

**CABINET**  
**10 MAY 2015**  
**6 MONTHLY REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE  
BUSINESS RISK REGISTER**

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Rupert Turpin, Business Management

Report from: Richard Hicks, Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation and Chair of Strategic Risk Management Group

Author: Anna Marie Lawrence, Performance & Intelligence Manager

**Summary**

In accordance with paragraph 4.1 of the Council's Risk Management Strategy, this report is to discuss the 6 monthly review of the Council's Corporate Business Risk Register.

**1. Budget and Policy Framework**

- 1.1 The Risk Management Strategy underpins all aspects of Council work and is fundamental to the Council Plan in terms of "giving value for money".

**2. Background**

- 2.1 Risk management is an integral part of good governance. The council recognises that it has a responsibility to identify and manage the barriers to achieve its strategic objectives and enhance the value of services it provides to the community.
- 2.2 This Risk Management Strategy incorporates and:
- promotes a common understanding of risk;
  - outlines roles and responsibilities across the council;
  - proposes a methodology that identifies and manages risk in accordance with best practice thereby seeking to prevent injury, damage, loss and reducing the cost of risk.
- 2.3 The strategy is reviewed annually to ensure that it remains up-to-date and continues to reflect the council's approach to risk management.
- 2.4 The Corporate Risk Register, which accompanies the strategy, ensures that all relevant key risks are recorded and this is reviewed and managed every 6 months by both management and Members.

- 2.5 The Corporate Risk Register was last reviewed by Extended Management Team (EMT) on 22 July 2015, Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 8 October 2015 and Cabinet on 27 October 2015.
- 2.6 At that time the Cabinet agreed the following proposed amendments to the Council's Risk Register from Corporate Management Team:
- a) SR04 Performance Management and SR13 Equality and Diversity were removed from the Corporate Risk Register, as these are processes and not risks.
  - b) SR31 Public Health Transition was removed from the Corporate Risk Register as the transition has been completed successfully and services incorporated into normal business.
  - c) SR28 Better Care Fund was removed from the Corporate Risk Register and all information included in SR25 Adult Social Care Transformation.
  - d) SR32 Data and information were included in the Corporate Risk Register with a low risk scoring of DII as a result of new ways of working corporately and with partners.
- 2.7 The Cabinet also considered the recommendations from the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee and agreed the following:
- a) request that the narrative for Risk SR03b (Finances) be updated to reflect the recent announcement from the Chancellor concerning local government finance allowing Councils to retain all the money they raise from Business Rates, given the uncertainties which now existed about how local government finance would be calculated.
  - b) SR17 Regeneration to include the consequences of not achieving the target of 20,000 new homes.
  - c) a Briefing Note be provided to all Members of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee on risk SR 25.01 on how the Council was ensuring that clients fully understood how to use their personal budgets and risk SR26.06 details of the projects including start and end dates.
- 2.8 The Cabinet did not agree to include a new risk of the impact of the European Union (EU) referendum.

### **3. 6 monthly review of the Council's Corporate Business Risk Register**

- 3.1 Risks owners have reviewed their risks and updated them taking account of the amendments made, as set out at paragraph 2.7 above:
- a) The narrative for Risk SR30b (Finances) has been amended
  - b) SR17 Regeneration the new homes and population figures have been amended and an additional mitigating action of the Local Plan has been added.

- c) Briefing notes on risk SR25.01 and SR26.06 have also been completed.
- 3.2 Extended Management Team (EMT) reviewed these amendments and additional proposals on 27 January 2016 and changes to the Risk Register are detailed in Appendix A and B (additions/amendments are highlighted grey):
- 3.2 The meeting discussed and agreed that an additional risk on 'Welfare reform' be added to the Corporate Risk Register at SR33 with a risk score of DII.
- 3.3 It is noted that during the discussion at the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October 2015 comment was made that the description of catastrophic risks as also being "showstoppers" was inappropriate and unhelpful. It has however been agreed to leave "showstopper" as an aid to understanding.
- 3.4 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee also sought clarification on the respective roles of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Audit Committee regarding risk management. Members are advised that the role of Overview and Scrutiny Committee is to scrutinise how risk management is working in the council and challenge specific risks and their ratings, whilst Audit Committee is concerned with the framework and controls for risk management and have a specific role to seek assurances that there are adequate controls in place to mitigate key risks and that the Council is operating effectively.

#### **4. Consultation**

- 4.1 Risk owners have been consulted on the proposed amendments to the risk register. Extended Management Team reviewed these amendments on 27 January 2016.

#### **5. Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

- 5.1 The Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered this report on 14 April 2016.
- 5.2 A Member suggested that Cabinet consider, as a new risk, the impact on the Council of future local government structures in the area. In response, the Chief Executive assured Members that this was something the Council was closely monitoring. There was a risk that if current discussions became prolonged a model may be imposed by the Government but he felt that any changes would not happen for some time and therefore it would be best to wait and see if this became a risk in the future.
- 5.3 In response to a question, officers advised that the Council's approach to risk and the types of risk it measured was in line with other similar councils.

5.4 The Committee agreed to:

- a) note the Extended Management Team's recommendations on amendments to the Council's Risk Register as detailed in section 3 of the report and Appendices A and B, and
- b) recommend the revised Risk Register for final approval by Cabinet on 10 May 2016.

## **6. Financial, legal and risk implications**

- 6.1 This report brings forward the six monthly review of the Council's risk register, which is integral to the Council's approach to risk management.
- 6.2 There are no direct financial or legal implications arising from this report although clearly the inability to control or mitigate risks could have a financial or legal impact.

## **7. Recommendations**

- 7.1 The Cabinet is asked to approve the amendments to the Council's Risk Register, as detailed in Appendix A and B to this report.

## **8. Suggested Reasons for Decisions**

- 8.1 The establishment of a corporate framework for risk management is recommended by CIPFA and SOLACE and will complement and support the work already being carried out within each directorate to manage risks.

### **Lead officer contact**

Anna Marie Lawrence: Performance & Intelligence Manager  
Ext 2443 /email [annamarie.lawrence@medway.gov.uk](mailto:annamarie.lawrence@medway.gov.uk)

**Appendices:** Appendix A – Record of Amendments  
Appendix B – Corporate Business Risk Register

### **Background papers**

Report to Cabinet *Annual Review of the Risk Management Strategy and 6 Monthly Review of the Council's Corporate Business Register*  
<http://democracy.medway.gov.uk/mgconvert2pdf.aspx?id=28718>

## SUMMARY OF CORPORATE RISK REGISTER – RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

| Risk Ref | Rating Feb13 | Rating Aug 13 | Rating Feb 14 | Rating Jul 14 | Rating Jan 15 | Move ment  | Risk Description   | Owner  | Portfolio Holder | Link to Corporate Priority                                   | Link to Corporate Commitment   |
|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--|--|------------------|--|--|
| 3b       | AI           | AI            | AI            | AI            | <b>AI</b>     | →          | Finances   | Chief Finance Officer                        | Alan Jarrett     | Giving value for money                                       | Value  |
| 26       | AII          | AII           | AII           | AII           | <b>AII</b>    | →          | Children's Social Care   | Director Children and Adults Services        | Mike O'Brien     | Children & young people having the best start in life        | We will work with partners to ensure the most vulnerable children and young people are safe  |
| 9b       | BII          | BII           | BII           | BII           | <b>BII</b>    | →          | Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track                  | Director Children and Adults Services        | Mike O'Brien     | Children & young people having the best start in life        | We will work with partners to ensure the most vulnerable children and young people are safe  |
| 25       | BII          | BII           | BII           | BII           | <b>BII</b>    | →          | Adult Social Care Transformation                                   | Director Children and Adults Services        | David Brake      | Adults maintaining their independence and live healthy lives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will work closely with our NHS and voluntary sector partners</li> <li>We will ensure that people have choice and control in the support they receive</li> <li>We will support carers in the valuable work they do</li> </ul> |
| 27       | BII          | BII           | BII           | CII           | <b>CII</b>    | →          | Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools | Director Children and Adults Services        | Mike O'Brien     | Children & young people having the best start in life        | We will champion strong leadership and high standards in schools   |
| 17       | BII          | BII           | CII           | CII           | <b>CII</b>    | →          | Delivering Regeneration  | Director Regeneration, Community and Culture | Rodney Chambers  | Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will secure a reliable and efficient local transport network</li> <li>Support the provision of new homes and improve existing housing</li> <li>Ensure that people have the skills to take up job opportunities</li> </ul>    |
| 21       | CII          | CII           | CII           | CII           | <b>CII</b>    | →          | Procurement and Tendering  | AD Legal and Corporate Services              | Adrian Gulvin    | Giving value for money                                       | Value  |
| 2        | DII          | DII           | DII           | DII           | <b>DII</b>    | →          | Business Continuity & Emergency Planning                           | Director Regeneration, Community and Culture | Rupert Turpin    | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do      | Value  |
| 32       |              |               |               |               | <b>DII</b>    | <b>NEW</b> | Data and Information   | AD Legal and Corporate Services              | Adrian Gulvin    | Giving value for money                                       | Value  |
| 33       |              |               |               |               | <b>DII</b>    | <b>NEW</b> | Impact of Welfare reform   | Chief Finance Officer                        | Alan Jarrett     | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do      | Value  |



## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

## RISK MATRIX - STRATEGIC PROFILE FOR JANUARY 2016

|                 |   |          |     |            |    |
|-----------------|---|----------|-----|------------|----|
| Likelihood<br>↑ | A |          |     | 26         | 3b |
|                 | B |          |     | 9b, 25     |    |
|                 | C |          |     | 17, 27, 21 |    |
|                 | D |          |     | 2, 32, 33  |    |
|                 | E |          |     |            |    |
|                 | F |          |     |            |    |
|                 |   | IV       | III | II         | I  |
|                 |   | Impact → |     |            |    |

**Likelihood:**

- A Very high
- B High
- C Significant
- D Low
- E Very low
- F Almost impossible

**Impact:**

- I Catastrophic (Showstopper)
- II Critical
- III Marginal
- IV Negligible

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR<br>03b  | Finances  | Owner                     | Chief Finance<br>Officer   | Leader's Portfolio  | Current Risk<br>Score   | A  | I | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority Giving Value for Money  |   |                           |  |   |   |  |   |          |           |
| Vulnerability  |   |                           | Trigger  |   | Consequences  |  |   |          |           |
| <p>There continues to be a major risk over the Council's ability to deliver a balanced budget without recourse to reserves, whilst at the same time delivering good quality services to the people of Medway.</p> <p>The move away from central support from Government and greater reliance on local taxation through council tax and retained business rates, whilst providing local authorities with the opportunity to benefit directly from growth, also brings with it significant risks to overall funding.</p> <p>The ongoing reductions in revenue support grant over the medium term, together with continued demographic pressures facing both services for children and adult social care means that the risks to the Council's budget remain significant. This is exacerbated by the uncertainty over future settlements.</p> <p>Government reform of the welfare system also continues at pace and the impact on vulnerable people and families brings with it risks to the Council in terms of the demand for services.</p> |   |                           | <p>The provisional settlement announced on 17 December, indicated reductions in Revenue Support Grant of 85% for Medway over the next four years and was reasonably consistent with the assumptions made in the Medium Term Financial Plan, which forecast a 'gap' of around £40 million by 2019/20.</p> <p>This may to some extent be mitigated by the ability to raise a further 2% pa from council tax via the 'social care precept' and in future years by the opportunity offered from 100% retention of business rates, however this reliance on local taxation for the majority of its revenue funding also exposes the local authority to significant risk.</p> <p>The Chancellors budget announced on 8 July 2015 confirmed the continued reduction in revenue support grant over the medium term, as well as announcing further changes as part of the programme of welfare reform. The grant reductions already feature in the Council's MTFP, but work is needed to evaluate the impact of the welfare reforms on the people of Medway and the consequent implications for the Council in terms of CTRS, housing, social care and welfare provision.</p> |   | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very difficult decisions around funding allocation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Service cuts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Quality of service compromised.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cutback in staffing on an already lean organisation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> VFM Judgement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Negative local publicity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Damage to reputation.</p> |  |   |          |           |
| Code   | Description   | Managed By                | Desired Outcome  | Output  | Milestones/PIs  | Monitoring   |   |          |           |
| SR 03b.01  | Need to ensure effective response to the spending review, but also lobbying for greater local powers to raise revenues. | Chief Finance Officer     | Co-ordinate responses with members, brief MP's, agree media campaign, solicit support from peer authorities/partnerships.  | VFM Judgement - adequacy of financial planning, effective budget control.<br>Increased devolution of tax raising powers to the Council. | On-going  | Six monthly  |   |          |           |
| SR 03b.02  | Align priorities and activity of the Council to resource availability through MTFP process.                             | Corporate Management Team | Co-ordinate responses with members, agree media campaign, solicit support from peer authorities and partners.  | VFM Judgement - adequacy of financial planning, effective budget control, balanced budget and adequacy of reserves.                     | Medium Term Financial Plan in September.<br>Capital and revenue budget agreed by Council in February September 2014 to February 2015 for 2015/2016 budget and council tax. On going for 2016-2017.  | Quarterly budget monitoring<br>Six monthly then monthly from September onwards |   |          |           |



**CORPORATE RISK REGISTER**

| Code      | Description                                 | Managed By                | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs | Monitoring  |
|-----------|---|---------------------------|--|--|----------------|-------------|
| SR 03b.03 | Create resources for investment priorities. | Corporate Management Team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Track funding opportunities</li><li>- Maximise asset values for disposal</li><li>- Consider prudential borrowing</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- External investment</li><li>- Asset release</li><li>- Revenue cost associated with prudential borrowing.</li></ul> | On-going       | Six monthly |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 26   | Children's Social Care  | Owner   | Director of Children and Adults  | Children's Services Portfolio   | Current Risk Score   | A  | II | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|----|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority  |   | Children & Young People in Medway have the best start in life |  |   |  |  |    |          |           |
| Vulnerability   |   |   | Trigger  |   | Consequences   |  |    |          |           |
| <p>The continuing high demand for services for children in need, including the need for protection and looked after children puts pressure on the Council's resources.</p> <p>Increased expectations by Regulator in relation to standard of care and provision provided.</p> <p>Challenges in recruiting to key posts would impact on the Council's ability to deliver good quality and consistent practice.</p> |   |   | <p>Numbers of children in care and those with high level child protection needs increase.</p> <p>Increased caseloads impact on quality of work being undertaken with children in need, including the need for protection and looked after children.</p> <p>Partner agencies not fulfilling their role in supporting the most vulnerable.</p> |   | <p>- Budget pressures with consequences across the Council.</p> <p>- Limits ability to divert resources to early help which ultimately must be part of the solution to increasing numbers of looked after children and preventing children and young people from becoming subject to child protection plans.</p> <p>- Poorer outcomes for children and young people.</p> <p>- Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement.</p> |  |    |          |           |
| Code  | Description   | Managed By  | Desired Outcome  | Output  | Milestones/Pis   | Monitoring   |    |          |           |
| SR 26.01  | Recruitment & retention & workforce development strategy for children's social workers developed. | Children's Social Care (AD); Human Resources Service Team     | Well trained & supported workforce.  | Permanent staff numbers.  | As per strategy and plan.  | Reviewed bi monthly via Medway Safeguarding Children's Board (MSCB) Children's Improvement Board |    |          |           |
| SR 26.02  | Implement improvement plan to strengthen quality of practice.                                     | Children's Social Care (AD)                                   | Improved outcomes for vulnerable children.   | -Reduced drift<br>-Less children subject to CP plans for 2 yrs plus<br>-Improved educational outcomes for LAC<br>-Voice of child clear and heard. | Children subject to CP plan 2 yrs plus.<br>Educational outcomes LAC.<br>Reduce delays in care proceedings.   | CSCMT, CADMT & Corporate Parenting Board and MSCB Children's Improvement Board                   |    |          |           |
| SR 26.04  | Implementation of the Children's Social Care Quality Assurance Framework                          | Deputy Director for Children and Adults                       | Good quality and consistent practice.  | Learning and thematic Audits and other quality assurance tasks are completed as per the QA framework.   | The learning points from completed auditing activity are aggregated so as to inform learning.  | Reviewed bi monthly in line with QA framework schedule   |    |          |           |
| SR 26.05  | Strengthen MSCB.  | Director of Children and Adults                               | Strengthened partnership arrangements for supporting vulnerable children.  | Stronger focus on core business.  | Multi agency attendance at CP conferences.   | CADMT & MSCB   |    |          |           |
| SR 26.06  | Implementation of projects to better manage demand around edge of care and early help.            | Partnership Commissioning (AD), Children's Social Care (AD)   | Safely reduce C&YP entering and staying in the care system.  | Edge of care response.<br>Early help.   | Reduced demand for CSC services.   | Council plan monitoring CSCMT, CADMT, and MSCB Children's Improvement Board                      |    |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 09b  | Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track  | Owner   | Director of Children and Adults  | Children's Services Portfolio  | Current Risk Score  | B | II  | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority  |  | Children & Young People in Medway have the best start in life |  |  |   |   |   |          |           |
| Vulnerability   |  |   | Trigger  |  | Consequences  |   |   |          |           |
| Changes in the demographics and in the legislative requirements affect SEN and YOT. |  |   | The Council is unable to address these issues with cost effective, innovative solutions.   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Poorer outcomes for children and young people.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Budget pressures with consequences across the Council.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement.   |   |   |          |           |
| Code  | Description  | Managed By  | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs  |   | Monitoring  |          |           |
| SR 09b.04   | The additional demands of the SEND reforms and increase in the number of children with complex needs places significant pressures on the DSG High Needs Block  | School Effectiveness and Inclusion (AD)                       | Improved outcomes for C&YP as per strategy.<br><br>Ensuring service delivered within budgetary constraints.  | Good management information to inform commissioning and robust challenge.<br>Provision made within budget.   | Less out of area SEN placements; more children being educated in mainstream schools with outreach; Increased local specialist provision.  |   | SEN data is reviewed quarterly.   |          |           |
| SR 09b.05   | Ensure practitioners are equipped to be compliant with changes in the Youth Justice system and that monitoring systems are in place to track this. Development of intensive interventions that can be used as an alternative to custody - DfE bid submitted to research needs and most effective interventions to support young people on edge of offending. Alternatives to custody being developed and the functional family therapy (FFT) work. | School Effectiveness and Inclusion (AD)                       | - Lower numbers of first and repeat entrants to the YJS.<br>- Lower number of custodial and repeat custodial sentences.<br>- Effective analysis of data to inform practitioners input.<br>- Ensuring service delivered within budgetary constraints.<br>- Magistrates have confidence in interventions. Suitable placements are developed for vulnerable children which keep them safe and enable magistrates to impose an order as an alternative to secure remand. | Performance is monitored monthly (proxy figures) and quarterly (YJB information) 1: 1 meetings with Head of Service; business case for preventative support. | Grant provided by MoJ for developing alternatives to custodial remand is used effectively for innovative support and budget not exceeded by custody bill.<br><br>Successful bid to DfE.<br><br>Needs assessment was completed.<br><br>We currently have an intern working with the Council to spec different alternatives to custody. That piece of work will be completed by end of April. |   | The improved outcomes, confidence of YJB and partners, and the security of the monitoring arrangements by the YOT management board indicate a strong service which can respond to any expected changes. Consequently, it is recommended that this risk be removed from the register |          |           |
| SR 09b.06   | A comprehensive strategy in place to ensure that partner agencies work cooperatively to identify and deal with CYP   | Deputy Director, Children & Adults                            | - Ensure that we have a comprehensive strategy in place for CSE and missing.<br>- All professionals working  | Comprehensive joint K & M LSCB strategy for CSE has been signed by the MSCB and missing protocols in place via CSC   | The K & M CSE strategy has been reviewed and recommendations operationalised. is being  |   | Kent & Medway CSE Subgroup<br>MSCB<br>MASE Panel  |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

|           |   |  |   |  |  |   |
|-----------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
|           | <p>who are identified as, or at risk of becoming, victims or perpetrators of CSE and missing.</p> <p>All professionals, voluntary groups and the wider community including hard to reach groups are aware of, and have an understanding of CSE and missing.</p> <p>Establishment of CSE Unit alongside police – multi agency co located to manage CSE in Medway</p>                       |  | <p>directly with CYP have an understanding and knowledge of CSE and missing; and develop appropriate skills.</p> <p>- Increase the awareness and understanding of CSE and missing by all professionals, voluntary groups, wider community including hard to reach groups.</p> <p>Improvement of identification, prevention, support disruption and prosecutions</p> | <p>Multi agency and single agency approved consistent training is completed by all staff.</p> <p>All child protection courses make direct reference to CSE and missing</p> <p>Awareness raising campaign agreed and implemented.</p> <p>Co location of social worker managed by CSE Operational lead within co location with police MASE Group and Risk management panel</p> | <p><del>reviewed to incorporate recent recommendations and findings to inform the CSE Strategic action plan.</del></p> <p>Any review will be signed by the MSCB in the forward plan</p> <p>All relevant staff complete available CSE training.</p> <p>Case management systems capable of recording CSE cases.</p> <p>Analysis and identification of victims through data analyst within CSE Unit; social work pathways for identified victims; themes and early identification to safeguard young people in Medway</p> | <p>(Strategic)</p> <p>MSCB/Workforce development</p> <p>P &amp; I /CSC AD</p> <p>MSCB</p> <p>MASE</p> |
| SR 09b.07 | <p>A comprehensive strategy in place to ensure that partner agencies cooperate to identify and deal with CYP who are identified as, or at risk of becoming, victims or perpetrators of CSE, missing, have been radicalised or are at risk of radicalisation.</p> <p>Other professionals and community groups have an understanding and an awareness of the Governments Prevent agenda</p> |  | <p>An area wide group – Community Safety Partnership, Medway YOT Board and MSCB - co-ordinates and monitors Prevent work.</p> <p>Vulnerable young people are safeguarded and risks to the community are minimalized</p> <p>Medway agencies share information on vulnerable young people at risk of radicalisation.</p>  | <p>Prevent training and awareness is provided to all key staff, schools and governors.</p> <p>Child Protection courses cover the risk of radicalisation</p> <p>Community groups are offered training to raise awareness of the Prevent agenda and to identify young people who might be at risk of radicalisation.</p>   | <p>- By December 2015</p> <p>- From January 2016</p> <p>- From January 2016</p>  | <p>By YOT Board or Community Safety Partnership and MSCB</p> <p>MSCB</p> <p>MSCB</p>                  |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 25  | Adult Social Care Transformation   | Owner                              | Deputy Director, Children & Adults   | Adult Services Portfolio   | Current Risk Score  | B | II  | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority Adults maintain their independence and live healthy lives   |  |                                    |  |  |   |   |   |          |           |
| Vulnerability  |  |                                    | Trigger  |  | Consequences  |   |   |          |           |
| <p>The local population of older people and disabled adults is increasing significantly - Joint Strategic Needs Analysis, POPPI and PANSI intelligence.</p> <p>New responsibilities for the LA resulting from the Care Act will increase pressure on Adult Social Care services.</p> <p>The ambition of the Better Care Fund (BCF) is to describe Medway's potential for the integration of Adult health and social care and then to deliver the agreed integration.</p> <p>The achievement of these ambitions represents a significant challenge to the local authority and our health partners (The Council only controls a small proportion of the system, alongside the CCG and Medway Foundation Trust).</p> <p>There is a risk that the changes needed across the system will take longer to implement than our current ambitions state.</p> |  |                                    | <p>Demographic impact.</p> <p>Care Act implementation in April 2015.</p> <p>The current timeframe for BCF is to have described the roadmap for integration by 31 March 2017.</p> <p>Whilst the overall national ambition for integration remains same, the priorities and timescales for delivery within that overall ambition may shift at a national level. Uncertainty around national policy and budget in relation to integration/NHS/Council</p> |  | <p>Potentially significant increase in spend on Adult Social Care.</p> <p>Potential impact on ASC resources.</p> <p>Potential risk around supporting wider health economy.</p>        |   |   |          |           |
| Code   | Description  | Managed By                         | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs  |   | Monitoring  |          |           |
| SR 25.01   | <p>Personal Budgets giving people more choice and control.</p> <p>Commissioning sufficient capacity and a suitably wide range of services to meet need.</p> <p>Prevention, early help and re-ablement services.</p> <p>Close management oversight, and action as required, to manage the budget.</p> | Deputy Director, Children & Adults | <p>Best outcomes for people (as per their support plans) and best value for the Local Authority as statutory body and commissioner.</p> <p>A safe and stable local sector of providers that can meet our local needs and provide high quality care and support to older people, disabled adults and carers.</p>  | <p>All clients are offered Personal Budgets/Direct Payments.</p> <p>Joint strategies and commissioning plans with NHS.</p> <p>The Provider Forum engages the sector and assists us to work in partnership in a meaningful and effective way.</p> <p>Monthly scrutiny of budgets at AMT and audits of practice and Personal Budgets/Direct Payments. Management action as required.</p> | <p>Personal Budgets performance as per KPI.</p> <p>Category Management project on high cost placements.</p> <p>End of year spend within budget.</p> <p>Dynamic Purchasing System.</p> |   | <p>Monthly.</p> <p>As per star chamber and procurement forward plan.</p> <p>Monthly at AMT and quarterly at CADMT.</p> <p>Gateway process as per procurement forward plan.</p> <p>Council plan monitoring –</p> |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| Code     | Description   | Managed By                                    | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs  | Monitoring  |
|----------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
|          | New responsibilities arising from Care Act, for example, providing assessments and services for carers and self funders.  |   |  | Implementation of Care Act changes.  |   | implementation of Care Act is a key project.  |
| SR 25.02 | <p>Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) post Cheshire West judgement, resulted in a rapid increase in the number of applications for DoLS, challenging several parts of the system – administration, Best Interest Assessors, Advocacy services.</p> <p>Risk of legal challenge and breaching statutory timeframes.</p> | Deputy Director, Children & Adults            | People in a care home or hospital are not deprived of their liberty illegally. | DoLS applications to Medway as a Supervisory Body are processed and assessments carried out within timeframes. | <p>Setting up of Medway DoLS office – complete.</p> <p>Communication to care homes and other relevant settings to ensure compliance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005.</p> <p>Recruitment and training of the required number of Best Interest Assessors.</p>   | <p>Breaches monitored weekly.</p> <p>Updates to AMT.</p> <p>DH Quarterly monitoring report.</p> <p>DH annual statutory return.</p>  |
| SR 25.03 | Risk that the introduction of the Care Act 2014 will result in a significant rise in the cost of provision and implementation costs from April 2020. Still too early to tell what impact will be on current social care budgets or plans.   | Deputy Director for Children and Adults       | To be care act compliant in line with national timescales.                     | Introduction of a cap on the costs of care, means testing and new appeals process                              | Phase 2 of Care Act from April 2020 <b>Note:</b> The original implementation date for phase 2 was April 2016. The Care and Support Minister announced in July 2015 that the cap will now be delayed until April 2020. Full modelling and financial implications have not yet been undertaken. The final statutory regulations and guidance are not however expected until October 2015. | We have undertaken an initial impact assessment of the effects of the Care Act, are carrying out further financial modelling and will continue to refine our assumptions as we develop our final Better Care Fund response. |
| SR 25.04 | Shifting of resources to fund new joint interventions and schemes might destabilise current service providers, particularly in the acute sector   | Assistant Director, Partnership Commissioning | To describe Medway's potential for integration by nationally set timeframes    | Working closely with MFT and CCG to bring in agreed programmes that will manage the channel-shift process      | To describe the route-map for integration by 31 March 2017 <b>Note: We are working to national timescales that are currently under review and the council is one third of the triangular partnership so not</b>   | A Transition Plan will be developed and implemented with Medway NHS Foundation Trust to ensure areas of concern are   |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

|          |   |   |   |  |  |   |
|----------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
|          |   |   |   |  | able to exercise overall control.  | identified early and appropriate actions implemented in a timely fashion. Contingency plans put in place  |
| SR 25.05 | Operational pressures on the workforce will restrict the ability to deliver the required investment and associated projects to make the vision of care outlined in our Better Care Fund submission a reality, including workforce recruitment, skills analysis and change management. | Assistant Director, Partnership Commissioning | A review of the services within the "ring-fenced" / pooled budget will identify those services that require additional resource, additionally it will identify those services not performing or where need has moved forward. | The ambition for the partnership for 2016 and beyond needs to be developed in line with rapidly changing needs, central policies (yet to be formalised) and available resources. | To describe the route-map for integration by 31 March 2017<br><b>Note: We are working to national timescales that are currently under review and the council is one third of the triangular partnership so not able to exercise overall control.</b> | Our 2014 schemes include specific non-recurrent investments in the infrastructure and capacity support of the overall organisational development including workforce. |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 27  | Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools  | Owner   | Director of Children and Adults   | Children's Services Portfolio  | Current Risk Score  | C | II  | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority   |   | Children & Young People in Medway have the best start in life |   |  |   |   |   |          |           |
| Vulnerability  |   |   | Trigger   |  | Consequences  |   |   |          |           |
| <p>Councils are accountable for the outcome of performance of all schools but have reduced levers to drive action and change. The Government's expectation is for all schools in special measures to become academies</p> <p>The OFSTED school inspection framework replaces 'satisfactory' with 'requires improvement'. Any school with 2 consecutive 'requires improvement' will be in a category.</p> |   |   | A failing OFSTED inspection for a maintained school for which the Council has a statutory responsibility. |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on children and families of being in a school that fails to provide quality provision.</li> <li>- Performance ratings as measured through Ofsted reports and Performance tables impact on parental and community confidence.</li> <li>- Financial consequences.</li> <li>- The DfE will expect that the school becomes a sponsored academy with further financial consequences to Medway including an expectation that the LA pays the legal costs for the transfer.</li> <li>- Damage to reputation.</li> <li>- Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement.</li> <li>- Progress and progression for children &amp; young people are impacted negatively.</li> </ul> |   |   |          |           |
| Code   | Description   | Managed By  | Desired Outcome   | Output   | Milestones/Pis  |   | Monitoring  |          |           |
| SR 27. 01  | Analysis of school data is used to agree a school partnership rating so that appropriate support can be put in place. | School Effectiveness and Inclusion (AD)                       | Schools results in line with or exceed nationally expected progress measures.                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School Challenge and Improvement Team support schools to identify actions needed to improve pupil progress.</li> <li>- Data shows progress to be in line with similar schools nationally and then to be in upper quartile.</li> <li>- Implementation of School Improvement Strategy.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of schools below floor threshold reduces</li> <li>- Number of schools in an OFSTED category reduces and remains low.</li> </ul>   |   | <p>RAMP meetings with head and Chair of Governors.</p> <p>CADMT performance reports.</p> <p>Council Plan monitoring.</p> <p>School Effectiveness Strategic Board.</p> |          |           |



## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

|          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SR 27.02 | The proportion of schools in Medway with an OFSTED judgement requires improvement (3) is currently higher than national; and the proportion of schools with good and outstanding judgements is currently lower than national. | School Effectiveness and Inclusion (AD) | Schools move up from requires improvement to Good and from Good to Outstanding. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Core SCI training developed and delivered in a targeted way.</li> <li>- OFSTED preparation in place for Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Governors.</li> <li>- NLES and LLEs linked to schools to give additional experience to draw on for delivering good and better practice.</li> <li>- Work closely with the teaching school alliances to develop leadership and improve the quality of teaching across subject areas.</li> </ul> | OFSTED judgements place more schools in the Good or Outstanding categories. | SCI team meetings.<br>OFSTED liaison and monitoring.<br>CADMT performance reports.<br>Council Plan monitoring.<br>School Effectiveness Strategic Board. |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 17  | Delivering regeneration   | Owner   | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture  | Inward investment, strategic regeneration and partnerships Portfolio         | Current Risk Score   | C          | II | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|------------|----|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority Everyone Benefitting from the Area's Regeneration   |   |   |  |  |  |            |    |          |           |
| Vulnerability  |   |   | Trigger  |  | Consequences   |            |    |          |           |
| <p>Medway's regeneration plans to regenerate the area with 30,000 50,000 people to Medway up to 20,000 jobs and 17,000 29,000 new homes in the next 20 plus years.</p> <p>There are challenges for the provision and maintenance of effective infrastructure. Particular areas of concern are flood protection, highways and water capacity.</p> <p>It is vital the benefits are felt by the population of Medway, so that the new jobs are not filled by only people from outside the area.</p> |   |   | The Council fails to achieve the economic, social and infrastructure regeneration agenda.  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Regeneration projects not completed.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Potential damage to Council's reputation.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Not able to meet member, government and the public's expectations.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Deteriorating physical and infrastructure assets.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Investment wasted.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Young people are not catered for in the 'new world'.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Low skills base among some residents remains.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disconnect between skills and employment opportunities.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance of low aspiration culture.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Increased commuting and pressure on transportation.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Negative impact on community cohesion. |            |    |          |           |
| Code   | Description   | Managed By                                      | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/Pis   | Monitoring |    |          |           |
| SR 17.01   | Outline infrastructure needs identified.  | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture | Identification of inward investment priorities.  | Progressing key regeneration sites and infrastructure plan jointly with KCC. | - Generation of funds to carry out the work and investors confidence;<br>- 20 year development programme.  | Quarterly  |    |          |           |
| SR 17.02   | Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) alerted to the impact of lack of funding and dialogue opened with External Partners.             | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture | HCA confirm any funding commitments and business plans for HCA sites<br>Stewardship agreements completed for each HCA site- HCA confirm any funding commitment to projects and plans for HCA sites | Funding identified to continue regeneration.                                 | Regeneration projects agreed with Members.   | Quarterly  |    |          |           |
| SR 17.04   | Regular meetings with stakeholders including developers to lever in external funding and bring forward transformational programmes. | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture | External financial arrangements to fund transformational programmes and deliver plans that are implemented on time and to budget.  | Investors come forward for regeneration sites.                               | As detailed in individual delivery plans.  | Quarterly  |    |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| Code     | Description   | Managed By                                      | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs   | Monitoring                                |
|----------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| SR 17.05 | Working with the Local Enterprise Partnership to attract funds to Medway. | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture | External financial arrangements to fund transformational programmes and deliver plans that are implemented on time and to budget. Create and protect long-term jobs in the private sector, and programmes which will deliver sustainable jobs. | <del>Growing Places Fund (GPF):</del><br><del>£4.4m Rochester Riverside;</del><br><del>£2.99m Chatham Waterfront.</del><br><del>TIGER (Thames Gateway</del><br><del>Innovation, Growth and Enterprise)</del><br><del>£20m for North Kent and Thurrock</del><br><del>for business loans and grants.</del><br><del>£4m for Strood Flood Defences</del><br><del>(Public Works Loan Board).</del><br><del>£29m Local Growth Funding from</del><br><del>the Local Enterprise Partnership.</del> | As detailed in individual delivery plans.  | Quarterly                                 |
| SR17.06  | Working towards the adoption of the new Medway Local Plan                 | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture | New Local Plan and Planning Policy Guidance adopted  | To complete the development of the Local Plan and Planning Policy Guidance as outlined in the Local Development Scheme published 2015  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred options consultation completed in Jan/Feb 2016</li> <li>• Publication Nov/Dec 2017</li> <li>• Submission March 2018</li> <li>• Anticipated adoption Dec 2018</li> </ul> | Development Plans Advisory Group Meetings |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 21   | Procurement and Tendering   | Owner                             | Legal and Corporate Services (AD)  | Resources Portfolio  | Current Risk Score  | C  | II | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|--|----|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority  |   | Giving Value for Money            |  |  |   |  |    |          |           |
| Vulnerability   |   |                                   | Trigger  |  | Consequences  |  |    |          |           |
| <p>Strategic Sourcing Plans and standard procurements do not realise the savings predicted and included in budget projections.</p> <p>Contracts are not appropriately and consistently managed such that the potential for regular reviews and annual reductions are not taken.</p> |   |                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budget pressures</li> <li>- Audit reviews reveal weaknesses.</li> </ul>           |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council does not achieve value for money.</li> <li>- Damage to reputation.</li> <li>- Increased costs of purchasing services.</li> <li>- Not achieving cost efficiencies.</li> <li>- Overspend on budget allocation.</li> <li>- Failing to achieve Members' expectations.</li> </ul> |  |    |          |           |
| Code  | Description   | Managed By                        | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs  | Monitoring   |    |          |           |
| SR 21.01  | Member chaired Procurement Board with the Council's Monitoring Officer responsible for the strategic procurement direction that meets every four weeks. | Legal and Corporate Services (AD) | To deliver the Procurement Strategy.   | Procurement Board meets every four weeks.                                | On-going.   | Every four weeks.  |    |          |           |
| SR 21.02  | Forward Procurement Plans in place for each category theme (people, place and corporate).   | Category Management               | Timely commencement of procurement ensuring contracts are in place.  | Plans monitored by the Procurement Board every four weeks.               | Taken over by Category Management team after "go-live" in December 2012.  | Every four weeks.  |    |          |           |
| SR 21.03  | Strategic Sourcing Plans which are agreed with the relevant service and monitored regularly.  | Category Management               | Predicted savings that are sensible and achievable and the ability to take alternative action if under performance occurs. | Regular savings reports to the Portfolio Holder and to the Finance team. | Completed and due to be monitored in 2015/16.   | Procurement Board strategic oversight with Category Management team day-to-day management. |    |          |           |
| SR 21.04  | Building capacity in contract management including the use of external support.   | Category Management               | Good regular engagement with suppliers. Regular discussions about performance and savings.                                 | Identification of contract management savings.                           | Commenced and to be reported throughout 2015/16.  | Portfolio Holder strategic oversight with Category Management team day-to-day management.  |    |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 02   | Business continuity and emergency planning                    | Owner   | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture   | Business management (cross cutting) Portfolio   | Current Risk Score  | D | II   | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority  |   | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do |   |   |   |   |  |          |           |
| Vulnerability   |   |   | Trigger   |   | Consequences  |   |  |          |           |
| <p>Duties under the Civil Contingencies Act require councils to have an Emergency Plan. The Emergency Management and Response Structure may not be robust enough to respond to a major emergency.</p> <p>Every business activity is at risk of disruption from a variety of threats, which vary in magnitude from catastrophic through to trivial, and include pandemic flu, fire, flood, loss of utility supplies and accidental or malicious damage of assets or resources.</p> |   |   | A significant adverse event occurs and the Council is found wanting or negligent in its planning and/or operational response  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Response to event is not rapid, adequate nor effective.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Lack of clear communication lines<br><input type="checkbox"/> Essential service priorities not clearly understood.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Communication between agencies and the public is poor.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Residents expect more from their Council<br><input type="checkbox"/> Local press quick to seize issue.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Comparisons made with other local authorities and resilience groups<br><input type="checkbox"/> A death, or deaths, in the community<br><input type="checkbox"/> Legal challenge under the 'Civil Contingencies Act 2004' |   |  |          |           |
| Code  | Description   | Managed By  | Desired Outcome   | Output  | Milestones/Pis  |   | Monitoring   |          |           |
| SR 02.01  | Continue to develop the Council's Emergency Plan.             | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised plan agreed by CMT</li> <li>- Continued engagement with Kent Resilience Forum</li> <li>- Staff trained in emergency response management</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing plan in place - Programme of on-going review of COMAH plans - Emergency response operations room in place.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft plan update in place.</li> <li>- Relevant staff training during 2015.</li> </ul>   |   | On-going   |          |           |
| SR 02.02  | Business continuity plans completed to implement the actions. | Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture         | All services will have an up-to-date and tested Business Continuity Plan.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BCM Policy agreed.</li> <li>- BCM principles and project aims communicated to divisional management teams across the Council.</li> <li>- A Corporate Recovery Plan.</li> <li>- IT Recovery Plan in place.</li> <li>- Draft flu plans in place.</li> <li>- Winter preparedness plans in place.</li> </ul> | Plans tested.   |   | Quarterly reports to Strategic Risk Management Group |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR 32   | Data and Information  | Owner                             | Legal and Corporate Services (AD)  | Adrian Gulvin Portfolio  | Current Risk Score   | D                          | II | Reviewed | July 2015 |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------|----|----------|-----------|
| Link to Corporate Priority  |   | Giving Value for Money            |  |  |  |                            |    |          |           |
| Vulnerability   |   |                                   | Trigger  |  | Consequences   |                            |    |          |           |
| <p>Moves to implement the Digital Strategy with innovative collaborations about "Big Data" open the Council to increased information risk particularly regarding personal and health data.</p> <p>Conversely not sharing information with partners and others minimises the Council's ability to improve service delivery and reduce costs.</p> |   |                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budget pressures</li> <li>- ICO Audit reveals areas for improvement</li> <li>- Digital Strategy</li> <li>- Big Data project with academics</li> </ul> |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data loss leads to damage to reputation.</li> <li>- Not achieving cost efficiencies through Digital Strategy changes</li> <li>- Failing to achieve Members' expectations.</li> <li>- Failing to find new innovations</li> </ul> |                            |    |          |           |
| Code  | Description   | Managed By                        | Desired Outcome  | Output   | Milestones/PIs   | Monitoring                 |    |          |           |
| SR32.01   | Digital Strategy Officer Board includes the Senior Information Risk Owner                                       | Legal and Corporate Services (AD) | To ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place for sharing information.  | Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs) ISAs and Standards Operating Procedures (SOPs) detailing roles and responsibilities. | On-going.  | Regular                    |    |          |           |
| SR32.02   | Information Sharing Agreement (ISA) for Kent  | Legal and Corporate Services (AD) | Provides the basis for ISAs within Kent organisations and outside  | PIAs, ISAs and SOPs and where appropriate Data Licence Agreements.   | On-going   | Kent ISA reviewed annually |    |          |           |
| SR32.03   | Security and Information Governance Group   | Legal and Corporate Services (AD) | Providing a corporate overview of all information risk across projects and initiatives   | Minutes of SIGG meetings attended by representatives from Public Health, RCC and C&A Departments                       | On-going   | Regular                    |    |          |           |
| SR32.04   | Meetings between Senior Information Risk Officer and Caldicott Guardian (Deputy Director C&A) on specific risks | Legal and Corporate Services (AD) | Good regular engagement to discuss risk areas  | PIAs, ISAs and SOPs co-signed where relevant   | Ad hoc as and when required.   | Regular                    |    |          |           |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

| SR<br>33   | Impact of Welfare Reform   | Owner   | Chief Finance<br>Officer   | Leader's Portfolio  | Current Risk<br>Score  | D | II   | Reviewed | New Jan 2016 |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|----------|--------------|
| <b>Link to Corporate Priority</b>  |  | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do |  |   |  |   |  |          |              |
| Vulnerability  |  |   | Trigger  |   | Consequences   |   |  |          |              |
| A wide range of changes in Government policy under the broad banner of 'Welfare Reform' could have a significant impact on the Council's resources. Some could impact directly on the Council's resources, such as the introduction of the living wage and the 1% per annum reduction in social rents, whereas others impact adversely on a cohort of the more vulnerable members of the community, which in turn increases demand for some the Council's core services – social care, housing and revenues and benefits. As the changes are implemented on a phased basis the Council not able to fully predict the impact they will have on its resources. |  |   | Since 2012 the Government has embarked upon a major programme of welfare reform, with the broad aims of encouraging people back into work and addressing a perceived 'dependency culture' in Britain. These measures have included:<br>- Changes to tax allowances and thresholds<br>- Reform of benefits (eg. Universal Credit, the cap)<br>- Changes in eligibility for social housing<br>- Introduction of the living wage<br>- An influx of both identified and unidentified customers |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on some of the most vulnerable citizens.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Consequent impact on demand for core council services.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Transfer of additional responsibilities to local authorities.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Direct and indirect impacts on council staffing resources.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Direct Impact on Rent Income Stream to HRA<br><input type="checkbox"/> Increase in homelessness/Evictions<br><input type="checkbox"/> Negative local publicity and reputational damage.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Unidentified customers impacted by the welfare reform presenting to the Council too late to prevent homelessness. |   |  |          |              |
| Code   | Description  | Managed By  | Desired Outcome  | Output  | Milestones/PIs   |   | Monitoring   |          |              |
| SR 33.01   | Provide direct financial support for the most vulnerable members of the community.   | Phil Watts  | Customers are able to sustain tenancies and mortgages.<br>Families remain resilient and less likely to need Council care services.   | Implementation of the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council tax reduction scheme;</li> <li>Discretionary relief;</li> <li>Enhanced housing benefit;</li> <li>Welfare provision.</li> </ul> | The number of customers receiving a housing duty presenting with the following reasons for their homelessness <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mortgage arrears (repossession or other)</li> <li>Rent arrears on:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local authority or other public sector dwellings;</li> <li>Registered social landlord /other housing association;</li> <li>Private sector dwellings.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> KPI rent arrears as % of rent debit.  |   | Government P1E quarterly returns (homelessness)                    |          |              |
| SR 33.02   | Establishment of the Welfare Reform Officer Group, to take forward the recommendations of the Welfare Reform Members Task Group. | Phil Watts  | Staff from different services and directorates provides a joined up approach, meeting the challenges the welfare reform poses for our customers. In addition as many of our residents as possible are delivered a  | Establish a Welfare Reform Officer Group incorporating members from relevant services.<br><br>Produce and deliver an action plan to implement the recommendations of the Welfare Reform Members Task Group.   | Monitor action plan and provide six monthly update reports to O&S Committee:<br><br>August 2016<br>February 2017<br>August 2017  |   | Welfare Reform Officer Group<br><br>Six monthly updates to BSD O&S |          |              |

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

|          |  |              |   |   |  |  |
|----------|--|--------------|---|---|--|--|
|          |  |              | consistent message.   | Regular reporting.  | February 2018  |  |
| SR 33.03 | The direct provision of and referral to money advice services.   | Various      | Customers are clearly signposted to free and independent money and debt advice, which will help them in budgeting and managing debts.   | Produce specification for service provision and tender.<br><br>Tender service and award service contract.<br><br>Brief staff on procedures.<br><br>Launch service and undertake wide publicity campaign for our customers.                                      | Number of referrals made<br><br>Number of referrals made where debt in line with Council tax arrears and rent arrears reduce           | Quarterly  |
| SR 33.04 | Closer working with the DWP in relation to implementation of Universal Credit.   | Phil Watts   | Deliver the Council's commitments in terms of the Delivery Partnership Agreement.   | Undertake joint meetings and working arrangements with DWP.<br><br>Undertake joint publicity campaign to signpost customers to the DWP and where appropriate support them with online access to the application process.<br><br>Formalise debt advice services. | Number of joint events held with partners to promote Universal Credit  | Welfare reform Officer group<br><br>Six monthly updates to BSD O&S |
| SR 33.05 | Review of the HRA business plan to address the impact of the 1% reduction in rents and the high value subsidy figure which is being legislated in the proposed Housing Bill. | Marc Blowers | The Council has a clear understanding of future viability of HRA business plan and delivery of services, allowing the Council to plan effectively for the future provision of the service | Review the business plan once the Housing and Planning Bill has been passed and the high value subsidy figure is announced (expected June 2016)<br>Consult on the plan with HRA tenants and present to BSD O&S.   | Monitoring of Business Plan annually<br><br>Quarterly budget monitoring.<br><br>O&S report on revised HRA business plan – October 2016 | O&S Committee<br><br>Quarterly budget monitoring                   |