

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

**Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO**

Risk			Risks as at: 31/07/2019							
What is the issue:	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls	Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
what is the root cause/			(See Scoring Table)				(See Scoring Table)			
problem – what could go wrong			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk	

**STRATEGIC AREA - Adult Social Care**

<p><b>1. Care Services &amp; Commissioning (ASC) - Budget - Compliance/DOLS</b> Lack of budget / resources to comply with changes in DOLS legislation</p>	<p>- DOLS assessments not carried out; - Potential for individuals to be illegally deprived of their liberty, for safeguarding due to lack of oversight and for legal claims against LCC, and fines. 'Reputational risk if someone dies whilst illegally deprived of their liberty, financial risk if taken to court</p>	<p>- Following legal advice from a Barrister, Leadership has agreed a revised prioritisation system that is reviewed regularly. - Use of Independent BIAs - Use of form 3b - Development of internal staff (Social workers - BIA) - JE completed for BIAs (unsuccessful), further request for market supplements made, waiting list risk assessed monthly and prioritisation system agreed with Leadership (reviewed regularly)</p>	4	4	16	<p>-Report to Exec – seeking additional funding for 12month project <u>-Wider recruitment planned and to be funded</u></p>	4	3	12		Tracie Rees	<a href="#">31.10.2019 Ongoing</a>
<p><b>2. Care Services &amp; Commissioning (ASC) - Mental Health - Statutory Duty</b> LCC is legally obliged under the Mental Health Act (MHA) to provide 24/7 service</p>	<p>- Risk of harm to, or by, mentally ill person - Breach of compliance and possible fines - Reputational damage - Impact on morale and stress if staff working outside hours - Increased staff turnover leads to immediate resource issues; also recruitment and training requirement - Potential delays and can increase working hours. - Not meeting MHA legislation - Potential delays and can increase working hours.</p>	<p>- 24/7 rota reviewed with AMPs and Unions and due for implementations shortly; - using non-AMPs for appropriate functions</p>	4	4	16	<p>- Management support to AMHPs; - Continue to consider options for recruitment, Continue to escalate. - Pilot of new 7 day rota commenced 04.09.2018 and was reviewed at the end Nov 2018, but issue of cover still not resolved. - Review to be completed to change To. Meantime the risk remains high as the council may not be able to undertake its statutory duty. <u>- Pilot of new 7 day rota commenced 01.09.2018 and was reviewed at the end Nov 2018, day time workers working a Sat shift as part of their normal working week. Market supplements have been agreed for EDT workers, open advert for AMHPs, secondments and overtime offered to AMHPs and SW across ASC</u></p>	4	3	12		Tracie Rees	<a href="#">31.10.2019 Ongoing</a>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019														
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls			Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required			Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:																
what is the root cause/																
problem – what could go wrong																
<b>3. Care Services &amp; Commissioning (ASC) - Data breach</b> Human error as demands on role increase likelihood for breach with access to sensitive data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sensitive data shared with wrong individuals</li> <li>- Distressing to service users</li> <li>- Reputational damage to LCC</li> <li>- ICO investigation and potential fines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- E-learning staff training - mandatory</li> <li>- HR action against offenders / disciplinary / dismissal / court</li> <li>- Shared learning</li> <li>- Information sharing agreement / DPA policy</li> <li>- Caldicott Guardian - TR</li> <li>- Automated message on log-on</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewing toolkits / refresher training / reviewing guidance and training on GDPR requires regular refresher</li> </ul>	4	3	12				Tracie Rees	<a href="#">31.10.2019 Ongoing</a>		
<b>STRATEGIC AREA - City Development and Neighbourhoods</b>																
<b>4. Neighbourhood and Environmental Services - Lack of Adequate Resource Capacity</b> Increase in the demand led services, along with the reduction in head count could mean that there are insufficient resources to deliver the required service levels.  During times of change, staff are not always aware of the changes being made, resulting in confusion etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teams already at a minimum and extra workloads are unsustainable.</li> <li>- As demand-led services increase, workload and public expectations increase.</li> <li>- Likelihood of key person dependency as teams reduce further (fewer people in key roles).</li> <li>- Potential risk of non-compliance or breaches/lack of a substantial control environment.</li> <li>- Service delivery requirements not met.</li> <li>- Staff wellbeing may be harmed.</li> <li>- Reputational damage may result from unplanned building closures due to staff shortages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing prioritisation arrangements are in place.</li> <li>- Policies and procedures are in place.</li> <li>- Processes are in place.</li> <li>- Regular briefings and PDRs</li> <li>- Organisational review consultation process.</li> <li>- Managing expectations with senior officers / stakeholders</li> <li>- Accessing external grants</li> </ul>	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building adequate criteria and expectations into Service Reviews</li> <li>- Income generation to fund service specific posts / resources</li> <li>- Better use of existing internal &amp; external resources (partnerships)</li> </ul>	3	3	9				John Leach	<a href="#">31.10.2019 Ongoing</a>		
<b>5. Neighbourhood and Environmental Services - Beaumont Park Depot</b> Condition of depot creating risks to service delivery, individuals working on site and visitors, situation identified in H&S report in 2011.  Previously requested in 2014 to be accommodated in Capital Programme. Strategic Director with Head of Finance moved to be dealt with as part of Depot Review passed for action to Director of EBS following site visit in Nov 2017. Options drawn up Feb 2018 but later abandoned. NES awaiting confirmed direction re-resolution. <u>Director of EBS now progressed further work.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Serious accident injury and or death to staff/member of public.</li> <li>- Reputational damage to LCC.</li> <li>- Insurance claims against the Council.</li> <li>- Legal challenge.</li> <li>- Media exposure.</li> <li>- Adverse effect on budget/finances.</li> <li>- Closure of premises, loss of service.</li> <li>- Breaches in legislation and/or non-compliance.</li> <li>- Demand led services may not be met.</li> <li>- Significant delay to decide and implement a solution could weigh heavily in any proceedings that would follow a serious incident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On going review of depot in-house Business Change Manager facilitating with E&amp;B. Undertaking options appraisal with input from Legal, Planning and Highways.</li> <li>- Building conditional surveys reviewed under the TNS Programme.</li> <li>- Agreed to manage outside of Depot review with separate budget allocation.</li> <li>- NES/P&amp; O have ensured operational mitigating action in place. I13Dedicated Banksman employed to manage traffic movement on site.</li> <li>- All staff trained in banksman duty of care.</li> <li>- H&amp;S team undertaken review C13of short term safety measures for pedestrians and vehicles on site.</li> <li>- £125k approved from Loss Reduction Risk fund to install one way system, plus £10k EBS. (NEW ADDITION). Meeting held with EBS 11th April - Trees and Woodland Team and Landscapes Team ensuring all appropriate alternative storage options are utilised. EBS committed to confirmation/delivery of scheme within budget and to providing implementation timescale asap. Andy Keeling supporting NES urgent request for appropriate action.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New site</li> <li>- Suitable adaptation of existing to accommodate operational practices and introduction of one way traffic system.</li> </ul>	4	2	8	Unknown at present	Matthew Wallace	<a href="#">31.10.2019 Ongoing</a>				

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:			(See Scoring Table)									
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<p><b>6. Neighbourhood and Environmental Services - Reduction in Income Generation Programmes</b></p> <p>With reductions in public demand in Building Control and Pest Control income generated by the Council may be significantly reduced and income generation/revenue targets may not be met.</p> <p>Also, 'one off' income programmes are set as recurring within the budgets/accounts; impacting further on future financial targets. Competition from competitors e.g., Crematorium.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budgets are not adhered to.</li> <li>- Income streams continue to reduce (e.g. Building Regs) due to the economic climate.</li> <li>- Targets remain the same or increase, against income sources and staff reductions.</li> <li>- One off income is disclosed as recurring, increasing the savings gap.</li> <li>- Internal recharges, e.g. for community space, will reduce as services reorganise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budgets are in place and alternative savings option appraisals are performed and saving plans are implemented.</li> <li>- Policies and procedures are in place.</li> <li>- Ashco business development arrangements are in place.</li> <li>- An agreement is in place for withdrawal of internal services from community settings under the TNS programme.</li> <li>- Draw on external funding</li> </ul>	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introducing new ways of working to encourage entrepreneurial opportunities</li> <li>- External funding opportunities further explored</li> </ul>	2	4	8	N/A	John Leach	<u>31.10.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>
<p><b>7. Tourism, Culture &amp; Investment - Markets</b></p> <p>Risk relating to trader attrition and inability to attract new traders particularly during the market improvement works</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trader occupancy rates currently sit at 51% average. This is due, it is felt, to the ongoing improvement works taking place in the area and the general malaise in city centre retail.</li> <li>- Ongoing regeneration in the Market will, it is hoped, halt the reduction in traders</li> </ul>	<p>The public square will be used to attract footfall and the new screen will complete in spring 2019. An investment programme for the outdoor market had been agreed by the City Mayor but that has no changed and there is no agreed programme of work.</p>	4	4	16	Need review and reprioritise works with CM. High risk remains	3	4	12	Work to Market is urgently needed as without improvements new commodities cannot be expected	Mike Dalzell	<u>30.09.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO			Risks as at: 31/07/2019									
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong			(See Scoring Table)				(See Scoring Table)					
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<p><b>8. Tourism, Culture &amp; Investment - Markets</b></p> <p>The prevalence of incidents of anti-social behaviour in and around the Market area</p>	<p>- Public and Traders cease to use the Market because of the prevalence of ASB issues</p> <p>-Negative media coverage impacting perceptions of the Markets and deters shoppers</p>	<p>Inspectors regularly patrol The presence of security officer has no doubt made a huge difference in regards to antisocial behaviour on the market, however the problem still exists within the City Centre and is prevalent on the outer fringes of the Market Place..</p>	4	4	16	<p>- Market rules are complemented with zero tolerance. Security staff are engaged. Make frequent Police Patrols</p>	3	4	12	<p>-The presence of security officer has no doubt made a huge difference in regards to antisocial behaviour on the market, however the problem still exists within the City Centre and is prevalent on the outer fringes of the Market Place...</p> <p><u>Homeless people and substance abusers currently get fed at Leicester Market 7 days a week. Work is ongoing to try to locate alternative feeding stations so that people do not congregate on the Market from as early as 4pm daily</u></p>	Mike Dalzell	<p><u>31.10.2019</u></p> <p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:			(See Scoring Table)				(See Scoring Table)					
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<p><b>9. Tourism, Culture &amp; Investment - De Montfort Hall</b>                      Loss of operational ability, falling below customer expectation, loss of reputation, knock on effect to touring promoters if facilities not up to industry expectation.</p> <p>Root problem: The stage lift has recently suffered some failures and if this lift were to cease operation, we would not be able to change format of the hall to enable DMH to hold the variety of performances we currently have booked</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of income</li> <li>- Loss of reputation</li> <li>- Negative PR.</li> </ul>	<p><del>- Responsibility for maintenance of the stage lift has rested with DMH until recently. EBS have now taken on responsibility. We have had the lift serviced this Summer 2017, with recommendations for some repairs to take place in Summer 2018 which would cost approximately £30k but the lift really needs to be replaced entirely at a cost nearer £200k. The recent conditional report suggest that the lift will fail in 12-18 months. Property services have expressed that they do not have a budget to service our needs. <u>Stage lift works delayed until summer 2020. Increased risk of breakdown even with upweighted inspection programme.</u></del></p>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Works procured but cannot be carried out until Aug 2019.</li> <li>- Mitigation and controls to be put in place reduce risk of failure in meantime.</li> </ul>	5	2	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation in place for 2hr callout until works can be undertaken..</li> <li>- Tender in process</li> </ul>	Mike Dalzell	<u>31.10.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>
<p><b>10. Tourism, Culture &amp; Investment - De Montfort Hall</b>                      Loss of operational ability, falling below customer expectation, loss of reputation, knock on effect to touring promoters if facilities not up to industry expectation.</p> <p>Root problem: The flying bars recently suffered some failures and if the flying bars were to cease operation, we would not be able to continue with our programme of shows.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of income</li> <li>- Loss of reputation</li> <li>- Negative PR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsibility for maintenance of the flying bars has rested with DMH until recently. The recent condition report commissioned by Theatre Plan, suggest that the flying bars will fail in 12-18 months. Approximate cost of replacement would be £200k.</li> <li>- Further investigation is required.</li> <li>- EBS will struggle to fund from maintenance budgets.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replacement took place during summer, 2018.</li> <li>- Now operational and appears reliable, although some minor adjustments still required to software,</li> </ul>	5	2	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Circa £100k. Funded via EBS capital.</li> <li>- All fully operational, need to find ongoing way to fund renewal / replacement given DMH revenue budget reduction.</li> </ul>	Mike Dalzell	<u>31.10.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019								
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls	Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:			(See Scoring Table)				(See Scoring Table)			
what is the root cause/										
problem – what could go wrong										
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk	

**STRATEGIC AREA - Corporate Resources and Support**

<p><b>11. Delivery, Communications and Political Governance - Unplanned Election Event</b></p> <p>The service may struggle to manage a number of unplanned, additional elections, as well as a number of different type of elections e.g. House of Lords, Referendums etc.</p> <p>Unable to source suitable polling stations and a count venue for unplanned elections.</p> <p>Ability to deliver planned elections severely compromised by short notice unplanned elections e.g. snap general election due to current Brexit issues or a further referendum relating to Brexit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elections not performed appropriately/challenges received and elections may have to be re-run.</li> <li>- Impacts on delivery of planned elections</li> <li>- Reputational damage.</li> <li>- Adverse effect on finances.</li> <li>- Media coverage.</li> <li>- Public complaints.</li> <li>- Increase in resource requirements.</li> <li>- Could lead to increased expectations on the existing trained core team, who hold relevant and detailed knowledge.</li> <li>- The potential repetition of impacts and pressures that arose during 2011 elections.</li> <li>- Impacts also on the wider capacity and resources of the Council which would be needed to support delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Returning officer and nominated deputies are in place.</li> <li>- Insurance is in place.</li> <li>- Many elections can be planned and have set dates. Monthly planning meetings and work underway in preparation for the next planned elections (Mayoral and Local) in May 2019 taking account of lessons learned from recent elections and now also for European Parliamentary elections in late May. Monthly meetings have considered and will continue to review the risk of a further short notice general election due to continued issues nationally arising from Brexit negotiations.</li> <li><b>- Since 2015 staffing plans for each election have sought to further develop the skills and experience of both the core team and to develop individuals to perform other key roles relating to aspects such as postal vote processing, election count and on polling day. This provides a wider pool of experienced staff to draw on.</b> May 2015 and 2016 elections and EU referendum enabled newer members of the core team to develop further skills and experience in specific aspects of the elections process which was further consolidated by 2017 general election.</li> <li>- Electoral Commission guidance gives detailed support in the planning and management of each specific type of elections.</li> <li>- A number of the Electoral Services team undertaking professional AEA qualifications. Recruited two new electoral services officers who are becoming embedded in the team and will be undertaking the appropriate core professional training</li> <li>- In recent elections have drawn upon external expertise e.g. training delivered via AEA and involved a wider group of staff from across the Council to support the process.</li> <li>- Detailed debriefs have been done after each election in recent years <b>including the recent May 2019 elections</b> and used to feed into planning for future elections. The successful delivery of</li> </ul>	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to develop skills and expertise across the wider electoral services team including completion of formal training &amp; qualifications - a number of staff undertaking relevant qualifications.</li> <li>- Use external or peer support where feasible e.g. from other local authorities.</li> <li>- Consider training/up-skilling a pool of contingency staff.</li> <li>- Keep under review staffing skills and expertise within the team and more widely</li> </ul>	4	2	8		Miranda Cannon	<b>31.10.2019</b> <b>Ongoing</b>
---	--	---	---	---	----	--	---	---	---	--	----------------	-------------------------------------

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

**Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO**

**Risks as at: 31/07/2019**

Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		(See Scoring Table)					
							Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<b>12. Finance - Information and Customer Access - Cyber Security</b> Increasing profile and expertise to circumvent established defences increase vulnerability of LCC data.	- Data hacked and released into public domain; - Reputational damage - seek alternative more expensive solutions; - Fines from ICO; - Staff stress increases; - Damage to identified individuals; - Denial of service	- Technology defences - Awareness campaign - Targeted follow up's - Built into new system standards from 3rd party applications (secure passwords, TLS) - Daily back-up of systems	4	5	20	- Technology solutions, requires cost effective considerations - Continued awareness training etc	4	5	20		Alison Greenhill	<a href="#">31.10.2019</a> <a href="#">Ongoing</a>
<b>13. Finance - Tactical Decision Making</b> Business solutions considered by services, which impact upon Information Services service delivery, are taken without consultation or considering the impact	- Increased budget pressure to implement / maintain expensive systems - Increased pressure achieve service budget / targets - Staff morale decreases - Reduction in service capacity - Breach of licences leading to fines - Security risks of data / service - Service support to other parts of council affected - Internal reputational damage	- Consultation with Hoss to increase knowledge and understanding of IT requirements at early stages of projects - Create Target Operating Model (TOM) - Enforcing Digital Transformation (DT) gateway process - Provide clear criteria for commissioning new IT solutions - Business Continuity (BC) process includes costs to service	4	4	16	- Monitor effectiveness of identified mitigations to determine future actions / plan	4	4	16		Alison Greenhill	<a href="#">31.10.2019</a> <a href="#">Ongoing</a>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<p><b>14. Finance - Introduction of Universal Credit (UC) Full Service Legislation</b></p> <p>Transfer of Housing support from the local authority, as under Housing Benefit (HB), to DWP. Schemes are not identical and in some instances not as generous as under HB. Impacts complex to explain as some claimants will remain on HB in the interim, for periods as fixed by the DWP.</p> <p><u>Implementation of UCFS was June 2018. Rollout will take 2/3 years to fully complete. Claimants move from LCC administered HB to DWP administered UC. Risk is impact on claimants changing from 1 system to another and the significant differences between the 2 regimes</u></p>	<p>Adverse impact on resident household income</p> <p>Increasing poverty</p> <p>Rent arrears (HRA)</p> <p>Potential homelessness</p> <p>Increased demand for discretionary funding</p> <p>Adverse impact on CT collection and increased arrears</p> <p>Increased demand for welfare advice services – Rent policy and collection arrangements will be challenging ( different impact to rent arrears)</p> <p>– Housing policies and procedures will require review</p> <p>– Potential need to increase allocated staff resources</p> <p>– Rental payments are delayed thus arrears build up leading to financial consequences for the Authority.</p> <p>– Housing Associations &amp; Private landlords</p> <p>– Financial consequences in £m</p> <p>– Increase to bad debt provision (Rent £2m arrears &amp; CT £3.5m in year collection loss)</p> <p>– Reputational damage</p> <p>– Demand for Crisis Support will increase (Est 200%)</p> <p>– Demand for Social Welfare Advice will increase (12.5%)</p> <p>– Demand upon Discretionary funding may exceed Government budget Allowance.</p> <p>– Demand for Council Tax Discretionary Relief (CTDR) support may exceed budget</p> <p>– Waiting and assessment periods, sanctions and compliance requirements will lead to delays in first payments and monthly reassessments of entitlement will be carried out</p>	<p>– LCC have a UC support strategy, risk log, Equality Impact Assessments with associated comms and action plans</p> <p>– Housing Service are developing a UC Full Service impact strategy, reviewing and developing a Homelessness prevention policy</p> <p>– Housing Options are monitoring the occurrences of this phenomenon</p> <p>– Detailed comms and action plans have been created by both Revenues &amp; Customer Support &amp; Housing</p> <p>– Comprehensive engagement programme is in place with commissioned providers to alert them to the increase in demand.</p> <p>– Every commissioned service has a business continuity plan which can be deployed should demand outstrip provision.</p> <p>– LCC UC strategy, risk log and ETA</p> <p>Comms and action plan</p> <p>Engagement with DWP &amp; SWAP</p> <p>Staff training</p>	4	4	16	<p>– Effective and repetitive communication campaign</p> <p>– The Council has written to DWP to raise their significant concerns regarding the impacts likely as a result of the introduction of full service Universal credit.</p> <p>– Social Welfare advice discussions ongoing at the Strategic SWAP (Social Welfare Advice Partnership) group re the identification and management of demand</p> <p>– Recognition of increased demand for crisis support Engagement with provider, Action Homeless, actions within their Business continuity planning.</p> <p>– DHP (Discretionary Housing Payments)/CTDR potential to request consideration of additional resources from Exec.</p> <p>– Reputational damage should be defensible as this is a DWP benefit and the local authority has no control over the timetable or administrative processes for this change.</p> <p><u>- Monitoring and reporting to Doff and Executive</u></p> <p><u>- Regular engagement with DWP</u></p> <p><u>- Redirection of staff resources</u></p> <p><u>- Regular review of customer support</u></p>	3	3	9	<p>£2m Rent arrears</p> <p>£0.5m Grant loss</p> <p>£3.6m CT loss</p>	Alison Greenhill	<u>31.10.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>



**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

**Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO**

**Risks as at: 31/07/2019**

Risk What is the issue:  what is the root cause/  problem – what could go wrong	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures   (See Scoring Table)	Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls   (See Scoring Table)	Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact Likelihood Risk		Impact Likelihood Risk			
<b>14. Finance – Introduction of Universal Credit (UC) Full Service – Continued Financial</b> DWP admin grant funding will reduce without the ability to reduce admin & staffing costs accordingly. DWP payments are not expected to cover the total costs of administering the UC process and the local support function as required.	– Financial consequences up to £0.5m upon HB/CT administration. – Delays in UC assessments and setting of recovery requests will affect the ability to collect council tax in year. – Unable to achieve efficiencies as insufficient resources required to cope with increased work demands – Potential creation of backlogs of work – Unable to apply an attachment to benefit to recover debt from UC, as other debts have more priority – LCC bad debt write offs increase – Likely impact on mental health, potential for increased aggression at front facing services – increase in self harm referrals – Existing HB overpayment recovery will be affected as claimants on recovery plans transfer to UC and we have little prospect of recovery through UC attachments.	– Budgets will be closely monitored and reviewed – DHP & CTDR spend monitored closely by the Director of finance – Learning from peer experience where possible – Review operational procedures – CT undertake annual promotion of Direct Debits – Robust Comms plans in plain literature is being reviewed to strengthen the message to pay – Overpayment recovery – discount pilot being operated by Business Services Centre, – Review alternative recovery options, based on findings of other Financial Services areas – This will be monitored by ASC/Public health – S02's will be monitored to identify work related stress and understand impacts on officers to plan and put in place support						
<b>14. Finance – Introduction of Universal Credit (UC) Full Service – Continued Customer Access</b> Any claimants who do not have the educational or language skills could find it very difficult to access UC. This could be compounded by lack of access to IT to enable them to engage in the application, compliance and claim management process as required under their claimant commitment.	– Increased need for educational, digital & personal support – increase in Stress Action Plans and associated resources to support staff, – increase in staff absence – Stress action plans – especially in front of house services including libraries etc	– Staff resources across Housing and Finance are being reviewed and where possible expanded. – Access to digital support, education and personal support provision is being mapped, reviewed and robust Comms being developed to help mitigate impacts and also support customers to satisfy claimant commitment criteria						

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO											
Risk			Risks as at: 31/07/2019								
What is the issue:	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls	Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date	
what is the root cause/											
problem – what could go wrong			(See Scoring Table)				(See Scoring Table)				
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk		
<b>15. Finance - Financial Challenges</b> The Council fails to respond adequately to the cuts in public sector funding over the coming year or years. Additional risk due to absence of Government plans beyond 19/20	- Council is placed in severe financial crisis. Reputational damage to the Council and substantial crisis job losses. If the process is not properly managed, the Council will have little money for anything but statutory 'demand led services'	- Budget balanced in 19/20 - Spending review 4 programme underway and previous spending reviews largely complete. <u>- £56m service transformation fund as at 31/3/19</u> <u>- managed reserve balance available to smooth 20/21</u>	5	3	15	- Heavy involvement of City Mayor and COO in ensuring spending review programme delivers. - Appropriate change management/ project management arrangements to be put in place for major review areas. - Delivery of spending review 4	5	2	10	Alison Greenhill	<u>31/03/2020</u> <u>19/2021 and On-going</u>
<b>16. Legal - Workloads &amp; Pressure - Client Care</b> Services within the Council are stretched with increased demands and pressures. Unrealistic deadlines at times can be set for major projects, procurement and contracts. There is a concern that whilst corporate policy is correct and general awareness of correct procedures/rules exists, it may not be implemented effectively within services.	- Timely legal advice from clients not sought. - Failure to comply with laid down guidelines. - Breach of regulations or law e.g. data protection. - Council found to act unlawfully. - Challenges to procurement processes. - Cost implications from requirements not being followed/deadlines being missed/ not delivering value for money for Council. - Award made against council etc. - Staff demotivated - Negative Press/Reputation of Council	- Reviewing practices to be improve flexibility of approach. - Channel Shift. - Raising awareness - corporate messages. - Early engagement - feeding into deadlines. - Attending project boards. - Projects to look at new ways of working.	4	4	16	- Completion of review of practices by September 2019. - Improved use of technology e.g. Electronic Signatures/Virtual Hearings/Channel Shifts (Corporate Channel shift program - March 2019). - Need to increase comms program/training and awareness of current practices (deadlines with project plan).	4	3	12	Kamal Adatia	<u>31.10.2019</u> <u>Ongoing</u>
<b>STRATEGIC AREA - Education and Children's Services</b>											
<b>17. Children's Social Care and Early Help - Budget</b> Loss and / or reduction of services to achieve budget savings	- Reduction in preventative services impacting on ability to deliver Statutory services - Inability to deliver Placement Sufficiency - Decrease Capacity / Increase demand - Potential reduction of staffing levels - Limited ability to deliver some front line services - Potential for future claims against authority	- Strategic Oversight and clear governance arrangements in place - SCE Programme Board oversees all budget reduction projects	5	4	20	- Star Chamber oversight regarding saving reductions and undeliverable savings.	5	3	15	Caroline Tote	<u>31.12.2019</u>
<b>18. Children's Social Care and Early Help - GDPR</b> Change in Data Protection regulation (GDPR) which came into force May 2018.	- Historic breaches of information due to human error continue; - Under new regulations the size of potential fines significantly greater; - Inaccurate data within systems; - Inaccurate decisions made for service user; - Could lead to data breaches and significant fines and incorrect service provision for service user. ICO involvement	- Training cascaded across services; - Compliance monitored; - Lessons learnt have been cascaded; - Actions taken where necessary	4	4	16	- Developing clear and consistent HR response. - Staff have completed GDPR training session. - GDPR understood across services.	4	3	12	Caroline Tote	<u>31.12.2019</u>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<b>19. Learning Services - Financial Deficit</b> A rising number of LA maintained schools are reporting financial deficits.	- Schools carrying significant financial deficits present a financial risk to the Council unless they are quickly supported to bring deficits back to a balanced budget position. - The LA has limited capacity to intervene in schools in deficit.	- A School Finance Group meets monthly to receive reports on the current position in relation to school budgets. - Schools receive letters requesting reassurances once deficits are notified and are required to apply for a licenced deficit in certain circumstances. - An independent business manager is also appointed in some instances, to help the schools concerned address their budget deficits	4	4	16	- Investigate further options such as additional capacity to support schools via more hours allocated for school business manager support.	4	3	12		Paul Tinsley	<a href="#">31.10.2019</a>
<b>20. Learning Services - External Market</b> External competition continues to threaten the future viability of the City Catering Service	- If the current rate of decline continues then the service will soon begin to make a loss. - City Catering Service losing business. - Impact on other services due to the difference being picked up by the General Fund affecting delivery of those other services	- Discussions with school business managers and report commissioned from APSE consultant	4	4	16	- Prepare options paper to take to Executive	3	4	12		Paul Tinsley	<a href="#">31.10.2019</a>
<b><u>STRATEGIC AREA - Public Health</u></b>												
<b>21. Public Health - Budget - External Influences</b> External national imperatives without associated budget introduced which will impact on local delivery.	- Call on finances from NHS pay award; - Changes in financial call due to changes in clinical requirements/fluctuations in drug/treatment market prices; - Prioritisation / decommissioning / reduction of existing service delivery model	- Internal decision making process; - Expertise within team to assess choices and inform management briefings / options appraisal; - Advocacy by Director Public Health (DPH) with national bodies;	4	4	16	- Political escalation; - Corporate responsibility; - Service & budget planning - Utilise partnership approach - Explore alternative treatment/therapy options	3	4	12		Ivan Browne	<a href="#">15.01.2020</a>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<b>22. Public Health - Budget Restrictions - Commissioning</b> Reduced budget for services impacts on financial viability to potential 3rd party contractors who may deem may package to be unsustainable.	- Loss of existing contractors unable to fulfil contracts within reducing financial envelope; - May not be attractive to new providers during tenders; risk of failed procurement - Loss of service provision; - Impact on community who require service; - Impact on NHS as demand increases for other services; - Decreased morale; - Reputational damage to LCC	- Bespoke procurement methods - Briefing of lead members to highlight potential risks and consequences; - Internal decision making process; - Expertise within team to assess choices and inform management briefings / options appraisal; - Advocacy by Director Public Health (DPH) with national bodies; - Provider negotiations; - Working with internal departments (legal / procurement / contract management/ finance)	4	4	16	- Continue with existing controls; - Explore joint commissioning (internal with LCC, and external with county and regionally) - Implement management of change processes - Accept new and novel approaches to commissioning including encouraging consortium applications	4	3	12		Ivan Browne	<u>15.01.2020</u>
<b>23. Public Health - Technology</b> Systems / technology not fit for purpose to support services and commercial objectives, lack of IT knowledge.	- Inability to achieve savings targets; - Service delivery remains static or not effective - Reduced morale of staff seeking organisational development and progress - Reputational damage - Lack of system integration - Customer dissatisfaction - Loss of income - Legal challenges - <b>impact on customers and loss of income</b>	- Realistic business plans and objectives set based on current technology capabilities - Project team involvement in new system deployment which impacts on service delivery - Communications with service users to manage expectations - Discussions with IT to understand potential development opportunities for systems in future - Working with IT to ensure sufficient testing of new system takes place; - Scrutiny of current systems to review concerns - <b><u>SS Data Project Officer in place/ new tender for software provider undertaken</u></b>	4	4	16	- Project group with IT to establish problems / limitations of current systems and review options on market as solutions - Ensure adequate engagement of CCG/ HIS to ensure systems run as effectively as possible	3	3	9		Ivan Browne	<u>01.01.2020</u>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			
<p><b>24. Budget Restrictions - Funding</b> Ongoing austerity for Public Sector requires changes to service delivery to comply with available budget, continued reductions could force termination of services to ensure priority services remain available. <u>Capital Costs increase beyond the approved budget creates service budget problems</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change in service provision</li> <li>- Decreased / ceased service /user contact</li> <li>- Decreased / ceased service effectiveness</li> <li>- Reputational damage</li> <li>- Increased demand on other public services (primary / secondary health care / Social Care / Leisure Centres)</li> <li>- Risk of missing safeguarding issues</li> <li>- Impact on council statutory duties</li> <li>- Judicial review;</li> <li>- Central government intervention</li> <li>- <u>Continued decline in condition of leisure centres/negative impact on customers and income</u></li> <li>- <u>Unable to deliver leisure centre capital programme due to unaffordability</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PH Return to Central Government (Return On Investment (ROI))</li> <li>- Staffing restructure</li> <li>- <u>Employing new commissioning and delivery model for key services</u></li> <li>- Invest to save opportunities explored</li> <li>- Internal briefings / decision making process</li> <li>- Political <u>oversite</u></li> <li>- Articulating associated risks; <u>through spending review process</u></li> <li>- Scrutiny</li> <li>- Clinical Governance Process in place</li> <li>- Monitoring to identify adverse effects</li> <li>- <u>Maintenance Plans with EBS</u></li> <li>- <u>Leisure Centre Capital Programme Revised Business Case</u></li> <li>- <u>Alliance Leisure appointed via National Leisure Framework</u></li> </ul>	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue with existing controls</li> <li>- Secure additional revenue e.g. income generation through commercial opportunities</li> <li>-Continue to explore a variety of potential local and national funding opportunities including commercial, government, academic, grant funding</li> <li>-Utilise in kind support/asset sharing where possible</li> <li>- Cross organisational opportunity review of priorities and resources</li> <li>- <u>Further ROI Business Cases to fund capital improvement/improve income and customer experience</u></li> </ul>	2	5	10		Ivan Browne	<u>15.01.2010</u>
<p><b>25. Public Health - Public Health - Contract Management</b> Dilution of resources within Contract Management Service appear to impact on Public Health specific support for all elements of contract management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delay in process leads to delay delivering identified actions;</li> <li>- Current assurance practices are not sufficiently robust;</li> <li>- Service delivery impact;</li> <li>- Negative impact on service user;</li> <li>- Reputational damage;</li> <li>- Impact on PH team capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Management through performance review group</li> <li>- Concern escalations</li> <li>- Service ownership / involvement in contract meetings</li> </ul>	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of SLA ongoing provider/client satisfaction feedback</li> <li>liaising with new contract managers to fully understand PH services</li> <li>-Awaiting DMT decision on further actions</li> </ul>	2	2	4		Ivan Browne	<u>15.01.2010</u>

**Appendix 4a - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register**

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO		Risks as at: 31/07/2019										
Risk	Consequence /effect: what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be, to whom and why	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further controls			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
What is the issue:												
what is the root cause/												
problem – what could go wrong												
			Impact	Likelihood	Risk		Impact	Likelihood	Risk			

**DELETIONS**

<del>3. Care Services &amp; Commissioning – Failure to meet statutory timescales to assess people deprived of their liberty. This is amalgamated with risk 1 as it is linked to being a consequence from lack of budget</del>	<del>Reputational risk if someone dies whilst illegally deprived of their liberty, financial risk if taken to court</del>	<del>Raised issue corporately, JE completed for BIAs (unsuccessful), further request for market supplements made, waiting list risk assessed monthly and prioritisation system agreed with Leadership (reviewed regularly)</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>16</del>							<del>Tracie Rees</del>	<del>31.07.2019 Ongoing</del>
<del>10. Tourism, Culture &amp; Investment Project Disruption (building site) over a sustained period of time is and (will have) a detrimental affect on trade. The project has run for three and half years with another two years to go. Reduced score to 12</del>	<del>Traders leave the market and income is reduced, Rental levels chargeable reduce</del>	<del>– Provide regular updates to traders so they can plan for disruption – Review providing financial support when appropriate to help in the short term. Delays in the decision making process in regard to Outdoor Market improvements are making it difficult to sustain regular updates to traders without creating more frustration</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>16</del>	<del>Ensure build programme is of minimum duration possible and planned to minimise disruption. Decision needed urgently.</del>	<del>3</del>	<del>3</del>	<del>9</del>	<del>Cost incurred to date are unsustainable. Seek to deliver remainder of project at minimum compensation levels. This stance has been maintained wherever possible.</del>		<del>Mike Dalzell</del>	<del>04/09/2019</del>
<del>15. Finance – Corporate Fraud Failure or inability to effectively detect, prevent, investigate and deal with corporate fraud. Risk score now 9</del>	<del>– Reputational damage – Potential for losses in £millions – Investigations not effectively carried out – Fraud difficult to quantify so cannot always evidence effective outcomes</del>	<del>– Corporate Fraud Team has accredited financial investigator – Good engagement with Police Financial Crime Unit – Recruitment to posts</del>	<del>5</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>20</del>	<del>– Aiming to implement seconded Police officer</del>	<del>5</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>20</del>			<del>Alison Greenhill</del>	<del>31.07.2019</del>
<del>25. Strategic Commissioning and Business Development – Safeguarding/teaching and learning workforce programmes are ineffective and Local Authority has insufficiently trained staff to deliver and manage the range.</del>	<del>– Stress management failings, lacks capacity and competency – Potential adverse impact on inspection outcomes.</del>	<del>– Work Life Balance policies, and supporting wellbeing website www.childrensworkforce/ supporting wellbeing Learning Training &amp; Development Plan refreshed – New department priority and focus on qualification and safeguarding training.</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>16</del>	<del>– Management to implement health and safety and wellbeing policies and seek advice and support to mitigate risk of undue stress in the workforce – New corporate team to actively engage in implementing workforce strategy and limited strategy and plans.</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>3</del>	<del>12</del>			<del>TBC</del>	<del>31.07.2019</del>