	Severe effect on service provision or a Corporate Strategic Plan priority area. Effect may require considerable /additional resource but will not require a major strategy change.	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.
Communities	Minimal impact on community.	Noticeable (positive or negative) impact on the community or a more manageable impact on a smaller number of vulnerable groups / individuals which is not likely to last more than six months.	A more severe but manageable impact (positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups / individuals which is not likely to last more than twelve months.	A lasting and noticeable impact on a significant number of vulnerable groups / individuals.
Environmental	No effect (positive or negative) on the natural and built environment.	Short term effect (positive or negative) on the natural and or built environment.	Serious local discharge of pollutant or source of community annoyance that requires remedial action.	Lasting effect on the natural and or built environment.
Financial Loss / Gain	**Under £0.5m**	**Between £0.5m - £3m**	**Between £3m - £5m**	**More than £5m**
Fraud & Corruption Loss	Under £50k	Between £50k - £100k	Between £100k - £1m	More than £1m
Legal	No significant legal implications or action is anticipated.	Tribunal / BCC legal team involvement required (potential for claim).	Criminal prosecution anticipated and / or civil litigation.	Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation (> 1 person).
Personal Safety	Minor injury to citizens or colleagues.	Significant injury or ill health of citizens or colleagues causing short-term disability / absence from work.	Major injury or ill health of citizens or colleagues may result in. long term disability / absence from work.	Death of citizen(s) or colleague(s). Significant long-term disability / absence from work.
Programme / Project Management *(Including developing commercial enterprises)*	Minor delays and/or budget overspend but can be brought back on schedule with this project stage. No threat to delivery of the project on time and to budget and no threat to identified benefits / outcomes.	Slippage causes significant delay to delivery of key project milestones, and/or budget overspends. No threat to overall delivery of the project and the identified benefits / outcomes.	Slippage causes significant delay to delivery of key project milestones; and/or major budget overspends. Major threat to delivery of the project on time and to budget, and achievement of one or more benefits / outcomes.	Significant issues threaten delivery of the entire project. Could lead to project being cancelled or put on hold.
Reputation	Minimal and transient loss of public or partner trust. Contained within the individual service.	Significant public or partner 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.	Serious potential for enhancement of, or damage to, reputation and the willingness of other parties to collaborate or do business with the council. Dissatisfaction regularly reported through council complaints procedure. Higher levels of local or national interest. Higher levels of local media / social media interest.	Highly significant potential for enhancement of, or damage to, reputation and the willingness of other parties to collaborate or do business with the council. Intense local, national and potentially international media attention. Viral social media or online pick-up. Public enquiry or poor external assessor report.