

Strategic Risk Management

LEAD OFFICER: Penny Mell, Head of Policy and Transformation
REPORT AUTHOR: Catherine McNicholas, Performance and Transformation Officer

WHY HAS THIS REPORT COME TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE?

The Strategic Risk Register is reported to Audit Committee on a regular basis as part of the Council's approach to strategic risk management.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Audit Committee considers the Strategic Risk Register and agrees the report.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Copeland Borough Council are required to manage risks and this is especially relevant due to the scale, pace and change occurring at present. The Strategic Risk Register is an essential part of the Corporate Policy Framework and it is a key part of the Performance Management Framework.
- 1.2 The Strategic Risk Register (attached at Appendix A) describes the Council's identified corporate and strategic risks and controls.

2. RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 Following a review in July 2012 the Strategic Risk Register now contains 10 risks which have been identified to monitor and manage. These are:-
 - Securing financial viability
 - Lack of capacity, resources and capability to deliver the change programme
 - Challenge/Judicial review
 - Not defining Council core business
 - Inability of the Council to make the necessary decisions in a timely way
 - Making partnerships work during times of significant change
 - Failure to design services to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the community
 - Reputation
 - Meeting statutory responsibilities during a time of budgetary change
 - Nuclear

2.2 In line with the Performance Management arrangements risks are reviewed monthly by managers and then by the Corporate Leadership Team. As part of this review, 3 areas have been recently added to the Horizon Scanning section of the Risk Register. The horizon scanning section of the Strategic Risk Register is used to capture areas of potential risk for the organisation. As more detail becomes available, Corporate Leadership Team will review these areas and assess if and when they should be added to the Strategic Risk Register.

The 3 areas are:

- Local Government Finance Bill
- Capacity – identifying, understanding and managing single points of failure
- External Funding

2.3 In January the scoring of the risk register was also reviewed by the Corporate Leadership Team and the following changes have been made:

Risk 2: Lack of capacity, resources and capability to deliver the change programme: The Likelihood was changed from Very High (6) to High (5). This was due to the on-going work of the Change Programme Board and the appointment of the Transformation Programme Manager.

Risk 3: Challenge/Judicial review: The Likelihood was changed from Very High (6) to High (5). This was due to the risk is currently being treated.

Risk 6: Making partnerships work during times of significant change: The Likelihood was changed from Very High (6) to High (5). This was due to the work we have done and continue to do to engage with our partners and also our shared service arrangements.

Risk 7: Failure to design services to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the community: The Likelihood was changed from Very High (6) to High (5). This was as a result of a number of initiatives including our work with the Citizens Advice Bureau and the redesign of services including within Housing.

Risk 8: Reputation. The Likelihood and Impact was changed from Very High (6), Critical (3) to High (5), Marginal (2). This change was due to steps taken to ascertain and review Customer Feedback.

2.4 Table one below shows the changes in score from October 2012 to January 2013

	Strategic Risks	October 2012		January 2013	
		Likelihood	Impact	Likelihood	Impact
1	Securing financial viability	6	3	6	3
2	Lack of capacity, resources and capability to deliver the change programme	6	3	5	3
3	Challenge/Judicial review	6	3	5	3
4	Not defining Council core business	6	3	6	3
5	Inability of the Council to make the necessary decisions in a timely way	6	3	6	3
6	Making partnerships work during times of significant change	6	3	5	3
7	Failure to design services to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the community	6	3	5	3
8	Reputation	6	3	5	2
9	The role of the Council within Nuclear	6	3	6	3
10	Meeting statutory responsibilities during a time of budgetary change	6	3	6	3

3 STATUTORY OFFICER COMMENTS

- 3.1 The Monitoring Officer's comments are: Report describes risks, likelihood and impact in appropriate detail, together with mitigating measures and reporting arrangements
- 3.2 The Section 151 Officer's comments are: The financial risk and risk implications of the Council's policy initiatives and business decisions are being analysed and addressed in the register. Work is being completed to regularly review the risk register and decisions made on what can be done to treat, transfer, terminate risks or whether the Council has to tolerate the risks and mitigate their effects.
- 3.3 Policy Framework Comments: The Strategic Risk Register forms an integral part of the Corporate Policy Framework alongside the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Corporate Plan.
- 3.4 Other consultee comments, if any: None.

4 HOW WILL THE PROPOSALS BE PROJECT MANAGED AND HOW ARE THE RISKS GOING TO BE MANAGED?

- 4.1 Delivery of the actions agreed will be monitored quarterly and reported to CLT and the Audit Committee.

5 WHAT MEASURABLE OUTCOMES OR OUTPUTS WILL ARISE FROM THIS REPORT?

- 5.1** The report outlines the Council's approach to Strategic Risk Management. The Council is required to identify and manage risks by the four T's – Treat, Tolerate, Transfer or Terminate. This is particularly important due to the scope and pace of change occurring.

List of Appendices

Appendix A Strategic Risk Register

Strategic Risk Register 2012/13

Risk Description 1: Securing financial viability								
Risk Score	Likelihood - Very High (6), Impact - Critical (3)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown settlement for the next year or going forward A number of national policy changes which impact on finances e.g. localised business rates and council tax Volatility of finances e.g. over or under achieving Scale and pace of the financial targets Limited or unknown ability to secure additional income (link to assets) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) identifies 2.5 million reduction over 2 years Failure to define core business Not achieving buy in to make that reduction Securing the decision Implementation of the savings Unknown Settlement Impact of County Council decisions e.g. recycling Cuts in other public services – impact on the Council – leading to increase demand of council services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not being able to fund core business Affect the most vulnerable in society Increase demand on services e.g. homelessness Lead to a different change programme Less prepared for alternative delivery models Credibility/Reputation (personally and as an organisation) Inability to achieve investment in priority areas based on evidence/need Slash and burn 	Chief Executive with Head of Corporate Resources	05/07/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change Board established to oversee the corporate change programme Close scrutiny of the MTFS A clear process for delivering a policy lead budget agreed PDG's established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing close scrutiny of MTFS Monthly budget monitoring Change Programme Board meets regularly to deliver planned actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly budget monitoring Achieve outcomes and targets for all projects Change Programme Board meets regularly 	Monthly

Risk Description 2:		Lack of capacity, resources and capability to deliver the change programme						
Risk Score		Likelihood - High (5), Impact - Critical (3)						
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Required management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale and pace of change – immediate volume of work Imperative behind the changes (incremental change not sufficient) Managing and leading the change (significant transformation required) Change fatigue (3 years) Transformation change ‘v’ normal service delivery Risk of losing key staff – staff thinking what’s best for them Recruit and retain elected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of key staff Reliance on good will (pushed too far) Failure to define core business Partnership breakdown (over reliance on partnerships) Prioritisation – failure to prioritise Leadership and management of the change programme insufficient Insufficient capacity to deal with the scale and pace of change required Loss of existing elected members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Continuity Organisational resilience Don’t deliver key services Performance declines Core services don’t get delivered to those who most need them Reputation Staff absenteeism Morale 	Chief Executive	05/07/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Corporate Leadership team in place & Change Programme Board established New Performance Appraisal System in place Core curriculum devised & delivered Competency Framework in place North West Employers continue to support Process for delivering policy led budget devised & underway Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change Programme Board to deliver change programme. CLT to monitor organisational performance & wellbeing Continue with change support for staff Change Management Policy C2C Budget to support organisational change Transition Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee & Resident satisfaction Change Programme Board to deliver change programme on time & to standard Staff turnover Absenteeism Staff retention 	Quarterly

members					allocated and underway for Organisational Development PDG's Member Development Member briefings			
---------	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Risk Description 3: Challenge/Judicial review								
Risk Score	Likelihood - High (5), Impact - Critical (3)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Required management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions that will have an impact on local communities Potential reduction in discretionary services (high visibility) A safe decision (appropriate and timely decision) – process needs to be proportionate, robust and safe Community appetite to challenge decisions unknown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failing to consult or communicate appropriately Failure to deliver to the timetable Risk of pre-determination Ineffective process in place Insufficient resources devoted to the decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial loss Reputation damage Need to start the process again Lost time Lost saving (linked to MTFS) 	Chief Executive with Head of Policy & Transformation	05/07/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Management Training delivered Policy Forecast Change Programme Board established Decision making process devise and agreed Equality Scheme and approach to EIAs agreed. PDGs established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation plan and delivery mechanism to be agreed Key stakeholders to be engaged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation plan devised and delivered on time. Engage key stakeholders 	Monthly

Risk Description 4:		Not defining Council core business						
Risk Score		Likelihood - Very High (6), Impact - Critical (3)						
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaining consensus over core business Gaining agreement about what to stop Ineffective employment of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of clarity on core business Timeliness of clarifying core business Not following through on a decision No corporate approach Holding the line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Continuity Organisational resilience Performance falls Affect the most vulnerable in society Don't delivery key services well Less prepared for alternative delivery models Inability to achieve investment in priority areas based on evidence/need Reputation 	Chief Executive	05/07/12	Change Programme Board established Decision making process agreed PDGs established Performance Management Framework established MTFS	Effective communication with stakeholders, partners and staff Consultation plan to be agreed and delivered Continue to monitor MTFS	MTFS Customer Satisfaction Budget delivered	Quarterly

Risk Description 5:		Inability of the Council to make the necessary decisions in a timely way						
Risk Score		Likelihood - Very High (6), Impact - Critical (3)						
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional response to make decisions Unpopular decisions Close knit community Elected members learning in their roles Cross council support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions overturned Preparedness to make informed decisions Individuals choosing to not participate in decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't get clarity Can't deliver the MTFS Political fallout Uncertainty Reputation damage Morale issues 	Chief Executive with Director of Services	05/07/12	Change programme Board established Decision making process agreed PDGs established Joint regular sessions with Informal Executive Regular Member briefings on key issues. Member & staff engagement Training & Development programme for Officers and Members	Effective communication with stakeholders Continued staff engagement Communicate need for change Setting priorities Scenario Planning	MTFS Consultation plan devised and delivered	Monthly

Risk Description 6: Making partnerships work during times of significant change								
Risk Score		Likelihood - High (5), Impact - Critical (3)						
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some partners are in the same position (public sector partners e.g. austerity measures) Capacity is therefore reduced Not sure which partners the Council is reliant on (which partners are most important to deliver the change agenda) Strategic alignment of key partnerships Reducing partnership arrangements to a small 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each agency having to make its own savings Lack of joined approach to savings programme and impact analysis Retrenchment of partners Lack of capacity to work together on known issues Taking resources out of partnership arrangements (cash and people) Will need to re-prioritise partnership arrangements around agreed priorities The need for new and different partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to work differently in the future to maintain service provision Reputational impact Ability to maintain key relationships and the benefits associated with them 	Director of Services	05/07/12	Copeland Partnership Chief Executive Officers group	Review partnerships and partnership arrangement Stakeholder/Partner Engagement Plan Priority Setting Match skills to deliver for the future	Number of relevant and sustainable partnerships	Quarterly

number of strategic partnerships Realising the best opportunities through partnership working								
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Risk Description 7: Failure to design services to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the community								
Risk Score	Likelihood - Very High (5), Impact - Critical (3)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers who are most vulnerable will be most affected by any reduction in service delivery Role of a district council Need to invest in service areas which support the most vulnerable in the community Most 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence of need or impact Taking decisions that have multiple impacts on the same communities Not identifying opportunities to work differently to help maintain services for those most in need Not engaging the hard to reach in the decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities and residents suffer Health-related impacts worsen Community cohesion challenged Demand for public services increase Reputational issues for the Council Staff morale as unable to help those most in need or sustain these services most needed 	Director of Services	05/07/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key services being delivered for those in need. Partnership work around financial inclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Needs Analysis Consultation Plan devised and agreed Stakeholder Engagement Alternate ways of working analysis Working with partners around delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ill Health IMD data Fuel Poverty Child Poverty Consultation respondent profiles EIA for services Investment Profile for each service Relevant and sustainable partnerships 	Monthly

vulnerable in society experience multiple impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most likely to be struggling at household level • Least likely to have a voice in the decision-making process 								
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Risk Description 8: Reputation								
Risk Score	Likelihood - High (5), Impact - Marginal (2)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding appropriately to inaccurate or adverse media coverage may take significant resources from organisational leaders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeated adverse coverage in local or national media. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short time to respond, so planned events or activities are disrupted; • Damage to Council's reputation • Limited resources are stretched; • Strategic communication is less likely to be possible due to constant firefighting 	Chief Executive	03/08/12	Communication Strategy Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan	Opportunities to consider future approach. Continue with Engagement plan including all elected members, stakeholders and the community	Reduced incidence of adverse or inaccurate media	Quarterly

Risk Description 9:		The role of the Council within Nuclear						
Risk Score	Likelihood - Very High (6), Impact - Critical (3)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Reguired management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to represent the community with regard to economic impacts of hosting the SL and national plutonium stocks Failure to meet statutory obligations through NSIP (Nationally Significant infrastructure projects) (New Build and New Grid) process. Failure to support commitments to MRWS process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to retain staff Failure to retain skills NSIP and MRWS programme slippage PPA commitments not met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to represent the community Securing community benefits 	Director of Services	12/9/12	Temporary and permanent staff recruitment PPA's in place	PPA monitoring, nuclear programme updated	Milestones and regulatory requirements met	6 monthly

Risk Description 10:	Meeting statutory responsibilities during a time of budgetary change							
Risk Score	Likelihood - Very High (6), Impact - Critical (3)							
Vulnerability/contributing factors	Trigger(s)/Event(s)	Potential Impact/Consequences	Risk owner	Date Identified	Action/ Controls already in place	Required management action/control	Critical Success Factors & KPIs	Review date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to identify all statutory obligations and where these are met within the organisation Impact of budget reductions on ability to carry out statutory duties Failure to identify new and changing requirements Failure to retain sufficient critical Financial penalties Failure to retain critical mass to meet statutory obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to retain critical organisational knowledge Failure to retain staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to achieve could result in financial penalties. 	Chief Executive	08/08/12	Identified different service types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor new and emerging requirement Monitor continued delivery of existing requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet statutory requirements Meeting regulatory requirements e.g. INSPIRE Investment required to meet new/emerging statutory requirements 	Quarterly

Horizon Scanning – Risks that can be identified but insufficient detail to action at this time

- Welfare Reform – Universal credit
- Local Land Charges Litigation
- Local Government Finance Bill
- Resource/Capacity – single points of failure
- External Funding

Risk Matrix

The Strategic Risk Register contains risk scoring. Two scores are given on each risk; one of the likelihood that the risk could happen (6=Very High to 1=Almost Impossible) and second, what the scale of the impact could be if that risk occurs (4=Catastrophic to 1=Negligible).