

TRAFFORD COUNCIL

Report to: Accounts and Audit Committee
Date: 20 March 2013
Report for: Information
Report of: Audit and Assurance Manager

Report Title

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (SRR) – 2012/13 Quarter 4

Purpose of the Report

The Accounts and Audit Committee is asked to consider this report which contains an update on the strategic risk environment for quarter four, 2012/13. This includes arrangements in place to manage each of the strategic risks.

Recommendation

The Accounts and Audit Committee reviews the report.

Contact person for access to background papers and further information

Name: Mark Foster – Audit & Assurance Manager. **Extension:** 1323

Kerry Bourne – Senior Audit & Assurance Officer **Extension:** 4603

Background Papers: Corporate Risk Management Policy and Strategy

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Council's Strategic Risk Register (SRR) contains the strategic risks the Council is likely to face in achieving its high level corporate objectives.
- 1.2 In accordance with the Council's Risk Management Policy, the Corporate Management Team (CMT) provides regular quarterly updates on the strategic risk environment and in particular performance in managing the specific risks incorporated within the strategic risk register (SRR).
- 1.3 This report, for quarter four 2012/13, is based on information provided by risk owners through February 2013.
- 1.4 The report highlights changes since the previous quarterly update but also as referred to in 2.3 below, key developments since the Committee last received an update in September 2012.
- 1.5 It should be noted that the Audit & Assurance Service is currently updating the corporate Risk Management Guidance. A refreshed Risk Management Policy and Strategy is to be presented to the Accounts and Audit Committee in March 2013 and updated guidance will be issued in early 2013/14.

2. THE STRATEGIC RISK ENVIRONMENT – RISK EXPOSURE AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

- 2.1 Section 3 of this report contains a summary listing of the highest strategic risks identified. The Audit & Assurance Service requested strategic risk owners to provide an update on the strategic risks that are under their remit including progress in managing these risks.
- 2.2 **Overall, it is considered that the level of strategic risk faced by the Council remains fairly stable. There have been two changes to risk assessment scores since the last update to CMT (2012/13 quarter 3 report – December 2012). SR5 (relating to the Council's medium term financial position) has reduced from 25 to 20 remaining a high risk level, and SR6 (relating to the Council's delivery of its capital programme) has reduced from 12 to 9, remaining at medium risk level.**
- 2.3 Since the last strategic risk monitoring update was reported to the Accounts and Audit Committee (Quarter 2 report 2012/13 in September 2012), **there has been one addition to the SRR. SR22: "Failure or delay in implementing the Local Welfare Assistance Scheme which replaces the DWP Social Fund in April 2013, putting vulnerable residents at risk and causing reputational damage to the Council".**

- 2.4 The risk charts on page 4 shows an analysis of the current strategic risks. The chart analyses the levels of risk exposure in terms of impact and likelihood. The number of strategic risks for each risk level is shown. **There are now 22 strategic risks (five of which are considered high level).**
- 2.5 It is considered that the strategic risk environment is stable overall as highlighted in the summary analysis of each risk on pages 5 to 11.

Future Action

- 2.6. There will be a further summary SRR update report produced in June 2013. As part of that process, a number of risks will need to be reviewed in terms of considering their future inclusion in the register, given, for instance, any relevant changes coming in to effect from 1 April 2013 e.g. the introduction of the Council tax reduction scheme and, also from April, the accommodation move back to the Town Hall. The Accounts and Audit Committee will receive a further detailed update at its September 2013 meeting.

Comparison of Risk Levels December 2012 and March 2013

IMPACT		Risk Levels – December 2012				
Very High(5)		5	3	3	1	
High (4)		1	1		1	
Medium (3)		1	2	3	1	
Low (2)						
Very Low (1)						
		Very Low (1)	Low (2)	Med. (3)	High (4)	Very High (5)
		LIKELIHOOD				

IMPACT		Risk Levels – March 2013				
Very High(5)		5	3	3		
High (4)		1	1		2	
Medium (3)		1	3	2	1	
Low (2)						
Very Low (1)						
		Very Low (1)	Low (2)	Med. (3)	High (4)	Very High (5)
		LIKELIHOOD				

High Risk
Medium Risk
Low Risk

3. Summary Table –Strategic Risks (March 2013)



Red	Amber	Green
-----	-------	-------

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Strategic Risk Title / (Directorate) / (Portfolio)</i>	<i>Risk Level</i>	<i>Management of Risk - Direction of Travel *</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1	Transformation Programme is not delivered with the speed, scale and degree of innovation required to maintain future financial sustainability. (T&R)/ (T&R)	8 Low	↑ Improvement	<p>In 2012/13 the Council has a savings target of £12.161m; this and savings for 2011/12 and 2010/11 were delivered within schedule.</p> <p>In 2013/14, £6,474m (34.6%) of the full MTFP savings (£18,685m) is classified as Transformation savings.</p> <p>Governance arrangements for the Transformation programme were reviewed in January/ February 2012 by the TPR Group to promote a focus on fundamental organisational change whilst ensuring the in-year transformation savings were being monitored and delivered to schedule.</p> <p>Based on the level of savings achieved to date and the governance improvements in place, this risk is considered to be well managed and therefore has been given a low rating.</p>
2	Major regeneration projects, including Altair, Altrincham Strategic Framework delivery, LCCC, Old Trafford Master Plan (OTMP) and Carrington development do not proceed due to economic and financial constraints. (EGP) / (EGP)	15 Medium	↔ Stable	<p>All project risks contained and detailed within individual project plans. Overall, all projects within tolerance.</p> <p>Urmston Phase 2 is now completed.</p>
3	Whilst safeguarding services in Trafford have been inspected and rated by OfSTED as good with good prospects for improvement, this is an area of Council responsibility that requires constant high levels of vigilance to guard against the risk of harm or abuse to Children that could have been prevented through intervention and support of	20 High	↔ Stable	<p>No change since the last update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership working and communication in safeguarding services are good, both within the CYPS and between the CYPS, health partners and other agencies. Guidance and direction for staff are good and staff report experiencing professional challenge and support, with accessible managers and clear decision making. • The CYPS has recruited to a number of posts in recent months. The number of

	<p>services. In particular, the risk of the Safeguarding Board not being effective in undertaking its duties and responsibilities and/ or insufficient numbers of staff, particularly social workers with relevant experience, to provide effective safeguarding services to children and young people. (CYPS)/ (Supporting Children and Families)</p>			<p>high quality applicants was high indicating Trafford's good reputation as an employer. New staff have settled into Trafford well and are very positive about their early experiences here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caseloads are high but manageable and the workload management system is helping to promote balanced workloads in line with the capability of staff and their level of experience. • Training and support for social work staff is being reviewed to comply with the new national professional capabilities framework that is still in development. • The Munro Review of child protection services and the government response indicates Trafford's direction of travel is in line with current thinking and work is in progress to address the Munro recommendations. • The Family Justice Review recommendations are progressed as are the requirements for changes to adoption processes.
4	<p>Demand for school places underestimated and/ or additional school places are not delivered to satisfy increased demand. (CYPS)/ (Education)</p>	<p>15 Medium</p>	<p>↔ Stable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All children have been allocated places for the 2012/13 academic year. • The demand for primary and secondary school places continues to be monitored. Plans with capital resources allocated to them are progressing well. • There has been a delay in receiving 2013/14 capital allocations from the Department for Education so planning of future projects is currently on hold until level of funding is known.
5	<p>There continues to be uncertainty regarding the Council's medium term financial position given the reliance that exists on support from Central Government. The grant settlement for 2013/14 and the indicative position for 2014/15 were announced on 19 December 2012. A new feature of the financial regime for local authorities is the Business Rates retention Scheme. This will allow the Council to have a share of 24.5% of</p>	<p>20 High</p>	<p>↑ Improvement</p>	<p>The Council has agreed its budget for 2013/14 and issued a provisional budget for 2014/15.</p> <p>New risks from the local government financial settlement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks and rewards in the growth/ reduction in business rates; • Changes in the number and cost of Council Tax Benefit claims; • The cost of local welfare assistance (replacement of the DWP Social Fund) <p>All of which will require close monitoring during this first year of operation.</p>

	<p>any growth rates above the baseline set for Trafford. However, the Council will become responsible for 49% of any reductions below the baseline.</p> <p>There are a large number of outstanding appeals against business rates that could adversely impact on the Council. These appeals are determined by the Valuation Office Agency. (T&R)/ (Finance)</p>			<p>Austerity is now expected to last until at least 2017. In addition to reducing funding there continue to be cost pressures and demands on the budget including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased demand on and in the cost of adult social care • Investment rates continue to be suppressed • Pressure from Transport and Waste Disposal levies. <p>The Government has also signalled that austerity is likely to continue through to 2017. Their high level spending plans for 2015/16 are expected to be announced in March/ April 2013.</p>
6	<p>Reduced value of surplus assets and reduced Government Grant impacting on delivery of Capital Programme. (T&R)/ (Finance)</p>	<p>9 Medium</p>	<p>↑ Improvement</p>	<p>Government funding has been suppressed and remains unchanged. The sale of spare Council assets has also been suppressed due to the economy. This has reduced the availability of local discretionary funds. Available resources need to demonstrate a pay back in terms of budget savings and social capital beyond the cost of capital investments.</p> <p>The Capital Programme has been fully reviewed and remodelled as part of the 2012/15 budget process and is monitored and reported on a quarterly basis. The Community Infrastructure Levy represents a potential significant improvement in the availability of funds. Values set at realistic levels and some evidence of minor improvements, and new approaches introduced.</p>
7	<p>Affordability of long-term accommodation project. (T&R)/ (T&R)</p>	<p>6 Low</p>	<p>↑ Improvement</p>	<p>Close monitoring of costs of decant and main contract is undertaken on a continuing basis. New governance and project management arrangements are now in place to manage the identified risk by close scrutiny of the project and the developer. Contingency included in overall project costs.</p>
8	<p>Ability of partnership working in relation to vulnerable adults and older people. (CWB)/ (Adult Social Services)</p>	<p>20 High</p>	<p>↔ Stable</p>	<p>No change in the risk since the last update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Health and Wellbeing Partnership Board has been set up and work is underway to create a transition plan for the transfer of Public Health responsibilities which has been rated green by the Department of Health. • Robust project management approaches

				<p>are in place in relation to integration of TPS and Operational Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Strategic Commissioning Group. • Review of Public Health Due Diligence.
9	Ability of partnership working to release resources with sufficient speed and execution to deliver joint objectives around children. (CYPS)/ (Supporting Children & Families)	15 Medium	↔ Stable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Partnership Agreement (Section 75) for CYPS Commissioning with NHS Trafford is now in place with associated governance arrangements implemented. Joint Commissioning Management Board established. Work is underway to transfer the Agreement to Trafford CCG following the closure of NHS Trafford at 31 March 2013. • Community Health Services Tender completed with both CYPS and CAMHS lots awarded to Pennine Care. • Provider S75 agreement to be 'novated' to Pennine Care to minimise disruption. • Children's Trust Board receives quarterly performance indicator updates.
10	Demand for eligible services outstrips resources in adult social care (CWB)/ (Adult Social Services)	20 High	↔ Stable	<p>No change in the risk since the last update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Delivery Programme Board established to monitor and manage demand, performance and savings delivery. • Business Case portfolio in place. • Resource Allocation System introduced and embedded. • Improvements made to re-ablement services / embedding of telecare offer. • Local Business performance indicators developed. • As an improvement action the Directorate is to implement LD and Mental Health programmes which is now complete. • The integration of TPS and Operational Services to deliver more effective population management – Ongoing Telecare, Ascot House Assessment and Re-ablement. • Partnership working with acute trust to more effectively manage demand.
11	Failure of the Adult Safeguarding Service (CWB)/ (Adult Social Services)	10 Medium	↔ Stable	<p>No change in the risk since the last update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and launch of new Safeguarding procedures. • Refresh of adult safeguarding board.
12	Breach of health and safety legislation leading to prosecution under the Corporate Manslaughter Act	10 Medium	↔ Stable	<p>No change in the risk since the last update. Based on the findings of service audits undertaken with Trafford's schools, several new toolkits have been produced to</p>

	(T&R) / (T&R)			address areas requiring improvement, such as Use of Display Screen Equipment, lone working and driving at work. A programme of audit of Fire Safety is starting in Trafford's schools in February 2013. This will give increased assurance about the Council's arrangements for managing Fire Safety.
13	Council does not agree, adopt and deliver carbon reduction targets. (ETO)/ (Highways & Environment) & (EGP)/ (EGP)	12 Medium	 Stable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trafford successfully submitted its 2012 CRC Scheme annual report and purchased and surrendered the required number of carbon allowances. • A contract for the installation of Automatic Meter Readers has been agreed and installation is underway. Progress has also been made on the electronic population of the Council's energy database. • A new CRC management group comprising officers from ETO, EGP and Audit now meets to ensure data robustness and CRC scheme compliance and strengthen forward planning and coordination across services. • A refreshed Energy & Water Management Plan, including street lighting and transport, is being prepared to provide a framework for carbon emissions reduction. • In December 2012, the government issued its response to the consultation on simplifying the CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme. The qualification year for Phase 2 of the CRC is 2012/13. Based on current assumptions, under the proposed new arrangements, Trafford would fall out of the CRC Scheme at the beginning of Phase 2 in 2014/15.
14	Statutory targets relating to Adult Social Care services are not met. (CWB) / (Adult Social Services)	12 Medium	 Stable	<p>No change in risk since the last update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring is in place within the service and a range of weekly, monthly and quarterly reports are overseen by Business Delivery Board and reported through to SMT. • Performance is monitored against national and local performance indicators as per Directorate Performance framework. Action plans are implemented, where appropriate, against underperforming targets.

15	Major event leading to inability to deliver critical services to vulnerable people. (CWB)/ (Adult Social Services)	9 Medium	↔ Stable	No change in the risk since the last update. Business continuity plans are to be established, monitored and tested.
16	Failure to complete the Business Continuity (BC) Programme Project, resulting in an increased risk that the Council may fail to deliver Council services in the event of significant disruption. (T&R)/ (T&R)	12 Medium	↔ Stable	No change in the risk since the last update. Testing plan is to be developed by the Local Resilience Forum by April 2013. Plans are to be reviewed on an annual basis. Business Impact Analysis documents are in the process of being updated.
17	Financial and other implication as a result of coalition Government policy to fast track initially "outstanding" schools and then all other schools to academy status. (CYPS)/ (Education)	15 Medium	↔ Stable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 Trafford schools have Academy Status. • One school has been approved Academy status and will convert in June 2013. • In total 12 secondary schools and 4 primary schools have or are about to convert. • A number of other schools are giving consideration to conversion. • There remains a very low level of interest in primary schools, <p>We will continue to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor closely the position regarding the status for schools that currently have expressed an interest to convert and work with the Headteacher and Governing Bodies. • To continue the programme of meetings with senior officers in CYPS.
18	Continuity and availability of Council systems, infrastructure and telephony services in the run up to, during and following the relocation of the Data Centre from Friars Court in Sale, to the newly built Data Centre in the refurbished Town Hall. (T&R)/ (Finance)	10 Medium	↔ Stable	The risk remains the same. The detailed migration plan is currently being finalised and will be released with the detailed move schedule by April 2013. The plan will detail the process and quantify downtime required for the move(s). With new infrastructure being procured to facilitate this, downtime is anticipated to be minimal. It is anticipated the risk will stay at medium.
19	The implementation of the new localised council tax reduction scheme is not implemented on time due to the very short timescale and legal challenges are lodged over the Council's consultation process and	10 Medium	↔ Stable	<p>The final scheme was approved by full Council on 23 January 2013, ahead of the DCLG cut-off date.</p> <p>The project is now focusing on IT testing and staff training, ahead of the April go live date.</p>

	Equality Impact Assessments. (T&R)/ (Finance)			
20	Public Health: transfer of responsibility to the Council April 2013. (CWB)/ (Community Health & Wellbeing).	9 Medium	↔ Stable	Transition plan is in place for the transfer of Public Health responsibilities which has been rated green by the Department of Health.
21	Adult Social Care Budget 2012/13: Ability to implement wide range of savings proposals in the current economic conditions. (CWB)/ (Adult Social Services).	20 High	↔ Stable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of savings proposals delivered. • Business Delivery Programme Board continues to monitor the savings proposals, alongside the demand led budgets and performance indicators/ outcomes.
22	Failure or delay in implementing the Local Welfare Assistance Scheme which replaces the DW Social Fund in April 2013, putting vulnerable residents at risk and causing reputational damage to the Council. (T&R & CWB)/ (T&R & Community Health & Wellbeing)	10 Medium	↔ Stable	A collaborative model, based on positive intervention has been developed and endorsed by CMT. A lead Executive Member has been identified, together with a timetable for sign off. A steering group and underpinning task and finish groups have been established to deliver the project plan and ensure timely and effective implementation of the model.

* Note: This indicates the direction of travel in respect of performance in managing the risk and not direction of travel of the risk level.

APPENDIX 1 – STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (March 2013)

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number		1	
Corporate Priorities	All Corporate Priorities	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	No specific link			
RISK	Transformation Programme is not delivered with the speed, scale and degree of innovation required to maintain future financial sustainability.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promises to the public around the living environment significantly impaired. Some of the statutory obligations will be under significant strain. 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Transformation Vision and Principles set by CMT and Executive; Transformation programme incorporated into MTFP; Implemented a robust business planning process to review and approve all business cases for inclusion within the MTFP and Transformation Programme; Invested in capacity required to deliver the programme of change, including a full time Programme Manager to oversee delivery of the Transformation programme and management of the Transformation Team; Transformation Team is mobilised to support delivery of the programme; Work on high priority projects is progressed well and has already delivered savings as well as better outcomes for residents; Programme governance established and implemented incorporating a monthly Transformation Board (sponsoring group); monthly meeting of day to day Senior Responsible Officers representatives (TPR), in addition to project and programme boards for individual projects/ work programmes; Monthly reporting of progress against the delivery of the programme which includes exception reporting, progress reporting and benefits realisation reporting to the Transformation Board; Transformation Team supporting the definition and implementation of the new operating model post 2015. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	2	Impact	4	Exposure	8
RISK LEVEL		Low Risk				
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Milestone achievements of individual/ collective projects. Monthly Highlight Reporting of Transformation Programme Performance to the monthly Transformation Board Realisation of benefits and tracking of delivery of those benefits Changes to business models and structures within the organisation Improved customer satisfaction from residents following the implementation of projects – better outcomes for residents. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators (1 to 4, 1 = inadequate and 4 = effective).						
	3					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Transformation Team service reviews, which have also taken account of feedback from Scrutiny Transformation Team skills and competency audits implemented Transformation programme website due to be launched, to support skills transfer and communication Governance arrangements reviewed 					

Person or Group Responsible for management of risk		Corporate Director, Transformation & Resources			
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R Huntington, Director Performance & Improvement. April 2009; October 2009; and February 2010 • K Griffiths, Acting Director Performance & Improvement. July 2010 • H Baker, Transformation Programme Manager. January 2011 • S Maynard, Transformation Programme Manager. August 2011; and January 2012 					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	S Maynard	Designation	Transformation Programme Manager
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	S Maynard	Designation	Transformation Programme Manager

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	2		
Corporate Priorities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money • Fighting crime • Better roads and Pavements 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive environmental impact • Better homes • Health and improved quality of life for all • Strong economy 		
RISK		Major regeneration projects, including Altair, Altrincham Strategic Framework delivery, LCCC, Old Trafford Master Plan (OTMP) and Carrington development do not proceed due to economic and financial constraints.				
Consequences		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to deliver on promise to community. • Negative impact on reputation. • Adverse impact on urban regeneration. • Failure to deliver the Core Strategy housing and employment growth targets • Negative impact on economic and housing growth in the borough. 				
Controls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead officers identified • Consultants in advisory role where appropriate • Officer/ member steering groups in place • Regular performance meetings with developer/ key stakeholders • Detailed project plans in place. • Altrincham Delivery Group 				
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	Altair = 3 Altrincham = 3 LCCC = 3 OTMP = 3 Carrington = 3	Impact	Altair = 5 Altrincham = 5 LCCC = 5 OTMP = 5 Carrington = 5	Exposure	Altair = 15 Altrincham = 15 LCCC = 15 OTMP = 15 Carrington = 15 Average = 15
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk (Average)			
Risk Performance Indicators		<p>Altair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPO confirmed, Development Agreement extended to 31 March 2013 and developer proposals being finalised. • Funding strategy dependent upon pre-letting key parts of development – possibility of increasing residential element as hotel market not strong in this location. <p>Altrincham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altrincham Forward Board reviews – quarterly • Consultation on Altrincham Town Centre Plan being undertaken (Summer 2012) • Delivery of pipeline developments, including Graftons (on site), new hospital, interchange and Altair (see above) 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of local traders/ organisations/residents LCCC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCCC started on site • Tesco on-site – delivery being monitored • Stretford High School completion Summer 2012 OTMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essex Way development on-site – completion Summer 2013 • Tamworth refurbishment and demolition works on site – completion March 2014 • Hullard refurbishments on site – completion December 2013-02-14 HCA funding bid submitted for Shrewsbury Street scheme – decision May 2013 Carrington <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project meetings with Shell – quarterly • Outline of spatial concepts being developed • Engagement with key stakeholders ongoing • Flixton Road junction improvements on site – completion December 2013 				
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	Altair = 3 Altrincham = 4 LCCC = 3 OTMP = 3 Carrington				
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	Regular performance meetings with developers/ key stakeholders to ensure project time times and delivery of key mile stones.				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Economic Growth and Prosperity				
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G Pickering, Corporate Director PPD. April 2009 • J Valentine, Head of Asset Management. October 2009 • P Harvey, Director of Environment. February 2010 and July 2010 • D Smith/ J Valentine, Head of Strategic Planning & Houses/ Head of Asset Management. May 2010 and January 2011 • D Challis, Asset manager. June 2011 • N Gerrard, Corporate Director EGP & Steph Everett, Growth Delivery Manager. September 2011; and February 2012 					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Rob Haslam/ John Steward	Designation	Acting Strategic Planning Manager/ Interim Economic Growth Lead
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Stephen James	Designation	Economic Growth Manager

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13		Risk Number	3
Corporate Priorities		Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	
RISK	Whilst safeguarding services in Trafford have been inspected and rated by Ofsted as good with good prospects for improvement, this is an area of Council responsibility that requires constant high levels of vigilance to guard against the risk of harm or abuse to children that could have been prevented through intervention and support of services. In particular, the risk of the Safeguarding Board not being effective in undertaking its duties and responsibilities and/ or insufficient numbers of staff, particularly social workers with relevant experience, to provide effective safeguarding services to children and young		

		people.				
Consequences		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm or abuse of children • Sanctions/ penalties against Service. • Legal liability claims. • Negative impact on reputation. 				
Controls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings of the Director of Children's Services Safeguarding Group. • Independent Chair appointed and Safeguarding Board governance and planning approved. 				
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	4	Impact	5	Exposure	20
RISK LEVEL		High Risk				
Risk Performance Indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for the risks are multi-agency and depend on all parties to achieve successful outcomes and sustained improvement; • There were staffing implications arising from the CQC/OFSTED Inspection report in April 2010 around the need to strengthen the role of LADO and Independent Reviewing Team and the role of Statutory Children's Compliant Service. The issues have been addressed and additional resources identified as appropriate. 				
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The direction of travel is improving. The Service was inspected by OFSTED and CQC in April 2010 and the report concluded that the overall effectiveness of safeguarding and the capacity for improvement were good, with only a few exceptions, performance is better than statistical neighbours and nationally. In addition in December 2010 children's services in Trafford were rated as performing excellently by OFSTED and this rating was confirmed for a second year in December 2011. • The TSCB remains independently chaired and made good progress against its 2010/ 11 business plan. A revised business planning process has now been developed linked to the children and young people's strategy and a three year plan is complete. The work of the TSCB sub-groups is robust and they are monitoring and quality assuring safeguarding outcomes for children. • Multi-agency preventative work with children in need is well developed and effective and the number of new children coming into care in 2010/ 11 reduced. However, the current number of child protection plans and children in care is high and reasons for this are analysed regularly with actions taken if appropriate. • Action plans have been developed following recent inspections but all recommendations are very minor. • Partnership working and communication in safeguarding services are good, both within the CYPS and between the CYPS, health partners and other agencies. Guidance and direction for staff are good and staff report experiencing professional challenge and support, with accessible managers and clear decision making. • The CYPS has recruited to a number of posts in recent months. The number of high quality applicants was high indicating Trafford's good reputation as an employer. They are settling into Trafford well and are very positive about their early experiences here. • Caseloads are high but manageable and the workload management system is helping to promote balanced workloads in line with the capability of staff and their level of experience. • Training and support for staff are of consistently high quality, especially the multi-agency training arranged by the TSCB for which take-up is good. • The Munro review of child protection services and the government response indicates Trafford's direction of travel is in line with current thinking and work is in progress to address the Munro recommendations although full clarity is not yet available from government in terms of detailed expectations. 				

Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plans from recent inspections to be progressed and monitored within CYPS. Requirements of the Munro review are being progressed via an implementation plan.
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Corporate Director of CYPS			
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C Pratt, Corporate Director CYPS. April 2009 and October 2009 M Woodhouse, Interim Corporate Director CYPS. March 2010 and July 2010 D Brownlee, Corporate Director CYPS. January, April, July, September 2011 and January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	4	
Corporate Priorities				Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		
RISK	Demand for school places underestimated and/ or additional school places are not delivered to satisfy increased demand.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory duty not discharged. Negative impact on reputation. Ad hoc expensive provision required Disruption to pupils education 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough review based on most recent birthrates undertaken in January 2012 taking into account recent and planned housing developments. The comprehensive plan, giving the analysis of and projecting the increased demand for school places considered by the Executive in March 2012 now being implemented. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	3	Impact	5	Exposure	15
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators						
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	The direction of travel remains stable. Planning for school places continues to be an area of risk. All pupils have been placed in schools for the 2012/13 academic year, although not necessarily in the preferred choice of parents. Robust plans are in place for creating additional places in 2013/14 to meet continued growth in demand. However, this will be subject to the Council receiving sufficient capital resources in the next Government Spending Review.					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to update the review undertaken on most recent birth rates and taking into account recent and planned housing developments. Monitor the potential consequence of the economic recession of parents transferring from private schools to Trafford state schools. Continue to monitor the demand for primary and secondary school places; produce a plan for meeting these; secure the necessary capital resources and deliver the plan. Update the Executive when Spending Review allocations are published (December 2012). Subject to approval, implement the comprehensive plan. 						
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Corporate Director of CYPS			

Previous risk reviews completed:

- C Pratt, Corporate Director CYPS. April 2009 and October 2009
- M Woodhouse, Interim Corporate Director CYPS. March 2010 and July 2010
- D Brownlee, Corporate Director CYPS. January, April, July, September 2011 and January 2012

Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	5		
Corporate Priorities	All Corporate Priorities	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives				
RISK	<p>There continues to be uncertainty regarding the Council's medium term financial position given the reliance that exists on support from Central Government. The grant settlement for 2013/14 and the indicative position for 2014/15 were announced on 19 December 2012. A new feature of the financial regime for local authorities is the Business Rates retention Scheme. This will allow the Council to have a share of 24.5% of any growth in rates above the baseline set for Trafford. However, the Council will become responsible for 49% of any reduction below the baseline.</p> <p>There are a large number of outstanding appeals against business rates that could adversely impact on the Council. These appeals are determined by the Valuation Office Agency.</p> <p>Two other changes have resulted in greater risk being transferred to local government. These are the local council tax support scheme (replacing the national council tax benefit scheme) and the local welfare scheme (replacing the DWP social fund). The Government has also signalled that austerity is likely to continue through to 2017. Their high level spending plans for 2015/16 are expected to be announced in March/April 2013.</p>					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing level of services across the Authority. • Adverse perception of the Authority. • Negative impact on reputation. • Potential political impact. 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's budget for 2013/14 was agreed in February 2013 • An indicative budget for 2014/15 was also agreed by the Council • Budget and financial management information systems in place • Regular (at least monthly) budget monitoring reports • Liaison with Valuation Office • Government safety net will limit losses on business rates (Trafford's maximum liability in 2013/14 is £2.4m) • Minimum level of reserves established to provide short term cover for losses 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	5	Impact	4	Exposure	20
RISK LEVEL			High Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Finance monitoring Council's current year budget • Regular (at least monthly) budget/ financial monitoring (Directorates) • TPR monitoring transformation savings. • Consideration of the likely position in 2015/16 will be re-assessed after the Government's spending plans for that year are released 					
Effectiveness of	3					

controls and performance indicators					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will need to refresh MTFP • Other options for savings being developed by Corporate Directors. 				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Director of Finance				
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I Duncan, Director of Finance. April 2009; October 2009; February 2010; July 2010 and January 2011 • I Kershaw, Head of Financial Management. August 2011 and January 2012. 					
Risk Review Date	September 2012	Completed By	Ian Duncan	Designation	Acting Corporate Director – T&R
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Ian Duncan	Designation	Director of Finance

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	6	
Corporate Priorities		Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	No specific link			
RISK	Reduced value of surplus assets and reduced Government Grant impacting on delivery of Capital Programme.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in ability to deliver capital improvement plans. 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital programme and land sales programme reviewed from April/ July 2012 to take account of likely resource availability • Monitor generation of capital receipts. • Forecasts updated on a ¼ basis. • Review of capital expenditure plans accordingly – either continuing to proceed, flexing, rescheduling or postponing as appropriate. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	3	Impact	3	Exposure	9
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital receipts. • Monitoring existing commitments. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	4					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	None proposed at present. Values set at realistic levels and some evidence of minor improvements, and new approaches introduced.					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Acting Corporate Director of Transformation & Resources					
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I Duncan, Director of Finance. April 2009; October 2009; February 2010; July 2010 and January 2011 • I Kershaw, Head of Financial Management. August 2011 • J Valentine, Head of Asset Management. January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Jeremy Valentine	Designation	Head of Asset Management	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Jeremy Valentine	Designation	Head of Asset Management	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	7	
Corporate Priorities	Value for Money	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	•Strong Communities •Strong Economy			
RISK	Affordability of long-term accommodation project.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially not meeting the needs of future organisational model • Costs of maintaining current accommodation becomes excessive • Cannot fully deliver Transformation Process • Services do not meet emerging needs and delivery objectives 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme and Project Management in place • Full integration with transformation process through Programme Office • Project Board fully informed of key risks on a regular basis • Contract price agreed and most affordable solution selected, with affordability being checked on an ongoing basis • Means of reducing costs and increasing income being developed throughout the project • Potential Value Engineering options made • External Quantity Surveyors appointed to regularly assess the preferred Developers Cost Plan 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	2	Impact	3	Exposure	6
RISK LEVEL			Low Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output specification • Cost against benchmark 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	3 – Controls are effective. Finances relating to project assessed by team including Finance Manager, and awareness of likely costs included in budgeting process; additional items means of reducing overall cost are being pursued.					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	No additional measures necessary provided costs are within expected parameters, monitoring outcomes and additional affordability measures are being followed up.					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Long-term Accommodation Board					
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G Pickering, Corporate Director PPD. April 2009 • J Valentine, Head of Asset Management. October 2009, February 2010, August 2011 and January 2012. • S Withington & J Boland, Senior Project Manager & Project Manager LTA Programme. July 2010 • J Valentine/ D Geary/ J Boland, Head of Asset Management / Senior Project Managers. January 2011. 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Jeremy Valentine	Designation	Head of Asset Management	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Jeremy Valentine	Designation	Head of Asset Management	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	8
Corporate Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Health & Wellbeing • Low Council Tax • Value for Money 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Health & Improved Quality of Life for All.		
RISK	Ability of partnership working with health to deliver joint objectives for vulnerable adults and older people and to improve health inequalities.				
Consequences	• Not meeting service objectives around key groups of people.				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend is not best utilised/ limited value for money. • Could lead to reduced service/ support to vulnerable persons. 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership Boards in place • Mechanisms in place to support decision-making and deliver governance • Regular leadership and oversight meetings with Council and NHS Chief Executives. • Leadership and engagement by relevant Chief Officers in respective fields. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	5	Impact	4	Exposure	20
RISK LEVEL			High Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signing-off procedures on key agreements and arrangements • Delivery of health and wellbeing indicators 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	<p>3 – There are forums in place which enable Adult Social Services and PCT commissioners to meet on a regular basis, to ensure the deliver of joint partnership objectives. The Health and Wellbeing Partnership Board has been set up and work is underway to create a transition plan for the transfer of Public Health responsibilities. There are Boards in place to oversee the delivery of joint services e.g. the Mental Health Commissioning Partnership Group and the Integrated Community and Equipment Services Board.</p>					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work closely with PCT as it transfers the commissioning function to GP consortia. • Work with the Director of Public Health to secure new arrangements for Public Health • Work with Health and Wellbeing Partnership to implement Health and Wellbeing Strategy. • Ensuring existing partnerships have governance arrangements in place that are fit for the future. 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Corporate Director CYPS			
Previous risk reviews completed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D McNulty, Chief Executive. April 2009. • D Hanley, Deputy Director CWB. February 2010; July 2010 and January 2011. • J Walker, Performance & Partnerships Manager, August 2011 • D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Wilmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	9
Corporate Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children • Value for Money 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Health & Improved Quality of Life for All	
RISK	Ability of partnership working to release resources with sufficient speed and execution to deliver joint objectives around children.			
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not meeting service objectives around key groups of people. • Unable to deliver services to as many people as the Council ought to. • Spend is not best utilised/ limited value for money. • Could lead to reduced service/ support to vulnerable persons. 			

Controls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children's Trust Board Joint Commissioning Management Board Mechanisms in place to support decision-making and deliver governance. Regular leadership and oversight meetings with Council and PCT Chief Executives. Leadership and engagement by relevant Chief Officers in respective fields. 				
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	3	Impact	5	Exposure	15
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children and Young Persons delivery plan Signing-off procedures on key agreements and arrangements. 				
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of a Shadow Health and Well-Being Board for Trafford provide a governance structure supporting local planning, integrated strategic needs assessment and ensuring local accountability, promote integrity and partnership and review major service redesigns of health and wellbeing related services provided by the NHS and Local Government. Strategic Partnership (Section 75) for CYPS Commissioning with NHS Trafford is now in place with associated governance arrangements implemented. Provider Partnership Agreements signed on an interim basis with both CMFT and Bridgewater pending the outcome of tender exercise. CYPS lead role in the Trafford community services tender for those areas relating to children and families. Children's Trust Board receives quarterly performance indicator updates. CTB successful in bidding for a range of project funding from the LAA reward grant to support partnership delivery of priorities. 				
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work closely with PCT as it transfers the commissioning function to GP consortia and establish links with emerging bodies such as National Commissioning Board and Public Health England. Work with the Director of Public Health to secure new arrangements for Public Health. Ensuring existing partnerships have governance arrangements in place that are fit for the future. 				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Corporate Director of CYPS			
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M Woodhouse, Interim Director CYPS. March and July 2010 D Brownlee, Corporate Director CYP. January, April, July, September 2011 and January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	10
Corporate Priorities	Quality Care for Adults	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Health & Improved Quality of Life for All	
RISK	Demand for eligible services outstrips resources in adult social care.			
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overspend on budgets. People do not receive services they are eligible for. 			
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of MTFP and in year savings. Monitoring of budgets at SMT and service level. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Delivery Programme Board established to monitor and manage demand, performance and savings delivery • Business case portfolio in place • Resource allocation system introduced and embedded • Improvements made to re-ablement services/ embedding of telecare offer. • Improved performance data in place, to identify trends in take up of services. • Local business performance indicators developed 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	4	Impact	5	Exposure	20
RISK LEVEL			High Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget monitoring. • Project monitoring. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	4 – Delivery of savings is on target but demand for services is increasing and impacting on budget.					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on delivering in year and future savings. • Implement austerity measures. • Improved performance data to identify trends in take-up of services. • Improved intelligence around take-up by potential service users. • Implement LD and mental health programmes 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			CWB Interim Director – Operations/ Director of Commissioning			
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D Hanley, Director of Operations. April 2009; July 2010 and January 2011 • J Walker, Performance & Partnerships Manager. October 2009, February 2010 and August 2011 • D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	11
Corporate Priorities	Quality Care for Adults	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Strong Communities •Health & Improved Quality of Life for All 	
RISK	Failure of the Adult Safeguarding Service.			
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential harm to vulnerable individuals. • Legal action against the Council. • Adverse impact on reputation. 			
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Safeguarding strategy in place. • Discrete Safeguarding team. • Training provided to all key staff. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with a wide range of partners. Robust management information and quarterly monitoring in place Regular multi-agency safeguarding management meeting in place. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	2	Impact	5	Exposure	10
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMT reporting. Reports to Safeguarding Board. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	3					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-agency review re: extending safeguarding role and responsibilities underway. Reports on safeguarding incidents, by individual provider, to be introduced. Implement quality assurance arrangements. Re-launch communications with public and partners. 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Deputy Director CWB			
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D Hanley, Deputy Director CWB. April 2009; October 2009; July 2010 and January 2011 J Walker, Performance & Partnerships Manager. February 2010 and August 2011 D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	12
Corporate Priorities	Value for Money	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		
RISK	Breach of health and safety legislation leading to prosecution under the Corporate Manslaughter Act.			
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible personal conviction of Officers and/ or Members. Adverse impact on reputation. Financial consequences of fines/ legal claims. 			
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and Safety policy. Procedures in place to ensure legal compliance. Risk assessments and safe systems of work. Health and Safety Advisors aligned to each Directorate to provide expertise and support. Member awareness. Management training Improved support to schools to be provided via SLA 			

Risk Assessment	Likelihood	2	Impact	5	Exposure	10
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety team track all accidents/ near misses. • Six month report to CMT/ Executive and Annual Report to Council • Targets set for accident reduction • Corporate Health and Safety Improvement Plan 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	2					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of work plan to implement recommendations from February 08 report. • Audit & Assurance to undertake a review of the Council's corporate health and safety arrangements. 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			All			
Risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G Pickering, Corporate Director PPD. April 2009 • P Valentine, IBU Manager. October 2009 • J Arnold, Health & Safety Manager. February 2010; July 2010, January 2011 and August 2011 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	C Hay	Designation	Workforce & Core Strategy Officer	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	J Arnold	Designation	Health & Safety Manager	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	13		
Corporate Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Cleaner, Greener Borough • Value for money • Low Council Tax 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Environmental Impact • Better Homes • Strong Economy 			
RISK	Council does not agree, adopt and deliver carbon reduction targets.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial consequences due to lack of CRC compliance • Reputation damage to the Council 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders engaged • Low Carbon Infrastructure Delivery Group established • The Energy and Water Management Plan • The Borough –wide Sustainability Strategy • E-technology monitoring tools being utilised 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	4	Impact	3	Exposure	12
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the Energy and Water Management Plan • Delivery of the borough-wide Sustainability Strategy • Reporting compliance with CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme • Corporate Greenhouse Gas Emissions reporting data • Emissions data for the local authority area (published by DECC) 					
Effectiveness of controls and	2					

performance indicators					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and update the corporate Energy and Water Management Plan Review and update the borough-wide Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan Implementation of continuous audit reviews and recommendations. 				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	EGP are primarily responsible for this risk supported by ETO				
Risk reviews completed: A Hunt, Sustainability Manager. September 2011 and January 2012					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	A Hunt	Designation	Sustainability Manager
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	A Hunt	Designation	Sustainability Manager

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	14	
Corporate Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Council Tax and Value for Money. Quality Care for Adults 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		Health & Improved Quality of Life for All		
RISK	Statutory targets relating to Adult Social Care services are not met.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services fail. Adverse impact on Council's reputation. Failure to meet personalisation agenda 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance management framework in place (now also captures PCT information). Established data flows on statutory/ national indicators and performance indicators. Monitoring in place within service – a range of weekly, monthly and quarterly reports overseen by Business Delivery Board and reported through to SMT Mental Health Trust engaged through Partnership meetings. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	4	Impact	3	Exposure	12
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance monitored against national and local performance indicators as per Directorate Performance framework. Action plans implemented, where appropriate, against underperforming targets. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	3					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	Ensure the roll out of the new operating model continues to address key personalisation performance indicators.					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Performance Manager/ Senior Business Relationship Partner (CWB)					
Risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J Walker, Performance & Partnerships Manager. April 2009; October 2009; February 2010; July 2010, January 2011 and August 2011 D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. August 2011 and January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah	Designation	CWB Senior	

Date			Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay		Management Team
------	--	--	---	--	--------------------

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number		15
Corporate Priorities	Quality Care for Adults	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		Health & Improved Quality of Life for All		
RISK	Major event leading to inability to deliver critical services to vulnerable people.					
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interruption to service provision to vulnerable people. • Financial loss to the organisation. 					
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business continuity plans under development within Directorate with supporting action plans actively monitored. • Plan development with providers. 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	3	Impact	3	Exposure	9
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	Action plan to develop business continuity plans monitored.					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	2					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete process of establishing business continuity plans • Establish programme for testing plans 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Deputy Director CWB			
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D Hanley, Deputy Director CWB. April 2009; July 2010 and January 2011 • J Walker, Performance & Partnerships Manager. October 2009, February 2010 and August 2011 • D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number		16
Corporate Priorities	All	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health & Improved Quality of Life for All • Better Homes • Positive Environmental Impact • Strong Economy 	
RISK	Failure to complete the Business Continuity (BC) Programme Project, resulting in an increased risk that the Council fails to deliver Council services in the event of significant disruption.				

Consequences		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to meet requirements of the Civil Contingencies Act, good practice and Use of Resources Assessment criteria • Failure to have sufficient plans in place at a service and corporate level to respond effectively to local and widespread disruption, including that caused by emergencies • Failure to continue the delivery of critical Council services including those vital to human welfare during disruption 					
Controls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set of templates and guidelines in place to guide service business continuity planning • Performance Business Partners have responsibility to support Directorates to review plans on an annual basis • Council wide Civil Contingencies Steering Group in place to plan testing of plans and to monitor the effectiveness of the plans 					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	3	Impact	4	Exposure	12	
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk				
Risk Performance Indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All services to have a Business Continuity Plan • Testing programme in place with review periods linked to risk • Corporate BC Plan to be produced • Service level and Corporate Business Continuity Plans to be tested. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators		2					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing plan to be developed by the Local Resilience Forum by April 2013 • Many plans have been indirectly tested as a result of the comprehensive Olympics testing programme • Business Impact Analysis documents are in the process of being updated 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Jayne Stephenson				
Previous risk reviews completed:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Harrison, Temporary Business Continuity Lead. February 2010; May 2010; July 2010 and January 2011. • J Stephenson, Head of Partnerships & Performance. August 2011 							
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	J Stephenson	Designation	Head of Partnerships & Performance		
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	J Stephenson	Designation	Head of Partnerships & Performance		

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	17	
Corporate Priorities	Preserving and Improving Educational Excellence	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Bright Futures		
RISK	Financial and other implication as a result of coalition Government policy to fast track initially "outstanding" schools and then all other schools to academy status.				
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant reduction in Dedicated Schools Grant. • Possible reduction in "buy back" arrangements of school services – loss of income • Possible reduction in purchase of authority wide service contracts e.g. Payroll, Grounds Maintenance, Buildings Maintenance, Legal, Audit, Insurance etc. • Human Resource implications – if we no longer provide services to a substantial number of schools then will not need to maintain (or be able to afford) current staffing levels – unless we substantially increase costs to other schools. 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All good and outstanding schools are eligible for independent Academy Status. All satisfactory schools may convert to Academy Status with good/ outstanding sponsor. • Underperforming schools will be compelled to convert as part of an Academy chain. 					
Controls	Monitoring the position of schools who have expressed an interest.					
Risk Assessment	Likelihood	5	Impact	3	Exposure	15
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twelve secondary and 3 primary schools have Academy Status. • A further primary school has been approved for conversion by the Secretary of State. • A number of other secondary schools are giving serious consideration to conversion. • There is a very low level of interest in primary schools. • Numbers under constant review. • Working relationships with schools that have converted to Academy status remain excellent. 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLA improvement programme in place. • Dialogue and review of SLAs agreed for 2012/13 has commenced feedback from schools and has been positive to date and School Improvement Services has achieved buy back of £120,000. • Programme of regular meetings with Academy principles to ensure effective partnership working continue to take place. • Academies have become members of the Schools Joint Negotiating Committee. • Academy schools are represented on the School Funding Forum. 					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue to offer value for money service level agreements to schools who become Academy Status. • To monitor closely the position regarding status of schools that currently have expressed and interest and to work with the Headteacher and Governing Bodies. • To continue the programme of meeting with Senior Officers. 					
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Corporate Director: CYPS/ Acting Corporate Director T&R					
Previous risk reviews completed:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M Woodhouse, Interim Corporate Director CYPS. July 2010 • D Brownlee, Corporate Director CYPS. January April, July, September 2011 and January 2012 						
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee	Designation	Corporate Director CYPS	

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13			Risk Number	18
Corporate Priorities	All Corporate Priorities	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	No specific link	
RISK	Continuity and availability of council systems, infrastructure and telephony services in the run up to, during and following the relocation of the Data Centre from Friars Court in Sale, to the newly built Data Centre in the refurbished Town Hall.			
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to continue the delivery of ICT dependent council services, including those vital to vulnerable or at risk groups • Disruption to back office services and citizen/business facing web content and forms and mobile applications 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced level of internal and external telephony services (land lines) • Accessibility of corporate information and records impaired • Negative impact on reputation 				
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed project plan and risk register being prepared and experienced technical member of staff allocated to do the planning, liaison and scheduling of the move to minimise disruption and risk • Request made to the Transformation Board for a Project Manager to be allocated to lead this work during the period September 2012 to end of April 2013 • Systems and services will be migrated in stages (with regression plans) as opposed to a single "big bang" approach, with robust testing and pre-planning carried out before any planned moves • Liaise closely with our vendors and partners such as Virgin and BT etc. to plan each migration • Plan and risk register will be monitored and challenged by the ICTMT on a regular basis in the lead up to, during and post any moves, ensuring lessons learned are incorporated in later stages as appropriate 				
Likelihood	2	Impact	5	Exposure	10
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk		
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign off at ICTMT of method statement and risk register prior to each stage of the move • Project monitoring • Adoption of a robust change control procedure to manage the work and any deviations from plan 				
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	3 – This is a new risk on the risk register, but it is felt the planned approach and monitoring will ensure the risk is effectively mitigated				
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work closely within ICT to ensure technical assessment and readiness • Brief T&R DMT and TPR in due course of plans and key dates • Communicate more widely with the business as part of migration, especially to confirm dates when systems or services may be unavailable • Waiver for additional hardware signed off, procurement can now commence • Move planned for the 4th/ 5th and 11th/ 12th May, 				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	ICT Management Team				
Risk Review Date	June 2012	Completed By	David McIlroy	Designation	Head of Business Change and ICT
Risk Review Date	July 2012	Completed By	David McIlroy	Designation	Head of Business Change and ICT
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Chris Walker	Designation	ICT Operations Manager

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012 /13			Risk Number	19
Corporate Priorities	Low council tax and value for money. Improving health and wellbeing of residents.	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Health and improved quality of life.	
RISK	The implementation of the new localised council tax reduction scheme is not implemented on			

	time due to the very short timescale and legal challenges are lodged over the Council's consultation process and Equality Impact Assessments.				
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor customer service. Delays in awarding council tax reductions to vulnerable people. Delays in recovering council tax debts. Inaccurate reduction calculations leading to overpayments. Risk to the Council's reputation 				
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal project management methodology will be followed. Programme governance will be established with regular reporting. Early decision on appointing IT supplier will be made. Extensive consultation will be undertaken with stakeholders. MORI assisting with consultation process. 				
Likelihood	2	Impact	5	Exposure	10
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk		
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key project milestones will be documented. Formal monthly reports to the Corporate Director will be given. 				
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	4.				
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Plan will be compiled by Head of Service. Reports will be submitted to the Corporate Director on progress. Monthly meetings will take place with the Executive Member. 				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Corporate Director – T&R				
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P Mather, Head of Revenues & Benefits. February 2012 					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Carl Lamb	Designation	Development and Support Services Manager
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Carl Lamb	Designation	Development and Support Services Manager

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number	20
Corporate Priorities		Improving Health & Wellbeing	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives	Health & Improved Quality of Life for all	
RISK		Public Health: transfer of responsibility to the Council April 2013			
Consequences		Transferred budget may not be sufficient to meet duties and existing liabilities			
Controls		Robust programme for transition. Detailed analysis of public health contracts			
Likelihood	3	Impact	3	Exposure	9
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk		
Risk Performance Indicators	Public Health Transition Plan				
Effectiveness of controls and performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transition plan is being closely monitored Detailed work on budget and contracts underway 				

indicators					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)	Continue to work closely with the PCT and Public Health colleagues				
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk	Corporate Director, Communities & Wellbeing				
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationships Partner. March 2012. 					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number		21	
Corporate Priorities		Improving Health & Wellbeing	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		Health & Improved Quality of Life for all		
RISK	Adult Social Care Budget 2012/13: Ability to implement wide range of savings proposals in the current economic conditions.						
Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficulty of implementing wide range of budget savings proposals destabilises provision with potential that people may not receive the services they are eligible for. Not delivering budget savings within agreed timescales leading to an overspend Potential risk to destabilising the social care market in Trafford arising from implementing wide range of budget savings proposals 						
Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular monitoring of budget at SMT and service level Robust plans for implementation of budget savings proposals Business Delivery Programme Board to monitor and manage savings delivery Performance data in place to identify trends in take up of service Market management and intelligence role of CWB commissioning officers 						
Likelihood	4	Impact	5	Exposure	20		
RISK LEVEL				High Risk			
Risk Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget monitoring SMT reporting Business Delivery Programme Board's role in monitoring and managing savings proposals delivery 						
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators	3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each proposal has agreed business case and risk rating Consultation exercise was completed Budget savings proposals being closely monitored. Performance data being collected on an on going basis 100% of savings proposals delivered. 						
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)							
Person or Group Responsible for management of	Corporate Director CYPS						

risk					
Previous risk reviews completed:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J Kay, Finance Manager and D Wagstaff, Senior Business Relationship Partner. March 2012 					
Risk Review Date	August 2012	Completed By	Anne Higgins, Jo Willmott, Jeremy Kay & Mark Grimes	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Deborah Brownlee, Linda Harper, Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Senior Management Team

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER 2012/13				Risk Number		22	
Corporate Priorities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Health & Wellbeing • Value for Money 	Link(s) to Community Strategy Key Objectives		Health & Improved Quality of Life for all		
RISK		Failure or delay in implementing the Local Welfare Assistance Scheme					
Consequences		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerable residents at risks • Reputational damage to the Council 					
Controls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model endorsed by CMT • Lead Executive Member identified • Steering Group established • Project Plan 					
Likelihood	2	Impact	5	Exposure	10		
RISK LEVEL			Medium Risk				
Risk Performance Indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery within the set timetable • Monitoring against Project Plan 					
Effectiveness of controls and performance indicators		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model agreed and endorsed by CMT • Agreed timetable and Project Plan • Delivery of model from 01.04.13 					
Improvement Actions (ref to action plans)							
Person or Group Responsible for management of risk			Corporate Director T&R				
Risk Review Date	February 2013	Completed By	Jo Willmott & Jeremy Kay	Designation	CWB Director of Operations & Finance Manager		