| | | | | | | | | Curi | rent Score | Risk Respo nse; | | | | idual isk | Action Owner / (Date) | Action Compl ete |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|---|---|---|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Dep t. | Ris k# | Risk | Causes (s) | Consequences (s) | Risk Owner | List of current controls | I | L | Ris k Sco re | Tolerat e Treat Termin ate Transf er | Further Actions / Additional Controls | ı | L | Ris k Sco re | | (Yes or No) |
| • | I. M | edium Term | Financial Strategy | (MTFS) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All | 1.1 | Risk around the MTFS including the ability to deliver savings through Service Redesign/ Transform ation as required in the MTFS, impact of the living wage and other demand and cost pressures | Reducing government funding Increased demand for the most vulnerable continues to increase: Adult Social Care / CYPS Significant efficiencies/sa vings already realised and implemented thereby making it increasingly difficult to deliver unidentified savings | Service Delivery Negative impact on all services as further service cuts will be required to reduce deficit Reputation Significant impact on reputation exacerbated by the need for quick and potentially crude savings if a more considered approach not adopted Financial Loss of income Restricted funding from other sources | Chief Executive/ All Directors | MTFS approved Public consultation undertaken Monitoring processes in place at both departmental and corporate level Settlement reviewed and MTFS updated Progress with savings monitored and reported to Scrutiny Commission regularly Improvement to Transformation programme including governance | 5 | 5 | 25 | Treat | Further investigation of living wage costs and offsetting actions Further investigations of the children's placements overspend Greater emphasis on commissioning, active communities and demand management Review MTFS assumptions Review savings due to the possibility of front loading funding reductions in 2016/17 and 2017/18 Transformation Programme Review of Programme Design to be undertaken in | 5 | 5 | 25 | Chief Executive / All | |

| | collaboration with Corporate Finance with focus on | Directors |
|--|---|-----------|
| | strengthening and implementing design principles, processes and governance to ensure the effective and timely development of project proposals and business cases. Paper outlining proposed revised approach to be submitted to Transformation Delivery Board by October 2015. | Ongoing |
| | In alignment with the outcome of Programme Design Review, the PMO will review current programme reporting and develop and implement a reporting regime which provides Transformation Delivery Board with a clear and relevant view on progress of all appropriate projects/change initiatives from concept development to benefits realisation – timescale for delivery to align with Programme Design Review | |

| | | | Failing schools | Service Delivery | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|----|-------|---|---|---|----|---|--|
| C& FS | 1.2 | Local Authority legal requireme nts to meet deficit budgets from maintaine d schools becoming sponsore d academy, and pressure from Sponsors to meet repair costs. | normally accompanied by deficit budget position Impacts inc; • Sponsors are seeking building repairs/updat es before agreeing to sponsor schools • Central agenda/strate gy pushes for more conversion • Deficit budgets return to the Local Authority at the point of conversion. • No identified funding source to support sponsorship | Local academy strategy objectives unachievable If sponsorship projects are approved Capital programme slippage and delays to other major schemes People Displaced children needing to be relocated if school closes Stress/pressure on pupils, parents, teachers Reputation Sponsor schools walk away from arrangements unless demands met If the school continues to sustain underperformance (and no sponsor found) then the DfE | Director - Children & Family Services / Assistant Director Education & Learning | Challenged DfE and EFA regarding funding requirements for sponsored academies. Embedded new arrangements for Capital Planning and Delivery Groups designed to better assess and co-ordinate demands on the capital programme. Funding provision is made in the DSG reserve to meet the costs of sponsored academies deficits | 4 | 4 | 16 | Treat | Continue to challenge DfE and EFA regarding funding requirements for sponsored academies. There has been a significant slowing of academy conversions in recent months. In terms of sponsorship and meeting the costs of deficit budgets, this has largely related to secondary schools. Shepshed Hind Leys and High School are the only remaining outstanding secondary schools awaiting sponsorship conversion early next year (and having a sizeable deficit budget), although some primary schools are expected to come forward as a consequence of government policy change. | 4 | 4 | 16 | Head of Strategy- Education Sufficienc y/ Finance Business Partner | |

| | | | projects | could direct LCC to close the school. Financial Demand on limited Dedicated School Grant (revenue) resources Diversion of capital funding from other schools If schools close there will be a negative impact on the transport budget as the LA will have to transport children to other schools. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|----|-------|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| CE | 1.3 | Funding and reputation risks: CIL Regulatio ns (1 April 2015) are now in force which restrict the pooling of section 106 contributio ns | No CIL in place by District Councils Regulations now in force (6th April 2015) | Financial Failure to secure funds putting LCC at financial risk Reputation Possible need for challenge / defend challenge in high court | County Solicitor/ Head of Planning, Historic & Natural Environm ent | • | Agreed positions established with District Councils | 5 | 4 | 20 | Treat | Analyse data of s106 contributions since 2010 Re Categorisation and agreement reached with LPAs | 5 | 3 | 15 | Head of Planning, Historic & Natural Environm ent (on going) | |
| CR | 1.4 | The cost arising | Latest estimates | Reputation • Amounts involved are | Assistant Director – | • | Detailed review of MMI claims | 4 | 4 | 16 | | Fund audit due this year to establish if | 4 | 4 | 16 | | |

| from | from MMI | large and LCC is | Strategic | | undertaken | | | reserve holding is | | Assistant | |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|-----------|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------|------------------------------------|--|------------|--|
| uninsured | indicate an | currently the MMI's | Finance & | | before payments | | | sufficient and | | Director – | |
| risks | increasing | largest creditor | Property/ | | made | | | deductible level | | Strategic | |
| increases | liability | (£2.2m) | Finance | • | Significant | | | appropriate | | Finance & | |
| | Proposed | | Manager | | uninsured loss | | | Review reserve | | Property | |
| | settlement | <u>Financial</u> | | | fund created | | Treat | levels in light of future | | / Finance | |
| | from the | Currently provided for | | | has been | | rreat | claims | | Manager | |
| | Independent | a 15% levy with MMI, | | | increased | | | | | | |
| | only 15p per | will be reviewed by | | | (£2.2m) using | | | | | December | |
| | £1 of claims | MMI in 2 years. | | | 14/15 | | | | | 2015 | |
| | Independent | Liability insurance | | | underspend to | | | | | | |
| | insurance | increased significantly | | | mitigate against | | | | | | |
| | company | at last renewal (>50%) | | | the | | | | | | |
| | close to | due to insurer's | | | consequences | | | | | | |
| | agreement, | perceived risk. If | | | MMI and similar | | | | | | |
| | which means | correct LCC is | | | situations | | | | | | |
| | LCC will be | exposed to the | | | Risk | | | | | | |
| | effectively | deductible amount and | | | management | | | | | | |
| | self-insured | potential future | | | work continues | | | | | | |
| | for new | increases | | | to minimise claim | | | | | | |
| | claims in this | | | | numbers, | | | | | | |
| | period | | | | education to | | | | | | |
| | | | | | departments | | | | | | |
| | | | | | regarding | | | | | | |
| | | | | | maintenance of | | | | | | |
| | | | | | controls | | | | | | |
| | | | | | New process for | | | | | | |
| | | | | • | checking | | | | | | |
| | | | | | insurance cover | | | | | | |
| | | | | | for high risk | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Property | | | | | | |
| | | | | | contracts | | | | | | |
| | | | | • | Academies only | | | | | | |
| | | | | | expected to be | | | | | | |
| | | | | | insured by LCC or FA scheme in | | | | | | |
| | | | | | future | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Deductible | | | | | | |
| | | | | | increased to | | | | | | |
| | | | | | £250k to reduce | | | | | | |
| | | | | | premiums | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | payable | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|----|-------|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| C& FS | 1.5 | Significant pressures on the children's social care placement budget, which fund the care of vulnerable children. | High cost placements increasing especially in relation to behaviour & CSE issues | Financial High cost and overspending of budget | Assistant Director- Children's Social Care | • | T3 Project being closely performance managed by Departmental Transformation Board Placements Commissioning Board established Weekly tracking of admissions and discharges of Children in Care Working with Impower to increase foster carer numbers | 3 | 15 | Treat | T3 placement commissioning strategy is in progress Cohorts of children being targeted for lower cost measures Changed decision making processes to be put in place Monthly high level DMT reviews to be introduced | 3 | 5 | 15 | Assistant Director- Children's Social Care December 2015 | |
| A& C | 2.1 | Care Act - Phase 2 financial risk for funding received for 15/16 and beyond. (Total funding for Phase 1 and Phase 2 - | Care Act Phase 2 implementatio n delayed by Ministers until April 2020. Funding allocation isn't specific to Phase 2, whether some of this will be taken back is unclear. | Uncertainty about what claw-back if any in 15/16. Uncertainty if there will be a reduction of Care Act Allocation in 16/17. Project and staffing resources funded from this funding stream, - continued affordability which will impact department/operational teams. Impact on staff and staffing number – potential redundancies. | Assistant Director – Promoting Independe nce | | Significant use of fixed term contracts. Recruitment now ceased. | 4 | 20 | Treat | Staffing being reviewed for the savings to be made if funding withdrawn. Mitigate redundancies through usual Council Policies. | 3 | 5 | 15 | Assistant Director – Promoting Independe nce December 2015 | |

| | | £5.5m per annum) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|----|-------|---|---|---|----|---|--|
| CE / A &C | 2.2 | Better Care Together - There are a number of strategic risks associate d with the health and social care economy' s 5 year plan and strategic outline (investme nt) case. | Breakdown in maintaining a strong vision and joint partnership working across LLR | Service Delivery BCT programme outcomes are not delivered and the programme fails leading to reputational risks, partnership breakdown and financial instability within the health and care economy BCT care pathway changes fail to maintain safe, high quality clinical care The shift of care from acute to community settings is not modelled or implemented effectively leading to unforeseen pressure in other parts of the health and care economy Financial The investment case within the SOC in not fully supported, leading to gaps in the | Director- Adults & Communit ies/Directo r of Health and Care Inclusion / Assistant Director — Strategy & Commissi oning | Representation from the LA on the LLR Partnership Board and BCT Delivery Board and workstreams where appropriate. Programme has been reshaped to define the outcomes to be achieved by each workstream within the BCT. Business Justification templates completed to outline benefits, costs and risks of each workstream within the BCT programme The majority of the Leics BCF deliverables are aligned to the urgent care and frail older people's work streams Further modelling | 4 | 4 | 16 | Treat | The following additional controls have been provided by BCT: • As the Programme progresses from the design to implementation phase, further clarity is needed on the detail of governance arrangements between BCT programme and HWBs. Meeting with BCT Independent Chair and BCT programme Director being arranged to progress this. • The Programme is strengthening its programme controls by undertaking a task and finish exercise that will closely triangulate BCT programme planning, risk management, performance management, communications and engagement. The | 4 | 3 | 12 | Director- Adults & Communit ies & Director of Health and Care Inclusion Ongoing | |

| financial plan/assumptions for delivering the programme The savings from BCT are not achieved, leading to gaps in the financial plan/assumptions for delivering the programme. A notional figure of £5m impact on ASC has been highlighted within the Strategic Outline Case. | work is in progress led by the BCT programme office on the bed reconfiguration proposals BCT update included in all- member briefings on a regular basis. BCT reports to HWBB and Cabinet approving the 5 year plan and the Strategic Outline Case. | BCT programme is currently developing an outcome and milestones document which will set out the detail of delivery plans for the next 12-18 months. • Public consultation planned in the Autumn to be led by the BCT programme. | |
|---|--|--|--|
| People Partners are unable to provide sufficient staffing resource to deliver the programme leading to failure to deliver at the required pace and scale Lack of LLR integrated workforce plans Reputational The communication and engagement plan for BCT is ineffective leading to lack of public | BCT Scheme of Delegation has been shared with the council for comment, feedback given. Social care/prevention strategies for each LA have been drafted to inform the BCT delivery plan .The Chief Executive, (Rutland County Council, SRO, Social Care), are being consolidated by into one | | |

| | | | Decreased income Continual economic climate High unemploymen t / Reduction | support or opposition to the plans Service Delivery Service users losing support/income leading to a rise in number of people needing support from LCC and | | overarching document. Social Fund claims are lower due to more focused eligibility criteria A&C finance team monitoring impact of benefit | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|---|---|-------------|-------|--|---|---|----|---|--|
| All | 2.3 | LCC and partners do not have the capacity to meet expected increase in demand caused by the Welfare Reform Act | in wage increases Changes in the benefit system Introduction of Universal Credit transfers responsibility to vulnerable people Inadequate information for business cases jeopardising robust decision making More demand for advice services No central funding for Local Welfare Provision post | other local agencies People Families less able to maintain independence Difficulty in identifying and implementing effective preventative measures 'Hard to reach' groups slip through the net Reputation Cases of hardship / lack of support in media Potential inspection Public confused as to which Agency has responsibility Financial | Director of Adults & Communit ies / Assistant Director – Strategy & Commissi oning/ Assistant Chief Executive | changes on departmental income and debt recovery Debt strategy plan approved and being implemented Information booklet on major WRA changes developed and circulated to all A&C staff and shared with CYPS LCC agreed contribution towards the districts hardship funds to assist people in financial difficulty Additional contingency help for non-collection of council tax | 5 | 5 25 | Treat | Options to mitigate loss of Local Welfare Fund being explored Maintain awareness of legislative changes and timing of WRA roll-out | 5 | 4 | 20 | Director of Adults & Communit ies / Assistant Director – Strategy & Commissi oning / Assistant Chief Executive Septembe r 2015 | |

| April 2015 • PIP migration for new and existing service users including appointee and deputyship in receipt of DLA who were under 65 on 8 April 2013 commences 13/7/15 | A&C debt increases Demand led budgets under more pressure Risk of litigation / judicial review Increased risk due to the migration from Disability Living Allowance to Personal independence Payments locally effective from 13 July 2015 over the following 2 years. The longer term risk has also now increased in relation to the Governments rollout timetable that most existing benefit claimants will be moved over to Universal Credit during 2016 and 2017. However, it has now been | Plan in place for CCF to deal with PIP for all LCC appointeeship / Deputyship cases. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 2017. However, it has now been | | | | |
| | acknowledged that at least 700,000 claimants will not be on Universal | | | | |
| | Credit by the end of 2017. | | | | |

| CR | 3.1 | The County Council's services have a growing dependen ce on ICT systems and infrastruct ure. Hence maintainin g ICT systems and having the ability to restore services quickly and effectively in the event of an outage is vital. | Business evolution and dependencies cause additional load and complexity on existing infrastructure, reducing resilience to failure. Current data centre reaching end of life | Service Delivery Unable to deliver critical services Disruption to day to day operations Loss of key information Loss of self-service customer facing options / Public unable to use all access channel People Alternate business continuity arrangements likely to result in backlogs of work Reputation Negative stories in press Key partners impacted may influence contract renewal Financial Potential penalties Additional costs related to internal and external recovery | Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y / Assistant Director – Customer Services & Operation s | • | DR testing done on all critical systems and integration of critical systems (technical tests) DR testing scenarios can be easily created using isolated bubble e.g. by service without impacting live environment Romulus court recovery can now recover a service at RC in minutes Host server down can now automatically reallocate its services to another server in minutes Property provide power resiliency – recent updates to testing generators Critical system list signed off by Corporate Resiliency. Built into service desk and DR recovery processes Service BC plans developed for all | 5 | 3 | 15 | Treat | | Continue review of current plans to ascertain gaps, to put forward improvement proposals Notification of all planned changes that may impact infrastructure Data Centre replacement project underway Completion of first year of planned DR test DR tests need Corporate Resiliency Group input and input from Strategic DR plan owner (Kevin Turner) via DR working group Server virtualisation programme 95% complete | 4 | 3 | 12 | Design & Commissi oning Manager December 2015 Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y & Assistant Director – Customer Services & Operation s April 2016 | |
|----|-----|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|----|-------|--|---|---|---|----|--|--|
|----|-----|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|----|-------|--|---|---|---|----|--|--|

| | | T | T | T | T | - itela - 1 | | | | | Г | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
|----|-----|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|----|-------|--|-----|----|--|---|
| | | | Increased information | Comice Delivery | | critical services. | | | | | | | | | |
| CR | 3.2 | The responsibi lity to protect the confidenti ality, integrity, availability and accountab ility of informatio n means there is a continuing risk of failure of information n security. | sharing Increased demand for flexible working increases vulnerability of personal, sensitive data taken offsite. More hosted technology services Greater emphasis on publication of data and transparency Greater awareness of information rights by service users Increased demand to open up access to personal sensitive data and information to support integration of | Service Delivery Diminished public trust in ability of Council to provide services Failure to comply with Public Service Network (PSN) Code of Connection standard would result in the Council being disconnected from PSN services, with possible impact on delivery of some vital services. People Loss of confidential information compromising service user safety Reputation Damage to LCC reputation Financial Financial penalties | Director – Corporate Resource s & Transform ation/ Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y | New, simplified Information Security and Acceptable Use policy signed off PSN compliance achieved Regular penetration testing and enhanced IT health checks in place Improved guidance about data transfer tools Simplified Security and Acceptable Use Policy approved Communication plan re information security Mobile device management implemented | 4 | 4 | 16 | Treat | New security governance arrangements to be introduced PSN compliance requirements built into BAU Actions from external tests build into BAU Personal responsibility for information security to be built into new staff terms and conditions Ongoing implementation of relevant policies | 4 ; | 12 | Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y Sept 2015 Head of ICT Operation s Sept 2015 | |

| All | 3.3 | Failure by LCC to provide effective business intelligenc e to services will restrict implement ation of effective strategies, impacting council wide priorities and delivery of the Transform ation Program me | services and development of business intelligence. No clearly defined corporate Business Intelligence (BI) function Insufficient BI on customers and cost of services Reduced research, performance and finance support for projects Inadequate data quality and data sharing Demand influenced by unmanageabl e external environment Range of cultural, Information Management, | Service Delivery Inadequate information for business cases Jeopardise importance of robust and effective evidence based decision making Transformation priorities not being met People Difficulty in identifying and implementing effective preventative measures Less productivity through duplication of work Reputation Inaccurate returns | Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y/ Assistant Chief Executive | Data and BI Enabler Programme underway Data and BI Board established New Head of BI appointed TOM for Centre of Excellence for Data and BI agreed New Centre of Excellence established | 5 | 3 1 | T | Treat | Development of Data Framework model Development of technology roadmap for reporting and BI New mode for engagement with Transformation projects embedded Data and BI Strategy to be approved | 5 | 3 | 15 | Team Manager, Informatio n & Data Septembe r 2015 Design & Commissi oning Manager Sept 2015 Head of Business Intelligenc e Sept 2015 | |
|-----|-----|--|---|--|--|--|---|-----|---|-------|---|---|---|----|--|--|
| | | ation Program | cultural, Information | Reputation | | Excellence | | | | | | | | | - | |

| | | | predictions for growth (and decline) For e.g. Waste | number of data sets required under the Transparency Agenda Financial Risk of litigation/judicial review | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|----|--------------|---|---|---|----|--|
| All | 3.4 | Insufficien t capacity to provide Informatio n & Technolo gy solutions to support major change projects | Imbalance of IT resources versus IT requirements Demand outweighs supply Loss of knowledge and lack of continuity as a result of staff turnover and/or inadequate investment in skills and competencies Difficulties in recruitment and retention | Service Delivery Departmental and corporate objectives not met or delayed Delays to project delivery Financial Failure to support delivery of efficiency programme and ICT replacement projects | Director – Corporate Resource s & Transform ation/ Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y | I&T work programme provides forward visibility of demand Use of external contractors to fill specific skills gaps Analysis of likely future demand Improved forward planning through implementation of JIRA Identification of key skills and workforce plan to retain, develop and recruit | 4 | 4 | 16 | Treat | Implementation of Information and Technology Strategy Development of demand management approaches | 4 | 4 | 16 | Assistant Director – Informatio n & Technolog y April 2016 |
| C& FS | 3.5 | Breach of Data Protection Act - retention of files longer | Decommissionin g of Adult Case management System (SSIS) C&F Management Team has | Service Delivery • Service delivery adversely affected by out of date data People | Assistant Director – Commissi oning & Developm ent / Head of | Legal Services' view is that any fines for not retaining data when it should be retained for example in | 4 | 4 | 16 | Tolerat e | Review policy annually to see if position has changed | 4 | 4 | 16 | Assistant Director – Commissi |

| 4 | . Tra | than required | | Details of Vulnerable people at risk of disclosure Reputation Potential adverse media attention and public lack of confidence Financial Potential financial penalties | Strategy – Business Support | • | litigation, would be greater than if data is kept securely for longer than legally required. Data securely held | | | | | | | | | oning & Developm ent / Head of Strategy – Business Support October 2015 | |
|---------|-------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|----|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| E& T | 4.1 | Impact of an increase in unplanne d and speculativ e local developm | National and local housing shortage Government impetus to build new homes Lack of 5 year housing | Service Delivery Significant increase in both the number and complexity of planning applications received Increase in the number of appeals | Director – Environm ent & Transport | • | Working with district councils to help identify, prioritise and program work to establish housing plans. Additional expertise | 3 | 5 | 15 | • | Continue to assist districts in formulation of planning documents to predict county wide housing requirements Identify pinch points on transport network early to begin design | 3 | 3 | 9 | Head of Service | |

| | | ents to address the shortfall in the 5 year housing supply which could have an adverse impact on the functionin g of the transport network. | supply District level plans not in place Pressure on districts for early determination of planning applications Increased developer 'know-how' Shortage of expert resources | Negative impact on other core LCC strategies (LTP3) People Undue pressure on staff as expert and specific knowledge required Safety issues/congestion/accidents for residents if schemes not properly planned and approved Reputation Difficulties to maintain reputation of being a quality and fair Highways Authority Developments in the wrong location Financial Increase in legal costs Loss of developer contribution Public funds needed to address impact of developers | | • | resource recruited Analysing different options for the phasing , funding and delivery of transport infrastructure Monitoring number of applications and structuring team to ensure they can be turned around as efficiently as possible, however there is still a minimum amount of time that a transport assessment takes | | | | Treat | work on potential schemes so that they can be later funded by developers in appropriate circumstances Review of planning responses across the authority | | | Transport Policy & Strategy, Head of Planning, Historic & Natural Environm ent Ongoing | |
|--------------|-----|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|----|-------|--|---|------|--|--|
| | | | | developers | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | tnership Wo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C &F S | 5.1 | Improved outcomes and financial benefits of | New phase two outcomes frameworks requires large data | Service Delivery Reduction in families supported Increase in reactive | Director – Children & Family Services / Assistant | • | Data project underway to increase provision, quality and from a range | 5 | 3 | 15 | | Measuring outcomes to demonstrate reduced demand. Cost benefits | 5 | 3 15 | | |

| | | Supportin g Leicesters hire Families (SLF) are not achieved, leading to inability to financially sustain the SLF service beyond 2015/16 | collection New framework includes much broader measures to achieve in order to pull down TFU monies | People Families and individuals do not achieve their potential Reputation Loss of confidence in place based solutions Financial Related services unable to reduce budgets if demand not decreased | Director- Children's Social Care | of services Training for workers to achieve optimum outcomes with families at earliest opportunity Leicestershire has now completed phase one of PBR and pulled down additional funding into the pooled budget SLF Service is now fully up and running and merged into C&F Services Whole family working is being rolled out across a range of | | | | Tre | analysis to be shared with partners to progress further conversation around future funding Discussions with partner organisation to secure ongoing funding Leicestershire to enter PBR phase two early therefore enabling us to draw down additional money into the pooled budget | | | Assistant Director- Children's Social Care / Head of Supportin g Leicesters hire Families October 2015 |
|---------|-----|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|----|-------|---|---|----|---|
| E& T | 5.2 | Insufficien t /unknown funding for transport schemes to deliver economic growth and LTP3/Stra tegic Plan | Changes to local and national funding streams (i.e. SEP) Lack of available match funding Lack of / insufficient future plan | Service Delivery. People and Reputation A transport system that does not support population and economic growth, LTP3/Strategic Plan Financial Major impact on funding sources | Director – Environm ent & Transport | Services Fed into MTFS / LLEP / SEP processes Development of Enabling growth action plan Engagement with centre and LLEP to develop more coherent working relationships Working with | 5 | 4 | 20 | Treat | Continued engagement with centre and LLEP to develop more coherent working relationships Continue to work with SCG, Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Advisory Group and Leicester City to increase the prominence of | 3 | 12 | Director – Environm ent & Transport |

| & | Unknown funding | SCG, Leicester | transport investment | |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| availability | for development of | and | in delivery of | |
| of match | future schemes | Leicestershire | economic benefits | |
| funding. | | Transport | Continue to | |
| | | Advisory Group | understand future | |
| | | and Leicester | DfT funding models | |
| | | City to increase | in order to optimise | |
| | | the prominence | opportunities | |
| | | of transport | available | |
| | | investment in | Continue to develop | |
| | | delivery of | future plan | |
| | | economic | | |
| | | benefits | | |
| | | Continuing to | | |
| | | understand future | | |
| | | DfT funding | | |
| | | models in order | | |
| | | to optimise | | |
| | | opportunities | | |
| | | available | | |
| | | Continuing to | | |
| | | develop future | | |
| | | plan | | |

| All 6.1 | The Authority does not obtain the required value and level of performan ce from its providers /suppliers | Lack of robust contract management /performance measures for in-house services Robustness of supply chain Reduced funding and resources Staff turnover leading to lack of continuity in contract management Insufficient investment in contract management skills and competencies | Service Delivery Business disruption due to cost and time to re-tender the contract Standards/quality not met resulting in reduced customer satisfaction Relationships with providers/suppliers deteriorate People Additional workload where disputes arise Reputation Customer complaints Financial VfM/ Efficiencies not achieved Increased costs as LCC has to pick up the service again Unfunded financial exposure (MMI) | Director – Corporate Resource s & Transform ation / Assistant Director – Corporate Services & Transform ation | The performance of the Authority's 23 'top' contracts is monitored on a quarterly basis to ensure that a robust approach is taken to managing performance. Departmental and Corporate CCB ensure that sufficient consideration is given to contract and relationship management; and to managing liabilities at the outset of the procurement. | 5 | 3 | 15 | Tre | Approach to Supplier continuity assurance (based on plans for business critical services) underway Contract Management Toolkit and training interventions being developed as part of the Effective Commissioning Enabler (Transformation Programme) Roll out of e-tendering to help make contract KPI's and management more visible. Commissioning support model is being developed with specific focus on establishing a contract management function to help strengthen arrangements. New Commissioning & Procurement Strategy identified range of additional measures to be implemented | 4 | 3 | 12 | Head of Commissi oning and Procurem ent Support Septembe r 2015 | |
|---------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|----|-----|--|---|---|----|--|--|
|---------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|----|-----|--|---|---|----|--|--|

| CF S | 7.1 | Historic Evidence of previously unknown serious historic issues of child sexual exploitation or | Historic Concerted effort to explore historic exploitation and abuse in response to the Goddard Inquiry and Police Operations | Service Delivery Need to review and redesign current service in the light of lessons learnt Reputation Potential adverse | Reputatio n_Chief Executive | • | Established Goddard Inquiry Strategic Governance Group to oversee planned investigation and information gathering Pro-active engagement with the Goddard Inquiry | 5 | 5 | 25 | • | Further planning for known events e.g. National Enquiry | 5 | 5 | 25 | Reputatio n Chief Executive Reputatio n & Service Delivery | |
|---------|-----|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|--|--|

| | T | | D | <u> </u> | | | Dinasta |
|------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------|----------------------|------------------|
| abuse is | | media and | Reputatio | | Trea | t | Director - |
| identified | | political risk | <u>n &</u> | | | | Children & |
| | | <u>Financial</u> | <u>Service</u> | | | | Family |
| | | Increased | <u>Delivery</u> | | | | Services |
| | | cost of | Director - | | | | |
| | | settling | Children & | | | | <u>Legal</u> |
| | | claims and | Family | | | Understand fully the | County |
| | <u>Current</u> | service | Services | | | emerging care | Solicitor |
| Current | | redesign | | | | costs | |
| <u> </u> | Concerted effort | | <u>Legal</u> | CSE team | | | <u>Financial</u> |
| The | in response to | | County | embedded in the | | Effective Council | Director - |
| Council | the Goddard | | Solicitor | police specialist | | wide approach | Corporate |
| does not | Inquiry and | Service Delivery | | response team | | | Resource |
| have the | Police | Increase in | <u>Financial</u> | New operational | | | s |
| capacity | Operations | the volume of | Director - | guidance and | | | |
| to meet | result in the | work beyond | Corporate | governance | | | Ongoing & |
| the | significant | the capacity | Resource | arrangements in | | | o 4 st |
| demand | increase in | of the | s | place | | | 31 st |
| on the | identified cases | planned | | LSCB CSE Co- | | | December |
| CSE | | service | | Ordinator in | | | 2015 |
| service | | People (Public) | | place | | | |
| Service | | The Council | | p.acc | | | |
| | | fails to | | | | | |
| | | support | | | | | |
| | | victims and | | | | | |
| | | those at risk | | | | | |
| | | Reputation | | | | | |
| | | Loss of public | | | | | |
| | | confidence in | | | | | |
| | | the Council | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | and political | | | | | |
| | | instability | | | | | |
| | | <u>Financial</u> | | | | | |
| | | Increased cost of | | | | | |
| | | settlement and | | | | | |
| | | service delivery | | | | | |

Department

| A&C = | Adults & Communities | E&T = | Environment and Transport |
|-------|----------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| CE = | Chief Executives | PH = | Public Health |
| CR = | Corporate Resources | All = | Consolidated risk |