![Medway Council - Serving You]

CABINET

20 DECEMBER 2011

ANNUAL REVIEW OF RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND 6 MONTHLY REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE BUSINESS RISK REGISTER

Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Alan Jarrett, Finance
Report from:	Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture and Chair of Strategic Risk Management Group
Author:	Joy Kirby, Quality Assurance & Client Manager

Summary

In accordance with paragraph 4.1 of the Council's Risk Management Strategy, this report is to discuss both the annual review of the Risk Management Strategy and 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 Performance Plan in terms of "giving value for money".

2.   Background

2.1   Cabinet undertook the annual review of the strategy on 30 November 2010 and agreed with the strategy and officers' recommendations and that no significant changes needed to be made at that time.

2.2   The Corporate Risk Register was last reviewed by Cabinet on 29 March 2011. The following changes were made to the register at that time:

- Risk Ref: SR 21 – Procurement downgraded to C2.
- Risk Ref: SR23 – 'Improvement Plan for Housing Service (HRA)' downgraded to E2

3.   Related Information

3.1   The Risk Management Audit 2010/2011 confirmed that risk management arrangements are satisfactory. However it identified that training and arrangements regarding the creation of directorate risk registers require further development.

3.1.1   These two issues were outstanding actions from the plan reported to the Audit Committee in March 2010.

3.1.2   Service risks continue to be recorded in service plans and monitored by Service Managers and through Assistant Directors quarterly reports. It was agreed that adding risks to Covalent, the Council's performance management system, should be in a later phase of implementation (2011/12) and that training would be provided to assist managers in using Covalent to manage risks.

3.1.3   The Strategic Risk Management Group, in consultation with the Research and Review team (who manage Covalent), have agreed a phased approach, detailed in Appendix D, to take this forward

4   Advice and analysis

4.1   The Strategic Risk Management Group has reviewed the Risk Strategy, (Appendix A) and recommended that no significant changes need to be made at this time

4.2   Risks owners have reviewed their risks and updated them as detailed in Appendix C and the following recommendations have been proposed:

4.2.1   SR 24 – Managing Change be replaced with a new risk SR 30 Delivering Better for Less Transformation.

4.2.2   SR 09a - 'Delivering the Transformation Agenda' be removed as the Transformation programme no longer exists and that it be replaced by a new risk SR 25 'Adult Social Care Demographics' to recognise that the focus must now be on the demographic impact on both demand and capacity to deliver statutory responsibilities. The risk rating of C2 remains the same.

4.2.3   SR 09b – 'Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track' be retained and refocused but remove and create a new risk concentrating on looked after children (ref SR26) risk rating B2. This reflects the fact that there is National and local evidence that children and young people in care are more vulnerable to poorer outcomes which could impact on our statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement and increased costs.

4.2.4 SR 08a – 'Partnership Working' be removed as it is too generic and be replaced with three new risks focusing on key partnerships as described in 4.2.5, 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.

4.2.5 Create a new risk SR 27 risk rating B2 to reflect the fact that Councils are responsible for poor performance of schools including independent, academies and free schools but lack levers for change with potential impact on our statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement and could have financial consequences.

4.2.6 Create a new risk SR 28 risk rating D2 relating to the implementation of the Government's agenda to the Health system whereby the Council may be unable to influence decision-making when the new health clusters are created which could have a negative impact on the community and lead to a reduction in health services to Medway.

4.2.7 Create a new risk SR 29 risk rating B2 focusing on the transition to a new provider for mental health social care services with the potential for the outcome to significantly impact on services to clients and lead to an increased reliance on Council led services.

4.2.8 Amend SR 02 Business Continuity & Emergency Planning to recognise the World Health Organisations' continuing concerns regarding the risk of pandemic flu.

4.2.9 Appendix B summarises the risk rating of the risks on the register incorporating the proposals detailed above.

5. Consultation

5.1 The Strategic Risk Management Group and risk owners have been consulted on the review of the Risk Management Strategy and proposed amendments to the risk register. Members will be consulted via Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet.

6. Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee

6.1 The Business Support Overview and Scrutiny considered this report on 2 December 2011. Members discussed several issues around current risk ratings and officers responded with reasons for the risk rating. These included SR 19 - Down Turn in the Economy', SR21 - Procurement, SR 25 - Adult Social Care Demographics.

6.2 Members also observed that there was no mention of consultation on hospital mergers and acute services in risk SR28 – Changes to the Health System. Officers explained that the report was compiled in September and that these issues are a more recent development.

6.3 Re: SR27 – Government Changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools. Members also expressed concern regarding financial impact for the Council if one of the schools or academies failed. Officers

explained that the funding is related to the children and the Council would receive the funding if this happened however there could be additional consequential financial issues.

7.   Financial, legal and risk implications

7.1   There are no direct financial, legal or risk implications arising from this report although clearly the inability to control or mitigate risks could have a financial or legal impact.

8.   Recommendation

8.1   The Cabinet is asked to:

a) Note the comments of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
b) Approve the Risk Management Strategy, as set out in Appendix A to the report;
c) Approve the amendments to the Council's Risk Register as detailed in section 4 of this report.

9.   Suggested reasons for decision

9.1   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

Joy Kirby: Quality Assurance & Client Manager
Ext 1422 /email joy.kirby@medway.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix A - Risk Management Strategy
.   Appendix B – Record of Amendments
                             Appendix C - Corporate Business Risk Register
                             Appendix D - Phased approach to developing Directorate
                                              Risk Registers

Background papers

Internal Audit's management action plans from the risk management audit 2006/2007, 2007/2008, 2008/9, 2009/10 and 2010/11

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

1.   Introduction

1.1   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.

1.2   This 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.

1.3   The strategy sets out:

- a definition of risk and what is meant by risk management
- actions that need to be taken.
- roles and responsibilities

1.4   The strategy will be reviewed annually to ensure that it remains up-to-date and continues to reflect the Council's approach to risk management.

2.   The Benefits of Risk Management

2.1.   The following diagram sets out the benefits that are associated with sound risk management.


Created March 2006, 5th review September 2011

**Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy**

3.   What is Risk Management?

3.1   Risk management is a focus on the risks facing the Council, making the most of opportunities (making the right decisions) and achieving objectives once those decisions are made.

3.2.1   The process of risk management can be illustrated through the risk management cycle:

**RISK
IDENTIFICATION**

RISK ANALYSIS

MONITORING

PRIORITISATION

RISK MANAGEMENT

Zurich Municipal Management Services

3.3   Risk helps to deliver performance improvement and is at the core of decision-making, business planning, managing change and innovation. It needs to be practised at both management and service delivery level. It enables the effective use of resources, secures the assets of the organisation and its continued financial and organisational well-being

3.4   There are two types of risks:

direct threats (damaging events/issues) which could lead to a failure to achieve objectives. An example might be severe flooding in Strood affecting the local economy and residential properties.

opportunities (constructive events/issues) which if exploited could offer an improved way of achieving objectives , but which are surrounded by threats. An example was the move to the new Corporate HQ with all ICT in one building. Having established a potential risk there is a need to work on a strategy to mitigate the risk. This particular risk has been successfully dealt with.

3.4.1   Business v Operation risks

Business/service risks : Those which have been identified as potentially damaging to the achievement of the Council's objectives and departmental/ service business plans.   An example might be a major fire in a Council School.

Operational risks: Risks which managers and staff are likely to encounter in the day-to-day work situations. An example might be a loss of key staff.

3.5   Risk is a condition, an act, situation or event with the ability or potential to impact on customers, units/departments by either enhancing or inhibiting corporate/departmental performance, attainment of corporate/ departmental objectives or meeting customers and stakeholders' expectations.   The Scope of Business Risk model below shows the number of areas that can be affected.

Political

Economic

Social

Techno-logical

Legislative/ Regulatory

Environmental

Competitive

Customer/ Citizen

Managerial/ Professional

Financial

Legal

Partnership/ Contractual

Physical

Zurich Municipal Management Services

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

3.6   Risk are benchmarked against corporate goals:

a)   Impact: To what extent the issue, assuming it were to manifest itself to the degree defined in the consequences, would impact on the organisation's ability to achieve its vision, aims and priorities? These are measured as:

        I   Catastrophic (Showstopper)
        II   Critical
        III   Marginal
        IV   Negligible

b)   Likelihood: (resource allocation): Taking into account existing measures to manage issue (not those planned or not yet in operation), how likely is the 'impact' to occur within the timeframe of the corporate plan? i.e. 2007/10. These are measured as:

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

3.7   It may not be cost-effective to manage all risks – even significant ones. In these circumstance the Council may decide to tolerate the risk.

To help the council make that decision all risks will be categorised using the measures detailed at 3.6 and plotted against the Council's Strategic Risk Profile shown below:

	IV	III	II	I
A	▓			
B	▓	▓		
C	▓	▓		
D	▓	▓	▓	▓
E	▓	▓	▓	▓
F	▓	▓	▓	▓

The Council have agreed the tolerance line be drawn at CII (Significant & Critical). The council will then decide what action to take to monitor such risks.

3.8   Risks will be regularly monitored using service planning and AD Quarterly reports and the Council's performance management system (Covalent). Risks above the tolerance line (CII) will be escalated to the next management level as detailed in Appendix 1.

3.9   Effective risk management includes regularly reviewing our emergency planning programmes and service continuity management to maintain a high standard in our response to potential crises. This means developing, implementing and maintaining an action oriented process for responding to any emergency, managing major incidents and recovering the service level to the local community.

4.   Roles & Responsibilities

4.1   The following details the roles and responsibilities for delivering risk management.

Who	Roles & Responsibilities
Members	• commit to the Risk Management Strategy • review risks through the 6 monthly reports on key strategic risks and information contained in the Council Plan, Cabinet reports and AD quarterly reports. • Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committees receive reports on key service risks.
Management Team (MT)	• review and manage the Council's key strategic risks every 6 months. • provide leadership and support to promote a culture in which risks are managed with confidence at the lowest appropriate level
Strategic Risk Management Group (Membership shall be: A chairman who is a nominated director and one representative from each Directorate with an overall responsibility for risk issues.)	• chair of group to sponsor risk management at MT (currently Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture). • ensure the Council's key strategic risks are reviewed, updated and presented to MT every 6 months. • regularly review the risk management and control process employed across the Council.

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

Who	Roles & Responsibilities
Strategic Risk Management Group	• review any findings and recommendations of the external auditors, internal audit or other third party in relation to risk management. • review the impact of any changes in the organisation on the risk management process and the response to these changes including the update of the risk register. • champion risk management, the practice, risk awareness and buy in across the organisation. • champion and oversee the implementation of business continuity planning for the organisation • oversee the development of service continuity plans and provide strategic support for the emergency planning service.
Directorate Management Teams (DMT)	• ultimate responsibility for the management of all directorate risks and maintenance of a sound system of internal control within the directorate and across partnership working • review and monitor the effectiveness of the risk management actions relative to the significant key risks to the directorate on a quarterly basis. • reflect significant changes to business objectives and related risks and, where relevant, address them in the Directorate Business Plan.
Assistant Directors	• oversee the effective implementation of risk management within their service area within the agreed principles and framework • discuss significant key risks and risk management actions with their portfolio holders and report on progress through the AD Quarterly Reports. • alert Directorate Management Team (DMT) if impact or likelihood of the risk increases.

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

Who	Roles & Responsibilities
Service Managers	• identify risks for their service areas, assess them for likelihood and impact, propose actions to mitigate them and allocate responsibility for the controls mitigating the risk. • record them into service plans. • discuss significant key risks and risk management actions with AD and reporting progress through the AD Quarterly Reports. • alert their line manager if impact or likelihood of the risk increases.
Staff at all levels within the council	• identify, assess and report risks within their service areas • practice risk management in their day to day activities • alert their line manager if impact or likelihood of the risk increases.

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

5.   **Progress on actions identified when the strategy was first agreed by Cabinet in April 2006.**

| Action	How	By Whom	Progress
Council agrees the risk management strategy	Cabinet and O&S Committees.	Business Support O&S Committee and Cabinet	Cabinet (24/04/06) agreed the strategy. Business Support O&S (13/04/06) concentrated on the key risk analysis tables. Business Support O&S (16/10/07) recommended approval of the revised Risk Management Strategy to Cabinet..
Nominate a Member to sponsor risk management	Councillor Alan Jarrett has agreed to undertake this role		Councillor Alan Jarrett continues to undertake this role
CMT and Members to regularly review key strategic risks	Determine dates for meetings and arrange a slot on the agenda.	Quality Assurance & Client Manager (R&D) & Democratic Services	6 monthly reviews of the Council's key strategic risks have been implemented for CMT and Members.
Adopting an alternative Cabinet report format that includes a clear 'opportunities and risks' section.	Guidance to be issued to report authors	AD Customer First, Democracy & Governance	Cabinet report template now revised to include a specific section on risk.
Nominate representatives for the Strategic Risk Management Group (SRMG) and arrange meeting dates	a) Directors to inform Chairman of the Group. b) Arrange dates for future meetings	a) Directors b) Quality Assurance & Client Manager (R&D)	a) SRMG meet every three months with representatives from directorates. b) Future meetings arranged

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

Action	How	By Whom	Progress
Foster a culture for risk management	a) Adopt the roles and responsibilities contained in the risk management strategy b) Training for staff c) Communicate the requirement for effective risk management to members, staff and partners through team briefings and Connections.	a) Cabinet b) Quality Assurance & Client Manager (R&D) with Organisational & Learning Development? c) Quality Assurance & Client Manager (R&D) with service managers and corporate Communications.	a) Roles and responsibilities were agreed when strategy was adopted. b) CMT has agreed to a programme of training. Phase 1 - training for Senior Management. Took place in August 2007, Phase 2 – training for Members and service managers took place in February 2008 and February 2009, Further Member Training took place in August 2011. Phase 3 - implement refresher training for managers and train new managers as appropriate. c) Communication for both members and mangers takes place through training and a web site to be developed on the Council's intranet.
Manage risks at the lowest level at which the manager has authority, responsibility and resources to take actions	a) Include risk management in staff induction. b) Discuss risks at team meetings and one-to-one meetings.	a) Quality Assurance & Client Manager (R&D) with Organisational Learning & Development. b) Service and team managers	a) risk management is included in the Managers' Induction pack. b) on-going

Medway Council
Risk Management Strategy

Action	How	By Whom	Progress
Ensure all relevant key risks are recorded in a Corporate risk register.	Identify existing systems and processes and work towards integration where appropriate.	Strategic Risk Management Group	It has now been agreed that there will be a corporate risk register (determined and agreed at CMT) and service risk registers (determined by directorates). It is proposed that relevant risks identified through DMTs will be put forward to CMT to be considered for inclusion in the corporate risk register.
Integrate risk management into the service planning process	Service planning templates include a risk section.	Research & Review	Service planning template includes a section for the identification and management of risks. These will eventually be recorded in Covalent, the Council's performance management system.
Strive to improve the effectiveness of our risk management arrangements and learn from our experience.	a) Review recommendations of the external auditors, internal audit or other third party in relation to risk management. b) ensure risks are regularly reviewed at all levels across the organisation. c) risks are escalated as appropriate. d) the Strategic Risk Management Group to monitor the effectiveness of the arrangements.	a) Strategic Risk Management Group & CMT b) Strategic Risk Management Group c) All staff d) Strategic Risk Management Group.	a) The SRMG have review, and developed anaction plans to action address the issues identified in the internal risk management audit 2010/11. b) & c) The SRMG are reviewing procedures to ensure appropriate links are made to the new performance reporting system. d) To be progressed once (b) & (c) above have been agreed.

Medway Council Risk Management Strategy
Appendix 1 – Monitoring and Escalation of Risk

```
Risks agreed with
portfolio-holders

Service                Record and rate          Risks above the          for inclusion in
Managers    ──────▶   risks in service  ──────▶ tolerance line** are ───▶ Divisional
                      plans and into            reported to ADs           Business Plans
                      Covalent *

Record Risks          Risks reviewed           Directorate               Risks assessed
in                    and those above          Management                and those above
Directorate  ◀──────  the tolerance line ◀──── Team (DMT)      ◀──────    the tolerance line
Risk Register         reported to                                        reported to

Risks reviewed        Corporate                Risk Reviewed             Corporate Risk
and those above       Management               and recorded              Register reported
the tolerance line    Team            ──────▶  in Corporate     ──────▶  to
reported to                                    Risk Register

                                                                         Members
```

* – reports will be produced from Covalent as and when required.
** - tolerance line is currently C2

SUMMARY OF CORPORATE RISK REGISTER – RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

Risk Ref	Rating Sep 10	Rating Mar 11	Rating Sep 11	Move ment	Risk Description	Owner	Portfolio Holder	Link to Corporate Priority
3b	A1	A1	**A1**	→	Finances - longer term	Chief Finance Officer	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
19	A2	A2	**A2**	→	Down turn in the economy	Chief Executive	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
9b	B2	B2	**B2**	→	Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track	Director Children and Adults	Les Wicks and David Widley	Children & young people having the best start in life
13	B2	B2	**B2**	→	Equalities & Diversity	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Tom Mason	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do
17	B2	B2	**B2**	→	Delivering Regeneration	Director Regeneration, Community and Culture	Rodney Chambers	Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration
26			**B2**	→	Looked after children	Director Children and Adults	David Widley	Children & young people having the best start in life
27			**B2**	→	Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools	Director Children and Adults	Les Wicks	Children & young people having the best start in life
29			**B2**	→	Transition to a new provider for mental health social care services	Director Children and Adults	David Widley	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do
30			**B2**	→	Delivering Better for Less Transformation	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
4	C2	C2	**C2**	→	Performance Management	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
21	A2	A2	**C2**	↓	Procurement	AD Housing and Corporate Services	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
25			**C2**	↓	Adult Social Care Demographics	Director Children and Adults	David Brake	Adults maintaining their independence and live healthy lives
22	D1	D1	**D1**	→	Treasury Management	Chief Finance Officer	Alan Jarrett	Giving value for money
2	D2	D2	**D2**	→	Business Continuity & Emergency Planning	Director Regeneration, Community and Culture	Alan Jarrett	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do
28			**D2**	→	Implementation of the Government's agenda to the Health system	Director of Public Health	David Brake	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do

1

Last updated September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

RISK MATRIX - STRATEGIC PROFILE FOR SEPTEMBER 2011

Likelihood	IV	III	II	I
A			19	3b
B			9b, 13, 17, 26, 27, 29, 30	
C			4, 21, 25	
D			2, 28	22
E				
F				

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

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 03b	Finances - longer term		Owner	Chief Finance Officer	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio	Current Risk Score	A	I	Reviewed	26-Sept-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Giving value for money

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
The Medium Term Financial Plan and SR 2010 identify both significant cost pressures for the Council and unprecedented cuts in funding over the next 3 years. The settlement for 2012/13 confirmed a further 8% cut in grant support and although there is to be a review of the distribution formula for 2013/14 there is no guarantee that this will be beneficial in terms of avoiding further cuts to grant and the MTFP predicts further cuts of 4% in both 2013/2014 and 2014/15.	Announcement of the Spending Review in October 2010 and settlement detail in December 2010 has confirmed fears of unprecedented funding reductions	Very difficult decisions around funding allocation Service cuts Quality of service compromised. Cutback in staffing on an already lean organisation VFM Judgement Negative local publicity. Damage to reputation.

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 03b.01	Need to ensure effective response/lobbying to Govt proposals for CSR and settlement and target media campaign in support	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 budgetary control.	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.	September to February 2012 for 2012/13 Budget and Council Tax. Ongoing for 2013-2015	6 monthly then monthly from September onwards

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 19	Down turn in the economy	Owner	Chief Executive	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio	Current Risk Score	A	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Giving value for money

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
A continual downturn in economic conditions would impact upon the Council's ability to: a) support the vulnerable in our community and manage potential increase in child poverty, homelessness, benefit take-up, potential increase in anti-social behaviour and crime. b) deliver the capital programme with reduced receipts c) balanced budgets with reduced income through fees and charges d) take forward Medway's regeneration and educational agenda	A worsening global economic climate that impacts upon Medway - 'double dip' recession.	- Negative impact on the community - Increased pressure on existing resources - Reduction/cuts to services - Increased costs of purchasing services - Land value decline putting partnering arrangements at risk - Quality of service compromised. - Relationship with partners may deteriorate - Damage to reputation. - Negative publicity - VFM Judgement jeopardised - Reduced fees and charges income - Potential debt arrears (both council and others) - Increased benefit take up

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 19.01	Regular monitoring of economic downturn by Corporate Management Team and Medway Economic Board	Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture	Performance indicators on downturn examined regularly	Continue to assess the situation	- Council income - Planning and Building Control applications - Vacancy rates - Houses under construction - Benefit take-up - Leisure income	Quarterly
SR 19.02	Medway Plan for local businesses	Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture	Helping local businesses to survive the recession.	Continue to assess the situation	- all invoices paid in 20 days - Opportunities for local firms to bid for contracts	Monthly
SR 19.03	Working with partners to deliver an annual 2 month benefit take-up campaign	Chief Finance Officer	Increase in numbers taking up benefits	Continue to assess the situation	N181-Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events DWP DSO	Monthly
SR 19.04	Review investment strategy for regeneration/education initiatives	Chief Finance Officer	Assess funding streams and adjust spending priorities	Continue to assess the situation	Capital monitoring reports	Monthly

Corporate Business Risk Register

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 19.05	Regular reports on capital programme to Management and Members	Chief Finance Officer	Reports based on historic data forecast to end of year position	• Finance Teams to produce data in collaboration with Managers. • Management to identify corrective action. • Members (Cabinet) to approve action, implement effective project management and capital monitoring arrangements	Monitoring reports	Quarterly

Covalent: Septembert 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 09b	Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track	Owner	Director Children and Adults	Children's Services Portfolio		Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011
Link to Corporate Priority	Children and Young People Having the Best Start in Life									

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
- There are more, younger, people coming into the system with intensive support SEN needs. - These services represent major components of the Councils funding provision. - Changes in the youth justice system requiring new skills set within existing practitioners and changes to funding requirement for remand	The Council is unable to address these issues with cost effective, innovative solutions.	Poorer outcomes for children and young people Costs spiral with consequences across the Council Revenue problems not resolved by capital investments Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 09b.04	A 5 year SEN Strategy setting out milestones towards more inclusive, VFM, local provision to meet the needs of CYP with SEN, has been developed.	Inclusion (AD)	Ensuring service delivered within budgetary constraints	Strategy adopted by Cabinet in January 2010 and provision is being developed.	Less out of area SEN placements; more children being educated in mainstream schools with outreach.	SEN data is reviewed as part of the AD's quarterly performance digest and ADQ.
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. Begin to plan intensive interventions that would 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 / offending	Inclusion (AD)	- Lower numbers of first and repeat entrants to the YJS. - Lower number of custodial and repeat custodial sentences. - Effective analysis of data to inform practitioners input. - Ensuring service delivered within budgetary constraints. - Magistrates have confidence in interventions. Suitable placements are developed for vulnerable children which keep them safe and enable magistrates to impose on the 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. Successful bid to DfE. Needs assessment being commissioned.	The number of YOT clients are reviewed monthly and quarterly with reports being taken to the YOT management board (chaired by CEO)

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 13	Equality and diversity		Owner	Communications, Performance & Partnerships (AD)	Customer First & Corporate Services Portfolio	Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
Ensuring the council complies fully with its duties under equalities legislation to carry out diversity impact assessments. Public sector spending cuts allied with the passing of the Equality Act 2010, increase the profile of equalities issues and the potential for claims, including court action, if DIA processes are not rigorous or given appropriate consideration in decision making. The effectiveness of DIAs is dependent upon services routinely gathering equalities data about the patterns of usage of their service and the difference they make and using data and intelligence to inform impact assessments.	A case is brought and the council is found to have failed its duties under equalities legislation	Cost to go to a tribunal Not meeting people's needs Financial liability / court action Seen as a poor employer Loss of reputation Adverse inspection for children and adults services

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 13.02	Policies on Cabinet forward plan given focused corporate support to ensure DIAs are completed	Communications, Performance & Partnerships (AD)	All policy documents have a robust DIA which is undertaken at an early stage in policy formation.	- Programme for carrying out diversity impact assessments in place for all service areas and being carried out. - Relevant policies and significant changes to service due to go to cabinet are not considered unless DIA has been carried out - Item on agenda of meetings for Equal and Access Group - DIA review group is now established to improve consistency of DIA's across the authority, Positively, external inspectors have described the DIA process as sound.		Quarterly

6

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 17	Delivering regeneration		Owner	Director Regeneration, Community and culture	Leader's Portfolio		Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
Medway's regeneration plans to regenerate the area to bring 30,000 people to Medway up to 20,000 jobs and 17,000 new homes in the next 20 plus years. There are challenges for the provision and maintenance of effective infrastructure. Particular areas of concern are flood protection, highways and water capacity. 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. The programme will be significantly affected by the current economic down-turn. At present funding for future regeneration is uncertain.	The Council fails to achieve the economic, social and infrastructure regeneration agenda	Regeneration projects not completed Potential damage to Council's reputation Not able to meet member, government and the public's expectations Deteriorating physical assets Developers deterred Investment wasted Young people are not catered for in the 'new world' Low skills base among some residents remains Disconnect between skills and employment opportunities Maintenance of low aspiration culture New jobs unfilled or filled by non-local population Increased commuting and pressure on transportation Negative impact on community cohesion

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 17.01	Outline infrastructure needs identified.	Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture	Completion of a Community Infrastructure Levy policy and identification of inward investment priorities.	Start made on key regeneration sites	- Generation of funds to carry out the work and investors confidence; - 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 plan developed for all ex-SEEDA sites.	Funding identified to continue regeneration.	Regeneration projects agreed with Members	Quarterly
SR 17.04	Regular meetings with stakeholders to consider the delivery plans	Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture	Delivery plans are implemented on time and to budget	Investors come forward for regeneration sites.	As detailed in individual delivery plans	monthly

7

Covalent: September 2011

EXTRACTED FROM THE CORPORATE RISK REGISTER HELD ON COVALENT (3 AUGUST 2011)

SR 26	Maximising outcomes for Looked after Children in the context of increasing demand	Owner	Director Children and Adults	Children's Services Portfolio	Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Children and Young People Having the Best Start in Life

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
The council cannot narrow the gap in outcomes between children in care and their peers The increased demand for high level child protection services, including for looked after children, puts pressure on the council's ability to invest in preventative services	The Council is unable to address this issue with cost effective, innovative solutions Numbers of children in care and those with high level child protection needs continue to rise Increased caseloads may start to impact on quality of work being undertaken with looked after children and children subject to child protection plans	Costs spiral with consequences across the Council – limits ability to divert resources to early help which ultimately must be part of the solution to increasing numbers of looked after children Poorer outcomes for children and young people Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement ❑ Local placement capacity may be exhausted leading to more expensive out of area placements which may not best meet the needs of children and young people

Code	Mitigating action	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 26.01	End to end review of looked after children processes, needs analysis and evaluation of effectiveness of early help being commissioned	Children's Social Care (AD)	Service is delivered within budgetary constraints whilst maintaining the safety of children and young people.	- Business case to inform budget decisions on investment in early help	- Work being commissioned	Reviewed monthly
SR 26.02	Introduction of Medway Model of social care practice to ensure all staff understand expectations on high quality practice and assessment	Children's Social Care (AD)	All staff effectively assess risks to children and develop SMART care plans that make a positive difference for looked after children	Medway Model Supervision notes that demonstrate improvements in quality and consistency of practice	Model introduced and training held for practitioners	Monthly
SR 26.03	In depth audit work on quality of care planning and multi agency conference and review processes supplements regular file audit programme	Children's Social Care (AD)	Good quality and consistent practice	Audit reports and recommendations	Audits of care plans completed with recommendations to share good practice and make improvements in place	Monthly

Covalent: September 2011

SR 27	Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools	Owner	Director Children and Adults	Children's Services Portfolio	Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	24- Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Children and Young People Having the Best Start in Life

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
Councils are responsible for poor performance of schools including independent, academies and free schools but lack levers for change.	A failing OFSTED inspection for a school for whom the Council has a statutory responsibility.	Financial consequences Damage to reputation Negative publicity Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory judgement

Code	Mitigating action	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 27.01	School data shows under achievement based on Fisher Family Trust predictions.	Assistant Director Inclusion and Improvement	Schools results in line with or exceed nationally expected progress measures	• School Improvement Team (SI) support schools to identify actions needed to improve pupil progress • Data shows progress to be in line with FFT of similar schools nationally and then to be in upper quartile	• Number of schools below floor threshold reduces • Number of schools in an OFSTED category reduces and remains low.	AD Performance Digest CPR meetings with staff
SR 27.02	The proportion of schools in Medway with an OFSTED judgement of satisfactory is higher than National and the proportion of schools with good 13 lower than National.	Assistant Director Inclusion and Improvement	Schools move up from Satisfactory to Good and from Good to Outstanding	• Core "Moving on Up" SI training developed and delivered in a targeted way • OFSTED preparation in place for Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Governors • NLES and LLEs linked to schools to give additional experience to draw on for delivering "Good"	OFSTED judgements place more schools in the Good or Better categories	SI team meetings AD Performance Digest OFSTED Feedback

SR 29	Transition to new provider for mental health adult social care services	Owner	Director Children and Adults	Adult Services Portfolio		Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26- Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do.

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
The procurement of and transition to a new provider fails to meet expectations and significantly impacts on services to clients.	The Council's procurement of a new provider for mental health adult social care services.	❑ Negative impact on clients and poor outcomes ❑ Increase in complaints

Code	Mitigating action	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 29.01	Specification for new provider was agreed and will work through procurement process.	Adult Social Care (AD)	A good provider who delivers for adults with mental health needs in Medway.	New provider takes over safely following managed transition on 01.02.2012.	Contract commencement 01.02.2012	Monthly.
SR 29.02	Contract management by Commissioner, Principal Officer for Mental Health and Service Manager for Performance Management.	Adult Social Care (AD)	A good provider who delivers for adults with mental health needs in Medway. A good employer who motivates staff and leads a safe and resilient staff team.	The full range of PIs in contract. Survey of clients and cares and feedback from staff.	PIs as per contract. Surveys.	Monthly. Annually.

10

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 30	Delivering Better for Less transformation	Owner	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio	Current Risk Score	B	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Giving value for money

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
The Better for Less programme is a council wide transformation programme which is intended to transform the way all council employees work to deliver improvements to customer service as well as making significant savings which are built into the MTFP budget projections for the next 4 years. If the programme is not delivered effectively and on time and in a way that ensures change can be sustained, improvements and savings will not be made.	1. Lack of clarity on the vision for change means programme loses impetus 2. Over emphasis on savings at expense of improvements mean the programme is regarded as another 'savings' programme 3. Lack of clear leadership of change programme across all council senior managers 4. Over reliance on external consultants to support change programme 5. Lack of attention paid to cultural and behavioural changes required to ensure change is sustained 6. Savings identified as part of BfL programme are 'overtaken' by other savings initiatives 7. Redundancy costs erode savings 8. Programme delivery and implementation slips impacting on delivery of savings 9. The high levels of fragmentation and duplication of staff effort in the council's current configuration means that when implementing change which moves admin and customer contact effort/work to the new models, a reorganisation of specialist services is also required to avoid surplus capacity being retained. This means a greater number of staff are impacted by the change and covered by formal consultation processes which increases anxiety and potential resistance	Additional budget deficit for 2012/13 and future years Requirement to make alternative savings proposals which may have greater impact on frontline services Services standards drop and growing customer expectations will not be met Drop in resident satisfaction Loss of faith by staff in ability of the council to deliver council wide change will impact on any future change initiatives

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

Code	Mitigating actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR30.01	For trigger 1: Ongoing communication of the vision and the case for change with messages tailored for different audiences	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	High levels of awareness and buy in for need to change and direction to be followed	Communications strategy	Strategy being revised for BfL Board approval in October	Monthly by BfL Board
SR30.02	For trigger 2: Detailed definition of the performance gains we expect the programme to deliver being developed.	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Shared understanding of what we want to be better, how we will measure that and ultimately delivery of improved performance	BfL measures of success	Performance framework being developed. Will be subject to member consultation before being agreed by BfL board	Monthly by BfL Board
SR30.03	For trigger 3: High profile of all senior managers maintained in communicating BfL aims and progress and responding to staff uncertainties which are natural with change on this scale	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Senior managers show visible leadership and feel supported to do so by the programme team	Communications strategy.	Good levels of support from directors in presenting staff briefings. More tailored briefings being developed for Ads and service managers to enable them to communicate BfL aims and progress to their staff with confidence. Communications Strategy being revised for BfL Board approval in October	Monthly by BfL Board
SR30.04	For trigger 4: Internal team established with secondees to ensure effective skills transfer from external consultants and council ownership of the change programme	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	Change management is council owned and led and skills are in place to ensure this and future change management programmes can be supported by council staff	Well resourced internal team with commitment to appropriate staffing continuity for all phases of the programme. Skills transfer plan delivered.	At end of August team is well resourced and skills transfer on target.	Monthly by BfL Board
SR30.05	For trigger 5: Devote more project team time to supporting teams in making the transition to the new ways of working	AD Communications, Performance and Partnerships	High levels of understanding of new ways of working required translating to changes in behaviour which will deliver improvements and secure sustained savings	Ongoing change readiness assessment and support plans for services as required	Shift of some project team resources to managing transition agreed by BfL Board in recognition that change on the scale envisaged does not happen without effective support	Monthly by BfL Board

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 04	Performance Management	Owner	Communications, Performance & Partnerships (AD)	Customer First & Corporate Services Portfolio	Current Risk Score	C	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Giving value for money

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
There have been in the past concerns that performance is not consistently managed across the council. The Council has introduced a comprehensive performance management (and business planning) framework. The major risk is that the removal of CAA will lead to less priority and focus being given to effective management of performance - at council wide and service levels.	The council fails to embed a robust performance management system	The Council is not clear on what it wants to achieve so cannot demonstrate difference it is making to the public customers do not receive the services they need Silo-ism reinforced Rate of improvement is impeded Not getting Value for Money or able to evidence it

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 04.08	Review performance management resource deployment across the council as part of better for less VfM project	Stephanie Goad	More effective performance management arrangements	An effectively resourced performance management framework to drive performance improvement	Outline business case being developed. Workshops held to develop new operating model. To be presented to BfL Board 5 October.	

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 25	Adult Social Care Demographics		Owner	Director Children and Adults	Adult Services Portfolio		Current Risk Score	C	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011
Link to Corporate Priority	**Older and Vulnerable People Maintaining Their Independence**										
Vulnerability (risk)			**Trigger (likelihood)**			**Consequences (Impact)**					
- The population of older people is set to considerably increase. - The expectations of vulnerable and older people and their families are rising.			Demographic impact on both demand and capacity to deliver statutory responsibilities			Costs spiral FACS criteria may need review					

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 25	Self-directed support and personal budgets	Social Care (AD)	Systems in place to allow citizens who require social care support to easily find and choose quality support, and control when and where services are provided and by whom.	Plans to offer all service users SDs/IB from October 2011	Target for 2011-2012 = 50%	Quarterly

14

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 21	Procurement		Owner	Housing & Corporate Services (AD)	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio	Current Risk Score	C	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Giving value for money

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
Procurement processes are not consistently applied across the council.	- Complaints/challenge from tenders to procurement decisions. - Audit reviews reveal weaknesses	- Legal challenges - Negative publicity - Council does not achieve value for money - Damage to reputation - Increased costs of purchasing services - Not achieving cost efficiencies - Overspend on budget allocation - Failing to achieve Members' expectations - Failing to achieve statutory responsibilities

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 21.01	Member chaired Strategic Procurement Board with the Council's Monitoring officer responsible for strategic procurement direction that meets every three weeks	Housing & Corporate Services (AD)	To deliver the Strategic Procurement Strategy	Strategic Procurement Board meets every three weeks	On-going	Every 3 weeks
SR 21.02	Forward Procurement Plans in place for each directorate	Directors	Timely commencement of procurement ensuring contracts are in place	Plans monitored by the Strategic Procurement Board every 3 weeks	On-going	Every 3 weeks
SR 21.03	Create a corporate contracts register	Procurement Team	A contracts register that records all contracts currently in place and date due to finish	Exploration of methods to collect data to populate register	January 2012	On-going in conjunction with the Strategic Procurement Board process

15

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 21.04	Review of procurement processes	Procurement Team	To ensure processes continue to be fit for purpose.	New Contract Procedure Rules and Revised Gateway Procurement Process: a) delivered and formalised as part of the Council's constitution on 01.01.11 b) more focus on control and monitoring with a greater strategic view of all procurement activity across the Council c) reviewed on an ongoing basis in conjunction with the Strategic Procurement Board.	On-going ,with next review scheduled May 2012	Managed by the Strategic Procurement Team through client engagement and the Strategic Procurement Board as part of a 3 weekly review
SR 21.05	Training in revised procurement procedures	Procurement Team	All staff involved in procurement will understand and be able to use revised procurement processes and procedures	Approximately 350 key officers trained between November 2010 and February 2011. Further training sessions planned for April 2011 onwards. Daily procurement surgeries have gone live from 14.02.11	Ongoing	On-going
SR 21.06	Expenditure Analysis	Procurement Team	Category Management delivered across organisation through classification of spend within Integra to industry standard classification system, against which expenditure analysis and compliance assessment can be undertaken	Synergies and economies of scale through consolidation of spend and contracts and amalgamation of suppliers Compliance checking to ensure procurement projects are being procured and managed in line with both EU procurement legislation and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules	Ongoing – 2011/12	On-going

16

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 22	Treasury Management		Owner	Chief Finance Officer	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio		Current Risk Score	D	I	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011
Link to Corporate Priority		Giving value for money									

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
a) The Council could lose money as happened to other local authorities when financial institutions fail. b) Unexpected changes in interest rates.	Loss of resources due to external events beyond the Council's control	- Loss of resources - Damage to reputation. - Negative publicity - VFM Judgement jeopardised - Increased pressure on existing resources - Reduction/cuts to services - Quality of service compromised. - Relationship with partners may deteriorate

Code	Mitigation Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 22.02	Review the treasury management strategy and performance	Chief Finance Officer	Recommend changes to the strategy as and when necessary in order to maintain a high level of stewardship of the Council's funds	The Outturn report in June. Mid-year report in November. Strategy in February. Monthly budget monitoring reports.	- Cost of external debt. - Breaches of policy - Interest earnt on investments.	June (Outturn), November Mid-year and monthly budget monitoring.
SR 22.03	Monitoring reports and regular review by members in both executive and scrutiny functions	Chief Finance Officer	To ensure that those with responsibility for the treasury management function appreciate the implications of treasury management policies and activities, and that those implementing policies and executing transactions have properly fulfilled their responsibilities with regard to delegation and reporting	• Enhanced member involvement, understanding, responsibility and scrutiny. • Continue training for officers and members	Member training carried out February 2010 and November 2010. On-going officer training	As & when required

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 02	Business continuity and emergency planning	Owner	Director Regeneration, Community and Culture	Finance & Deputy Leader's Portfolio	Current Risk Score	D	II	Reviewed	26-Sep-2011

Link to Corporate Priority	Safe, clean and green Medway

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)
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. 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.	A significant adverse event occurs and the Council is found wanting or negligent in its planning and/or operational response	Response to event is not rapid, adequate nor effective. Lack of clear communication lines Essential service priorities not clearly understood. Communication between agencies and the public is poor. Residents expect more from their Council Local press quick to seize issue. Comparisons made with other local authorities and resilience groups A death, or deaths, in the community Legal challenge under the 'Civil Contingencies Act 2004'

Code	Mitigation Actions	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	- Revised plan agreed by CMT - Continued engagement with Kent Resilience Forum - Staff trained in emergency response management	- Existing plan in place - Programme of on-going review of COMAH plans - Emergency response operations room in place. - Lessons learnt from National Watermark Exercise - March 2011	- Draft plan update in place - Programme of staff training in place by Winter 2011	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	- Gloucestershire County Council Model adopted and amended to reflect Medway's requirements; - BCM Policy agreed; - BCM principles and project aims communicated to divisional management teams across the Council. - A Corporate Recovery Plan reviewed in August 2011; - IT Recovery Plan in place; - Draft flu plans in place	Plans tested.	Quarterly reports to Strategic Risk Management Group

18

Covalent: September 2011

Corporate Business Risk Register

SR 28	Changes to Health System	Owner	Director of Public Health	Health and Adult Services Portfolio	Current Risk Score	D	II	Reviewed	26-Sept-11

Link to Corporate Priority	Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do.

Vulnerability (risk)	Trigger (likelihood)	Consequences (Impact)		
The Council is unable to influence decision-making when the new PCT and SHA clusters are created. Public Health Grant is inadequate to fund existing commitments	Implementation of the Government's agenda to the Health system MCG Shadow grant will be announced in autumn 2011	❑ ❑ ❑ ❑	Health services less focussed on Medway needs Reduction in public health programmes Negative impact on the community Negative publicity	

Code	Mitigating Actions	Managed By	Desired Outcome	Output	Milestones/PIs	Monitoring
SR 28.01	Ensure effective engagement of the Medway Commissioning Group (MCG) and Kent & Medway Cluster in Medway partnerships e.g. Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB), Medway Safeguarding Children Board (MSCB), Children's Trust, Health Partnership Board (HPB)	Director of Public Health	All members engage in pre-shadow HWB to establish board priorities and ways of working	Development programme including participation in national learning set	First meeting of HWB Nov 1st	Quarterly
SR28.02	Detailed record of current spend within public health portfolio coming to Council and associated contract details.	Director of Public Health	Clarity of any gap in funding.	Shadow Budget to be advised in Autumn 2011	Shadow budget Autumn 2011	Autumn 2011

Covalent: September 2011

PHASED APPROACH TO DEVELOPING DIRECTORATE RISK REGISTERS AND TRAINING

Phase 1:   Service-level risks identified as part of the divisional business planning process will be uploaded into Covalent (together with mitigating controls where possible). To be completed end of August 2011

Phase 2:   Data to be extracted by division via Covalent reports to determine quality and training needs. To be completed end of September 2011

Phase 3:   Draft risk registers to be put to DMTs for comment together with the escalation process. Throughout October 2011

Phase 4:   Train officers in relation to updating risk assessments and providing progress commentary on mitigating actions. Throughout November and December 2011

Phase 5:   Undertake first updating cycle. Throughout December/January 2011.

Phase 6: Incorporate any remaining mitigating actions from service plan risk registers that can be uploaded into Covalent. Throughout January 2011

Phase 7:   Produce directorate risk registers that meet the criteria as set out in the escalation procedure.   February 2012

Phase 8: Undertake a further programme of training for managers and members. March 2012 onwards

In-house training for Members took place on 8 August 2011.