

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
1. Adult Social Care & Safeguarding - Integration agenda. Risks associated with large programme of change in challenging financial context.	Failure against national commitments on integration. Services are not aligned; Financial risk; Conflict between priorities of organisations; Transformation programme targets are	High visibility at partnership forums; Support to frontline staff to maintain operational relationship management; Communication strategy for transformation in context of integration includes partners.	4	4	16	Establish clear partnership arrangement to agree and deliver Integrated Care in Leicester; maximise Better Care Fund (BCF) opportunity.	3	3	9		Ruth Lake	BCF plan complete; implementation planning through 2014/15
2. Adult Social Care & Safeguarding - Meet Health & Safety (H&S) expectations in regulated provision. Fail to maintain safe water systems in all units; Failure to maintain essential health and safety in intermediate care provision.	Ill health or death to residents and/or staff or visitors from water borne infections or poor H&S practices.	Water hygiene monitoring practice in place	5	3	15	Ensure all registered managers go on required training and fully understand the requirements for temperature checking, flushing regimes, tap cleaning etc. and can closely monitor those carrying out these tasks.	5	2	10		Ruth Lake	31.03.2016
3. Adult Social Care & Safeguarding - Failure to deliver satisfactory Intermediate care capacity. Ineffective partnership working with Leicester City NHS results in failure to implement new Intensive Care unit.	Failure to deliver intermediate care priorities and make efficiency targets; capital/reputational/political risks.	Strategy and redesign work to establish cross-economy commitment to intermediate care models	4	4	16	Engage with Health & Wellbeing Board as it establishes; establish programme board with Care Commissioning Group input	3	3	9		Ruth Lake	Work will be ongoing throughout 2014 to 2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>4. Adult Social Care & Safeguarding -Operational capacity Risk of legal challenge / fines from being unable to meet the additional demands arising from Cheshire West judgement on Deprivation Of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS). Risk re capacity to effectively scope the new DoLS cases; challenge from practice in care homes in applying DoLS via urgent applications in inappropriate circumstances</p>	<p>Breach of legislation; financial liability re Information Commissioners Office; breach of confidence in the Council</p>	<p>Manager briefings to ensure legal requirements understood; scoping of high risk cases to understand new DOLS cases; prioritisation of action on cases; monitoring of incoming pressures for DOLS team and use of independent Best Interest Assessor capacity; engagement with legal services re Court Of Protection applications and pressures. Additional resources agreed for recruitment via budget setting</p>	4	4	16	<p>Tracking of anticipated legal guidance on application of case law in practice; consideration of additional resources to support scoping exercise as this has not been completed due to lack of resources / competing priorities. Meeting with legal services to assess position / agree actions to mitigate risk 24 March. Issue to be escalated to Leadership Team. Further work via NHSE MCA project and HOS to address care home practice which is exacerbating the volume and timescales risks.</p>	4	3	12		Ruth Lake	31.03.2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>5. Information and Customer Access Staff: Capacity, capability and recruitment Capacity: There are insufficient resources to meet increase in demands, such as business application outage, application failure etc., due to an already lean structure. Teams are being worked increasingly hard including weekends and out of hours. Staff Retention: With a buoyant market place for the team's skills, staff may seek career progression outside the Council. Formal career progression opportunities may not be available internally. Recruitment: Department requires highly skilled people but applicants may be less likely to apply for jobs at the Council as it may not be seen as the employer of first choice.</p>	<p>- Unable to attract high calibre, skilled individuals. - Lack of adequate succession planning in some areas, leading to increased key person dependency vulnerability. - Vital skills and expertise are lost e.g. Lync, data warehouse. - Vacancies create more workload pressures and impact on the wellbeing of the remaining staff. - Staff more likely to elsewhere as the market picks up, especially as Job Evaluation means people are already being asked to do more for less. - Unable to meet service demand and Service Level Agreement and to deliver core services. Reputational damage.</p>	<p>- On-going review with HR to ascertain options. Options such as graduate recruitment being investigated and implemented where appropriate. - Training, motivation, internal career development to retain and develop staff. - Market increments for key posts (although this hasn't helped to attract applicants to recent posts). - Undertaking succession planning and knowledge sharing as much as possible. - Documentation to reduce dependency on key individuals - Approval to recruit two apprentices and another graduate. - Recruited a Graduate. - Overtime payment and TOIL where appropriate. - Third party support contracts - Application made for De Montfort University graduates for Info Gov & Mgt</p>	4	4	16	<p>- Consider up skilling/cross skilling the Team to increase scope of roles etc. - Work with HR to address particular concerns. - Succession planning, shaped by skills matrix. - Apprenticeships and graduate schemes for regular input of new talent/skills. - Capture and more proactively manage service demand. - Implement formal out of hours procedure. - Review technology architecture to remove any unnecessary complexity and reduce dependency on hard to source skills</p>	3	4	12		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
6.Information and Customer Access Finance and budget - impact on ability to meet Council requirements On-going pressure to reduce costs within the council which is impacting on the service capacity.	- Continued cuts lead to not enough people to deliver the service - Service demand may not be met - Targets and deadlines may be missed, e.g. delivery of new programmes and business solutions. - Loss of front line productivity across the Council as services are not available when needed.	- Engaging with the review of IT services to ensure there is a clear understanding of the services provided and the potential impacts of major service cuts. - Raise profile and demonstrate value of the team and the need for specialised resource.	4	4	16	- On-going existing actions.	4	4	16		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016
7. Information and Customer Access Capacity and Service Reporting Across the estate, the utilisation of application and network related hardware may not be fully understood.	- Reputational damage - Service delivery may not be met - Effect on available resources i.e. budget and staff if unplanned upgrades required - Negative effect on productivity - Affects ability to plan	- none noted currently (Tools are available but not being used)	3	5	15	- Maximise use of available tools - Develop framework/guidelines for operating procedures	2	4	8		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>8. Information and Customer Access Information Security The information and IT security environment is changing rapidly, altering the risk profile and requiring constant adjustment of controls e.g. Challenges of cloud computing, use of mobile devices for flexible working, bring your own device). It is challenging for central IT and information services to evolve infrastructure, policy, practice and guidance to keep up, and for the wider employee base to adapt their working practices to keep the organisation's information secure. In addition, requirements for national Code of Connection compliance also change over time, placing new security demands on the organisation. Failure to stay on top of security risks presents the risk of information security breaches.</p>	<p>- Information security breaches in which personal and/or sensitive Information is compromised. - potential for Data Protection monetary penalties, negative press coverage, reputational impact. - Impact on individuals (employees, service users, citizens) of their Information being compromised, including distress or damage such as identity theft and reputational impact. - Reduced trust in the Council, impacting on its ability to deliver key services - Lost productive time due to IT downtime</p>	<p>- IT security provisions including encryption, firewalls, virus protection, Secure Socket Layer connections where needed, access control. - Security standards, policies and procedures, maintained, proactively communicated and published for universal access. - Dedicated security roles undergoing professional development. - Assurance routes via 1. Work to obtain and maintain Public Service Network accreditation, 2. Internal audit, 3. Information Governance Toolkit. - Information and IT security are integral to IT procurement exercises, helping to ensure that software and hardware procured offer good security. - Technical Information Security Group to raise security issues, address concerns, track implementation of internal audit recommendations. - New approach to reporting on uptake of Data Protection training to support managers in compliance -</p>	4	4	16	<p>- Keep controls up to date to respond to evolving threats. - Increase manager awareness of the negative impact of staff change etc. on security awareness and capabilities. - Adjust security provisions to meet the next year's Public Service Network requirements. NB: in a changing context, controls need to evolve to maintain the risk exposure at the current level and prevent it from increasing. Therefore, only a limited risk exposure is anticipated.</p>	4	3	12		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>9. Information and Customer Access Demand and change management</p> <p>There is no clear demand pipeline especially around project related activity, which means it is difficult to plan staffing, prioritise and manage workloads etc. There is no Target Operating Model, so that service level expectations/outputs and deliverables are not always clear and not delivered upon under a uniform agreement across the business. In some instances, the least relevant priority is dealt with rather than the most significant. This is exacerbated as there is currently no consistent way to capture and manage Business Application support and demand. ICT cannot provide the additional flexibility, complexity and time/resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements are not made to processes and procedures. - Inefficient and/or ineffective operations are in place. - Internal reputation impacts. - Demand may not be met. - Service delivery affected. - Incidents are not appropriately identified and rectified. - Increased reliance on IT staff rather than departmental self-sufficiency. - Increased demand on ICT resources. - Supplier response times and deadlines to rectify fixes/changes are lengthy and not always a priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tactical improvement actions and plans have been identified and are in the process of being implemented. - Gateway process in place - Organisational restructure has been suggested and is being considered. - Business Continuity Management arrangements under review. 	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement holistic Disaster Recovery Plan. - Confirm roles and responsibilities. - Ask services to involve the customer services team in the planning/phasing/releasing of information etc. - Intended focus on more long term and forward planning. - Consider establishing a demand team (as part of the Methods review) 	3	5	15		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
9. Information and Customer Access Demand and change management - Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contract arrangements do not include performance targets, turnaround times SLA information etc., the Council is unable to hold them to account. - Data could be lost/unable to be restored - Delays in projects, tasks and assignments. - Adverse effect on budget. 				- Unlikely to be able to influence this risk in the near future as fundamental organisational change is required, so management actions are to maintain status quo and prevent the risk worsening.							

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>10. Information and Customer Access Impact on record keeping from use of shared drives and email</p> <p>Information on line of business systems including the Council's EDRMS can be more robustly managed than that on email and shared drives. Email has become the predominant means of business communication BUT this means that records of Council activities and decisions are stored in Outlook rather than systems where they can be sufficiently protected, findable and available as Council records. Shared drive management is also problematic . Many teams do not have a mature shared drive structure in place, and structures are sprawling. Some officers do not have access to shared spaces, only to individual Home drives.</p>	<p>-Excessive IT overhead from backing up and keeping available huge volumes of data, a proportion of which is redundant.</p> <p>- Business impact of not seeing the wood for the trees, where documents and files are accumulated to excess without consistent filing practices, naming conventions and disposal routines, and where defunct materials are still cluttering up drives.</p> <p>- Potential inability to access corporate records in personal storage locations without the presence of specific members of staff.</p> <p>- Potential loss of corporate records when employees leave the organisation and have used personal not corporate filing.</p>	<p>- Policies in place (e.g. Information Management Policy, Records Retention Schedule).</p> <p>- ICT induction briefly addresses email management and filing systems. Being reviewed now so there are stronger messages about managing content.</p> <p>- Information Management Team advising teams on an ad hoc basis re good records practice.</p> <p>- Guidance written on a shared drive refresh process - being tested with Children's Centres. Will enable a scaling up of assistance to services.</p> <p>- Draft guidance in place for driving down email volumes. In testing.</p>	3	5	15	<p>- Enterprise Content Management project to enable teams to review their saved content, to organise it and to cut it back to the necessary.</p> <p>- Relaunch of Information and Records Management policies.</p> <p>- Rollout of information management training for managers.</p> <p>- Improved induction training for information management.</p> <p>- Integration of IM skills into wider courses where appropriate.</p> <p>- Create a self service information and records healthcheck helping services to prioritise addressing weak areas (Jan-Mar 2015).</p>	3	4	12		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>10. Information and Customer Access Impact on record keeping from use of shared drives and email - Continued</p> <p>Even where well designed filing structures are in place, electronic disposal of records at the end of their lifetime is usually not taking place, leading to accumulation of materials.</p>	<p>- The accumulation of past materials impedes effective working on current issues.</p> <p>- Potential for the Council to be unable to locate the evidence it may need for its decisions and actions.</p> <p>- Increased overhead of responding to Freedom of Information requests.</p>					<p>- The success of the above controls is conditional on effective communications and strong buy-in cascaded across the organisation from senior management down.</p> <p>- Progress is also currently impeded by limited staff resources in Information Management.</p> <p>Restructure underway to</p>						

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>11.Information and Customer Access Information Governance compliance Key areas of risk are: flexible working practices which expose data to new risks, inappropriate disclosure of personal data, insecure and excessive information sharing externally and internally, lack of universal participation in Information Governance training, lack of awareness of the compliance and enabling role of Information Governance and failure to comply with the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. (Also see corresponding risks around Data Protection and Freedom of Information compliance.)</p>	<p>- Data may be lost or shared inappropriately. - Potential legal challenge. - Breaches in regulation/legislation, which may incur fines, reputational damage and negative media coverage. - Local breaches are not reported to the Information Governance Team until a compliant arises. There may be a number of unreported information governance breaches which are unreported and being managed at a local level. - Subject Access Requests: this area has failed in compliance in 2013, and could fail again in the future</p>	<p>- Policies and procedures in place e.g. security, retention and disposal. - Devices are encrypted. - Staff are briefed on Information Governance compliance and asset management. - Improvement plan identifies necessary procedural updates etc. - Good liaison with Information Commissioner's Office and increased visibility and compliance. - Regular reports to Directors on the importance of Information Governance compliance. - Staff are required to complete Information Governance training on induction and all staff were asked to complete training in 2013.</p>	4	5	20	<p>- Requirement for all to complete annual Information Governance awareness training should be enforced. - Introduce a self-service Information Governance health check for Managers to check their team's compliance and identify their own improvement actions. - Information Governance issues to be addressed more consistently in contracts outside IT Procurement (where this is systematic).</p>	4	3	12		Alison Greenhill	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
11.Information and Customer Access Information Governance compliance - Continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leicester City Council submissions to the NHS Information Governance (IG) Toolkit provide a health check on Information Governance policies and systems. - Self service IG Healthcheck tool for managers has been drafted. Next stage is testing. NB staff turnover and high rates of change are increasing the Council's exposure to risk here. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for services facing high staff turnover to prioritise Data Protection and security training to maintain capability levels. NB: in a changing context, controls need to evolve and be constantly refreshed to maintain the risk exposure at the current level and prevent it from increasing. Therefore, no reduction 						
12. Schools Capital. Raising educational achievement -The discontinuation of PCP (reduction in capital investment) and the continuing need to accommodate pupil increases.	A Statutory duty is not met	Delivery of Basic Need Programme to address pupil placements required by September 2015.	4	4	16	Continued assessment & development across the Primary School estate.	4	3	12	Staff time	Mark Lloyd	30/09/2015 then review 6 monthly

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
13. Property - Schools Capital. Raising educational achievement.	Reduction in capital investment in schools with ageing school stock and deteriorating condition Potential to not meet statutory building requirements. Reputational damage to the council.	Develop long term strategy across the Primary School estate	4	4	16	Develop long term strategy across the primary and retained secondary school estate is now underway, Condition surveys being undertaken in order to formulate a 3 year programme of works for Planned Capital Maintenance	4	2	8	Staff time	Mark Lloyd	30/09/2015 then review 6 monthly
14. Property - Maintaining Income (Capital and Revenue) on behalf of the Council	Economic downturn affecting budget	Voids and arrears monitored Monthly	4	4	16	Send rent demands, reviews and renewals on time - collect rent on time. Manage tenants in arrears.	3	4	12	Staff time	Mark Lloyd	30.04.2016 and ongoing
15. Property - Loss of use of Asset	Closure of buildings dues to asbestos	1. Findings of asbestos action plan being implemented. 2. Asbestos monitoring returns to be reported to DivMT and Heads of Property monthly. To Corporate Management Team if cause for concern. 3. Action plan works now completed, signed off by Health & Safety and now being monitored.				1. Ensure 100% compliance with asbestos returns with accurate data by holding Building Responsible Officers to account. 2.Ensure all buildings have an asbestos register				Staff time	Mark Lloyd	30.04.2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
	Closure of buildings due to poor water hygiene standards	1. Implementation of control regime comprising ongoing regular monitoring, reports, risk assessment reviews and maintenance with allocated budgets. 2. Water hygiene monitoring returns to be reported to DivMT and Heads of Property monthly. To Corporate Management Team (CMT) if cause for concern. 3. Spend of allocated capital budget for water hygiene and production of ongoing prioritised schedule of works ongoing. 4. Water hygiene responsibilities in non-op estate have been confirmed and necessary action taken.	5	3	15	1. Seek 100% compliance with water hygiene returns with accurate data. 2. Further budget for 13/14 works approved in capital programme subject to Corporate Management Team decision. 3. More rigorous audit of Building Responsible Officer monitoring to be undertaken.	3	2	6			

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
16. Property- Delay and compensation event claims are received leading to extensive costs.	Contingency held to address unforeseen issues may be overspent	All claims are monitored and are challenged using internal and external resources. Continued dialogue with the Finance Team to monitor the financial position.	5	4	20	Review meeting established with the contractor and information being sought to substantiate claims with the assistance of a programme analyst and specialist advisors To date information has not been forthcoming from the Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership.	4	3	12	Contingency provision is over subscribed	Mark Lloyd	30.04.2016 and ongoing
17. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Quality of care provision in the council's residential homes falls below required standards.	Detriment (harm) to individuals, groups or the Council (financial or reputational)	Management audits of practice and development of plans to promote improvements	5	3	15	Audit processes in place via Adult Social Care contracts and assurance team. This is in addition to Care Quality Commission inspections.	5	2	10		Tracie Rees	31.03.2016 and ongoing
18. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Failure to maintain quality, safe services	Reduced quality, safeguarding, staff sickness	Reed opening up the market, developing induction days and tools, benchmarking training and using the Swedish Derogation rule for consistency.	4	4	16	Monitor and engage with Reed to ensure development measures are undertaken. Monitor quality of agency staff	2	3	6		Tracie Rees	31.03.2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
19. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Failure to carry out effective statutory consultation will result in financial and reputational damage to the council.	Council could face legal challenge through judicial review	Consultations being run as a dedicated project overseen by a senior manager with some temporary additional resource. Ensure time is built into each review, development of all strategies etc. to allow for consultation	5	4	20	Stakeholder engagement strategy in place and we always seek advice from legal services and corporate consultation team. Legal services sign off all consultation materials and agree the approach and methodology. Officers to seek guidance from the corporate consultation team when needed	4	3	12	A Judicial Review legal challenge could cost the authority several millions if the methodology used by the Council is not robust	Tracie Rees	31.05.2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
20. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Future of the Councils 8 Elderly Persons Homes - High risk politically, however, failure to implement carries high financial risks in terms of deteriorating buildings and reducing occupancy levels. Delay to implementation will impact on budgeted savings. Legal challenge arising from TUPE consultation impacts on project delivery	An Executive decision was made (15.10.2013) to close 4 of the homes and sell 4 in 2 phases to achieve budget savings and address falling occupancy. Phase 1 is now completed. Phase 2 in progress.	A Programme/Project Board which will report to the Corporate Programme Management Office (CPMO) has been established to implement the Executive decision over 3 years	4	4	16	Care management teams to support and inform residents and carers. Deliver to project timescale and provide Executive with clear advice to support speedy decision making. Ensure effective TUPE process and an employment lawyer and HR to be part of implementation team.	4	3	12	There are budget savings of £3.5m associated with the future of the homes	Tracie Rees	31.12.2015
21. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Implementation of the 5 Year Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) Better Care Together Plan carries high financial and political risk	Financial impact/legal challenge	An LLR Programme Board has been established that includes health and social care chief officers	5	4	20	An LLR Programme Board has been established that includes health and social care chief officers	3	3	9	Operational and cost implications still to be determined	Tracie Rees	01.01.2019

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
22. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) - Non implementation of the Care Act 2014	High financial risk and operational non compliance	Phase 1 of the Act successfully implemented on 01/04/15. Phase 2 - Funding Reform now in detailed project planning for 01/04/2016 The implementation will report on a regulate basis to the ASC Leadership Team and Cllr Patel (Lead for ASC)	5	3	15	A Programme Board has been established that will report to the CPMO. Project work streams designed to deliver compliance	3	2	6	Full costs are still to be determined - financial assessment in progress National, regional and local work taking place to forecast increased demand.	Tracie Rees	31/03/2016
23. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) Quality of care in the Independent regulated services including; residential homes, domiciliary care and supported living providers falls below standards	Detriment (harm) to individuals, groups or the Council (financial or reputational)	High level Audit processes in places via Adult Social Care contracts and assurance team. This is in addition to Care Quality Commission inspections.	5	4	20	Quality Assurance Framework to be used to support identified failing providers.	5	3	15		Tracie Rees	31/03/2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
24. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) Non compliance with our duties under the Equalities Act. Failure to adequately identify and address (where possible) equality impacts of proposed actions.	Council could face legal challenge through judicial review	Equality impact assessments (EIA) are built into service reviews, strategy developments and decision making which help to identify equality impacts and actions to be taken.	5	3	15	Ensure all staff are fully aware of when to use EIA's and build this into their routine work (when necessary). Training to be offered through Better Care Together.	5	2	10	A JR legal challenge could cost the authority several millions if the methodology used by the Council is not robust	Tracie Rees	31/03/2016 and ongoing
25. Care Services & Commissioning (ASC) Review of Residential Care. Financial risk - largest area of spend and danger of inappropriate models of care.	Continued escalation of spend; inappropriate placements	Project Board in place; extensive research, analysis and engagement	4	4	16	Robust governance through project board, Commissioning Board and Lead Member Briefing	3	3	9	Current spend £44m gross	Tracie Rees	31/03/2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
27. Delivery, Communications and Political Governance - ELECTIONS 2015 Three elections taking place on one day will be complex and will require significant resources to deliver	- Elections are not performed appropriately/challenges are received. - Reputational damage. - Adverse effect on finances. - Media coverage. - Public complaints. - Increase in resource requirements. - The potential repetition of the impacts and pressures that arose during the 2011 elections.	- Risk log and project plan in place and planning work commenced at an early stage. - Core election planning team involving relevant expertise e.g. HR, training, ICT, comms along with electoral services staff meeting regularly to plan - Lessons learnt from previous elections reviewed and factored into current planning - Resources including staffing secured and training undertaken by all key staff - Emergency planning and events expertise used to work on aspects - security, evacuation, logistics and infrastructure	4	4	16	'- Continue regular planning meetings and review the project plan, risk log and issues log each time. Ensure mitigating actions for risks are acted upon.	4	2	8		Miranda Cannon	31/03/2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
28. Delivery, Communications and Political Governance - LEGAL CHALLENGE Increased legal challenges may heighten the need to ensure that processes are effective, efficient, communicated in a uniform manner and that managers and staff follow explicit guidance. Equalities Impact Assessments (EIAs) are likely to become an increasingly targeted area for Legal Challenge.	Communications are not performed in a uniform manner, not consistently worded, communicated or the tone are appropriate, leading to legal challenge. - EIAs due to constant changes and/or lack of centralised guidance around legislation give rise to non compliance. - Lack of legal expertise/appropriate resources.	- Internal audits and assessments (EIAs) are performed to help ensure the Council meets the Public Sector Equality Duty. - On-going reviews of guidance and legislation are conducted. - Processes and procedures in place. - Staff are aware of duties and responsibilities. - Expert support e.g. HR, equalities, consultation and research, CPMO in place with supporting guidance. - Lessons learned/changes arising from any challenge outcomes continue to be communicated and use of external panel to review EIAs for spending reviews / budget - EIA templates recently reviewed and revised	4	4	16	- Continue to build organisational consulting and communication strategies. - Review processes and gap analysis to explore the exposure. - Review external practice e.g. from other Local Authorities, which have been deemed as best practice and implement locally as appropriate. - Ensure the correct resources, with the relevant skills and experience are allocated to roles. - Ensure HR support is	4	3	12		Miranda Cannon	31/03/2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
28. Delivery, Communications and Political Governance - LEGAL CHALLENGE - Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for legal challenge by providers, staff etc. - Judicial review. - Reputational damage. - Adverse effect on budget/finance - Resource intensive. - Media exposure. - Information may be inappropriately shared. - Unrealistic public/political expectations. - Procurement process may be challenged. - Procedural rather than strategic challenges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equality checklist for different stages of capital projects developed so that equalities considerations at each stage are recorded and signed off - council EIA template being used for Health & Well Being Board reports and also for Better Care Together reports, standardising our approach. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory equalities e-learning package being scoped and developed - EIA e-learning module being developed - Consider these actions as one element of a wider package of support for evidence-based policy making and service development, linking in with divisional actions to promote the sharing of intelligence, strengthen practice around option appraisal, consultation and evaluation, and provide practical help with cost-benefit analysis (e.g. researching the scope of a problem, the reasons for intervention, and good practice solutions). 						

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
29. Housing - Impact of Welfare Reform on Housing Rents Account (HRA) rental income collection. Universal Credit (UC) is to be fully implemented in 2017 . Under UC, claimants will receive all their benefits, including housing costs element the, directly themselves, monthly in arrears. They will have to pay their FULL rent out of this. The biggest challenge to the HRA will be to collect the full rent from those working age claimants whose housing costs are no longer paid directly to the Landlord (LCC) as they are now.	Higher numbers of tenants in rent arrears leading to loss of rental income will adversely affect the HRA income. Could lead to greater number of evictions.	Promote setting up of Credit Union Bank Accounts (CUBA) with tenants., Focus Supporting Tenants and Residents (STAR) team support on those affected. maximise the number of tenants claiming Discretionary Housing Payment for bedroom tax affected cases. Identified tenants who are over-occupying in order to help with downsizing. Promotion/awareness to tenants of Discretionary Housing Payment. Income Management team strengthened. Amending Allocations policy to advise downsizing	4	4	16	Development of Northgate's IT system (phase 2) to support paperless direct debits. Proposal to introduce mandatory direct debit rent payment for new tenants will considered by Executive in June.	4	3	12		Ann Branson	30.11.2015 and ongoing
30. Housing Inability to meet regulatory requirements. Blue light emergency services having difficulty in accessing communal block security doors in an emergency situation.	Delay in attendance/treatment of emergency situations, e.g. medical, fire. Potential to cause death, major or minor injury. Litigation/reputational risk	Fire service have fire keys for security doors. Ambulance and police services do not have keys. In an emergency situation will use intercom system to request a tenant within the block to give access through the security door. Where this isn't possible Police will break-in on behalf of ambulance service.	5	3	15	Implement a programme of fitting key safes to house a fob/pac token along with signs providing instructions for gaining access.	5	2	10		Ann Branson	31/08/2015

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
31. Learning Quality and Performance - Schools in Ofsted categories or below floor standard converted to academies by order of the secretary of state.	Schools no longer Local Authorities (LA) schools; impact on overall schools budget and reputation of authority. Difficult to maintain an overview of Children /young people that the LA continue to be responsible for.	School improvement strategy and LA support plans. School2School partnership are in place. Performance dialogue meeting between School Improvement Advisor and school leadership teams for every school in the City. Support and challenge is provided in inverse proportion to need.	3	5	20	Targeted support packages in place for schools in scope for conversion. Half termly progress checks through team around the school meetings Whole school reviews for those schools that are Requires Improvement or in Special Measures - Regular reports submitted to Divisional Management Team re current position	4	4	16		Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
32. Learning Quality and Performance - Leicester could be subject to a targeted Ofsted inspection with multiple inspections across schools followed by Local Authority (LA) inspection.	LA can provide evidence to support positive outcome but resource demands would be significant. Major issue about credibility of service which could increase the number of schools changing to academy status	School improvement reserve budget	4	4	16	Positive response to recommendations identified in peer review completion of a detailed Self Evaluation Form leading to a revised school improvement framework Close work between LA Officers, Dept. For Education & Ofsted representation to manage RI/SM schools Action plans in place for new teams in the raising achievement service linked to Self Evaluation Form	3	4	12		Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016
33. Learning Quality and Performance (LQP) - Children's Capital Investment Delayed capital projects disrupts educational improvements in schools	The schools overall time and capacity to focus on educational improvements is reduced and/or comprised.	LQP services to be targeted where necessary to provide additional support. Relationship Management via HoS to capture risks and Issues for Schools are reported with resolution via Corporate Portfolio Management Office (CPMO).	4	4	16	CPMO provides regular update on the impact of any delay to the school and if required, LCC services between education and property are brought together to arrange support.	3	2	6	Staff time	Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
34. Learning Quality and Performance School closure required due to significant health and safety snags and defects works incomplete in capital projects. i.e. heating, ventilation, water and fire system failures	Statutory education days in schools for Children and Young People not met	Building Review Groups (BRG) are established by BSF property to identify and resolve high risk snags and defect items.	4	4	16	Resource management plan of how schools will be supported in BSF post handover to be developed between property and education.	4	4	16	Staff time	Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016 and ongoing
35. Learning Quality and Performance Leicester City Council reputation / relationships with schools are hindered by the delay in resolving snags and defects items with schools.	Low school engagement in sharing and / or celebrating impact of Building Schools For Future (BSF). Complaints from schools are likely to increase. High project staff turn over impact on schools confidence in LCC resolving snags and defects.	BSF School's in phase 3 to 6 identified as high risks are indicated on internal CPMO report with mitigating actions.	5	5	25	Resource management between property and education to be agreed. Children's Capital Governance to be reviewed to ensure resolution to snags and defects is reported and managed through the system. Clarity to schools provided on escalation route for snags and defects concerns	5	5	25	staff time	Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
36. Learning Services - Loss of Building Schools For Future (BSF) knowledge and Intelligence through high staff turnover in project teams	Resolution to issues delayed. Reactive handover with no record of change, agreement or clarity for schools	School have been asked to request BRG reports from BSF project team so that they can take ownership in prioritising issues / actions to be completed. Final list of issues and snags has been escalated for resolution.	4	4	16	Resource management plan of how schools will be supported in BSF post handover to be developed between property and education.	4	5	20	staff time	Jane Winterbone	31/03/2016 and ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>37. Public Health - Data Access and Sharing - Unresolved issues in national guidance on this matter. Pseudominised Hospital Episode Statistics data for 10 years has not yet been released to us. No current access to birth and deaths (temporarily withdrawn) and risk will be there depending on how long Office of National Statistics takes to approve permissions. Regarding data from General Practitioners (Systemone) the requirements for a data agreement with all data owners. This process is complicated and detailed.</p>	Offer a limited services in terms of core offer and other analyses required.	<p>Audit Information Governance within Division to support move to Information Governance Toolkit Level 3 Division of Public Health is at Information Governance Toolkit Level 2. Awaiting national decisions ether within the Department of Health, NHS England, Health and Social Care Information Centre and or the Information Governance Officer. Application made for births and deaths data. Current access through GEMCSU has not yet been activated for testing.</p>	4	4	16	<p>More timely data being released nationally on line (aggregated - does not support analysis at lower level). Maintain Information Governance Toolkit Level 2 and work to Level 3. Awaiting national decisions either within the Department of Health, NHS England, Health and Social Care Information Commissioner and/or the Information Governance Officer (secondary care data). Follow up application to Office of National Statistics. Information agreements being drawn up for specific projects (for</p>	4	3	12		Rod Moore	31/03/2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
38. Public Health- Capability and Capacity- Recruitment of staff with special knowledge and expertise	Potential future succession planning issues. Less effective commissioning of specialist programmes Contracts are procured without the correct expertise/knowledge resulting in corrective action of legal costs. Incurring of additional costs through a need for agency and temporary staff to provide cover for work areas	Adherence to Local Government Association/Public Health England guidance relating to recruitment of staff Job description written in a relevant way to attract target applicants. Pay scales broadly similar to National Health Service/market force. Job evaluation complete	4	4	16	Engage with Human Resources colleagues to understand and put in place steps to shape our recruitment offering to entice high calibre, relevant etc. candidates in future recruitment and enable successful succession planning Inc. protection of National Health Service pension arrangements Regarding the Consultant post job offer, in the interim a market increment will be applied for to ensure posts can be advertised closer to former NHS levels. In the longer term a higher substantive banding for the role will be sought. Seek grading scheme beyond market supplements	4	3	12		Rod Moore	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
39. Public Health- Clinical Governance - There is currently a lack of clinical governance at a corporate level within the Local Authority. The Director of Public Health (DPH) has an assurance role, however, the depth and levels of assurance allowing them to discharge their duties is currently unclear. In addition, to perform a robust assurance programme over all of the DPHs accountabilities would require significant investment/resource	Potential risks to patients and the public. Possible failure of external reviews/appraisals. Increase in costs.	- Clinical Governance Group is in place with Public Health - There are existing arrangements with stakeholders/providers; such as Clinical Commissioning Group , Leicestershire Partnership Trust etc who are required to deliver clinical governance assurance.	5	3	15	Continual on-going stakeholder engagement and development of existing and future relationships. Clinical Commissioning Group in place. Progress report to be made to Quality Surveillance Group. Framework for Clinical Group adopted	4	3	12		Rod Moore	31.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>40. Public Health Insufficient funding transferred to the LA on 1 October 2015 to meet the full cost of the Health Visiting and Family Nurse Partnership Service (FNP). Agreement has been reached with NHS England regarding the level of resource to be transferred. However, there are still some ambiguities e.g.. FNP licence fee. Furthermore, there is also a lack of performance data from the provider and an issue regarding the commissioning of registered versus resident population.</p>	<p>Increased costs to the local authority Reputational risk through the LA being forced to reduce service levels to meet unfunded costs Registered versus resident population: possible safeguarding issue due to families that may be missed</p>	<p>- Health Visiting Transfer Group with LA has considered the issue and worked with NHS England to clarify scope and funding. On the advice of this group the City Council (along with Leicestershire and Rutland County Councils) has not signed-off the estimates provided by Public Health England. Detailed reasons have been submitted to NHS England. Performance framework negotiated with provider re Health Visiting contract. Lead to be recruited and Action plan to be developed. Commissioning for Quality and Innovation (CQUIN) monies attached to delivery (£104K from NHS England, £104K from LCC). Ongoing meetings with NHS England and provider Discussion between NHS England and FNP National Unit to clarify ambiguities regarding FNP licence fee</p>	4	4	16	<p>Review of Health Visiting, Family Nurse Partnership and School Nursing (Healthy Child Programme 0-19 years) currently being undertaken for reprocurring services within budget. Awaiting response through NHS England Area Team or directly from NHS England nationally at this stage. Task group being set up across LLR to discuss a progressive action plan on moving from a registered to resident population</p>	4	3	12		Rod Moore	30.09.2015

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
41. Public Health - Integrated Sexual Health Service Provider (Staffordshire, Stoke on Trent Partnership) unable to continue to deliver the contracted services due to an apparent financial shortfall between the contract value and delivery costs.	Provider could give notice before end of contract forcing early reprocurement Quality of service could be compromised Potential financial, legal and reputational risk to the Council	Leicester City and Leicestershire and Rutland County Councils have a joint partnership management group who are work closely with the provider.	4	4	16	Continued meetings with other commissioners, legal advice sought, action plan awaited from provider action plan awaited from provider by end of June 2015	4	3	12		Rod Moore	30/06/2015
42. 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.	Stress management failings, lacks capacity and competency. Potential adverse impact on inspection outcomes.	Work Life Balance policies, and supporting wellbeing website www.childrensworkforce/ supporting wellbeing Learning Training & Development Plan refreshed – new Department priority and focus on qualification and safeguarding training.	4	4	16	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	4	3	12		Carl Edwards	01.03.2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>43. Legal - Key areas of risk are: flexible working practices which expose data to new risks, inappropriate disclosure of personal data, insecure and excessive information sharing externally and internally, lack of universal participation in Information Governance training, lack of awareness of the compliance and enabling role of Information Governance and failure to comply with the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. (Also see corresponding risks around Data Protection and Freedom of Information compliance.)</p>	<p>- Data may be lost or shared inappropriately. - Potential legal challenge. - Breaches in regulation/legislation, which may incur fines, reputational damage and negative media coverage. - Local breaches are not reported to the Information Governance Team until a compliant arises. There may be a number of unreported information governance breaches which are unreported and being managed at a local level. - Subject Access Requests: this area has failed in compliance in 2013, and could fail again in the future.</p>	<p>- Policies and procedures in place e.g. security, retention and disposal. - Devices are encrypted. - Staff are briefed on Information Governance compliance and asset management. - Improvement plan identifies necessary procedural updates etc. - Good liaison with Information Commissioners Office (ICO) and increased visibility and compliance. - Regular reports to Directors on the importance of Information Governance compliance. - Staff are required to complete Information Governance (IG) training on induction and all staff were asked to complete training in 2013. - Leicester City Council submissions to the NHS Information Governance Toolkit provide a health check on Information Governance policies and systems. - Self service Information Governance Healthcheck tool for managers has been drafted. Next stage is testing. NB staff turnover and high rates of change are increasing the Council's exposure to risk here.</p>	4	5	20	<p>- Requirement for all to complete annual Information Governance awareness training should be enforced. - Introduce a self-service IG health check for Managers to check their team's compliance and identify their own improvement actions. - IG issues to be addressed more consistently in contracts outside IT Procurement (where this is systematic). - Need for services facing high staff turnover to prioritise Data Protection and security training to maintain capability levels.</p> <p>NB: in a changing context, controls need to evolve and be constantly refreshed to maintain the risk exposure at the current level and prevent</p>	4	3	12		Kamal Adataia	31/03/2016 Ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>44. Local Services and Enforcement - LACK OF ADEQUATE RESOURCE CAPACITY</p> <p>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.</p> <p>During times of change, staff are not always aware of the changes being made, such as the recent relocation requirements, needs and plans etc, resulting in confusion etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teams already at a minimum and extra workloads are unsustainable. - As demand-led services increase, workload and public expectations increase. - Likelihood of key person dependency as teams reduce further (fewer people in key roles). - Potential risk of non-compliance or breaches/lack of a substantial control environment. - Service delivery requirements may not be met. - Staff wellbeing may be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing prioritisation arrangements are in place. - Policies and procedures are in place. - Processes are in place. 	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of succession planning is to be conducted. - Need to assess the service demand against the resource availability to understand impacts and generate action plans. - Develop further prioritisation arrangements. - Continually assess through performance appraisals and individuals one-to-ones. 	3	3	9		John Leach	31/03/2016

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>45. Local Services and Enforcement</p> <p>REDUCTION IN INCOME GENERATION PROGRAMMES</p> <p>With reductions in public demand in building, parking, licencing, 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budgets are not adhered to. - Income streams continue to reduce (e.g. Building Regs) due to the economic climate. - Targets remain the same or increase, against income sources and staff reductions. - One off income is disclosed as recurring, increasing the savings gap. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budgets are in place and alternative savings option appraisals are performed and saving plans are implemented. - Policies and procedures are in place. - Adhoc business development arrangements are in place. 	3	5	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to review income targets for recurring and 'one off' income with finance to resolve on-going issues. - Enhance the business development resources/opportunity. - Budget strategy review. - Service review/impacts. - Further marketing and promotional projects. 	3	4	12	N/A	John Leach	31/03/2016 Ongoing

Appendix 2 - Leicester City Council Operational Risk Register

Risk Register Owner: Andy Keeling, COO

Risks as at: 30th April 2015

Risk What is the issue: <i>what is the root cause/ problem – what could go wrong</i>	Consequence /effect: <i>what would occur as a result, how much of a problem would it be ?, to whom and why</i>	Existing actions/controls	Risk Score with existing measures (See Scoring Table)			Further management actions/controls required	Target Score with further management (See Scoring Table)			Cost	Risk Owner	Review Date
			Impact	Probability	Risk		Impact	Probability	Risk			
<p>46. Local Services and Enforcement RESOURCE & CAPACITY - INCREASED WORKFORCE AGE PROFILE</p> <p>Specialist skills and knowledge within the team may be lost due to future retirement programmes. Furthermore, national surveys have identified a lack of aspiration in individuals (younger generation, female workforce and some ethnicities) wishing to join the Council within these roles.</p>	<p>- Teams already at a minimum number and extra workloads may be unsustainable. - Likelihood of key person dependency as teams reduce further (fewer people in key roles). - Potential non-compliance with legislation/regulation. - Potential stress-related absence/claims. - Quality of service delivery may be affected</p>	<p>- "Step up" - work experience utilise. - Graduate project officers. - Training & Mentoring - Knowledge sharing</p>	3	5	15	<p>- Succession planning review is required. - Continue to enhance and develop the apprenticeship scheme. - Commence positive promotion of the work/career in this area. - Seek funding for apprenticeship. - Ensure knowledge sharing takes place. - Training/ Mentoring/ Structuring.</p>	3	4	12	N/A	John Leach	31/03/2016 Ongoing