

# BUSINESS SUPPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY 21 MARCH 2012

# 6 MONTHLY REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE BUSINESS RISK REGISTER

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community

& 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 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 The Corporate Risk Register was last reviewed by Cabinet on 20 December 2011. The following changes were made to the register at that time:
  - SR 24 Managing Change was replaced with a new risk SR 30 Delivering Better for Less Transformation.
  - 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.
  - 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.

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

#### 3. Advice and analysis

- 3.1 Risks owners have reviewed their risks and updated them and proposed the following amendments:
- 3.1.1 The risk rating for risk reference 27 Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools be reduced from B2 to C2 as we are clear and decisive about the actions we are taking as a council and increasingly so too are headteachers and chairs of governors.
- 3.1.2 Risk Ref: SR29 -Transition to a new provider for mental health social care services be deleted as this was completed 1 February 2012.
- 3.1.3 Two proposals relating to Risk Ref: SR30- Delivering Better for Less transformation are:
  - a) reduce the list of triggers and corresponding actions to reflect progress made;
  - b) given progress to date and the strength of governance of the programme the risk be down grade risk rating from B2 to C2

3.2 Appendix A - Record of Amendments, summarises the proposed amendments to the risk register.

#### 4. Consultation

4.1 The Strategic Risk Management Group and risk owners have been consulted on the proposed amendments to the risk register. Members will be consulted on the Corporate Risk Register via Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet.

#### 5. Financial, legal and risk implications

5.1 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.

#### 6. Recommendation

6.1 Members' views are sought on the Management Team's recommendations on amendments to the Council's Risk Register.

#### Lead officer contact

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

**Appendices:** Appendix A - Record of Amendments

Appendix B - Corporate Business Risk Register

#### **Background papers**

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

## APPENDIX A

# SUMMARY OF CORPORATE RISK REGISTER – RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

| Risk<br>Ref |    |    | Rating<br>Sep 11 | Proposed<br>Rating<br>Feb 12 |          | Risk Description   | Owner   | Portfolio Holder              | Link to Corporate Priority                                   |
|-------------|----|----|------------------|------------------------------|----------|--|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 3b          | A1 | A1 | A1               | A1                           | <b>→</b> | Finances - longer term   | Chief Finance Officer                                 | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 19          | A2 | A2 | A2               | A2                           | <b>→</b> | Down turn in the economy   | Chief Executive                                       | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 9b          | B2 | B2 | B2               | B2                           | <b>→</b> | Keeping vulnerable young people safe and on track                  | Director Children and Adults                          | Les Wicks and<br>David Wildey | Children & young people having the best start in life        |
| 13          | B2 | B2 | B2               | B2                           | <b>→</b> | Equalities & Diversity   | AD Communications,<br>Performance and<br>Partnerships |                               | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do      |
| 17          | B2 | B2 | B2               | B2                           | <b>→</b> | Delivering Regeneration  | Director Regeneration,<br>Community and Culture       | Rodney Chambers               | Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration             |
| 26          |    |    | B2               | B2                           | <b>→</b> | Looked after children  | Director Children and<br>Adults                       | David Wildey                  | Children & young people having the best start in life        |
| 4           | C2 | C2 | C2               | C2                           | <b>→</b> | Performance Management   | AD Communications,<br>Performance and<br>Partnerships | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 21          | A2 | A2 | C2               | C2                           | +        | Procurement  | Chief Finance Officer                                 | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 25          |    |    | C2               | C2                           | 4        | Adult Social Care Demographics                                     | Director Children and<br>Adults                       | David Brake                   | Adults maintaining their independence and live healthy lives |
| 27          |    |    | B2               | C2                           | •        | Government changes to Local Authority's responsibility for schools | Director Children and<br>Adults                       | Les Wicks                     | Children & young people having the best start in life        |
| 30          |    |    | B2               | C2                           | +        | Delivering Better for Less Transformation                          | AD Communications,<br>Performance and<br>Partnerships | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 22          | D1 | D1 | D1               | D1                           | <b>→</b> | Treasury Management Chief Finance Officer Alan Jarrett             |   | Alan Jarrett                  | Giving value for money                                       |
| 2           | D2 | D2 | D2               | D2                           | <b>→</b> | Business Continuity & Emergency Planning                           | Director Regeneration,<br>Community and Culture       | Alan Jarrett                  | Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do      |
| 28          |    |    | D2               | D2                           | <b>→</b> | 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      |

# RISK MATRIX - STRATEGIC PROFILE FOR FEBRUARY 2012

|            | A |        |     | 19                   | 3b, |
|------------|---|--------|-----|----------------------|-----|
|            | В |        |     | 9b, 13, 17,<br>26,   |     |
|            | С |        |     | 4, 21, 25, 27,<br>30 |     |
| _          | D |        |     | 2, 28                | 22  |
| Likelihood | E |        |     |                      |     |
| Like       | 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

| SR<br>03b  | Financ   | es - longer term   | Owner                        | Chief Finance<br>Officer   | Finance<br>Portfoli    | e & Deputy Leader's<br>io   | Current Ri<br>Score | sk A   | ı                        | Reviewed                                       | 29-Feb-2012   |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Link t   | to Corpo   | orate Priority Giving Value  | for Money                    |  | -                      |   |                     | •  | •                        |  | •   |  |  |
| Vulne  | erability  | 1  |                              | Trigger  |                        |   | Consequences        |  |                          |  |   |  |  |
| signification function functio | The Medium Term Financial Plan and SR 2010 identify both significant cost pressures for the Council and unprecedented cut 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 so guarantee that this will be beneficial in terms of avoiding urther cuts to grant and the MTFP predicts further cuts of 4% in both 2013/2014 and 2014/15. |  |                              | 2010 and settlement detail in December 2010 has confirmed fears of unprecedented funding reductions for both revenue and capital |                        |   | ☐ Service o         | cuts<br>of service<br>in staffing<br>gement<br>local pub | compronous on an licity. | ound funding all<br>mised.<br>already lean org |   |  |  |
| Code   |  | Description  | Managed By                   | Desired Outcome  |                        | Output  | 1                   | Milestones   | /PIs                     | Monitoring                                     |   |  |  |
| SR 03  | b.01   | Need to ensure effective<br>response/lobbying to Govt<br>proposals for CSR and<br>settlement and target media<br>campaign in support | Chief Finance Officer        | Co-ordinate respon<br>members, Brief MP<br>Agree media camp<br>Solicit support from<br>authorities/partner                       | 's,<br>aign,<br>n peer | VFM Judgement - adequacy of financial planning, effective budgetary control.  |                     | On-going   |                          |  | Six monthly   |  |  |
| SR 03  | b.02   | Align priorities and activity of the council to resource availability through MTFP process.  | Corporate<br>Management Team | Co-ordinate respon<br>members, agree m<br>campaign, solicit so<br>from peer authoriti<br>partners.                               | iedia<br>upport        | VFM Judgement - adequacy of financial planning, effective budget control, balanced budget and adequacy of reserves. |                     | 2012/13 E  | udget a                  | oruary 2012 for<br>and Council<br>2013-2015    | 6 monthly then<br>monthly from<br>September onwards |  |  |
| SR 03  | b.03   | Create resource for investment priorities  | Corporate<br>Management Team | Track funding opportunities  Maximise asset v for disposal  Consider prudent borrowing   |                        | External investment     Asset release     Revenue cost associated prudential borrowing                              |                     | On-going   |                          |  | Six monthly   |  |  |

| SR<br>19   | Down t   | urn in the economy   | Owner   |   | Finance<br>Portfoli       | · & Deputy Leader's<br>o    | Current Ris<br>Score  | A   | П                  | Reviewed | 29-Feb-2012 |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|----------|-------------|--|
| Link t   | to Corpo   | orate Priority Giving Value  | for Money   |   |                           |                             |   |   |                    |          |             |  |
| Vulne  | erability  | ·  |   | Trigger   |                           |                             | Consequences  |   |                    |          |             |  |
| the Co<br>a) sup<br>potent<br>up, po<br>b) deli<br>c) bala | ouncil's a<br>oport the<br>tial incresotential ir<br>iver the o<br>anced bu<br>es d) tal | wnturn in economic conditions bility to: vulnerable in our community ase in child poverty, homeless acrease in anti-social behaviou capital programme with reduced income the forward Medway's regeneration. | and manage<br>ness, benefit take-<br>ir and crime.<br>ed receipts<br>rough fees and | A worsening global economic climate that impacts upon Medway - recession. |                           |                             | <ul> <li>Negative impact on the community</li> <li>Increased pressure on existing resources</li> <li>Reduction/cuts to services</li> <li>Increased costs of purchasing services</li> <li>Land value decline putting partnering arrangements at ri</li> <li>Quality of service compromised.</li> <li>Relationship with partners may deteriorate</li> <li>Damage to reputation.</li> <li>Negative publicity</li> <li>VFM Judgement jeopardised</li> <li>Reduced fees and charges income</li> <li>Potential debt arrears (both council and others)</li> <li>Increased benefit take up</li> </ul> |   |                    |          |             |  |
| Code   |  | Description  | Managed By  | Desired Outcome   | Milestones/PIs Monitoring |                             |   |   |                    |          |             |  |
| SR 19  |  | economic downturn by   | Director of<br>Regeneration,<br>Community and<br>Culture                            | Performance indicat<br>downturn examined<br>regularly                     |                           | Continue to assess the situ | -  <br> -<br> -   | - Council incor<br>- Planning and<br>applications<br>- Vacancy rate<br>construction -<br>Leisure income |                    |          | Quarterly   |  |
| SR 19  | - 1  | businesses   | Director of<br>Regeneration,<br>Community and<br>Culture                            | Helping local busine survive the recessio                                 |                           | Continue to assess the situ | - all invoices paid<br>- Opportunities f<br>bid for contracts   |   |                    |          | Monthly     |  |
| SR 19  |  | Working with partners to<br>deliver an annual 2 month<br>benefit take-up campaign  | Chief Finance Officer   | Increase in numbers up benefits   | s taking                  | Continue to assess the situ | H <sub>0</sub><br>Be  | 81-Time busing Ber<br>nefit new<br>ents DWP   | efit/Cou<br>claims |          | Monthly     |  |
| SR 19  |  | Review investment strategy for regeneration/education initiatives  | Chief Finance Officer   | Assess funding strea<br>and adjust spending<br>priorities                 |                           | Continue to assess the situ | uation Ca   | pital mon   | itoring r          | eports   | Monthly     |  |

| Code     | Description  | Managed By | Desired Outcome | Output  | Milestones/PIs     | Monitoring |
|----------|--|------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| SR 19.05 | Regular reports on capital<br>programme to Management<br>and Members |            | 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  |

|                           | Keeping vulnerable young people and on track  | safe Owner           | Rose Collinson  | Childre  | n's Services Portfolio   | Current Ris  | sk B  | П  | Reviewed   | 24-Feb-2012  |  |  |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Link t                    | o Corporate Priority Children & Yo  | oung People Having   | the Best Start in I   | Life in Me   | edway  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vulne                     | erability   |                      | Trigger   |  |  | Consequences   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| intens - The fundin - Cha | e are more, younger, people coming i ive support SEN needs. se services represent major componer g provision. inges in the youth justice system requexisting practitioners and changes to mand  | nts of the Council's | effective, innovative solutions.  |  |  | □ Poorer outcomes for children and young people     □ Costs spiral with consequences across the Council     □ Revenue problems not resolved by capital investment     □ Impact on statutory responsibilities and regulatory juice. |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Code                      | Description   | Managed By           | Desired Outcome   |  | Output   | M  | 1ilestones/P  | Is   |  | Monitoring   |  |  |
| SR 09                     | b.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 downwithin budgetary constraints   | elivered   | Strategy adopted by Cabin<br>January 2010 and provisio<br>developed.   | n is being p   |   | more o   | children being   | SEN data is reviewed as part of the AD's quarterly performance digest and ADQ.   |  |  |
| SR 09                     | 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. | Inclusion (AD)       | - Lower numbers of and repeat entrant YJS Lower number custodial and repectustodial sentence Effective analysis of inform practitioner - Ensuring service delivered within buconstraints Maginave confidence in interventions. Suit placements are defor vulnerable child which keep them senable magistrates impose on the ordealternative to securemand | ts to the per of at s of data to s input.  udgetary istrates able eveloped dren safe and s to er as an | (proxy figures) and quarterly (YJB information) 1: 1 meetings with Head of Service Business case for preventative support. |  | Grant provide eveloping a ustodial rer ffectively fond budget in ustody bill. Offer Needs a commissione | Ilternationand is<br>or innover in<br>ot excessions successions in<br>successions in | ives to<br>used<br>vative support<br>eeded by<br>sful bid to | The number of YOT clients are reviewed monthly and quarterly with reports being taken to the YOT management board (chaired by CEO) |  |  |

| SR<br>13   | Equality  | y and diversity  |  | Communications,<br>Performance &<br>Partnerships<br>(AD)  |       | er First & Corporate<br>s Portfolio | Current Ris<br>Score                            | В   | H                            | Reviewed | 21-Feb-2012 |
|--|---|--|--|---|-------|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|----------|-------------|
|  |   | rate Priority Putting Our Co   |  |   | we do |                                     |   |   |                              | -        | -           |
|  | erability   | ouncil complies fully with its du  |  | Trigger Consequent A case is brought and the council is found to have □ Cost t  |       |                                     |   | to a tribu  | 1                            |          |             |
| equali<br>Public<br>Act 20<br>potent<br>not rig<br>makin<br>routing<br>their s | ities legis sector sp 110, incre tial for cla gorous or ng. The ef service ar | lation to carry out diversity impending cuts allied with the pastes the profile of equalities issaims, including court action, if given appropriate consideration of the citiveness of DIAs is dependenting equalities data about the difference they make an inform impact assessments. | pact assessments. ssing of the Equality sues and the DIA processes are on in decision ent upon services patterns of usage of | failed its duties under equalities legislation  |       |                                     | ☐ Not meeti☐ Financial I☐ Seen as a☐ Loss of re | ng people'<br>ability / co<br>poor empl<br>outation | s needs<br>ourt act<br>loyer |          | s services  |
| Code   |   | Description  | Managed By   | Desired Outcome Output  |       |                                     | M   | lestones/F  | Is                           |          | Monitoring  |
| SR 13  |   | plan given focused corporate l   | Communications,<br>Performance &<br>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 carried out Relevant policies and signification changes to service due to go to cabinet are not considered unled DIA has been carried out It agenda of meetings for Equal and Access Group - DIA review grown own established to improve consistency of DIAs across the authority, Positively, external inspectors have described the process as sound. |       |                                     |   |   |                              |          | Quarterly   |

| SR<br>17   | Delivering regeneration  | Owner  | Robin Cooper   | Leader'   | s Portfolio  | Current Risk<br>Score                    | В                 | П                 | Reviewed  | 21-Feb-2012 |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|--|
| Link t   | to Corporate Priority Everyone Ber   | nefitting from the A   | reas Regeneration  | -   |  | •  |                   | •                 | -         | -           |  |
| Vulne  | erability  |  | Trigger  |   |  | Consequences                             |                   |                   |           |             |  |
| 30,000 homes There effecti protec It is vi that that area. | ay's regeneration plans to regenerate 0 people to Medway up to 20,000 jobs in the next 20 plus years. are challenges for the provision and nive infrastructure. Particular areas of cition, highways and water capacity. ital the benefits are felt by the populatine new jobs are not filled by only peopprogramme will be significantly affected mic down-turn. At present funding for ertain. | and 17,000 new naintenance of oncern are flood tion of Medway, so ble from outside the | The Council fails to infrastructure regen  | □ 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   | Description  | Managed By   | Desired Outcome  |   | Output   | Miles                                    | tones/F           | Is                |           | Monitoring  |  |
| SR 17  | .01 Outline infrastructure needs identified.   | Director of<br>Regeneration,<br>Community and<br>Culture                               | Completion of a<br>Community Infrastr<br>Levy policy and<br>identification of inw<br>investment prioritie                    | vard  | Start made on key regene sites  Monitor market for change values | out t<br>confi<br>s in land - 20         | he work<br>dence; | of fund<br>and in |           | 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<br>Regeneration,<br>Community and<br>Culture                               | HCA confirm any fu<br>commitments and I<br>plans for all ex-SEE<br>sites<br>Stewardship agreer<br>completed for each<br>site | business<br>EDA<br>ments  | Funding identified to conting regeneration.                      |  | neratio<br>Membe  |                   | ts agreed | Quarterly   |  |
| SR 17.   | .04 Regular meetings with stakeholders to consider the delivery plans  | Director of<br>Regeneration,<br>Community and<br>Culture                               | Delivery plans are implemented on tin to budget  | me and  | Investors come forward fo regeneration sites.                    | As detailed in individual delivery plans |                   |                   | monthly   |             |  |

| SR<br>26  |  | ximising outomes for Looked after Idren in the context of increasing mand  Owner  Director of Children's Services Portf Adults |  |   |   | n's Services Portfolio  | Current R<br>Score  | isk E  | 3   | П        | Reviewed   | 28-Feb-2012 |  |                  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------|------------|-------------|--|------------------|
| Link 1  | to Corporate Priority Child  | Iren & Young   | People Having  | the Best Start in I   | Life in M   | edway   |   |  |   |          |            |             |  |                  |
| Vulne   | erability  |  |  | Trigger   |   |   | Consequences  |  |   |          |            |             |  |                  |
| in car<br>The in<br>includ  | ouncil cannot narrow the gap<br>e and their peers<br>ncreased demand for high leve<br>ling for looked after children,<br>v to invest in preventative ser | ion services,  | The Council is unable effective, innovative Numbers of childres child protection need Increased caseload work being undertachildren subject to | ability to d<br>part of the<br>- Poorer of<br>- Impact of<br>- Local pla  | ivert res<br>solution<br>utcomes<br>n statuto<br>cement o<br>out of a | ource<br>to in<br>for cory<br>capace<br>rea p                                     | es to ea<br>ncreasing<br>hildren<br>esponsi<br>city man<br>laceme       | arly help whic<br>ng numbers o<br>and young pe<br>bilities and re<br>y be exhauste<br>nts which ma | Council – limits h ultimately must be f looked after children eople gulatory judgement ed leading to more y not best meet the |          |            |             |  |                  |
| Code  | Description  | Mana   | aged By  | Desired Outcome   |   | Output  |   |  | Milestones/PIs Monitorin  |          |            |             |  |                  |
| SR 26   | End to end review of after children proces needs analysis and evaluation of effectivo fearly help being commissioned                                     | sses, Com  | regy &<br>missioning (AD)  | Service is delivered budgetary constrain whilst maintaining safety of children a young people.                                | ints<br>the   |   | Business case to inform budget<br>decisions on investment in early help |  |   |          |            |             |  | Reviewed monthly |
| SR 26   | Model of social care to ensure all staff understand expectathigh quality practice assessment   | practice   Care<br>tions on  | lren's Social<br>(AD)  | All staff effectively<br>risks to children ar<br>develop SMART ca<br>that make a positive<br>difference for looke<br>children | nd<br>re plans<br>ve  | Medway Model Supervisio<br>that demonstrate improve<br>quality and consistency of | ments in  | Practice   | dem   | onstrat  | ing impact | 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 |  |  |  | Good quality and consistent practice  |   | Audit reports and recommendations<br>Practice improvement                         |   |  | omm<br>actice   | endation |            |             |  |                  |

| SR<br>04  | Performance Management  |  | -  | ance & Services Portfolio S |  | Current Ris<br>Score                              | k C   | II                                   | Reviewed                          | 21-Feb-2012  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Link t  | to Corporate Priority Giving Value for  | or Money   |  | •                           |  | •   |   | •                                    |                                   |              |  |  |
| Vulne   | Vulnerability Trigger Consequences  |  |  |                             |  |   |   |                                      |                                   |              |  |  |
| consis<br>introde<br>busine<br>remov<br>effecti | have been in the past concerns that perstently managed across the council. The luced a comprehensive performance markers planning) framework. The major risk val of CAA will lead to less priority and for ive management of performance - at concern levels. | e Council has<br>nagement (and<br>k is that the<br>ocus being given to | The council fails to e<br>management systen  |                             | robust performance   | demonstrate customers d ☐ Silo-ism r ☐ Rate of in | difference<br>o not recei<br>einforced<br>aprovemen | e it is ma<br>ive the s<br>it is imp | aking to the p<br>services they i | need         |  |  |
| Code  | Description   | Managed By   | Desired Outcome                              |                             | Output   | M   | ilestones/F   | PIs                                  |                                   | Monitoring   |  |  |
| SR 04   | management resource F   | Communications,<br>Performance &<br>Partnerships (AD)                  | More effective performanagement arrangements |                             | An effectively resourced performance managemen framework to drive perfor improvement | t c   | utline mod<br>onsultation                           |                                      | ed. Formal<br>t in April          | By BfL Board |  |  |

| SR<br>21           | Procurement   | Owner                 |   | Finance & I<br>Portfolio   | Deputy Leader's  | Current Ris   | sk C                                      | П | Reviewed   | 29-Feb-2012   |  |  |  |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| Link to            | Corporate Priority Giving Value   | for Money             |   |  |  | -   | •   | - |  | •             |  |  |  |
| Vulne              | rability  |                       | Trigger   |  |  | Consequences  |   |   |  |               |  |  |  |
| Procure<br>council | ement processes are not consistently  | applied across the    | Complaints/challed decisions.     Audit reviews rev                                     | <ul> <li>Legal challenges</li> <li>Negative publicity</li> <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> <li>Failing to achieve statutory responsibilities</li> </ul> |  |   |   |   |  |               |  |  |  |
| Code               | Description   | Managed By            | Desired Outcome   | Out  | tput   | Milestones/PIs  |   |   |  | Monitoring    |  |  |  |
| SR 21.             | Member chaired Strategic Procurement Board with the Council's Monitoring officer responsible for strategic procurement direction that meets every three weeks | Chief Finance Officer | To deliver the Strate   |  | ategic Procurement Boa<br>ery three weeks  | ard meets O   | n-going                                   |   |  | Every 3 weeks |  |  |  |
| SR 21.             | Porward Procurement Plans in place for each directorate   | Directors             | Timely commencem procurement ensuring contracts are in place                            | ing Pro  | ns monitored by the Str<br>curement Board every  |   | n-going                                   |   | Every 3 weeks  |               |  |  |  |
| SR 21.             | Create a corporate contracts register   | Procurement Team      | A contracts register<br>records all contracts<br>currently in place ar<br>due to finish | s dat  | ploration of methods to<br>a to populate register  | collect O   | n-going                                   |   | On-going in<br>conjunction with the<br>Strategic<br>Procurement Board<br>process   |               |  |  |  |
| SR 21.             | Review of procurement processes   | Procurement Team      | To ensure processes continue to be fit for purpose.                                     | or Rev<br>Pro<br>a) (<br>of t<br>01.<br>b) (<br>mo<br>viet<br>acr<br>an  | w Contract Procedure R vised Gateway Procurer cess: delivered and formalise the Council's constitution 01.11 more focus on control anitoring with a greater w of all procurement acoss the Council c) reviongoing basis in conjurt Strategic Procurement | d as part n on and strategic tivity ewed on action with | as part on drategic vity ved on tion with |   | Managed by the Strategic Procurement Team through client engagement and the Strategic Procurement Board as part of a 3 weekly review |               |  |  |  |

## **APPENDIX B**

| Code     | Description                                | Managed By                         | Desired Outcome  | Output  | Milestones/PIs    | Monitoring |
|----------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|------------|
| 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 | Change procurement methodology             | BfL Board and<br>Procurement Board | Category Management<br>delivered across<br>organisation through<br>classification of spend<br>within Integra to industry<br>standard classification<br>system, against which<br>expenditure analysis and<br>compliance assessment<br>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  Focus on contract management to improve performance and manage demand | Ongoing – 2011/12 | On-going   |

| SR<br>25 | Adult Social Care Demographics   | Owner  | AD for Adult<br>Social Care   | Adult S                             | ervices Portfolio   | Current Ris   | sk C  | 11                   | I R       | Reviewed   | 21-Feb-2012  |
|----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|-----------|------------|--|
| Link t   | to Corporate Priority Adults maint   | ain their independe  | ence and live health  | ny lives                            |   |   | ·   |                      |           |            |  |
| Vulne    | erability  | Priority Adults maintain their independence  Trig  der people is increasing considerably (Joint lysis). The expectations of older people, their families are rising.  iption Managed By Description AD for Adult Social Care (as and local |   |                                     |   | Consequer   | nces  |                      |           |            |  |
| Strate   |  | Demographic impac  | · Significant increase in spend on Adult Social Care . Fair Access to Care Services eligibility criteria may need review and may need to be raised to Critical only as some Local Authorities are doing to manage the increasing demand and rising costs. |                                     |   |   |   |                      |           |            |  |
| Code     | Description  | Managed By   | Desired Outcome   |                                     | Output  | Milestones/PIs  |   |                      |           | Monitoring |  |
| SR 25    | Personal Budgets giving people more choice and control.  Commissioning sufficient capacity and a suitably wide range of services to meet need.  Close management oversight, and action as required, to manage the budget.  Move towards wholly commissioned service (externalisation of Linked Service Centres and day care) |  | Best outcomes for (as per their support and best value for Local Authority as statutory body and commissioner.  A safe and stable I sector of providers meet our local den and provide high quare and support to people, disabled accarers.               | ocal that can nands juality o older | All clients are offered Pers Budgets.  Joint strategies and comm plans with NHS Kent and I The Provider Forum engagesector and assists us to weartnership in a meaning effective way.  Monthly scrutiny of budge and audits of practice and Budgets. Management act required. | issioning Redway. Good in the cork in and Ets at AMT Personal | 2012 = 50<br>Re-commi<br>care, resid<br>care. | %<br>ssioni<br>entia | ning of d | ursing     | Quarterly As per procurement forward plan. Monthly at AMT, quarterly at CADMT and then year-end budget outcome |

| SR<br>27   | Government chang<br>Authority's respons   |                  | Owner           | Director of<br>Children and<br>Adults   | Childre  | en's Services Portfolio   | Current Ris<br>Score   | sk C                                      | П  | Reviewed                              | 24-Feb-2012  |  |  |
|--|---|------------------|-----------------|---|----------|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Link t   | o Corporate Priority  | Children & Young | g People Having | the Best Start in L   | ife in M | edway   |  |   |  |                                       |  |  |  |
| Vulne  | rability  |                  |                 | Trigger   |          |   | Consequer  | nces                                      |  |                                       |  |  |  |
| Councils are accountable for the outcome of poor performance of schools including independent, academies and free schools but have reduced levers for change |   |                  |                 |   |          | <ul> <li>Impact on children and families of being in a school that fails to provide quality provision which maximises learning outcomes</li> <li>Performance ratings as measured through Ofsted reports and Performance tables impact on parental and community confidence.</li> <li>Financial consequences</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   | Mar              | naged By        | Desired Outcome   |          | Output  | N  | Milestones/F                              | PIs  |                                       | Monitoring   |  |  |
| SR 27.   | School data s<br>achievement<br>Fisher Family<br>predictions.   | pased on         |                 | Schools results in li<br>or exceed nationally<br>expected progress<br>measures. |          | School Improvement Te support schools to ident needed to improve pupi     Data shows progress to with FFT of similar school nationally and then to b quartile   | ify actions<br>I progress<br>be in line<br>ols   | threshold<br>Number of                    | reduces<br>of schools<br>ategory                         | below floor<br>s in an<br>reduces and | AD Performance<br>Digest<br>CPR meetings with<br>staff |  |  |
| SR 27.   | The proportion of schools in Medway with an OFSTED judgement of satisfactory is higher than National and the proportion of schools with good is lower than National |                  |                 | Schools move up fr<br>Satisfactory to Goo<br>from Good to Outst                 | d and    | <ul> <li>Core "Moving on Up" SI developed and delivered targeted way</li> <li>OFSTED preparation in particular Senior Leadership Team Governors</li> <li>NLES and LLEs linked to give additional experien on for delivering "Good"</li> </ul>   | d in a solution of the color of | DFSTED jud<br>schools in th<br>categories | SI team meetings  AD Performance Digest  OFSTED Feedback |                                       |  |  |  |

|  | Delivering Better for Less transformation   | 5                                     |  | -   | Finance<br>Portfoli  | e & Deputy Leader's<br>io | Current Ri<br>Score | isk C  | 11           | Reviewed  | 21-Feb-2012  |  |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|--|
| Link t   | o Corporate Priority   Givi   | ng value for r                        | money                                      |   |  |                           | •                   | ·  | ·            |   |              |  |
| Vulne  | rability  |                                       |  | Trigger   |  | Conseque                  | nces                |  |              |   |              |  |
| 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 no delivered effectively and on time and in a way that ensures change can be sustained, improvements and savings will not be made. |   |                                       |  | Over emphasis or<br>improvements mear<br>another 'savings' pr     Savings identified<br>'overtaken' by other     Redundancy costs | Additional budget deficit for future years     Requirement to make alternative savings proposals which make greater impact on frontline services     Services standards drop and growing customer expectations not be met     Drop in resident satisfaction    Loss of faith by staff in ability the council to deliver council wide change will impact on any future change initiatives |                           |                     |  |              |   |              |  |
| Code   | Description   | Mana                                  | aged By                                    | Desired Outcome   |  | Output                    |                     | Milestones                                   | /PIs         |   | Monitoring   |  |
| SR 30  | For trigger 2: Detailed definition of the performance gains we expect the programme to delived developed.             | formance Perfo                        | munications,<br>ormance &<br>nerships (AD) | Shared understand what we want to be how we will measur and ultimately delivimproved performa                                     | e better,<br>re that<br>very of  | BfL measures of success   |                     |  |              | Quarterly by BfL<br>Board and members<br>through council plan<br>monitoring |              |  |
| SR 30  | .06 Trigger 6 - Detailed of potential impact of savings options on E targets carried out a budget setting             | of Perfo<br>BfL Parti                 | munications,<br>ormance &<br>nerships (AD) | Minimising duplicat<br>savings targets and<br>on frontline service<br>delivery  | l impact   |                           |                     | Budget pronot duplicate proposals, complimer | By BfL Board |   |              |  |
| SR 30  | .07 Trigger 7 - Minimise redundancies throug vacancy managemei redeployment where in interests of the buand employees | gh Perfo<br>nt and Parti<br>e this is | munications,<br>ormance &<br>nerships (AD) | Minimum number of redundancies  | of   |                           | -                   | Phase 1 Br<br>compulsor<br>voluntary         | y redunc     | lancies and 14  | By BfL Board |  |

| SR<br>22  | Treasury Man       | agement  | Owner                 |  | Finance<br>Portfoli                                    | e & Deputy Leader's<br>io   | Current Ri<br>Score  | isk D | ı   | Reviewed      | 28-Feb-2012   |  |  |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|--|---|--|-------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| Link t  | to Corporate P     | riority Giving Value fo                                      | or Money              |  | •  |   |  |       | •   |               | •   |  |  |
| Vulne   | erability          |  |                       | Trigger  |  |   | Conseque   | nces  |   |               |   |  |  |
| 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  |  |   | <ul> <li>Loss of resources</li> <li>Damage to reputation.</li> <li>Negative publicity</li> <li>VFM Judgement jeopardised</li> <li>Increased pressure on existing resources</li> <li>Reduction/cuts to services</li> <li>Quality of service compromised Relationship with partners may deteriorate</li> </ul> |       |   |               |   |  |  |
| Code  | Descrip            | otion  | Nanaged By            |  |  |   |  |       |   | Monitoring    |   |  |  |
| SR 22   |                    | ement strategy and   | Chief Finance Officer | Recommend chang<br>the strategy as and<br>necessary in order<br>maintain a high lev<br>stewardship of the<br>Council's funds   | l when<br>to   | The Outturn report in June. Mid-year report in November. Strategy in February. Monthly budget monitoring reports. |  |       |   | cy - Interest | June (Outturn),<br>November Mid-year<br>and quarterly budget<br>monitoring. |  |  |
| SR 22   | regular<br>in both | ring reports and review by members executive and y functions | Chief Finance Officer | To ensure that thos responsibility for the treasury management function appreciate implications of treasurativities, and that implementing policity executing transactivities with the delegation and responsibilities with the delegation and res | ent the sury es and those ies and ons led their regard | Enhanced member involunderstanding, responsibil scrutiny.     Continue training for offimembers                   | ility and February 2010 and 2010. On-going of  |       | Member training carried out<br>February 2010 and Novembe<br>2010. On-going officer traini |               | As & when required  |  |  |

|  | Business continuity a planning               | and emergency   | Owner   | Robin Cooper  | Finance<br>Portfoli | e & Deputy Leader's<br>o  | Current R<br>Score   | isk D          | ı    | 11 | Reviewed       | 21- Feb-2012   |  |
|--|--|-----------------|---|---|---------------------|---|--|----------------|------|----|----------------|--|--|
| Link t   | o Corporate Priority                         | Putting our cus | tomers at the cen                                   | tre of everything   | we do               |   |  |                |      |    | -              |  |  |
| Vulne  | erability                                    |                 |   | Trigger   |                     |   | Conseque   | nces           |      |    |                |  |  |
| 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. |  |                 |   | 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   | Description                                  | Ma              | anaged By   | Desired Outcome   |                     | Output  |  | Milestones/PIs |      |    | Monitoring     |  |  |
| SR 02  | .01 Continue to dev<br>Council's Emer        | gency Plan Re   | rector of<br>egeneration,<br>ommunity and<br>ulture | - Revised plan agr<br>CMT<br>- Continued engag<br>with Kent Resiliend<br>- Staff trained in<br>emergency respon<br>management | jement<br>ce Forum  | - Existing plan in place - P<br>of on-going review of COM<br>Emergency response oper<br>room in place   | review of COMAH plans Programme of staff training place by Winter 2012   |                |      |    | ff training in | On-going   |  |
| SR 02  | .02 Business conting completed to in actions | nplement the Re | rector of<br>egeneration,<br>ommunity and<br>ulture | All services will ha<br>up-to-date and tes<br>Business Continuit  | sted                | - BCM Policy agreed; - BCM principles and projecommunicated to divisional management teams across Council A Corporate Recovery Place in August 2011; - IT Recovery Plan in place - Draft flu plans in place - Winter preparedness pla | ect aims<br>al<br>s the<br>an  | Plans tes      | ted. |    |                | Quarterly reports to<br>Strategic Risk<br>Management Group |  |

| SR<br>28 | Changes to the Health System Owner  |                     | Director of Public<br>Health   | Adult S      | ervices Portfolio   | Current R<br>Score   | lisk                    | D  | H         | Reviewed | 20-Feb-2012 |
|----------|---|---------------------|--|--------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|-----------|----------|-------------|
| Link t   | o Corporate Priority Putting our  | customers at the ce | ntre of everything   | we do        |   | •  |                         |  |           | •        | -           |
| Vulne    | rability  |                     | Trigger  |              |   | Conseque   | ences                   |  |           |          |             |
| PCT ar   | ouncil is unable to influence decision-<br>nd SHA clusters are created.<br>c Health Grant is inadequate to fund   | -                   | Implementation of changes related to the Health and Social Care Bill Public Health shadow grant announced in February 2012 |              |   | <ul> <li>Health services less focussed on Medway needs</li> <li>Reduction in public health programmes</li> <li>Negative impact on the community</li> <li>Negative publicity</li> </ul> |                         |  |           |          |             |
| Code     | Description   | Managed By          | Desired Outcome  |              | Output  |  | Milestones/PIs          |  |           |          | Monitoring  |
| SR 28.   | 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) |                     | All members engag<br>pre-shadow HWB to<br>establish board pric<br>and ways of workin                                       | o<br>orities |   |  |                         | evelop<br>WB pr<br>dow H'<br>mme i<br>ped. | Quarterly |          |             |
| SR 28    | Detailed record of current spend within public health portfolio coming to Council and associated contract details.  |                     | Clarity of any gap i<br>funding and respon<br>DH.  |              | Reconciliation of shadow b<br>against future PH responsi<br>the Council |  | Complete by March 2012. |  |           |          | March 2012  |