

Risk Ref	Link to Objectives	Risk Description	Consequences / Impact	Risk Owner	Original Risk Score			Risk Action Tolerate / Treat / Transfer / Terminate	List of Current Controls / Actions Embedded and operating soundly	Current Risk Score (as at 01/04/2016)			Risk Action Tolerate / Treat / Transfer / Terminate	Further Action / Additional Controls	Action Owner	Action Target Date	Target Risk Score			
					I	L	Risk Score			I	L	Risk Score					I	L	Risk Score	
1	All	<u>Insufficient staff capacity and skills</u> If the departmental reorganisation doesn't provide the appropriate structure or is poorly implemented then service levels will be impacted and valuable experienced staff will be lost	Loss of performance / disruption Loss of experience / knowledge Uncertainty for staff Vacancies	Director	4	4	16	Treat	Interviewing top down Hand over arrangements to ensure knowledge is shared Reviewing resource capacity over next 12 months	3	4	12	Tolerate						0	
2	All	<u>Volume of externally driven work</u> If there is a sudden excessive volume of externally driven work received then resources will be used inefficiently	Peaks in workload Stress Inefficient use of resources	Director	4	4	16	Treat	Regular update meetings with Network Rail, Highways England Planning Officer Forums Working closely with the Leicester & Leicestershire Economic Partnership	3	3	9	Tolerate						0	
3	All	<u>Political Support / Democratic Cycle</u> If political priorities are not aligned to Commissioning Intentions then MTFS savings may not be achieved	Political agendas Public opinion / opposition Delays MTFS savings not achieved	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Engaging Lead Member /Members throughout the process Fully understanding / communicating consequences of actions	3	3	9	Tolerate						0	
4	All	<u>Changes to legislation</u> If there are significant changes / clarifications to legislation, policy or guidance then performance could be impacted and cost increases	Increased costs Changes in performance	Director	4	3	12	Treat	Engagement with Government / trade organisations to ensure we are aware of any changes Responding to appropriate legislative change consultations	3	3	9	Tolerate						0	
5	All	<u>Departmental Culture</u> If the departmental culture doesn't change to reflect the new Target Operating Model then there will be an impact on customers, MTFS savings and quality of service	No additional capacity built into new structure Priorities not delivered Inefficiencies Impact on morale Reputational damage	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Customer Focussed Approach (CFA) project Commissioning Academy / learning from other authorities	3	4	12	Treat	Implementation of CFA actions Working with CSC to develop our customer approach	According to action plan Ongoing	According to action plan Ongoing		3	3	9
6	A / C / D / E / F / G	<u>Insufficient / unknown funding</u> If there is insufficient / unknown funding for transport schemes then the transport system will not support economic and housing growth and other corporate / departmental priorities		Director	5	3	15	Treat	Engagement with the LLEP Working with SCG, Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Advisory Group and Leicester City to increase the prominence of transport investment in delivery of economic benefits.	5	2	10	Tolerate						0	

Risk Ref	Link to Objectives	Risk Description	Consequences / Impact	Risk Owner	Original Risk Score			Risk Action Tolerate / Treat / Transfer / Terminate	List of Current Controls / Actions Embedded and operating soundly	Current Risk Score (as at 01/04/2016)			Risk Action Tolerate / Treat / Transfer / Terminate	Further Action / Additional Controls	Action Owner	Action Target Date	Target Risk Score		
					I	L	Risk Score			I	L	Risk Score					I	L	Risk Score
7	All	<u>Challenge</u> If we incorrectly interpret legislation / requirements then a successful stakeholder challenge could be bought against us	Delays Reputational damage and costs associated with them Resource implications	Director	4	4	16	Treat	Early legal advice Equalities & Human Rights Impact Assessments undertaken Early engagement of commissioning support on procurement projects	4	3	12	Tolerate						0
8	A / B	<u>Communities</u> If we don't have appropriate co-ordinated arrangements in place across the authority to enable communities to deliver services then they are at risk of failure	Targets / priorities not achieved / achieved late Service failure Reputational damage due to service failure Fewer volunteers Increased costs	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Sharing commissioning intentions across departments Commissioning Academy Community Engagement	3	3	9	Tolerate						0
9	All	<u>Management Information</u> If we don't have appropriate management information regarding service delivery then this will impact on evidence based decision making	Service delivery quality failure Benchmarking comparisons ineffective Key services not fully understood, efficiency not optimised Decommissioning decisions not fully informed Services do not reflect the needs of service users and other stakeholders Savings not realised	Director	4	4	16	Treat	Development of 16/17 Team Plan approach including development of departmental Performance Management Framework Development of Departmental ICT Strategy Looking after Leicestershire - re-organisation	4	4	16	Treat	Continuation of actions already being taken			4	2	8
10	A / C / D / E / F / G	<u>Unplanned / speculative local developments</u> If there is an increase in unplanned and speculative local developments then this could have an adverse impact on the functioning of the transport network.	Increase in number and complexity of planning applications Increase in number of appeals Pressure on staff Safety issues / congestion / accidents Reputational damage as Highway Authority Developments in the wrong locations Increased legal costs Loss of developer contribution	Director	3	5	15	Treat	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 work on potential schemes so that they can be later funded by developers' in appropriate circumstances Review of planning responses across the authority	3	5	15	Treat	Continuation of actions already being taken			3	3	9
11	A / B	<u>Cumulative impact of Transformation Programme</u> If the cumulative impact of the Transformation Programme isn't fully understood then there could be unintended / additional negative impacts on Leicestershire residents	Unintended impacts Equality impacts Reputational risks	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Communicating with Change Boards / corporate groups Sharing commissioning intentions across the authority Reviewing commissioning strategy	3	4	12	Treat	Continuation of actions already being taken			3	3	9

Risk Impact Measurement Criteria

Scale	Description	Departmental Service Plan	Internal Operations	People	Reputation	Financial per annum / per loss
1	Negligible	Little impact to objectives in service plan	Limited disruption to operations and service quality satisfactory	Minor injuries	Public concern restricted to local complaints	<£50k
2	Minor	Minor impact to service as objectives in service plan are not met	Short term disruption to operations resulting in a minor adverse impact on partnerships and minimal reduction in service quality.	Minor Injury to those in the Council's care	Minor adverse local / public / media attention and complaints	£50k-£250k Minimal effect on budget/cost
3	Moderate	Considerable fall in service as objectives in service plan are not met	Sustained moderate level disruption to operations / Relevant partnership relationships strained / Service quality not satisfactory	Potential for minor physical injuries / Stressful experience	Adverse local media public attention	£250k - £500k Small increase on budget/cost: Handled within the team/service
4	Major	Major impact to services as objectives in service plan are not met.	Serious disruption to operations with relationships in major partnerships affected / Service quality not acceptable with adverse impact on front line services. Significant disruption of core activities. Key targets missed.	Exposure to dangerous conditions creating potential for serious physical or mental harm	Serious negative regional criticism, with some national coverage	£500-£750k. Significant increase in budget/cost. Service budgets exceeded
5	Very High/Critical	Significant fall/failure in service as objectives in service plan are not met	Long term serious interruption to operations / Major partnerships under threat / Service quality not acceptable with impact on front line services	Exposure to dangerous conditions leading to potential loss of life or permanent physical/mental damage. Life threatening or multiple serious injuries	Prolonged regional and national condemnation, with serious damage to the reputation of the organisation i.e. front-page headlines, TV. Possible criminal, or high profile, civil action against the Council, members or officers,	>£750k Large increase on budget/cost. Impact on whole council

Risk Likelihood Measurement Criteria

Rating Scale	Likelihood	Example of Loss/Event Frequency	Probability %
1	Very rare/unlikely	EXCEPTIONAL event. This will probably never happen/recur.	<20%
2	Unlikely	Event NOT EXPECTED. Do not expect it to happen/recur, but it is possible it may do so.	20-40%
3	Possible	LITTLE LIKELIHOOD of event occurring. It might happen or recur occasionally.	40-60%
4	Probable /Likely	Event is MORE THAN LIKELY to occur. Will probably happen/recur, but it is not a persisting issue.	60-80%
5	Almost Certain	Reasonable to expect that the event WILL undoubtedly happen/recur, possibly frequently.	>80%

Risk Management Matrix

		Impact				
5	Very High/Critical	5	10	15	20	25
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
1	Negligible	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5
		Very Rare/Unlikely	Unlikely	Possible/Likely	Probable/ Likely	Almost certain

Likelihood (Likelihood of risk occurring over lifetime of objective (i.e. 12 mths))

Risk Tolerance/ Reporting Criteria

<u>Tolerance Levels</u>	<u>Original /Current Risk Score</u>	<u>Expected Actions by Risk and Action Owners</u>	
White	1 to 2	Controls Monitoring = Escalation =	No action required No action required No action required
Low	3 to 6	Accept Risk or Maintain Controls Monitoring = Escalation =	Existing controls may be sufficient. No additional controls are required unless they can be implemented at very low cost (in terms of time, money, and effort). Actions to further reduce these risks are assigned low priority. Review six monthly /Reporting with service area Service area manager
Medium	8 to 12	Maintain Controls or Further Controls to reduce rating Monitoring = Escalation =	Controls required but consider in light of 4 Ts-Consideration should be as to whether the risks can be lowered, where applicable, to a tolerable level , but the costs of additional risk reduction measures should be taken into account (time, money and effort). Continued Proactive Monitoring/Review at quarterly / Reporting to DMT Business Partners / Relevant AD / DMT
High	15 to 25	Further Action/Controls to reduce rating Monitoring = Escalation =	Controls and further actions necessary. Substantial efforts should be made to reduce the risk. Arrangements should be made to ensure that existing controls are maintained. The risk reduction measures should be implemented within a defined time period. Continued Proactive Quarterly Monitoring / Report to CGC Chief Officer / CMT / Lead Member