

# Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission



**Report of:** Strategic Director - Neighbourhoods

**Title:** Directorate Risk Register Review October 2016

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Alison Comley – Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 357 4357

## **Recommendation**

The Commission review and scrutinise the Directorate Risk Register as at 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2016 which is attached to this report.

## **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 intervals.

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

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



## Policy

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 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 a 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

2. **Internal**  
Directorate Leadership Team / Risk Owners / Cabinet Member – Neighbourhoods
3. **External**  
Not applicable
4. **Background – Risk Management and the Corporate Risk Register**
  - 4.1. 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.
  - 4.2. Risk Assessment is the measure of likelihood and impact on objectives of an uncertain action of event.
  - 4.3. 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.
  - 4.4. 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.
  - 4.5. The CRR is currently under review.
5. **The Directorate Risk Register**
  - 5.1. As well as Corporate Risks, Directorate Risk 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.

**5.2.** 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

**5.3.** The Neighbourhood Directorate Risk Register is attached as 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.

**5.4.** The timing of presentation of the Directorate Risk Register to Scrutiny is such that the commission 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 aid effective challenge to both sets of information.

**5.5.** The Neighbourhood Directorate Scrutiny Commission last received the Directorate Risk Register in the April 2016 Scrutiny Commission meeting. The following paragraphs summarise the key changes to the risk environment since then:

- Re-design of services within the Neighbourhoods has resulted in new risks being transferred in to the Directorate.
- New risks to the Neighbourhoods include work around the Prevention of Homelessness, Business Rate Revenue and Housing Benefit Subsidy.
- These new risks have been transferred from the Business Change and People Directorates.

## **Other Options Considered**

**6.** None necessary

## **Risk Assessment**

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

## **Public Sector Equality Duties**

None necessary for this report

## **Legal and Resource Implications**

### **Legal**

None sought

### **Financial**

#### **(a) Revenue**

None arising from this report

#### **(b) Capital**

None arising from this report

### **Land**

Not applicable

### **Personnel**

Not applicable

## **Appendices:**

Appendix 1 – Neighbourhoods 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

## Agenda Item 9 – Appendix 1

### Neighbourhoods RISK REGISTER – September 2016

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
1.	<b>Managing Health and Safety matters across the directorate</b>									
	<p><b>Risk Description:</b> Death and injury of citizens and staff as a result of BCC being a sizeable landlord or through other services use of plant.</p> <p><b>Causes</b> Fire, asbestos etc not having robust plans to deal with known hazards. Non compliance with safety regulations etc, failure of routine/planned maintenance. Failure to design safe buildings (Construction Design and Management regulations).  Operatives' use of plant and appropriate communications and guidance. Poor training. Poor maintenance of plant and equipment.</p> <p><b>Consequences</b> Death, cost of court cases, reputation, confidence.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> ongoing</p>	All N'bourhoods Service Directors	<p>CHaSM s are regularly completed and updated – all managers</p> <p>Designated officer to support managers in mitigating risks – Martin Dunphy</p> <p>Maintenance of vehicles through Transport services – Nick Gingell</p> <p>Induction training and team briefing training on safe use of plant. – all managers Refresher training provided on a 2-3 year cycle – Gillian Douglas</p> <p>Housing Delivery:</p> <p>Fire safety policy in place inc. Fire risk assessments+ accelerated programme of works to address risks/issues ongoing. (N Debbage)</p> <p>Asbestos strategy/inspection regime in place + agreed processes for safe removal/encapsulation in line with Regulations. (N Debbage)</p> <p>Rolling 1 year (gas) and 10 year (electrical) safety checks on all properties/appliances (G Durden)</p> <p>Rolling samples of communal water systems for Legionella in place Risk assessment in place for domestic systems (G Durden)</p> <p>Regular checks of lift operations (min. 6 monthly) (G Durden)</p> <p>CDM Co-ordinators in place to</p>	<p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p>	Probable/significant (8)	Probable/Significant (8)		Ongoing, via quarterly returns from Service Managers.	Steven Barrett	Annual

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
			<p>prevent/manage all H&amp;S issues on all capital and Revenue programmes (N Debbage, G Durden, Z Naylor)</p> <p>The management, testing and maintenance of all Health and safety-related issues within Neighbourhoods is a day-to-day, business as usual activity, built into works programmes and plans.</p> <p>Quarterly feedback of information from Neighbourhoods Corporate Safety Rep – Steven Barrett</p>	<p>On track</p> <p>On track</p> <p>On track</p>						
<b>2. Waste Management</b>										
	<p><b>Risk description:</b></p> <p>Ensuring effective delivery of the waste contract</p> <p><b>Cause:</b></p> <p>Poor contract management (Quality and cost), ineffective service delivery.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b></p> <p>Reputation loss, public health risk, higher costs,</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b></p> <p>Short / medium term</p>	Gillian Douglas/ Netta Meadows	<p>Bristol Waste Company awarded a 10 year agreement – Cabinet decision made August 2016 .</p> <p>Commissioning lead being recruited to develop the agreement between BCC and BWC for delivery of services including new performance indicators for each element of the integrated waste service.</p> <p>Currently a new Waste Service Agreement is being Re-drafted to cover the new arrangements as agreed at Cabinet in August. This should be in place by December 2016.</p>	<p>September 2016 – BWC is continuing to deliver domestic waste collection, street cleansing and winter maintenance with new services being taken on, on a phased basis.</p> <p>December 2016</p>	Possible/ Critical (12)	Unlikely/ Critical (6)	<p>Ongoing work redrafting new Waste Service Agreement with BWC.</p> <p>Integrated waste services agreement to be developed by January 2017.</p> <p>Preparation is underway for transfer of the Household Waste Recycling Centres to BWC.</p> <p>Planned transfer of waste disposal and treatment contracts is also underway.</p> <p>Reporting on existing performance indicators to continue through Neighbourhoods Scrutiny.</p>	<p>December 2016</p> <p>September 2016 – January 2017</p>	Netta Meadows	December 2016
<b>3. Public Health – health protection systems</b>										
	<p><b>Risk description:</b></p> <p>Failure of the health protection system, including failure to protect the public from infectious diseases and emergency incidents</p> <p><b>Cause:</b></p> <p>Fragmentation of existing systems, partners undergoing re-organisation and capacity is a</p>	Becky Pollard / Patsy Mellor	<p>The Health Protection Committee meets quarterly, chaired by the DPH to provide assurance that local plans are in place to prepare for and manage public health emergencies.</p> <p>Public Health funding approved to support EH team to address the backlog in Food Safety inspections</p>	All on track	Unlikely/ Critical (6)	Unlikely/ Critical (6)	<p>Clearly agree and outline funding arrangements for communicable disease incidents and outbreaks.</p> <p>To continue to validate existing plans and procedures, ensuring plans are effective and well-practised.</p> <p>Utilise the agreed funding and work to clear the backlog of Food Safety Inspections</p>		<p>Becky Pollard/ Thara Raj</p> <p>Sophie Prosser/Thara Raj/ Simon Creed</p> <p>Adrian Jenkins</p>	Bi-annual

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>significant issue.</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> Preventable death/ illness from infectious diseases.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> ongoing</p>		<p>Bristol Immunisation and Vaccination group has been set up and will report to the Health Protection Committee</p> <p>Environmental Health Out of Hours rota implemented.– Adrian Jenkins</p> <p>Health Protection Committee Annual Report 2015/16 completed and being taken to the HWB October 2016. The report highlights achievement, gaps and priorities in the health protection system for the next year.– Becky Pollard</p> <p>A Mass Response plan for the Bristol area is being drafted to outline the local response arrangements to health protection incidents.</p>				<p>prioritising the highest risk rated premises and new businesses.</p> <p>Public Health funding agreed and recruitment underway.</p>		Nick Carter	
<b>4. Public Health – Commissioning</b>										
	<p><b>Risk description:</b></p> <p>The current providers of children and young people’s community health services, including health visiting and school nursing, have given notice on their contract to end at 31/03/16. The new contract is currently being commissioned and due to commence 01/04/2017. These services are mandated nationally and must be delivered.</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Notice given by current provider not to extend contract until 2017</p> <p><b>Consequence:</b> An interim provider must be secured to ensure continuous service provision.</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Interim provider commenced service provision in April 2016.</p>	Becky Pollard	<p>Interim providers commissioners group has been organised led by Bristol CCG who are the lead commissioner. - Anne Colquhoun and Rebecca Cross attend this meeting.</p> <p>A provider for 2016/2017 has been secured as Sirona in partnership with AWP and Bristol Community Health.</p>	Complete	Unlikely / critical	Unlikely / critical	No further action required			

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
<b>5. Public Health – clinical safety</b>										
	<b>Risk description:</b> Failure to assure the clinical safety of services we deliver or commission.  <b>Cause:</b> Poor contract management and contract delivery  <b>Consequences:</b> Legal liability and loss of contracts. Loss of grant if fail to deliver.  <b>Horizon:</b> Until clinical governance system is established	Becky Pollard	The Director of Public Health is overseeing the development of a clinical governance framework working with Bristol CCG  Robust contract management arrangements are in place.  Preliminary meeting taken place with CCG lead for clinical governance and partnership working arrangements discussed.  System needs to be set up to formalise these arrangements.	In development   Current	Likely/ Significant (10)	Possible/ Significant (6)	Clinical governance process paper is currently being considered by NHSE and the CCG, as many of the clinical incidents which may arise will be in secondary and primary care.  Proposals include adding to existing serious incident and significant event reporting processes managed by these partners.  An internal reporting template has been developed for other providers.  Revised arrangements will be included in new and existing contracts when finalised.	October 2016	Becky Pollard/ Barbara Coleman	Quarterly
<b>6. Public Health – grant</b>										
	<b>Risk description:</b> In year cut to the public health ring fenced grant in 2015/16 and uncertainty of public health grant allocation for 2016/17.  <b>Risk</b>  Inability to meet existing public health commitments and budget alignments to support the MTFP.  Potential risk of service reductions in both mandatory and non-mandatory public health services (including sexual health, health checks, health visiting and school nursing services, drug and alcohol services)	Becky Pollard	<b>Current Risk Management</b> To lobby Department of Health through its current consultation process for a 6.2% cut in public health grant funding to all local authorities across England.  To identify potential areas of savings within the current public health budget to minimise negative impacts on the health of the local population (including underspends and reserves)  <b>Arrangements (Current Mitigation)</b>  Produce a short and medium term financial strategy to take account of funding reductions and savings requirements  6.2% in year reduction has been identified and managed within current year.	Complete			Further reductions to the ring fenced grant are likely in addition to the public health contribution to current financial situation.  The senior public health team are undertaking a thorough review of expenditure across all programme areas to identify where savings may be made or where re-distribution of resources is required.		Becky Pollard / Barbara Coleman	On-going
<b>7. Knowledge, skills and expertise gap</b>										
	<b>Risk description:</b>				Probable/	Possible/				



	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>Reduced expertise and experience resulting from current voluntary severance</p> <p><b>Cause:</b> Reduced level of knowledge and expertise within redesigned services, post restructure</p> <p>Skills shortage could result in failure to comply with statutory duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Health Officers</li> <li>• Trading Standards officers</li> <li>• Licensing officers</li> <li>• Public Protection Officers</li> <li>• Housing Officers</li> <li>• Specialist/technical staff, eg, Quantity Surveyors, Project managers</li> </ul> <p><b>Consequence:</b> Reduced capabilities to deliver services to citizens</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> Short to medium term</p>	Alison Comley	<p>Neighbourhoods Directorate ensuring that VS decisions are being made through the NLT forum (on a weekly basis) to ensure a consistent and strategic approach to decision make on the VS process.</p> <p>Identify pinch points/areas of concern within the Directorate</p>	Current	Significant (8)	Significant (6)	<p>Service area re-designs</p> <p>Continue consistent NLT re-design discussions and VS decision making</p>	Ongoing	Service Directors	December 2017
8. Housing Revenue Account – maintain a balanced HRA 30 year business plan										

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p><b>Risk description:</b> Unviability of the HRA</p> <p><b>Causes:</b> Changes to rent policy and welfare benefit reform reducing income</p> <p><b>Consequences:</b> Lack of ability to deliver planned services, requirement to cut spending plans/reduce services</p> <p><b>Horizon:</b> ongoing</p>	Steve Barrett / Mary Ryan	<p>Regular updating and external review of HRA 30-year business plan, consultation on revised strategy and resulting budget implications</p> <p>Responsible officer (RO): Mary Ryan/Steve Barrett</p>	On track	Probable/ significant (8)	Unlikely/ significant (4)	HRA budget for 2016/17 has been agreed at Cabinet. Over the year 16/17 we are undertaking extensive consultation with stakeholders on different options in order to deliver a balanced 30-year business plan from 2017.	2016/17	Nicky Debbage	Bi annual
<b>9. Tree Management – maintain a rolling programme of tree management works across the city</b>										
	<p><b>Risk description :</b> risk of trees falling as a result of failure under certain weather conditions and/or due to disease</p> <p><b>Causes :</b> the council has 100,000 trees. Severe weather conditions and/or disease can lead to tree failure.</p> <p><b>Consequences :</b> if not managed effectively a tree may fall and present a risk to the public, staff and infrastructure</p> <p><b>Horizon :</b> ongoing</p>	Di Robinson / Gemma Dando	Clear tree management process that responds to HSE and HSW Act recommendations/guidelines. Risk based approach to managing trees with trees that are deemed to be high risk being felled.		Possible/ critical	Possible/ significant	<p>Where trees are subject to diagnostic tests or close monitoring, risk assessments should be updated on Confirm from the time that regular monitoring starts and where necessary the cyclical inspection regime made more frequent for that particular tree.</p> <p>Review resourcing of tree management by services that require input from the tree Management Team e.g. Cemeteries and Crematoria</p> <p>August 2016 – no further update</p>	2016/17	Richard Ennion	Quarterly
<b>10.</b>	<b>Failure to Prevent Homelessness</b>									
	<p><b>Risk newly transferred over to Neighbourhoods</b></p> <p><b>Risk description :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Failure to prevent homelessness</li> </ul> <p><b>Causes :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welfare reform</li> <li>- Changes to private renting</li> <li>- Shortage of affordable housing</li> <li>- Non-priority individuals with</li> </ul>	Nick Hooper	Working with private sector and voluntary and community sector providers to ensure an adequate supply of emergency accommodation for families. St Mungo's Broadway is commissioned to deliver outreach services to rough sleepers and a severe weather emergency protocol (SWEP) is in place to support rough sleepers if there is severe weather. Also working with providers to develop more PRS accommodation as move-on.				<p>Develop commissioning process for emergency accommodation needs in longer term. Joint Process with South Glos underway. Aim is to create more capacity and increase number of providers. New contract operating from May 2016. Separate but related process to create a 'block' contract for emergency accommodation is delayed until Oct 16.</p> <p>Reduce average number of families temporarily housed in emergency accommodation per night.</p>	<p>Oct-16</p> <p>2016/17</p>	<p>Gillian Douglas</p> <p>Gillian Douglas</p>	<p></p> <p>Quarterly</p>

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	<p>complex needs</p> <p><b>Consequences :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cost to Bristol City Council for T.A.</li> <li>- Reputational damage from street homelessness</li> <li>- Costs to wider system (e.g. Health)</li> <li>- Social costs to households</li> </ul> <p><b>Horizon :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current and on-ongoing</li> </ul>		<p>Emergency accommodation to be put on framework contracts.</p> <p>On-going review of processes between housing/children families.</p> <p>Restructuring of Housing Options is underway with Housing Advice working differently through the CSP to assess homeless households within 48 hours of presentation. This ensures earlier intervention and maximisation of prevention opportunities.</p> <p>Hardship Fund project within WRAMAS has been outreaching to families at risk of homelessness due to benefit cap and has increased work with h/hs subject to bedroom tax. This project runs to March 2017.</p> <p>Real lettings properties – target is on schedule with 13 properties already being let to homeless households as long term accommodation.</p> <p>New properties being accessed as interim accommodation (e.g. council properties) as a better value option than private spot purchased accommodation.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>			<p>Continue to roll out ‘Real Lettings’ (80 in total – over 2 years)</p> <p>Rough sleepers task group (led by St Mungos)</p> <p>Bring into use surplus BCC property for temp emergency accommodation.</p> <p>Complete restructuring of Housing Options</p>	<p>2016/2017</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>January 17</p>	<p>Olly Alcock</p> <p>Carmel Brogan</p> <p>Carmel Brogan</p> <p>Gillian Douglas</p>	<p>Yearly</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Monthly</p>
11.	<p><b>NEW RISK</b></p> <p><b>Potential large loss of Business Rate Revenue resulting from approximate 20% rateable value reduction, back-dated to 1/4/2010, in respect of Seabank Power Station</b></p> <p><b>Causes:</b> Successful appeal made to Valuation Office Agency</p> <p><b>Consequences :</b> Reduction in Business Rate by approximately £2.9 million, 49% of which will be</p>	Patsy Mellor/ Finance Business Partner	<p>Loss under Appeal provision was made for £820K, based on historic reduction of 3% for this type of appeal.</p> <p>Potential loss over the amount made under the appeal provision for this property likely to be in the region of £700K</p>	Awaiting official notification from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) of exact rateable value reduction	Highly probable	Highly probable	Further update once official notification received from VOA , which will enable exact figure of revenue loss to be supplied.	Expected by 31/3/2017	Paul Kimbrey	31/3/2017

	Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
	direct loss to Authority									
12.	<b>RISK NEWLY TRANSFERRED OVER TO NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>  <b>Potential large loss of Business Rate Revenue resulting from NHS applications for charitable status</b>  <b>Causes:</b> Advised by LGA to refuse but still ongoing  <b>Consequences :</b> Reduction in Business Rate between approximately £2m-£9m	Patsy Mellor/ Finance Business Partner	Mandatory Charitable Rates Relief. Current uncertainty around Health care trust and mandatory charitable relief.  Issue is being managed by Business Rates team but monitored by Finance Team. National position including Counsel's Opinion from LGA is that claims unfounded. Claims received so far rejected.  Counter application has been received.		Possible Critical (9)	Unlikely Critical (9)	Response to counter claim will be issue September.  Most instalments are up to date. Part year for 2015 unpaid but in communication with Trust to make payment.	Expected by 31/3/2017	Jo Hunt/ Martin Smith/ Anne Nugent/ Tony Whitlock/ Sheralynn McCarthy	Quarterly
13.	<b>RISK NEWLY TRANSFERRED OVER TO NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>  <b>The level of summons costs currently being charged where a summons is issued in respect of local taxation is £100.00. This figure is calculated using an outdated calculation and, in other local authorities, has been challenged in the Magistrates Court. There is the potential for the calculation to be challenged in Bristol although this risk has decreased over the last six months.</b>  <b>Cause:</b> Outdated calculation used that does not accurately account for expenditure leading to the possibility of an incorrect figure being calculated.  <b>Consequences:</b> 1. Potential for budget deficit of circa £800k based on projected income reduction.	Patsy Mellor / Finance Business Partner	Revised cost calculation issued to Magistrates Court and no challenge received as yet.		Unlikely Impact Significant, (4)	Unlikely Impact Significant (4)	Corporate finance to include review of cost calculation into work planning for 2016/17 in order that a revised cost calculation be delivered in time for 01 April 2017.	31/3/2017	Corporate Finance / Martin Smith	

Risk Description, Causes, Consequences and Horizon	Risk Owner	Current Risk Management Arrangements (Current Mitigation) Responsible officer (RO):	Status of Current Mitigation	Current Risk Like/Imp	Target Risk Like/Imp	Further Actions Required	Timeframe for Action	Responsible Officer for Action	Risk Review Period
--	------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------

14. Risk newly transferred over to Neighbourhoods									
<b>Housing Benefit Subsidy</b>  Description/Cause <b>Housing Benefit is recompensed for the monies paid out by the DWP usually on a £1 for £1 basis. Two issues have arisen from previous year's subsidy audits resulting in an increased risk/financial pressure.</b>  1. Increased use of temporary and 'exempt' supported accommodation, resulting in a loss of subsidy rebate in these areas. (Losses for 2016/17 are estimated at £1.5m and £1m respectively).  2. In addition the 2014/15 claim which was submitted in April 2015 and audited in November 2015 identified a sizeable level of incorrectness and qualification of £1.1. million.  Consequences/Horizon  The demand on temporary and 'exempt' supported accommodation remains high as does the level of incorrectness despite some measures that have already been put in place.	Patsy Mellor	<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 assessment officer transferred to the QC and Subsidy Team (June 2015)</li> <li>A monthly 'copy' of the subsidy claim is scrutinised by the QC and Subsidy Team to compare to previous estimates throughout the year (On going)</li> <li>Daily QA checking results in c3,400 cases being checked in and focuses in 3 main problem areas (On going)</li> <li>Training in targeted areas</li> <li>A full internal review has been undertaken of the existing QA and Subsidy</li> <li>Employed external subject matter experts to review existing process, outcomes confirmed as appropriate and signed off.</li> </ul>	➡	Significant /likely (10)	Significant/ Probable (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased focus to be given to service's performance</li> <li>Refocus QA and subsidy resource in to the areas identified in the 2014/15 audit</li> <li>Increase availability of training/mentoring to known staff in known areas</li> </ul>	On going  On going  On going	Sheralynn McCarthy	Quarterly / Monthly
15.									
<b>Reduction in HB and CTR administration grant</b>  Description/Cause	Patsy Mellor	<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible reductions in cost of</li> </ul>	➡	Significant / likely (10)	Significant / Probable (8)	The following are being considered/investigate with a view to reducing unit cost.		Sheralynn McCarthy	Monthly

<p>For 2016/17 as part of the reduction in central government grants the DWP have applied a 19% (£480k) reduction to BCCs Housing Benefit administration grant.</p> <p>In respect of DCLG's administrative grant for CTR this has broadly remained the same for Bristol at £693k</p> <p><b>Consequences/Horizon</b></p> <p>There is a real danger that that there will be further year on year reductions for both grants resulting in an increased pressure on the General Fund</p>		<p>Service currently undertaken by Applied Programme, e.g. evidence upload technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in automated processing systems via initiatives such as Automated Transfer of LA data (ATLAS)</li> <li>Improved local performance processes and procedures</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purchase New Integrate new claims and changes reporting forms.</li> <li>Further automation of ATLAS and any other new technologies as/when apply</li> <li>Possible purchase of new performance software</li> </ul>	<p>June 2016</p> <p>October 2016</p> <p>April 2017</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix 2
- Risk Matrix

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

Appendix 3
– Severity of Impact Guidance

		Effect on service provision	Potential Financial loss/gain	Potential Fraud & Corruption loss	Reputation	Legal	Environmental	Communities	Personal safety
1	Marginal	Very limited effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Impact can be managed within normal working arrangements	Under £0.5m	Under £50k	Minimal and transient loss of public trust. Contained within the individual service	No significant legal implications or action is anticipated	No effect (positive/negative) on the environment/community	Minimal effect on community	Minor injury to citizens or staff may result or can be prevented.
2	Significant	Noticeable and significant effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Effect may require some additional resource, but manageable in a reasonable time frame.	Between £0.5m - £5m	Between £50k - £100k	Significant public interest although limited potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation.  Dissatisfaction reported through Council Complaints procedure but contained within the Council  Local MP involvement  Some local media/social media interest.	Tribunal/ BCC legal team involvement required (potential for claim)	Short term effect (positive or negative) on the natural and or built environment.	Short term effect (positive or negative) on a small number of vulnerable groups/individuals	Significant injury or ill health of citizens or staff may result or be prevented.
3	Critical	Severe effect on service provision or a corporate Plan priority area. Effect may require considerable additional resource but will not require a major strategy change.	Between £5m - £10m	Between £100k - £1m	Serious potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation.  Dissatisfaction regularly reported through Council Complaints procedure.  Higher levels of local or national interest.  Higher levels of local media/social media interest.	Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation.	Serious local discharge of pollutant or source of community annoyance that requires remedial action.	Medium term effect (positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups/individuals.	Major injury or ill health of citizens or staff may result or be prevented. Long term disability/absence from work.
4	Catastrophic	Extremely severe service disruption. Significant customer opposition. Legal action. Effect could not be managed within a reasonable time frame, or by a short term allocation of resources and may require major strategy changes. The Council risks 'special measures' Officer/Member forced to resign.	More than £10m	More than £1m	Highly significant potential for enhancement of or damage to reputation  Intense local, national and potentially international media attention.  'Viral' on line social media  Public enquiry or poor external assessor report.	Criminal prosecution anticipated and or civil litigation (> 1 person)	Lasting effect on the natural and or built environment.	Lasting effect (positive or negative) on a significant number of vulnerable groups/individuals.	(Avoidable) Death of citizens or staff may result or be prevented. Long term disability/absence from work.

## Appendix 4

### Assessment of the likelihood guidance

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