

Risk Ref	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 (April 2017)			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	<u>Insufficient staff capacity and skills</u> If the department doesn't have the appropriate structure in place then service levels will be impacted	Loss of performance / disruption Loss of experience / knowledge Failure to achieve MTFS savings Failure to maximise income	Director	4	4	16	Treat	New departmental structure in place Use of consultants to address gaps in resources	3	3	9	Treat	Review of operating model, departmental processes and gap analysis	All HoS / TMs	May 2017	3	3	9
													Highways Delivery further re-organisation	PaC	(TBA)			
													Develop workforce plans and learning pathways for all posts	AS / HR BP / HoS / TMs	April 2017			
2	<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 Impact on day to day work Cumulative impacts Speculative impacts	Director	4	4	16	Treat	Managing customer, manager and member expectations including through: Regular update meetings with Network Rail, Highways England Planning Officer Forums Engagement with DfT Working closely with the Leicester & Leicestershire Economic Partnership	4	4	16	Treat	Planning further into the future, setting achievable targets and priorities through team and Heads of Service Plans	All HoS / TMs	April 2017 onwards	3	4	12
3	<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	5	15	Treat	Engaging Lead Member /Members throughout the process Fully understanding / communicating consequences of actions Managing implementation to take into account political context	3	4	12	Tolerate						0
4	<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 Lack of ability to long term plan	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Engagement with Government / trade organisations to ensure we are aware of any changes Responding to appropriate legislative change consultations	3	4	12	Tolerate						0
5	<u>Challenge</u> If we fail to comply or incorrectly interpret legislation / requirements then a successful 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 Environmental risk assessments completed / reviewed every 3 years and action plans in place to tackle areas of high risk	4	3	12	Treat / Tolerate	Progress completion of actions to tackle areas of high environmental risk	PCI / TK / NS	As per action plan	4	3	12
													Update report to DMT on environmental risks	JC / JG	May 2017			
6	<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	According to action plan	According to action plan	3	3	9
													Working with CSC to develop our customer approach	HoS / TMs	Ongoing			
													Departmental input into the development of corporate outcomes framework and development of commissioning plans	HoS / TMs	2017/18			
													Process reviews and gap analysis	HoS / TMs	May 2017			

Risk Ref	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 (April 2017)			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	<u>Insufficient funding</u> If there is insufficient funding then our ability to deliver plans, meet expectations and influence future developments will be affected	Plans not delivered Expectations not met / reputational damage Ability to influence future developments will be affected	Director	5	3	15	Treat	Financial management MTFS in place Development of longer term programmes 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	4	3	12	Tolerate						0
8	<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 17/18 Team Plan approach including development of departmental Performance Management Framework New departmental structure in place	3	4	12	Treat	2017/18 Team and Heads of Service Plans in place. Development of departmental Performance Management Framework	TMs / HoS TMs / HoS	April 2017 Ongoing	3	3	9
9	<u>MTFS savings / income generation</u> If projects fail to deliver the required level of income/ savings then outcomes will not be achieved and alternative savings/ income would be required	Higher savings burden in future years Alternative savings will be required, with potential impacts on service delivery	Director	5	4	20	Treat	Initial scoping work commissioned for both MTFS saving/ income generation projects, giving early indication of income generation/ saving potential Project support by Transformation Unit in place Development of commissioning strategy approach	5	4	20	Treat	Delivery of Transformation Programme Development of Departmental Performance Management Framework Departmental management team challenge to identify alternative savings and efficiencies Complete MTFS deliverability assessments for 2017 Transformation projects	PC HoS / TMs / DMT PC HoS / TMs	According to project plan Ongoing Ongoing April 2017	5	3	15
10	<u>ICT Support Resources</u> If there is a lack of ICT support resource then service delivery and development will be impacted	Impact on programme delivery / service delivery and development activity Unable to deliver required MTFS saving/ income generation target Less efficient / wasted time / resources Impact on development of management information Impact on staff morale / frustration	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Issues raised through Departmental ICT group, DMT and individual project boards.	3	4	12	Treat	Development and delivery of departmental ICT strategy	AS	2017/18	2	4	8
11	<u>External Partners</u> If key external partners (including district councils) fail to deliver expected benefits, service improvements, agreed actions / targets then priorities may not be delivered and budgets may be overspent	Priorities not delivered Relationships damaged Reputational damage Increased costs Budget overspend / failure to meet MTFS targets Impact on delivery of current and future strategies	Director	4	3	12	Treat	Informal arrangements in place to deliver effective partnership working. Working with partners to deliver priority work programme Continuing dialogue / engagement with key partners (including districts)	4	3	12	Treat	Reviewing key strategic documents	HoS / TMs	Various timescales	4	2	8

Risk Ref	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 (April 2017)			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
12	<u>Manual handling and new vehicles</u> If there is a delay in procuring new vehicles then this impacts on improving our manual handling issues and we are exposed to further Improvement Notices or Prohibition Notice by the Health & Safety Executive	Potential for serious physical harm Reputational damage Improvement / Prohibition Notice	Assistant Director Highways & Transport	5	2	10	Treat	New vehicles ordered	5	2	10	Treat	Complete audit once new vehicles are received	DP	April 2017	4	2	8
13	<u>Risk Assessments</u> If we have insufficient resource to implement Audit recommendations then service users' safety is at risk and LCC is at financial and reputational risk.	Failure in duty of care and service efficiencies Death, injury Potential serious reputational effect Potential litigation	Assistant Director Highways & Transport	5	3	15	Treat	Better quality system for new Risk Assessments in place Improved processes and documentation Prioritising assessments for those with complex medical needs	5	2	10	Treat	Develop and commence implementation of programme of assessing backlog and future RA reviews	MW	Dec 2017	5	1	10
14	<u>O License</u> If we fail to comply with the operators license then the license could be revoked / curtailed	License revoked / curtailed impacting on approx. 70 x 3.5 tonne + vehicles Breach of legal requirements Reputational damage	Assistant Director Highways & Transport	5	3	15	Treat	Record books in place Instructions / training given on requirements Tracking presentation of record books and completion Checking record books prior to handing over keys to drivers Random vehicle checks - CCTV / spot checks Development of an O'License dashboard to provide regular updates to DMT Dealing with issues through HR	5	2	10	Tolerate						
15	<u>Health & Safety General</u> If there is a lack of health & safety resources / skills / co-ordination within the department then risk assessments will not be completed / will not be completed adequately or acted upon	Potential for serious physical harm Reputational damage Improvement / Prohibition Notice Not in accordance with ISO18000 system Fines / financial penalties	Director	5	4	20	Treat	Established a departmental cascade of Health & Safety meetings and Health & Safety working group Departmental Health & Safety management system in place	5	2	10	Treat	Develop and deliver departmental and service area action plans H&S position review across Highways Delivery (action plan to follow and risk target score to be reviewed) LMS and DMT steer on repeat training	HoS / TMs DP AS	June onwards May 2017 April 2017	5	2	10
16	<u>3rd Party / voluntary sector</u> If the 3rd Party / voluntary sector have insufficient resource to effectively partner with LCC around shared agendas then we may not achieve our objectives.	Targets / priorities not achieved due to reliance on 3rd party / voluntary sector to support delivery. Some partnerships are disbanded Fewer volunteers Less training opportunities Reputational damage Increased costs / removal of grant schemes	Director	3	4	12	Treat	Reuse Plan for Leicestershire being implemented. Engaging with corporate partners re. future funding Working with organisations to minimise the impact of potential reduced funding from LCC Current strategic green infrastructure partnerships have action plans and governance in place	3	4	12	Tolerate						

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank