

Report to Cabinet
12 December 2012
Report of Head of audit, risk and insurance, LGSS
Subject Annual report on corporate risks

Item

9

Purpose

To update members on the key risks facing the council and the associated mitigating actions.

To consider if a new risk relating to the effects of climate change should be included as a separate risk in the corporate risk register as recommended by audit committee.

Recommendations

To approve the council's corporate risk register and actions to mitigate the risks.

To consider if the effects of climate change should be included as a risk in the corporate risk register.

To consider if changes should be made to risk CR10, business continuity.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority "Value for money services"

Financial implications

The financial implications of this report are none directly

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Waters – Deputy leader and resources

Contact officers

Steve Tinkler, head of audit, risk and insurance, LGSS 01604 367055

Steve Dowson, audit manager – Norwich, LGSS 01603 212575

Background documents

Report

Background

1. The council's risk management strategy states that cabinet should oversee effective risk management across the council, which is fundamental to the achievement of the council's priorities as stated in the corporate plan.
2. The process for reviewing the council's key risks is well embedded, with regular reviews by business heads of service groups, corporate leadership team (CLT) and audit committee to take account of changing circumstances.

Latest corporate risk register

3. Since cabinet approved the corporate risk register in December 2011 it has been reviewed by audit committee in January, July and November 2012.
4. The latest version of the corporate risk register was updated by CLT in October and reviewed by audit committee in November. It is attached at **annex 1** and is shown in risk score order, highest risk first.
5. Excluding wording and scoring changes to individual risks, a summary of the main changes to the register throughout the year is as follows:

July 2012

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| CR17 | contract management – expanded and title changed to 'Relationship management with key service delivery partners and the management of contracts.' This reflects key partnerships now in place, eg NPS; LGSS. Likelihood increased |
| NEW CR23 | community right to challenge – included in the Localism Act. This means that community organisations (along with private contractors if they choose) can challenge the council on the delivery of a service and in doing so trigger a procurement process, which will require resources to run the process |
| NEW CR24 | information security – with the risk of increased fines from the Information Commissioner and loss of reputation, it is vital that risks to data loss are identified and minimised |
| NEW CR25 | housing investment strategy - risk is the balance between the new standard for investment in the housing stock, managing the cash flow and right to buy. The council has taken on substantial debt to be repaid over 30 years. |

6. The following risks were removed:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| CR02 | single status – now complete, so risk removed |
| CR14 | service standards – significant progress made; on review it was decided that this risk could be removed |
| CR15 | corporate governance - significant progress made; on review it was decided that this risk could be removed. |

November 2012

- CR01** public sector funding – because some of the elements in this risk relate to income generation which is more in the council’s control, CLT suggested that this risk should be split into ‘public sector funding’ and ‘income generation’. This was supported by audit committee at its meeting in November.
- CR27** income generation has been added as a new risk, but with the same risk score as CR01 for the time being. Details for both risks will be further refined as part of the review process.
- NEW CR26** cash receipting system – new risk added relating to the need to replace the council’s cash receipting system by July 2013.

Further development of the risk register

7. A number of changes to the format and content of the register have been suggested by managers and CLT. It is proposed that rather than list risks in risk score order they should be grouped to show the type of risk, for instance financial, strategic, partners etc.
8. CLT also agreed that the content of the register needs to be further refined to ensure that elements that refer to service risks are identified and transferred from the corporate register to the relevant service risk registers.
9. The register will be further refined in line with the above and reviewed by CLT and audit committee as part of the normal reporting process.

Review by audit committee November 2012

10. At the audit committee meeting on 20 November 2012 the chair said that he considered that climate change was a major risk factor and was identified on the corporate risk registers of a number of local authorities. He suggested that it would be appropriate to group the measures that the council was taking to address the effects of climate change in one place and include them in the register.
11. The chief executive and audit manager pointed out that although the effect of climate change was a long term major issue facing the council, the purpose of the corporate risk register was to address those risks which could prevent the council from achieving its objectives over the period covered by the corporate plan.
12. Following further discussion members resolved
“to recommend to cabinet that the effects of climate change are included as a risk on the corporate risk register.”
13. The following information is provided to assist cabinet members in their decision. CLT believes that the short- and long-term effects of climate change are already being addressed by the council in a number of ways at an operational and county-wide level, in conjunction with other agencies:
 - a) The council’s environmental strategy contains an action programme to minimise the impact of climate change wherever possible. This includes achieving level 3

against the current climate change adaptation indicator (NI 188) by developing a robust approach to service risk and climate change.

- b) The council is a member of the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership, which has produced a climate change risk assessment for Norfolk local authorities. The report deals with climate change adaptation rather than addressing short-term effects. It includes prioritised registers of the risks posed to key local authority services together with recommendations of how to respond to these risks in order to start planning an adaptive response.

The report's executive summary states that:

- c) "... emergency planning and business continuity services ... are responsible for ensuring the resilience to short term weather events – as distinct to adaptation, which engages with long-term climate change – of the service areas which are included in this report, and their ability to fulfil this will not be directly at risk from climate change."
- d) The council is also a member of the Norfolk Resilience Forum, which has produced a Norfolk Community Risk Register which includes as risks severe/extreme weather conditions and flooding. The register is used to inform civil contingency planning in Norfolk
- e) The council has its own major emergency management strategy

14. However, one of the risks in the council's register is CR10 business continuity, which primarily concerns risks to council services. This could be renamed and expanded to include further details of the council's emergency planning role in the event of a significant emergency in the city.

15. Suggested changes to risk CR10 have therefore been highlighted on the register attached at annex 1, which members are asked to consider. The likelihood score has been amended from 3 (possible) to 4 (likely) because empirical evidence shows that the frequency of certain severe weather events is increasing.

Summary

16. Members can take assurance from the fact that the current corporate risk register is the result of continued review by managers, CLT and audit committee of the key risks that may have an impact on achieving the council's objectives. Each risk shows the owner and the mitigating measures in place to minimise any impact on the council and its provision of services to stakeholders.

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report

Detailed guidance to help with completing the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

Report author to complete

Committee:	Cabinet
Committee date:	12 December 2012
Head of service:	Head of audit, risk and insurance, LGSS
Report subject:	Review of corporate risk register
Date assessed:	27 November 2012
Description:	To approve the council's corporate risk register and consider the inclusion of the effects of climate change in the register

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Effective risk management is integral to delivering value for money services by mitigating the likelihood of unforeseen events which could cost the council money
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT strategy and business continuity are included as specific risks in the register
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Included as a specific risk in the corporate risk register
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments

	Impact			
Risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The report shows the steps taken to identify and mitigate all corporate risks

Recommendations from impact assessment	
Positive	
	The report demonstrates the process to identify, review and mitigate corporate risks that may prevent the council from achieving its key objectives
Negative	
Neutral	
Issues	

Norwich City Council

Key corporate risks

Approved by cabinet December 2011

Reviewed by audit committee January 2012

Updated by corporate leadership and departmental management teams April – June 2012

Reviewed by audit committee July 2012

Updated by corporate leadership team October 2012

Reviewed by audit committee November 2012

Key Corporate Risks Summary (next 2 – 3 years)

18 risks ranked, 4 red risks

		Impact / Consequences				
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
		1	2	3	5	7
Likelihood / Probability	5 Very High				1, 27	
	4 Likely			17a	8, 10	
	3 Possible			19, 25	5, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26	
	2 Unlikely				5, 11	
	1 Rare					

No.	Top Corporate Risks
Very High Likelihood – Major impact	
CR01	Public sector funding
CR27	Income generation
Likely – Major impact	
CR08	Customer demand
CR10	Emergency planning and business continuity


Council Priorities 2012-15

City Council Priorities
1. To make Norwich a safe and clean city
2. To make Norwich a prosperous city
3. To make Norwich a city with decent housing for all
4. To make Norwich a city of character and culture
5. To provide value for money services

Key Corporate Risks


Likelihood scored on a scale: 1 rare; 2 unlikely; 3 possible; 4 likely; 5 very high


Impact scored on a scale: 1 insignificant; 2 minor; 3 moderate; 5 major; 7 catastrophic



Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
CR01	All	5	5		25	Public sector funding	A major reduction in public sector funding, including consequences of changes in funding arrangements for other bodies.	Further economic decline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion of reserves Major financial problems Reputation damage Possible industrial action Changes become “knee jerk” Govt intervention Further savings required Council loses critical mass in key areas Service failures Potential disproportionate impact on the poorest and most vulnerable members of society 	S151 officer
							Impact on balancing the budget – significant change and financial savings required.	Change in national government policy as a result of the economic position.		
							New policies and regulations place a major financial burden on the Council e.g. RSG and HRA restructuring.	Unable to make saving within the required timescales		
						Change in direction of government policy.				
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Medium Term Financial Strategy incl. reserves policy, financial reporting to CLT & Cabinet, transformation projects regularly monitored, MTFS is regularly reviewed and updated. HRA business plan. Weekly review by CLT of government announcements to assess implications and response required.							CLT and S151 officer		Monthly or more frequently if needed	
CR27	All	5	5	NEW	25	Income generation	Impact on balancing the budget – significant change and financial savings required. Under-utilisation of assets. Failure to agree with GNDP partners CIL funding arrangements for investment in core infrastructure required to deliver homes and jobs. CIL income is below expectations.	Further economic decline. Unable to make saving within the required timescales. Other triggers: Bethel St Police Station – market value payment. Triennial pensions review. VAT partial exemption.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to raise capital receipts Decline in income streams (eg rents from investment properties) – insufficient funds to maintain current service levels Erosion of reserves Major financial problems Reputation damage Govt intervention Further savings required Council loses critical mass in key areas 	S151 officer



Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
							<p>Collapse in world markets leading to loss of income</p> <p>Low economic growth or recession reduces income</p>	<p>Variable energy prices.</p> <p>Increasing voids due to market and economy factors.</p> <p>Loss of major tenant.</p> <p>GNDP board decision or cabinet decision on CIL investment arrangements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service failures Potential disproportionate impact on the poorest and most vulnerable members of society Damage/costs across void portfolio Essential infrastructure to deliver growth in the GNDP area is delayed. 	
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
<p>Medium Term Financial Strategy incl. reserves policy, financial reporting to CLT & Cabinet, transformation projects regularly monitored, MTFS is regularly reviewed and updated.</p> <p>HRA business plan.</p> <p>GNDP have an agreed investment plan for the Greater Norwich area and have appointed consultants to advise on the use of CIL to help deliver this programme. Public examination on the soundness of the CIL tariff has been completed and inspectors report due in November 2012.</p>							CLT and S151 officer		Monthly or more frequently if needed	
CR08	All	4	5	↔	20	Customer demand	<p>Customer demand exceeds our capacity to deliver services as they are currently configured.</p> <p>Transfer of demand arising from service delivery changes or budget cuts by other public agencies</p>	<p>Excessive customer demand in key areas, particularly in relation to the need to cut services, or changes to policies eg council tax benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to cope with demand Complaints Reputation damage 	Deputy chief executive
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
<p>Proactive research on customer profile, forward planning, eg anticipating future events that will generate higher demand and use of data held to map and channel shift. Data capture, consultation, survey and service planning. Being robust about the role and responsibilities of Norwich City Council</p>							Head of service where relevant and customer contact		Continuous	
CR10	All	3-4	5	↔	15-20	Emergency planning and business	The council delivers a range of complex services to vulnerable elements of the community.	Occurrence of a significant event:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service disruption and inability to deliver services 	Deputy chief executive and executive

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
				↑		continuity	Organisations generally are experiencing significant continuity events once every five years on average. The council, businesses and members of the public in the city may also be at risk from the local effects of climate change in the medium to long term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IT failure Contractor collapse Severe weather events – storms, heatwaves, strong winds Flooding Sea level rise Fuel shortages Communications failure Pandemic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption of the delivery of goods and services to the council Increased requests for council resources and services Health and safety impact on staff and vulnerable residents Damage to council property and impact on tenants Reputation damage Years to recover Poor inspection reports 	head of business relationship management
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
<p>The council is a member of the Norfolk Resilience Forum, which has produced a Norfolk Community Risk Register</p> <p>Business continuity team with access to resources; action plans have been used to deal with actual total City Hall IT failure; alternative site for customer contact team; disaster recovery plan and the use of Blackberries for communications.</p> <p>The council has a major emergency management strategy and emergency planning room established at City Hall. Approach has also been used to test business continuity in the event of the main works contractor changing.</p> <p>Flu pandemic plan.</p> <p>The Norfolk Climate Change Partnership has produced a climate change risk assessment for Norfolk local authorities.</p> <p>Adaptations to protect the council from the local effects of climate change and address the causes are covered by corporate strategies such as the environmental strategy and sustainable community strategy, together with service plans.</p>						Public Health & Enforcement protection manager co-ordinates general business and the council's role in emergency planning. Service improvement manager co-ordinates the IT list of key officers. Heads of service responsible for works contracts and ensuring resilience is built into service plans.			All documents have review dates after valuable lessons learned. Business continuity plans for works contracts reviewed as necessary.	
CR05	All	3	5	↔	15	Delivery of the corporate plan and key supporting policies and strategies within the council's	The council has a clear set of corporate priorities within its corporate plan. Within the council's wider strategic framework, there are a number of key corporate strategies and policies which must be delivered across the organisation to realise	Corporate priorities are not on target to be delivered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key priorities for the City are not delivered Projects halted or delayed Adverse public opinion Projects / work completed to a lower quality Negative impact on outcomes for customers 	Executive head of strategy, people and democracy

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
						strategic framework, including environmental strategy and financial inclusion strategy.	the council's priorities e.g. environmental strategy, financial inclusion strategy etc The new localism act and other key pieces of legislation are changing the framework for local government and put new requirements on the council that must be met in a number of different areas. When this is combined with the significant savings the council will need to make to meet the government funding reductions, there is a risk that these changes will reduce the capacity of the council to deliver on its key corporate priorities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative performance ratings for the council Continual over-stretching of capacity Inconsistent approach taken across council Full benefits not realised Benefits of cross working not gained Lack of corporate working Staff confusion over policies and process Failure to take the opportunity to make the lives of Norwich citizens better 	
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Regular review of Corporate Plan, Medium Term Financial Strategy and other key policies and strategies, effective performance and programme management, corporate planning and service planning aligned with budget setting to ensure resources are in place to deliver priorities. Effective preparation for changes in legislation.							CLT and heads of service		Continuous process	
CR12	All	3	5		15	IT Strategy	The council has transferred its ICT service to LGSS and it will rely on LGSS to develop an ICT strategy for the council.	IT strategy fails to support the organisation moving forward and the Lean blueprint for a new council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoherent approach to IT systems Systems not customer friendly Systems are not integrated with one and other Drain on resources as staff work around the systems Lack of accuracy in key data Data are unreliable Key information not trusted Hinders management and service 	Executive head of business relationship management


Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improvements Failure to deliver council priorities 	
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
NCC has developed an ICT strategic direction document detailing the key areas where ICT is required to support business objectives and change. Management of the LGSS relationship will seek to ensure that NCC requirements are delivered.						Executive head of business relationship management for governance arrangements in contract and chairing corporate information assurance group			Bi-annual review of overall governance arrangements	
CR17	5	3	5		15	Relationship management with key service delivery partners and the management of contracts.	<p>The council has a number of key partnerships with LGSS, NPS Norwich, and NP Law. There is also a highways agency agreement with Norfolk County Council. This approach to service delivery requires a different managerial approach by the city council.</p> <p>The council also has a number of key contracts – eg with NORSE, BIFFA, and Anglia Windows Ltd, – which require strong, consistent procurement and client management.</p>	<p>Partnerships not managed effectively and key service outcomes not achieved.</p> <p>Contracts not managed effectively, and key service outcomes not achieved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council doesn't get value for money Benefits of partner and contract arrangements not realised Constant negotiation around the service delivery agreement Specification not adhered to Services not provided at an acceptable level Customer and staff complaints 	Deputy chief executive and executive head of business relationship management
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
<p>New governance structure is in place to manage the individual partnership agreements (eg NPS Norwich Board, LGSS liaison group, NP Law Board, all major contracts have strategic and operational governance arrangements with officer and member representation.</p> <p>In response to the council operating model training requirements are being reviewed and staffing structures refreshed to reflect this change. Contract management training has been completed for staff delivering environmental works contracts.</p> <p>A contract and business relationship management toolkit has been</p>						Business management group.			Monthly and quarterly reviews undertaken.	

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
	developed and is being deployed. This aims to create consistency of management of both financial and performance objectives and monitoring and management of all economic, social and environmental issues associated with the service.									
CR20	All	3	5		15	Level of reserves	The council has a legal duty to ensure it has a prudent level of reserves to conduct its business. Government policy. Economic climate	Reserves fall below acceptable levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate levels of reserves publicly reported by external auditors Government intervention Impact on reputation of the council 	S151 officer
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
Medium term financial strategy. HRA Business Plan. Planning and delivery of transformation (savings) programme. Contract and business relationship management to identify and respond to business delivery risks. Budget development, in-year monitoring and control						Chief finance officer, CLT and business management group			Quarterly	
CR21	1	3	5		15	Safeguarding children, vulnerable adults and equalities duties.	Safeguarding and equalities duties and responsibilities not embedded throughout the council and its contractors/commissioned services/partners. Short term works contracts mean that there is an ongoing requirement to ensure contractors comply with the council's safeguarding children and adults duties and those relating to equalities. Change in council service delivery model with an increase in the number of partnership arrangements will require new arrangements for the delivery of safeguarding and equalities duties. Impact of cuts on care services and benefit funding.	<p>Critical incident</p> <p>Change in contractor/commissioned service/partner.</p> <p>Change in contractor/commissioned service/partner</p> <p>Reduced service provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerable adults and children at greater risk of exclusion or harm Individuals from a community of identity dealt with inappropriately and at risk of exclusion Risk of judicial review on accessibility of services 	Deputy chief executive
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
Safeguarding children policy and procedures in place and reviewed annually through safeguarding group. Safeguarding compliance self assessment improvement plan being implemented Safeguarding vulnerable adult policy and procedures being prepared. Safeguarding						Safeguarding children - Head of local neighbourhood services and all contract managers. Safeguarding vulnerable adults - Tenancy support manager and all contract managers.			Quarterly	

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
						<p>duties included in new contracts and programme to ensure duties are embedded is in progress with new contractors, and joint training/ awareness sessions have been held. Equalities duties is overseen by corporate equalities group.</p> <p>A contract and business relationship management toolkit has been developed and is being deployed. This aims to create consistency of management of both financial and performance objectives and monitoring and management of all economic, social and environmental issues associated with the service and particularly in relation to safeguarding</p>	Equalities – Head of policy and programme management			
CR22	All	3	5		15	Industrial action	Changes to pension regulations and pay restraint and changes to terms and conditions could lead to industrial action by employees	National negotiating framework - failure to agree. Ballot of union members. Implementation of changes to the LGPS. Implementation of government interventions on pay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of key services Public safety Loss of income Reputation 	Executive head of strategy, people and democracy
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
<p>2 stages – managing the threat of industrial action and responding to industrial action</p> <p>Identify and agree with UNISON exemptions from strike action</p> <p>Identify and implement business continuity/contingency plans to maintain essential services and ensure statutory duties are met</p> <p>CLT agree and implement strategy for response to strike action ie assessing the scale of the action, communications, response depending on nature of the action, wider industrial relations implications, deductions from pay etc</p> <p>National and regional guidance</p> <p>Statutory immunities – Trade Union Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act</p>							Head of HR and learning		Monitor and review in line with national consultation and negotiations	
CR23	All	3	5		15	Community right to challenge	The Localism Act includes the community right to challenge. This means that community organisations (along with private contractors if they choose) can challenge the council on the delivery of a service and in doing	A successful challenge or series of challenges leads to a fragmentation of services.	Services become fragmented and remaining overheads cannot be mitigated and overall service cost increases.	Executive head of business relationship management

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
							so trigger a procurement process. This could lead to a fragmentation of services and leave the council with fixed overheads that would need to be paid for by the remaining services.			
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Keep services under review to ensure they are delivering value for money. If a challenge is successful ensure that the procurement process takes in to account all elements of the service including overheads. Ensure any contracts as a result of challenges are flexible and allow the council to manage budgets.							Heads of service			
CR24	5	3	5	↔	15	Information security	Sensitive and/or personal data is sent to the incorrect recipient or not kept securely, or is lost.	Data is emailed to insecure email addresses. Lap top or memory stick containing data is lost or stolen. Information is sent to incorrect addresses. Hard copy data is lost or stolen.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fine up to £0.5 million Reputational risk 	Executive head of business relationship management
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Regularly remind all managers and employees of their responsibilities for the use of and security of data. Avoid using mobile devices to store or process sensitive or personal data. Encrypt lap tops and data sticks when they are used to store or process sensitive or personal data. Proper disposal of confidential waste.							Managers to remind all employees of their responsibilities All employees regularly required to read and sign up to the relevant policies All new starters required to read and sign up to the relevant policies CLT to consider mandatory data protection training before access to any systems is granted (recommendation from Civica audit)			
CR26	All	3	5	NEW	15	Cash receipting system	The council needs to change its existing cash receipting system by the end of July 2013 to maintain compliance with Payment Card Industry standards The existing supplier is currently finalising a hosted system but this is unlikely to be available	The hosted system solution is not available on time or does not work and the council is unable to take card payments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cash flow if the council is unable to take card payments (currently nearly £300k per week) Cost of alternative solution Reputation Fines 	Executive head of business relationship management

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
							until Jan 2013 at the earliest. It will then begin to move current customers but may not have the resources to complete the exercise by the deadline	The supplier is unable to move the council to the new system by the deadline		
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
The supplier is finalising a hosted system and is hoping to move all current customers before July 2013, but other options are also being explored. Service improvement manager is leading the project to find a solution. Exploring other solutions with LGSS							CLT and executive head of business relationship management		Monthly	
CR17 a	5	4	3	↔	12	Failure of major contractor & legal challenge following an unsuccessful tender bid	The council has a number of key contractors who may be vulnerable to market and economy factors. In addition the number of legal challenges (and therefore injunctions preventing a contract award) is increasing due to the financial pressures and reducing workload	Key contractor goes into administration or an injunction is issued preventing the award of a new contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer and staff complaints Services not delivered Contingency plans have to be invoked Cost and time to retender contract Cost and time to defend legal challenge Additional unforeseen costs impact delivery of balanced outturn and reserve levels 	Executive head of business relationship management
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Monitor major contractors for warning signs and make any necessary contingency plans. Recently put into practice and contingency plans tested. Ensure a robust procurement process is followed in accordance with the appropriate procurement regulations, NCC processes and best practice. NPS JV to be extended to include works division. This arrangement will enable the JV to carry outwork that was previously contracted to private sector. This approach is in line with the Councils operating model. This will provide enhanced security over the supplier and increased direct control by the council. Contingency budget and allowance for failures within the calculation of prudent minimum balance of reserves More use of shared services reduces size and scope of contracts with private sector providers (e.g. ICT)							Head of service and contract manager have responsibility for business continuity planning Procedural matters following a failure of a major contractor will be undertaken by Executive head of business relationship management. Head of service and executive head of business relationship management to ensure procurement processes followed		Quarterly	
CRO4	3	2	5	↓	10 (was	Norwich and Homes & Communities	Reputation Change of rules by the	Material breach of contract Deadlines missed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects halted or delayed Adverse public opinion Increase in local 	Deputy chief executive

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
		(was 3)			15	Agency Strategic Partnership (NAHCASP) Three elements: 1) Development of land at Bowthorpe for mixed tenure (amber) 2) Other affordable housing and regeneration schemes (amber) 3. South city centre masterplan work (green)	government – tighter deadline for bidding for affordable housing grant Bowthorpe - need for master plan and detailed plan for phase one. Outline application submitted April 2012. Need to establish a future investment programme using funds from Bowthorpe development Need to establish deliverable development proposals and funding. Need to identify partner for delivery of affordable housing and care home provision.	Funding for some projects may not be obtained Failure to obtain planning approval Failure to establish investment programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unemployment Funding may have to be returned Core infrastructure and affordable homes may not be delivered 	
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Contract. Strategic Board includes Members and HCA. Officer Implementation Board. Annual Business Plan. Project managers for individual projects. Regular financial and budget reports. Two audit reports gave good assurance on controls. New outline planning application submitted in April 2012 to provide development framework for phased delivery of the site. Consultants appointed for south city centre masterplan work. Council to take on role of development partner for affordable housing in phase one and care home development partner has been agreed.							Head of city development		Monthly highlight reports	
CR11	3	2	5		10	Delivery of Joint Core Strategy (JCS)	The council, through the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, is seeking to promote delivery of the JCS. If delivered, JCS will see more than 30,000 homes built in the greater Norwich area, and 35,000+ jobs created over next 15 years. There has been a successful Legal challenge to the JCS. This	Failure of the GNDP board to agree a revised development strategy for Broadland.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputation damage Significant likelihood that the overall development strategy for the Greater Norwich area will not be delivered. 	Deputy chief executive

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
							will require a review of the development strategy for Broadland. The city council can adopt the strategy and this will enable work to continue on the identification of potential development sites and development management policies.			
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Ensuring that strategies being prepared with GNDP colleagues are as robust as possible and firmly grounded in reliable evidence. Inter-authority working based on consensus decision-making ensures all parties are in agreement with the proposed policy framework. All policy work is supported by comprehensive evidence in accordance with government guidelines.							Head of planning		Quarterly – business head of service group	
CR19	5	3	3	↔	9	Fraud and corruption	Poor internal controls lead to fraudulent acts against the council, resulting in losses. Bribery Act 2010 came into force 1 July 2011 – lack of guidance or policies	Failure in internal control. Discovery of fraudulent acts. Allegations received. Member of staff or councillor breaks the law. Council fails to prevent bribery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of income or assets Adverse public opinion Effect on use of resources Increased costs of external audit Cost of investigation and rectifying weaknesses Prison 	S151 officer
Action/controls and other mitigation							Responsibility for Action		Review Frequency	
Internal audit, fraud and corruption policy, Payment Card Industry security assessment to protect card payments, National Fraud Initiative, fraud team, whistleblowing policy and prosecution policy. Review and update as necessary policies and procedures. Assess risk of bribery, train staff and monitor and review procedures.							LGSS head of internal audit, risk and insurance		Quarterly	
CR25	3	3	3	↔	9	Housing Investment Strategy	As part of the reform of the HRA the council has taken on a substantial debt to replace the	Reduction in rental income (arising from a high level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver the Norwich Standard within the expected timescale 	Deputy chief executive

Risk No	Council Priority	Likelihood	Impact	Change	Risk Score	Description	Vulnerability	Trigger	Consequence	Ownership
						<p>former negative housing subsidy system. This debt will be repaid over a period not exceeding 30 years. In addition to debt repayments the council has adopted a new standard for investment in the housing stock and a commitment to fund a new build programme. Should the cost of works increase and/or the level of income reduce, then it may be necessary to review the housing investment strategy.</p> <p>In addition, below inflation/rpi increases in rents will impact on income.</p>	<p>of council house sales, increasing debt or other factors).</p> <p>Significant increase in the cost of delivering improvement works.</p> <p>Annual rent setting process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of resources to support a new build programme. Increased tenant dissatisfaction Reduced new build programme. 	and S151 officer.	
Action/controls and other mitigation						Responsibility for Action			Review Frequency	
Regular review of HRA business plan and housing investment plan to reflect financial position of the HRA. The main control will be the timescale for delivering the Norwich standard to all properties together with the delivery of any agreed new build programme.						Cabinet and CLT			Quarterly review of HRA BP by CLT. Annually as part of the budget setting process	