

## **STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

**LEAD OFFICER:** Director of Resources and Transformation

**REPORT AUTHOR:** Performance and Transformation Manager

### **Summary:**

This report presents the current Strategic Risk Register to the Audit Committee for consideration.

**Recommendation: That the Audit Committee considers the current Strategic Risk Register and comments on any matters arising as part of the Council's arrangements for managing risk.**

## **BACKGROUND**

All organisations need to consider arrangements for assessing and managing the risks which might prevent them from achieving their objectives. Identification of risks does not mean that those risks will happen. However acknowledging possible risks, their probability and impact if they were to happen, gives organisations opportunity to plan and put appropriate controls in place to minimise the impact or likelihood of the risks arising.

Creation and maintenance of risk registers is part of the framework of corporate governance which organisations are expected to have in place. Listing risks identified with plans to control them means that organisations can revisit them periodically to assess progress. A risk which may have seemed significant when it was first identified may be downgraded or another risk may need more urgent attention after review, as it now seems more likely to cause an unwanted impact. Any new risks can be added and the achievement of business objectives made more secure.

## **ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED**

The Strategic Risk Register (attached at Appendix A) describes the Council's identified corporate and strategic risks and controls. It is in a format reflecting advice gained through work with Zurich Municipal insurers to strengthen the Council's approach to risk management.

The Senior Leadership Team jointly identified strategic risks to achievement of the Council's corporate objectives.

The risks described in the attached Strategic Risk Register are presented in themes with a priority score and the controls in place to mitigate the risks are described. As an example a priority score (eg B2\*) uses the following scale:

Likelihood of Risk Occurring	Impact of Risk Occurring
A = Very high	1 = Catastrophic
B = High	2 = Critical
C = Significant	3 = Marginal
D = Low	4 = Negligible
E = Very low	
F = Almost impossible	

Using this scale to assign of priorities it has been possible to create a risk profile for the Council's corporate objectives. The numbers of the risks refer to items in the strategic risk register.

### Copeland Borough Council Strategic Risk Profile May 2011

A			10a, 16	
B			7, 11, 20	10b
C		15	1, 2, 3, 18	
D		8, 19, 21, 23		
E				
F				
	4	3	2	1

The Council's main strategic risks, which it is seeking to control and mitigate, are

10a	The nuclear industry which is a major employer has an uncertain future with the risk of significant downsize.
16	The Council's budget will be under strain due to 28% reduction in Government funding and lower income.
10b	The nuclear industry which is a major employer has an uncertain future with the risk of significant upsize.
7	Partnership working and their effective governance is essential
11	The nuclear industry is a major employer which requires time spent which may reduce resources for other issues.
20	Slippage, movement and rock falls on our coastal edges.
1	The Council's grant funded schemes are under increasing scrutiny as to achieving their outcomes
2	The Council's improvement in financial management may not be sustainable.
3	The Council is required to manage multiple programmes which draw on the same resources.
18	Transitional phase in senior management arrangements may hamper rapid

improvement.
--------------

## **CORPORATE PLAN**

The Strategic Risk Register contains risks that could impede delivery of the Council's corporate objectives. Identifying those risks and delivering on plans to control them will help to achieve these objectives.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Audit Committee is asked to consider and note the attached draft Strategic Risk Register attached at Appendix A.

### **List of Appendices :**

Draft Strategic Risk Register.

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

**FINANCIAL RISKS**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
16	The Council's budget will be under strain due to 28% reduction in the Government grant funding, lower income from fees and charges received and potentially increased demands for services.	Significant cut to grant funding occurs. Level of spend is higher than available budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large financial savings have to be made</li> <li>• Cuts in services</li> <li>• Potential redundancies</li> <li>• New ways of working become essential</li> <li>• Staff worry and morale issues</li> <li>• Public complaints and dissatisfaction</li> <li>• Unable to manage downsizing effectively</li> <li>• Have to use more reserves than planned</li> <li>• Level of reserves fall so the Council is less able to cope in the future</li> <li>• Council reputation damaged</li> </ul>	A2*	13th July 2009; 16 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010; 20 December 2010	Chief Executive	Close scrutiny of budget through MTFS. Shared Services Strategy in place. Service reviews carried out in 2010. Treasury management strategy in place. Review of income and charging taken place. Risk based reserve reviewed. Treasury management strategy in place.	New Council Plan agreed. Mechanism for review of future Council role, structure and activities. Communication with stakeholders, partners and staff. Update of MTFS.	Increased customer satisfaction. Consensus on policy and organisational change. Monthly budget monitoring. Comparison of income generated with budget target. Use of reserves less than budgeted. Performance shows continuing improvement.	Quarterly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
1	The Council has a number of schemes that are grant funded (either wholly or in part). Grant funding, which is dependent on delivering outputs, There is greater scrutiny from funders of outcomes achieved. VAT rules being followed and complying with grant monitoring regimes, may be clawed back.	Outputs not achieved and/or non-compliance with monitoring. Possible changes to funding offer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claw back of funding occurs</li> <li>• Less able to attract funding in the future</li> <li>• Council reputation damaged</li> <li>• Do not deliver key regeneration projects</li> <li>• Not able to achieve key strategic objectives</li> </ul>	C2*	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010; 20 December 2010	Julie Betteridge with Joanne Wagstaffe	Individual project files shared with finance and lead delivery service. Capital control group in place. Monitoring arrangements included in cost of schemes. Target to improve practice included in Corporate Governance Action Plan.	Develop strategic framework to maximize potential grant availability. Adopt good practice in governance. Better definition of accountable body status and member agreement needed. Accountable Body framework with guidance in place, procedures and training set up. Stronger project management.	Full cost recovery for all accountable body actions.	Half-yearly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
20	Slippage, movement and rock falls on our coastal edges	Rock Falls, creation of potentially dangerous features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public safety including loss of life and corporate liability</li> <li>• Threat to business and homes in some areas</li> <li>• Coastal access reduced</li> </ul>	B2	15 June 2010	Pat Graham	<p>Regular monitoring activity to be arranged in certain areas</p> <p>Rock netting already in place in some areas and dangerous features removed or fenced off.</p> <p>Public footpaths diverted from cliff edge and signage in place</p>	<p>Corporate Policy to be developed through L&amp;ES, Development Strategy and Operations</p> <p>Potential costs identified corporately</p> <p>South Shore Geological report re-commissioned, earlier recommendation implemented</p>	<p>Public safety and corporate liability managed, and reduces as far as possible</p> <p>Acquisition of 2 Lonsdale House, Wagon Road</p>	Quarterly

*(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)*

APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RISKS

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
10a	The nuclear industry, which is the major employer (14k jobs from 70k total), has an uncertain future with the possibility of a significant downsize.	Downsize in nuclear industry	Loss of sustainable community with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massive loss of jobs</li> <li>• Impact on housing market</li> <li>• Increase in disadvantaged areas</li> <li>• The population declines and gets older</li> <li>• Increased demand on services without the additional funding</li> <li>• No way to replicate the lost jobs</li> </ul>	A2*	23rd February 2009; 10 September 2009; 15 June 2010; 30 October 2010	Pat Graham with Julie Betteridge	Working with Central Government through the West Cumbrian Strategic Forum to ensure that Government departments are aware of issues to deliver improvements through Energy Coast Masterplan.	Maintain profile and communication to achieve continuing buy-in and resource through central Government. Seek diversification of economic opportunities.  Review of the Sellafield Socio-Economic Study May 2011. Work with partners to ensure supply of jobs and businesses.	Residents in employment. Adult skills improved. Alternative businesses secured and local business growth. Increased tourism spend.	Quarterly

(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
10b	The nuclear industry, which is the major employer (14k jobs from 70k total), has an uncertain future with the possibility of a significant upsize.	Grid connection DCLG application and pre application work. Nuclear New Build pre application and DCLG application for one or more sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New jobs created</li> <li>• Housing and schooling availability.</li> <li>• Competition for Council's staff</li> <li>• Travel issues</li> <li>• Increased demand in services which may not be reflected in RSG</li> <li>• Financial drain as no benefit to our grants</li> <li>• Current population may not have the required skills – so creating a wider gap between advantaged and disadvantaged</li> </ul> <p>Major financial burden places on Copeland to perform our statutory role, if we can't or don't play this part then the possibility of a favorable decision is severely compromised.</p> <p>Communities not engaged in the process</p>	B1*	23rd February 2009; 10 September 2009 15 February 2010; 15 June 2010 30 October 2010; 20 December 2010  25 June	Pat Graham with Julie Betteridge	Vision and direction arising from Energy Coast Masterplan. Early work commenced to identify CBC skills and technical expertise required to accommodate this significant and sustained growth area. Impact study of new build to be commissioned in Autumn 2010. Skills work on going. Spatial Planning Group established and Nuclear Infrastructure Group Response to NPS submitted. Active engagement with Whitehall.	Sound LDF plan and allow for growth across all spatial sectors. Work with partners and industry to aid our understanding of the implications of new build. Engage with communities and work on the Grid infrastructure. Lobby Govt and the industry to support this project financially. Influence DCLG and the consortia to support early consideration of a Cumbrian site. Develop a joint LA Board led by Copeland or Somerset to lobby jointly and adopt a clear stance when negotiating with utilities. Play an active role on advising the utility on community engagement	<p>Submission of Local Impact Report (x2)</p> <p>Secured a Planning Performance Agreement (x2)</p> <p>Agreed Statement of Community Consultation (x2)</p> <p>DCLG make timely decisions</p> <p>Infrastructure Improvements are delivered</p> <p>Grid Connection is secured from Harker to Heysham</p>	Quarterly



**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
11	The nuclear industry is a major employer in the Borough which requires significant amounts of time spent on working with it by Council leaders, which may reduce resources for other issues.	Extensive time and effort spent on NDA issues by Council leadership. Decommissioning at Sellafield, LLW and MRWS partnership process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focus of the Council does not widen – narrow focus</li> <li>• Distortion in priorities and funding</li> <li>• Deploying limited resources on activity not recognised in RSG</li> <li>• Not doing other activities that are important to the community</li> <li>• Residents not recognising Council's role</li> <li>• Council not credited for this work</li> <li>• Not seen as important by inspectors</li> </ul>	B2*	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010	Chief Executive with Pat Graham	Corporate Plans commit the Council to a range of objectives and outcomes beyond the nuclear agenda. Additional support for major projects in place to boost resources, for example offer of financial support from DECC. Increasing work with partners to gain support. West Cumbria Vision in place. MRWS partnership in place.	Government continuing to be lobbied regarding special workload and resource requirements. Developing further partnership working. Review Nuclear Working Party arrangements. PPA to be agreed enabling engagement with development partners. Additional management capacity planned.	Additional nuclear investment processes funded. MRWS community engagement successful.	Quarterly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
15	The Council may not address climate change adequately.	Resources diverted to other work; policy decisions which do not take climate change impacts into account. Carbon management targets not met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on specific communities</li> <li>• Coastal erosion</li> <li>• Increased costs</li> <li>• Economic impact on regeneration</li> <li>• Council's reputation</li> <li>• Council not playing full part in renewable developments and benefits.</li> </ul>	C3	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 15 June 2010; 30 October 2010	Julie Betteridge with Pat Graham	Strategic direction agreed. Nottingham Declaration signed. Working with Cumbrian partners. Capital and revenue schemes arising as required, and delivered to protect property and ensure safety. Sustainability Office in post. Energy Coast Masterplan includes energy efficiency. Agreed Carbon Management programme in place. Climate change action plan in place.	LDF will incorporate shoreline issues and impact on settlements, developments and physical access. Development and delivery of climate change action plan  Energy Performance Measures to be implemented and carbon management monitored by internal board.  Carbon footprint measures through procurement practices.	Managing events such as landslips and flooding.  Climate Change Action Plan adopted and implemented  Carbon management efficiencies and cost savings.	Half-yearly

*(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)*

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

**CAPACITY RISKS**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
2	The Council's improvements in financial management may not be sustainable.	Loss of key staff. Failure to maintain knowledge of technical requirements for financial management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory interventions</li> <li>• Council reputation damaged</li> <li>• Political risks</li> <li>• Inefficient use of resources</li> <li>• Impairs the overall improvement of the Council</li> <li>• Poor decisions made with poor information</li> </ul>	C2*	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 20 December 2010	Chief Executive	Budget monitoring cycle. Revised CSOs and financial regs Appropriately qualified staff. Regular training of managers. Development of succession plans Effective operation of Capital Monitoring Group. Use of Task and Totalview	Restructure of Accountancy Services. Regular review of CSOs and Financial Regs. Introduction finance procedures manual. Restructure of code base Further development of Task system. Better training and communication with budget holders	Production of Annual Accounts and Annual Budget to statutory deadline Compliance with OJEC requirements Savings from new contracts. Annual Audit Letter comments.	Quarterly

*(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)*

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
18	Transitional phase in senior management arrangements may hamper rapid improvement	Forward progress becomes difficult	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity problems at senior level;</li> <li>• Lack of confidence among external scrutiny and partners</li> <li>• Further management changes cannot be implemented</li> <li>• Council improvement is slow or does not happen</li> </ul>	C2*	10 September 2009; 15 February 2010; 14 June 2010; 20 December 2010	Chief Executive	New Corporate Leadership team in place. Sector support is available to offer advice and good practice, including Chorley BC.	Chief Executive's proposed restructure implemented. Service reviews to be carried out.	Corporate Governance reports; other Council service measures. Annual Audit Letter comments.	Quarterly

*(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)*

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

19	The Council's people are not sufficiently clear about or prepared to make the changes that are needed to reduce the Council's operating costs.	Employees or members do not support part of the changes that are required for the future of the Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence and sickness increases</li> <li>• Employment tribunal claims increase</li> <li>• Political unrest</li> <li>• Able employees leave</li> <li>• Council cannot enter new partnerships or agreements</li> <li>• Council cannot reduce its operating costs</li> </ul>	D3	15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 20 December 2010	Chief Executive	Choosing to Change programme acquired external support in organisational development. Revised HR policies and constitutional arrangements cover some aspects of this area. Communication plans experience from previous programmes	Choosing to Change programme to strengthen change management. Organisational Development Strategy to plan change in practice and culture.	Council can meet requirements to work in different ways and reduce its budget in 2011-13.	At least half-yearly
----	--	---	---	----	--	-----------------	--	---	---	----------------------

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
3	<p>The Council is required to manage multiple key programmes which draw on the same limited resources. :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects developed in isolation</li> <li>• Projects compete for limited resources</li> <li>• Non-priority projects proceed risking Council priorities</li> </ul>	<p>Lack of effective prioritisation. Reduced internal and external resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not delivering other projects</li> <li>• Do not make improvements</li> <li>• Increased pressure on staff</li> <li>• Public and members disappointed by progress</li> <li>• Management by crisis becomes the norm</li> </ul>	C2*	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010	Joanne Wagstaffe	<p>The 2010/11 Corporate Implementation Plan sets out an agreed set of priorities for the year which will take precedence for available resources. Council Executive report now focuses solely on the CIP and Council is made aware of progress</p>	<p>A new 2011-14 Council Plan will be developed this year (and associated 2011/2012 CIP) with the aim of sharpening our focus on key priorities. Develop skills to finetune prioritisation of actions against resources. Project and Programme management skills needs to be made available to a wider group of managers, including post-project evaluation.</p>	<p>Projects do not slip financially or in time; quarterly monitoring reports to Executive show completion as predicted. Achieve outcomes and targets for all projects.</p>	Quarterly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
8	The Council needs to recruit, retain and develop effective staff. The rural location, reputation of the Council, and presence of the nuclear industry can all be obstacles.	Unable to recruit and retain key staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vacancies and gaps in structure</li> <li>• Increased workloads on other staff</li> <li>• Absence and sickness increases</li> <li>• Staff leave – vicious cycle</li> <li>• Do not gain the flexibility and new skills required – e.g. the ability to work in partnership</li> <li>• Do not improve</li> <li>• Do not refresh the Council's culture</li> <li>• Do not achieve the corporate plan</li> </ul>	D3	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010; 20 December 2010	Joanne Wagstaffe	Additional recruitment channels being used, eg Cumbrian jobs website, as well as conventional advertising. Internet is becoming most important source of recruitment. Able to invest in career development for individuals. No permanent replacements to be recruited until after service reviews. Workforce strategy drafted.	Need to ensure that Council reputation is maintained. Develop workforce strategy. Work to reskill existing employees to take account of reducing resources and help to fill shortage professions.	Turnover rate at less than 10%	Quarterly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

**PARTNERSHIPS RISKS**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
7	Partnership working is an important issue and their effective governance is essential. Currently a lack of a planned and consistent approach to the management of partnerships could threaten achievement of outcomes through partnership working. There is a new arrangement for the Copeland Partnership to replace the LSP.	Lack of an effective approach to working in partnerships, leading to unsatisfactory outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential legal liabilities (accountable body)</li> <li>• Resources wasted</li> <li>• Not delivering the Council's agenda</li> <li>• Unable to deliver corporate objectives</li> <li>• Not an effective partner</li> <li>• Time wasted in some partnerships</li> <li>• Poor relationships with partners</li> <li>• Miss out on future partnership opportunities</li> <li>• Council takes the blame but not the praise</li> </ul>	B2*	23rd February 2009; 15 February 2010 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010	Julie Betteridge	BECWC governance review in progress. External support sought to tackle governance issues. Review of LSP and community partnerships nearing completion. A corporate working group is reviewing and assessing our partnership profile using CIPFA code of practice. Partnership protocol in place – to be reviewed during 10/11. Copeland Partnership to provide umbrella for range of partnerships.	A coordinated framework needs to developed and piloted by the corporate working group. To roll out the framework and an annual cycle of partnership review against performance management cycle and review with annual impact assessment. Revised protocol and programme management system. Support Cumbria-wide partnership improvements. Work to embed new partnership arrangements.	Prioritise annually our partnership engagement. Quarterly project management framework will be used to identify and report on impact and PI progress. Half-yearly report to Copeland Partnership	Half-yearly

*(Risk scores with \* are controlled as priorities)*



## APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION

### REPUTATION RISKS

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
21	Responding appropriately to inaccurate or adverse media coverage may take significant resources from organisational leaders.	Repeated adverse coverage in local or national media.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short time to respond, so planned events or activities are disrupted;</li> <li>• Damage to Council's reputation</li> <li>• Limited resources are stretched;</li> <li>• Strategic communication is less likely to be possible due to constant firefighting</li> </ul>	D3	21 September 2009; 15 February 2010; 14 June 2010; 30 October 2010; 20 December 2020	Chief Executive	Communication Strategy under review. Internal communication improved. Improvements achieved in national and local reputation during 20010/11. External expertise acquired. Revised strategy for media relations.	External advice sought; Service reviews opportunity to consider future approach.	Reduced incidence of adverse or inaccurate media	At least quarterly

**APPENDIX A - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER –MAY 2011 – DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION**

No.	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequences	Risk score [* above tolerance line]	Date identified or last amended	Risk Owner	Action / controls already in place and adequacy	Required management action/control	Critical success factors & KPI's	Review frequency
23	The Council may not respond quickly enough to Government policy change, have sufficient capacity to change or understand what is required.	Introduction of new Government programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customers do not receive service as expected;</li> <li>Adverse opinion locally and among external audience;</li> <li>Council's reputation suffers</li> <li>Resources are wasted in poorly managed change</li> </ul>	D3	14 June 2010; 20 December 2010	Chief Executive	Regular briefing from Monitoring Officer's team. Attendance at events and reading about change. Support from external sources obtained under Choosing to Change programme.	Ensure that managers are able to gain access to most up to date sources of information in most effective ways. Good change management arrangements in place.	Good result from external scrutiny. Employee and resident satisfaction.	Quarterly