

**AUDIT COMMITTEE – 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

**STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER – Full Review September 2014**

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 This brief covering note presents the draft Cabinet report for the latest review of the Strategic Risk Register (SRR), which has been programmed for consideration by Cabinet on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014.
- 1.2 This report forms part of the Audit Committee's assurance process where it was agreed that following completion of each review of the SRR, the Audit Committee considers the latest iteration of the SRR, and where appropriate, provides comments.

**2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 **It is recommended that the Audit Committee considers, and comments accordingly upon the outcomes of the recent review of the SRR, in relation to the management, challenge and development of the SRR, and continues to receive periodic updates as to the progress of the actions taken and their impact on SRR risks.**

**Contact Officers: Principal Corporate Risk Management Officer**  
**Telephone: 01226 77 3119**  
**Date: 24/10/2014**

## **Report of the Director (Finance, Property and Information Services)**

**CABINET – 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

### **STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER – Full Review September 2014**

#### **1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 The Strategic Risk Register (SRR) contains those high level risks which are considered to be significant potential obstacles to the overall achievement of corporate objectives.
- 1.2 Like all risk registers, it is important that the SRR remains up to date and reviewed regularly in order to accurately reflect the most significant risks to the achievement of objectives and facilitate timely and effective mitigations of those risks.
- 1.3 Following a review of the SRR in February 2014, a further review of the SRR was undertaken in September 2014. The outcomes of the review are detailed within the body of this report.

#### **2. Recommendations**

##### **2.1 It is recommended that :-**

- i. **Cabinet confirms that the high level strategic risks articulated within the SRR fully reflect the current position of the Authority; and,**
- ii. **Cabinet considers the content of this report and continues to commit to support the Corporate Risk Management process and the embedding of a Risk Management Culture**

#### **3. Introduction**

- 3.1 The embedding of a culture where Risk Management is considered a part of normal business processes is crucial to the successful delivery of the Risk Management Policy and Strategy and the implementation of good governance arrangements.
- 3.2 A robust and dynamic SRR sets the culture and tone for Risk Management across and throughout the Authority. The engagement of the Senior Management Team (SMT) in the Risk Management process through the ownership and review of the SRR demonstrates a strong commitment to lead and champion Risk Management 'from the top' and to further reinforce the continuing development of a Risk Management culture.
- 3.3 The risks in the SRR are owned by the Senior Management Team, with the management of individual risks being allocated to a Risk Manager (a member of SMT) and measures to mitigate risks allocated to Mitigation Action Managers (being those senior managers best placed to take responsibility to drive the implementation of those actions).

- 3.4 SMT is also responsible for ensuring that the SRR continues to clearly express those high level risks which have a significant bearing upon the overall achievement of corporate objectives and that they are being appropriately managed.
- 3.5 In order to provide assurance that the SRR is being appropriately managed, reviews of the register are facilitated by the Risk Management Section (RMS) on a six monthly cycle. The results of these reviews are discussed by the Authority's Directorate Risk Champions, and reported to SMT for further consideration and action. The outcome of this process is then reported to the Audit Committee and Cabinet.
- 3.6 This report provides a summary to Cabinet of the recent review, and highlights specific issues and actions for consideration. This ensures senior Elected Members are aware of the SRR and can contribute to its development. The consideration of the SRR by Cabinet contributes to the role of Elected Members in assisting in the development of strategy and contributing to the identification of high level strategic risks, rather than simply monitoring the management of the Risk Management process.

#### **4. Background and Context to the September 2014 Review**

4.1 The review that has been recently completed forms the third review of the SRR, which was significantly refreshed, following a 'zero-based' review of the SRR in May 2013.

4.2 The September 2014 review included:

##### **4.2.1 Consideration of the correct expression of the risk;**

Risk Owners are encouraged to consider risks in terms of Event > Consequences > Impact, to ensure risks are articulated in a full and meaningful way, that aids understanding.

Consideration is given to the allocation of 'We Will Statements' (sourced from recent reports in respect of Corporate Plan Performance updates) which provide assurances that the identified risks are linked to performance management metrics, which in turn are linked to Corporate Plan outcomes.

##### **4.2.2 Consideration of the level of 'concern' for each risk;**

Clearly, all risks logged in the SRR are significant. A 'traditional' quantitative Risk Management risk assessment of all SRR risks has been undertaken, and all of the risks logged in the SRR have been assessed as 'red', due to their high rating in terms of overall probability and / or impact.

Whilst risk mitigations are in place, and efforts are being made to ensure the intended outcomes of such risk mitigation actions are realised, the actual positive impact of these mitigations can often be hard to express in terms of the risk assessment itself, and ultimately, what are contextually small positive impacts on such significant risks may simply result in the maintenance of the assessment, rather than actually to improve it.

As part of the 'zero-based' review of the SRR in March 2013, the use of a 'Concern' level was implemented. This qualitative assessment gives the risk owner (or SMT collectively) the opportunity to consider the following dynamic elements of each risk, rather than focus on the traditional probability and impact assessments:

Concern Rating 1 (Red)	Concern Rating 2 (Red)	Concern Rating 3 (Amber)	Concern Rating 4 (Amber)	Concern Rating 5 (Green)	Concern Rating 6 (Green)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Little confidence the risk can be improved;</li> <li>▪ Unachievable Objective;</li> <li>▪ Difficult to influence; or,</li> <li>▪ Out of tolerance.</li> </ul>	Concern is between rating 1 and rating 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some confidence the risk can be improved;</li> <li>▪ Moderately achievable Objective;</li> <li>▪ Possible to influence; or,</li> <li>▪ Barely tolerable</li> </ul>	Concern is between rating 3 and rating 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confident the risk can be improved;</li> <li>▪ Achievable Objective;</li> <li>▪ Easily influenced; or,</li> <li>▪ Tolerable.</li> </ul>	Concern is less than rating 5

#### 4.2.3 Consideration regarding *existing* risk mitigation actions, as well as consideration of any *new* risk mitigation actions;

Each risk mitigation action is allocated a red, amber or green rating, in a similar way to the 'concern rating' (detailed above). Risk mitigation owners are also asked to consider a further assessment as to the overall progress and achievement of each of the actions. Of note is the fact that some risks may be logged as being 'amber' (or in some circumstances 'red') in terms of the overall Concern rating, but mitigation actions may be logged as 'Green'. The implication of this is that the actions being taken are on track, but due to factors such as the 'long-tail' nature of some risks, the action may be something that is aimed at *maintaining* the risk, rather than *improving* the risk.

Similarly, some risks may be logged as having a concern rating of 'green' with actions logged as 'amber'. This reflects that whilst the risk itself may be acceptable, the actions themselves may be less so. In these circumstances, attention should be given to ensuring the action is resourced to ensure it is able to deliver the intended outcomes. This is in addition to the '% complete' field within the register.

#### 4.2.4 Consideration of Future Council activity;

The current iteration of the SRR is aligned to risks that were identified in a Cabinet report (Cab.15.1.2014/6) submitted by the Chief Executive. Furthermore, SRR risk owners were asked to consider the wider implications of Future Council activity on the themes and issues identified within the SRR. This complemented existing activity within the Authority relating to the Future Council and the consideration of Business Units. It is envisaged that further consideration of the Future Council and the implications regarding Business Units will be reflected in further revisions to the SRR, which will be updated to reflect changing ownership of key activities relating, for example, to Safeguarding and Corporate Governance activities. Allied to this,

consideration of issues and impacts relating to the de-motivating and subsequent reduced morale of employees (through the Future Council change programme), and the resulting (potential) reduction in the capacity and overall good-will of the workforce to deliver services to the previous standards.

4.3 Cognisance was also given during each update meeting with the Risk Owner regarding any new or emerging risks that should be considered.

4.4 During the update meeting with the Chief Executive, the RMS was asked to ensure colleagues gave specific consideration to the following risk areas, as follows:

- OFSTED findings, in relation to Children's Services, including the Barnsley Safeguarding Children's Board;
- Child Sexual Exploitation, particularly in light of recent issues within South Yorkshire; and,
- The Customer Services Organisation (CSO) Programme, intended to assist with service re-design, incorporating the growth of online digital services.

4.5 All new additions to the SRR are noted in bold text within Appendix Two.

## **5. Outcomes from the February 2014 Review**

### **5.1 Risks that have worsened since the last Review**

#### **5.1.1 3023 – Failure to engage with Stakeholders:**

The main risk mitigation action ((18) Customer Services Strategy / Review) has been highlighted during the SRR review process as being at risk of slipping. This is despite robust and meaningful plans being developed by the CSO Project Team. The concerns highlighted during the review focused on the ability of the Authority, and in particular the capacity within Information Services to deliver the identified outcomes within the timescales planned.

#### **5.1.2 3030 – Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat:**

This risk reflects the concerns regarding the ability of the 'Future' Council to robustly respond to emergency events, as part of the Authority's statutory duties under the Civil Contingencies Act. It is envisaged that once the Future Council change programme is completed, activities to 'check and challenge' Business Unit's own resilience arrangements, as per 6.3.5 (in light of a revised Corporate Resilience Plan) may result in this risk improving later in 2015.

Although corporate emergency plans appear robust and are well delivered concern has been raised regarding the management of those incidents that are not 'significant' but cause disruption nevertheless such as those described in 6.3.5.

### **5.2 Risks that have improved since the last Review:**

5.2.1 There are no risks logged in the SRR that have improved since the last review in February 2014.

5.2.2 All risks currently logged in the Authority's SRR have remained static in terms of the level of concern for each risk. Despite the majority of risk mitigation actions having been progressed, the level of concern for these risks remains static. This indicates that of those mitigations that have progressed, most were designed to *maintain* the risk concern level, rather than *improve* it. This, in part is due to the significance of the risks logged in the SRR, many of which are of a long term nature, and despite best efforts to manage the probability and / or impact of these risks, there remains a significant residual element of negative impact. Furthermore, the uncertain environment the Authority currently operates in (with regard to Future Council activity and ongoing austerity measures) has also influenced risk owners to be pragmatic when considering any changes to the level of risk concern.

### 5.3. Key Strategic Risks

#### 5.3.1 'Red' Risks:

##### 5.3.2 3023 – Failure to engage with stakeholders.

Due to concerns regarding the CSO programme (described in 6.3.2) this risk is now logged as having a concern rating of '2', from a concern rating of '3' (amber) at the last review.

##### 5.3.3 3026 – Failure to achieve a reduction in Health inequalities within the Borough.

As per previous reports, this risk is currently logged as having a concern rating of '2'. It is important to note that despite this risk having been allocated a red concern rating, it is recognised that population based outcome measures are slow and challenging to change.

This risk also has one mitigation action logged as 'red' (see 6.3.3).

##### 5.3.4 3030 – Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat.

Issues described in 5.1.2 have merited this risk being allocated a concern rating of '2', from a concern rating of '3' (amber) at the last review.

5.4 There were no new risks identified during the review of the SRR. However, acknowledgement was given to the emerging Future Council strategy, and the need to ensure the SRR is updated to reflect this activity.

#### 5.5 Risk Profile:

The table below sets out the distribution of the SRR risks across the six 'concern rating' classifications:

Concern Rating	Number of Risks (as at Sept 2014)	Percentage (as at Sept 2014)	Number of Risks (as at Feb 2014)	Percentage (as at Sept 2014)
1	0	0%	0	0%
2	2	12%	1	6%
3	9	53%	9	53%
4	4	23%	5	29%
5	2	12%	2	12%
6	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average Risk Category Score</b>	<b>3.35</b>		<b>3.47</b>	

The 'Average Risk category Score' is calculated by examining the risk profile for the SRR, following each review.

Details of the average risk category score for SRR risks, from the zero based review in May 2013 are detailed below:

	Period			
	May 2013	Oct 2013	Feb 2014	Sept 2014
Average Risk Category Score	3.70 →	3.47 ↓	3.47 →	3.35 ↓

The developing trend regarding the Risk Category Score for risks logged in the SRR suggests that there is a small decrease in the overall scores, which indicates that the risk profile for the SRR is getting worse. This is clearly reflected in the risk updates detailed in sections 5.1.1 to 5.1.3.

## 6. Risk Mitigation Actions

6.1 Appendix One details the completed mitigation actions following the September 2014 review.

6.2 It is proposed to continue to log 'completed' mitigations on the SRR, until the next programmed review and subsequent iteration of the SRR is produced. At that time, it is likely 'completed' mitigations will then be logged in the 'Existing Control Measures' field within the SRR.

### 6.3 'Red' Risk Mitigation Actions

6.3.1 The following risk mitigation actions are currently logged as being 'red', which indicates the action may not have the desired (positive) impact on the risk itself, or the action is not progressing at the pace that was expected:

#### 6.3.2 3023 – Failure to engage with Stakeholders:

- (18) Customer Services Strategy / Review; Links to Customer Services Organisation Programme, which includes a broader restructure to bring together Customer Services functions. This also intends to identify

opportunities for other service areas not yet included in CSO programme - concern raised regarding capacity within Authority to deliver outcomes;

*This risk mitigation action reflects the concern raised by a number of SMT members regarding the capacity of the Authority to deliver the identified CSO outcomes on time and / or to the agreed budget.*

The concern regarding this mitigation has resulted in the risk itself being upgraded to 'red' status, as per 5.1.1, and therefore now warrants specific attention by SMT.

#### **6.3.3 3026 – Failure to achieve a reduction in Health inequalities within the Borough:**

- Development of Public Health 'distributed model' including the monitoring and reviewing of impacts and outcomes on Future Council

*This risk mitigation action reflects the uncertainties regarding the 'distribution' of activities from Public Health to Business Units, and their own ability and capacity to positively influence the outcomes of these activities.*

Whilst the concern rating for this risk remains static, the risk is still logged as a 'red' risk. The level of concern for this risk is significant, but it is appreciated the risk is almost impossible to mitigate in the short-term, due to the difficulties in changing peoples health and wellbeing choices and behaviours.

#### **6.3.4 3028 – Workforce Planning Issues:**

- (12) Organisational Development: Monitoring OD Strategy via Corporate Plan with subsequent reports to Scrutiny and FC Board to ensure managers are promoting the correct message regarding FC to employees

*This risk mitigation action reflects the concerns regarding the communication with employees by their Managers regarding the 'journey' towards the Future Council.*

#### **6.3.5 3030 – Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat:**

- Seek assurances from Business Units regarding their own business continuity planning and resilience arrangements to ensure they are robust and 'fit' with the Corporate Resilience Plan and enable services to be prepared for both significant emergencies, as well as more 'day-to-day' issues regarding for example, denial of access to a building, industrial action or significant IT issues that may affect the ability to deliver services at a local level

*This risk mitigation action reflects the need to ensure that resilience arrangements for the Authority remain robust and fit for purpose, both during the Future Council change programme, and beyond.*



## **6.4 New or Significantly Updated Risk Mitigation Actions**

6.4.1 The following mitigation actions have been newly identified, or significantly updated as part of the September 2014 review:

### **6.4.2 3021 – Failure to build the Economy of Barnsley:**

- (1) Jobs and Business Growth Plan - approved by Cabinet April 2014; and,
- Development of visitor economy approach, including the development of the Visit Barnsley website in partnership with BEP.

### **6.4.3 3023 – Failure to engage with Stakeholders:**

- Assessment of capacity within the Authority to be undertaken, to identify issues regarding resources to delivery CSO outcomes.

### **6.4.4 3025 – Failure to safeguard vulnerable service users:**

- Consideration of further Peer Review to ensure Future Council activity regarding the joining-up of Adults and Children's Safeguarding functions is appropriate: Rather than a Peer review, a report is being prepared to implement 'good practice' in terms of an independent Safeguard Board chairperson and, undertaking a sector-led improvement approach, with partners and agencies;
- (8) Stronger Barnsley Together: Programme Board now in place; Expressions of interest made regarding membership. Governance arrangements in place which includes the overseeing of the Executive Group being undertaken by H&WB Board, but full suite of infrastructure is not yet in place - this infrastructure is to be reviewed by an external consultant; and,
- Continuous Service Improvement Framework has been developed. It sets out how the partnership will continue to work together to improve the effectiveness of services for vulnerable children, young people and families. The purpose of this framework is to be specific about the key elements of the framework, so that they are collectively understood and effectively used. Good progress continues to be made around Improvement Board Actions.

### **6.4.5 3026 – Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough:**

- Commissioning of an external consultant to assist in developing a 'whole-Council' approach to Health Inequalities and the overall Council Strategy - overtaken by Future Council activity including the development of Public Health Strategy and Implementation Plan to enable the Director of Public Health to hold Service Directors to account regarding health outcomes that are now vested with service areas - reports to Public Health Governance Group and Scrutiny; and,
- Development of Public Health 'distributed model' including the monitoring and reviewing of impacts and outcomes on Future Council.

### **6.4.6 3027 – Failure to manage organisational change – 'Risk of Destabilisation of the Organisation':**

- (13) Employee Engagement: Summer 2013 and early 2014 Talkabouts complete and further Talkabout sessions planned for later in 2014; Middle

Managers Conferences October 2013 and May 2014; Employee Survey completed and action plan being developed; and,

- (20) Communications: Revised Communications Strategy to be reviewed.

**6.4.7 3028 – Workforce Planning Issues:**

- (12) Organisational Development: Monitoring Organisational Design Strategy via Corporate Plan with subsequent reports to Scrutiny and Future Council Board to ensure managers are promoting the correct message regarding Future Council to employees.

**6.4.8 3029 – Failure to safeguard information:**

- IT Business Plan produced and presented to 'check and challenge' session - now analysing other business plans to identify IT and resourcing requirements;
- Manage and deliver the refreshed Action Plan arising from the IT Security Health Check 2014;
- Phase 2 of Information Security Programme – roll-out of guidance and training to partners such as BH, Bull, NPS etc.;
- Programme of activity to assist in achieving Baseline Personnel Security Standard (BPSS);
- Review of current IT architecture complete - Action Plan has been developed and now requires delivering;
- Implementation of EGRESS secure email solution; and,
- Reviewing of processes to ensure a robust check of third parties / contractors / partners IG arrangements are appropriate and consistent.

**6.4.9 3030 – Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat:**

- Seek assurances from Business Units regarding their own business continuity planning and resilience arrangements to ensure they are robust and 'fit' with the Corporate Resilience Plan

**6.4.10 3031 – Strategic Performance, governance or compliance failure**

- SMT to review processes relating to approvals and decision making to improve efficiencies - new processes implemented including raising of Officer and Delegated limits and a less rigid process in terms of delegated reports - need to review outcomes in light of new statutory requirement for the recording of Officer decisions.

**6.4.11 3034 – Failure to deliver the MTFs:**

- Financial Monitoring (15 / 16) to ensure delivery is in line with plan.

**6.4.12 3035 – Loss of assets and resources as a result of a one-off incident of fraud / corruption / bribery or a sustained or widespread occurrence:**

- BLT awareness of increased risks; and,
- Creation of Corporate Fraud Team within Internal Audit Section from April 2015.

## **7. Assurance**

- 7.1 This report and the SRR will be submitted to the Audit Committee at their meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014, in order to provide assurance that these significant risks are being managed appropriately.
- 7.2 The Audit Committee have expressed a clear interest in receiving assurance from Cabinet that appropriate challenge and scrutiny of corporate risk management arrangements take place and engagement with significant risks through reports on the SRR will be a key source of assurance. The Audit Committee will be informed of the outcomes of Cabinet's consideration of the SRR.
- 7.3 The Council's external auditors, KPMG have recently undertaken an analysis of the content of Local Authority strategic risk registers. A report, prepared by KPMG (dated September 2014) was considered by the RMS, and a brief report was subsequently prepared and presented to the Council's Audit Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2014, confirming that the Council was broadly compliant with KPMG's findings, and no specific action was therefore required.

## **8. Future Review of the SRR**

- 8.1 Future reviews of the SRR are now programmed with other governance reports relating to Corporate Finance and Performance Management, in order for Cabinet to receive and consider governance related reports as a broad suite of documents.
- 8.2 It is likely that the March 2015 review of the SRR will focus on changes to the structure of the Council as a result of Future Council activity, as well as considering the impact of this, along with the progress made regarding the CSO programme against risk 3033 ('Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation - 'Failure to maintain current services').

Conversations with SMT regarding this risk, and risk 3023 ('Failure to engage with Stakeholders') suggest that more granularity is required to acknowledge the subtle links between the CSO programme, the engagement of stakeholders and the developing Future Council.

## **9. Delivering Corporate Plan Ambitions**

- 9.1 The SRR lists those significant risks which could impact upon the delivery of the Authority's objectives as set out in the Authority's Corporate Plan. Risks within the SRR are now linked solely to the Authority's Corporate Plan, in order to ensure that the register is focused upon those risks which are considered to be significant potential obstacles to the achievement of corporate objectives.

## **10. Risk Management Issues**

- 10.1 The report focuses upon the further development of the SRR and the contribution this will make to the embedding of a risk management culture throughout the Authority.

10.2 Failure to fully develop the SRR will present a significant risk to the successful implementation of the required Risk Management culture.

## **11. Financial Implications**

11.1 There are no specific financial implications arising directly from this report although there is often a cost in taking (or not taking) specific action identified through the risk management process. Most individual Cabinet reports have financial implications and so the application of good risk management is vital to ensure the most effective use of resources.

## **12. Appendices**

12.1 Appendix One – Completed SRR Mitigation Actions  
Appendix Two – Strategic Risk Register (full version)

## **13. Background Papers**

13.1 Various paper and electronic files and risk registers which are available for inspection at the Westgate Plaza One offices of the Authority.

**Contact Officers: Principal Corporate Risk Management Officer**  
**Telephone: 01226 77 3119**  
**Date: 27/10/2014**

## Appendix One: Completed Risk Mitigation Actions

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action Name
3024	Lack of educational attainment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (10) Barnsley Challenge: The Barnsley Challenge Plan has been refreshed and presented to the Challenge Board, and SMT. The refreshed Plan now requires approval by cabinet, programmed for November 2013; Approved and completed as at Feb 2014.</li> </ul>
3026	Failure to achieve a reduction in Health inequalities within the Borough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (7) Health and Well-Being Strategy and Board (13/14): Board established; JSNA undertaken, and inequalities identified; H&amp;WB Programme Boards now established; and,</li> <li>▪ (24) Integrating Public health roles and responsibilities and functions: Hub and Spoke model being developed; review of outsourced provision / contracts being undertaken; Public Health Development Programme established.</li> </ul>
3047	Failure to protect the health of the population from preventable health threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Health Protection Board to be established to provide assurances relating to preventable health issues; and,</li> <li>▪ Adapting to new ways of working / culture following transition into BMBC: Complete.</li> </ul>
3023	Failure to engage with stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (5) Volunteering Strategy: SLA in place with VAB to deliver core part of Strategy which is linked to Area and Ward plans. ESV in place internally - need to consider opportunities to expand the use of volunteers; Refresh of Carers Strategy may have impact on 'hidden' volunteering; H&amp;WB Board approved creation of 'Engagement Hub' which is intended to align engagement opportunities across all statutory bodies.</li> </ul>
3030	Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis of 12/13 AGS returns and sampling / challenge of returns (13/14);</li> <li>▪ Further development of Corporate Resilience Plan in liaison with Services and SMT;</li> <li>▪ Ad-hoc audits of schools Resilience Plans via standard school H&amp;S Audits (13/14);</li> <li>▪ Incorporation of Public Health into existing Council resilience and continuity plans and full refresh of Directorate resilience and continuity plans completed - submission of joint Flu Plan to Cabinet by H&amp;S and PH; and,</li> <li>▪ Analysis of 13/14 AGS returns and sampling / challenge of returns (14/15).</li> </ul>
3022	Inability to direct corporate strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Periodic review of Area Council Arrangements by Cabinet - to be undertaken in around June 2014 to ensure evidence relating to Commissioning and Procurement is included.</li> </ul>
3027	Failure to manage organisational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (14) Programme and Project Management: Capacity issues being identified and up-</li> </ul>

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action Name
	change - 'Risk of Destabilisation of the Organisation'	<p>skilling opportunities being developed - each directorate now leading on individual requirements; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (20) Communications: Revised Communications Strategy being developed and programmed for presentation to SMT.</li> </ul>
3028	Workforce Planning issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (12) Organisational Development: Organisational Development being presented to Cabinet 12/03/2014 which is linked to the 10 Priorities identified via Talkabout sessions; FC done including workforce strategy - to be monitored through Corporate Plan with subsequent reports to Scrutiny and FC Board.</li> </ul>
3029	Failure to safeguard information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (16) Use of Information Technology and Digital Opportunities (which has contributed to the identification of PSN CoCo related issues) - SAP upgrade outstanding;</li> <li>▪ Undertake annual IT Security Health Check to ensure compliance with Government Code Of Connection requirements (2013) and ensure the associated Action Plan is managed and completed;</li> <li>▪ Manage and deliver the Action Plan arising from the IT Security Health Check 2013;</li> <li>▪ Provide annual awareness to all staff relating to Information Security (13/14) - BOLD E-Learning package available - now 'policing' compliance; and,</li> <li>▪ Review current IT architecture and re-design where necessary to meet appropriate standards - Technical Architect post vacant and currently filled by consultant.</li> <li>▪ (22) Performance Management.</li> </ul>
3031	Strategic Performance, governance or compliance failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (21) Partnership Working (including focus on LSP): One Barnsley Partnership Governance Framework strengthened and streamlined.</li> </ul>
3032	Failure of partnership working / supply chains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (25) MTFS (14/15) - set and delivered;</li> </ul>
3034	Failure to deliver the MTFS - 'Failure of Future Council to achieve the required level of savings'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (26) Asset Management - report prepared, presented to Cabinet and approved;</li> <li>▪ Development of a range of budget saving options (KLoEs) to enable Future Council scenarios for 13/14 to be reflected in 14/15 budget;</li> <li>▪ Financial Monitoring (13/14) to ensure delivery is in line with plan;</li> <li>▪ Monitoring of Assumptions and Constraints within MTFS to ensure relevance, materiality and appropriateness, such as the provision for Equal Pay claims (see Risk 1630), and</li> </ul>

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action Name
3035	Loss of assets and resources as a result of a one-off incident of fraud / corruption / bribery or a sustained or widespread occurrence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the impact of the Digital Region Project (13/14); and,</li> <li>▪ Horizon Scanning with regard to general issues that may impact on LA Funding (13/14).</li> <li>▪ Develop and implement Fraud Awareness training for all staff via E-Learning platform (BOLD); and,</li> <li>▪ Ensure each BLT member undertakes annual Fraud Risk Self Assessment, and undertake analysis of results (14/15).</li> </ul>
1630	Failure to manage and make appropriate budgetary flexibility for Equal Pay Claims.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor and Review 13/14; and,</li> <li>▪ Escalate issue regarding around 500 additional claims relating to APT&amp;C issues - could settle on 'best terms' as not lodged as Employment Tribunal cases as yet, or could wait for legal direction.</li> </ul>

