

**CABINET – 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017**

**STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER – Full Review March 2017**

**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 the Council's corporate objectives.
- 1.2 Like all risk registers, it is important that the SRR remains up to date and is reviewed regularly in order to accurately reflect the most significant risks to the achievement of corporate objectives and facilitate timely and effective mitigations of those risks.
- 1.3 Following a review of the SRR in October 2016, a further review of the SRR was undertaken in March 2017. The outcomes of that review are detailed in the body of this report.

**2. Recommendation**

**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 Council; 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 within the organisation.**

**3. Introduction and Background**

- 3.1 The Introduction and background to the SRR is now included as Appendix One to this report. This details:
  - The context of the SRR in relation to the broader governance arrangements in place;
  - The importance of the SRR in relation to embedding Risk Management within the Council;
  - The management of the SRR;
  - The content of the SRR; and,
  - The review process to ensure the SRR remains a vibrant and dynamic document;

**4. Risk Profile**

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

Risk Concern Rating	Number of Risks (as at March 2017)	Percentage (as at March 2017)	Number of Risks (as at Oct 2016)	Percentage (as at Oct 2016)	Number of Risks (as at Mar 2016)	Percentage (as at Mar 2016)
1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	3	16%	4	20%	3	16%
3	5	26%	6	30%	7	37%
4	9	47%	9	45%	8	42%
5	2	11%	1	5%	1	5%
6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>

- 4.2 The total number of risks logged in the SRR has decreased by one since the last review in October 2016 (risk 3842 - Failure to ensure the transfer of 0-19 services that are coming back into Council control ensures customers remain safe, there is continuous service and that during and after the transition period customers remain safe) which has now been removed from the SRR and is now being managed at a Business Unit level.

The current review identified two risks that have had their risk concern rating reduced:

- Risk 3023 ('Failure to engage with Stakeholders') – was concern rating '3', now logged as concern rating '4': Reflects developments with regard to the revised Community Engagement Strategy that has been approved by Cabinet; and,
- Risk 3514 ('Failure to be able to deliver the ambitions and outcomes associated with the Customer Strategy Implementation (CSI) Programme') – was concern rating '4', now logged as concern rating '5': Reflects improved confidence to deliver the CSI programme.

- 4.3 Details of the average risk category score for the SRR, from the 'zero-based' review in March 2013 are presented below:

	Period								
	Mar 2013	Oct 2013	Feb 2014	Sept 2014	Feb 2015	Oct 2015	Mar 2016	Oct 2016	Mar 2017
Average Risk Concern Rating	3.70 →	3.47 ↓	3.47 →	3.35 ↓	3.5 ↑	3.47 ↓	3.37 ↓	3.35 ↓	3.52 ↑

- 4.6 The slight variance in the average concern rating is directly attributable to the removal of risk 3842, allied to slight changes to risks 3023 and 3514, detailed in section 4.2 of this report.

## 5. Outcomes of the March 2017 Review

- 5.1 The significant outcomes that are detailed in this document focus on:

- Significant / 'Red' Risks; and,
- New / Emerging Risks.

5.2 Significant / 'Red' Risks:

5.2.1 Risk 3026: Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3026 – Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough.	Director of Public Health
<b>Consequences:</b>	
Health inequalities persist. Life expectancy in Barnsley remains well below the national average. Such health inequalities challenge not just the health and social care services but every one interested in the future prosperity and well-being of the borough. <i>For more information, see Appendix Six.</i>	

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 often slow and difficult to change.

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Developing the Public Health Strategy and implementation plan including undertaking consultations regarding the Sustainability Transformation Plan;
- Further developing the distributed model by undertaking further refinement in 2017 including a full refresh of the model and development of an improvement action plan; and,
- Developing the governance arrangements regarding the use of the Public Health Grant by improving reporting arrangements between the Council and Public Health England.

5.2.2 Risk 3792: Failure to be prepared to assist in the event of an emergency resilience event in the region:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3792 – Failure to be prepared to assist in the event of an emergency resilience event in the region.	Director, Core Services
<b>Consequences:</b>	
Recent emergencies relating to industrial actions and flooding proves there is still an inappropriate reliance on the increasingly limited resources of the HS&ERS to manage and lead on the management of emergency events. <i>For more information see Appendix Six.</i>	

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Delivering against the approved Action Plan following a report to SMT;
- Developing the Councils overarching Business Continuity Plan, including infillings gaps within Business Unit arrangements; and,
- Liaison with colleagues within Environment and Transport regarding community flood resilience plans.

5.2.3 Risk 3793: Failure to ensure that appropriate disaster recovery arrangements are in place to ensure the Council is able to recover in the event of a business continuity threat or incident:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3793 – Failure to ensure that appropriate disaster recovery arrangements are in place to ensure the Council is able to recover in the event of a business continuity threat or incident	Director, Core Services
<b>Consequences:</b>	
In the event of a business continuity threat the Council will be unable to recover in an effective manner resulting in lost time and resources. Inability for customers to be able to access services and a lack of access to IT systems to enable employees to undertake their duties effectively. <i>For more information see Appendix Six.</i>	

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Working with the Health, Safety and Emergency Resilience Unit to assist in identifying IT related business continuity issues within individual Business Units;
- Developing plans and ensuring an appropriate location for a replacement server;
- Developing testing plans that will focus on people and behaviours; and,
- Meetings between Service Director (Information Services), Head of Health, Safety and Emergency Resilience and Risk and Governance Manager to unpick disaster recovery and business continuity arrangements.

### 5.3 New / Emerging Risks:

5.3.1 There are no new risks included on this version of the SRR. However, during conversations with Risk Owners, a number of emerging issues were discussed, including:

- Data Quality – increasing reliance on high quality data and information to assist in shaping services and measuring performance has resulted in increased pressure on the Research and Business Intelligence Unit; and,
- Adult Social Care – increased pressure on Councils budgets to cover adult care costs due to the implementation of the Care Act and issues regarding market building and an aging population;

As part of the next review of the SRR, these issues will be further unpicked, and included within the next iteration of the register.

5.4 Details of the risks logged on the SRR that have improved since the last review are logged in Appendix Two to this report.

5.5 There are no risks logged on the SRR that that have worsened since the last review of the SRR.

5.6 Details of all SRR risk concern ratings, including a direction of travel indicator to provide details of the ‘trend’ of the SRR risk profile are included as Appendix Three to this report.

## 6. **Risk Mitigation Actions**

6.1 The following risk mitigation actions have been logged as being ‘red’:

6.1.1 Risk 3792: Failure to be prepared to assist in the event of an emergency resilience event in the region:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3792 – Failure to be prepared to assist in the event of an emergency resilience event in the region.	Director, Core Services
<b>Mitigation:</b>	
Await feedback from SD BU6 following analysis of Community Flood Plans by Head of Health and Safety – outstanding due to structural changes within BU6 – Darton Flood Plan completed, five other Area Plans outstanding	

6.1.2 Risk 3034: Failure to deliver the MTFs and associated KLoE / Budget savings ‘Failure of Future Council to achieve the required level of savings’:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3034 – Failure to deliver the MTFs and associated KLoE / Budget savings ‘Failure of Future Council to achieve the required level of savings’:	Director, Corporate Services
<b>Mitigation:</b>	
Use of BPC Business Objects by Executive Directors and Service Directors (17/18) – Internal Audit Report identified a low level of compliance with BPC	

6.1.3 Risk 3699: Failure to ensure the Council’s commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation:

<b>Risk:</b>	<b>Risk Owner:</b>
Risk 3699 – Failure to ensure the Council’s commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation:	Director, Corporate Services
<b>Mitigation:</b>	
Development of shareholder role (SMT / Member / Cabinet level) to ensure the appropriate oversight of the trading / commercial activities is in place.	

6.2 Appendix Four details the completed / closed risk mitigation actions following the March 2017 review.

6.3 Appendix Five details those risk mitigation actions that are new following the March 2017 review.

## 7. Other Significant Changes to the SRR

7.1 Other significant changes to the SRR have been highlighted in bold text, and included within Appendix Six of this report.

## 8. Assurance

8.1 This report and the SRR (which is attached to this report as Appendix Six) itself will be submitted to the Audit Committee at their meeting of 19<sup>th</sup> April 2017, in order to provide assurances that these significant risks are being managed appropriately.

8.2 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.

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

- 9.1 Future review of the SRR are now programmed with other governance related reports such as those relating to Corporate Finance and Performance Management in order for Cabinet to receive and consider these governance related reports as a broad suite of documents.

## **10. Delivering Corporate Plan Ambitions**

- 10.1 The SRR lists those significant risks which could impact upon the delivery of the Council's priorities and objectives, as set out in the Council's Corporate Plan. Risks within the SRR are directly linked to the 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.

## **11. Risk Management Issues**

- 11.1 The report focuses on the further development of the SRR and the contribution this will make to the embedding of a risk management culture throughout the Council.
- 11.2 Failure to develop the SRR will present a significant risk to the successful implementation of the required Risk Management culture within the Council.

## **12. Financial Implications**

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

## **13. Appendices**

<b>Appendix One:</b>	<b>SRR Introduction and Background</b>
<b>Appendix Two:</b>	<b>Improved SRR Risks</b>
<b>Appendix Three:</b>	<b>Direction of Travel / Trend Report</b>
<b>Appendix Four:</b>	<b>Completed Risk Mitigation Actions</b>
<b>Appendix Five:</b>	<b>New Risk Mitigation Actions</b>
<b>Appendix Six:</b>	<b>Full SRR as at March 2017</b>

## **14. Background Papers**

- 14.1 Various papers and electronic files and risk registers are available for inspection at the Westgate Plaza One offices of the Council.

**Contact Officer:** Risk and Governance Manager  
**Telephone:** 01226 77 3119  
**Date:** 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The embedding of a culture where Risk Management is considered a part of normal business process is crucial to the delivery of the Risk Management Policy and Strategy and the implementation of good governance arrangements.
- 1.2 A robust and dynamic SRR sets the culture and tone for Risk Management across and throughout the Council. The engagement of the Senior Management Team (SMT) in the Risk Management process through their 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.
- 1.3 The risks in the SRR are owned by SMT, with the management of individual risks being allocated to a Risk Manager (a member of SMT) and measures to mitigate risks allocated to Risk Mitigation Action Managers (being those senior managers best placed to take responsibility to drive the implementation of those actions).
- 1.4 SMT is also responsible for ensuring that the SRR continues to express those high level risks which have a significant bearing upon the overall achievement of corporate objectives and that they are being appropriately managed.
- 1.5 In order to provide assurances that the SRR is being appropriately managed, reviews of the register are facilitated by the Risk and Governance Manager on a six monthly cycle. The results of these reviews reported to SMT for further consideration and challenge. The outcomes of these processes are then reported to the Audit Committee, and subsequently, Cabinet.
- 1.6 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 also contributes towards 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.

### 2. Background and Context to the March 2017 Review

- 2.1 The review that has recently been completed is the fifth review of the SRR, which was significantly refreshed, following a 'zero-based' review of the SRR in March 2013.

- 2.2 The current review included:

- **Consideration of the current expression of the Risk:**  
Risk Owners are encouraged to consider risks in terms of Event > Consequence > Impact, and these are logged within the 'Risk Title' and 'Risk Consequences' fields.
- **Consideration of links between Corporate Priorities, Outcomes and Risks:**  
Each Risk is clearly linked to a Corporate Priority, and these are logged in the 'Priority' field.

Clear links between Corporate Outcomes and Risks have been identified and logged in the 'Existing Control Measures' field, to demonstrate the relevance of risks to the Council's performance management framework.

- **Consideration of the level of ‘Concern’ for each Risk:**

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

Whilst risk mitigation actions are in place, and efforts are being made to ensure the intended benefits 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 *improving* it.

As part of the ‘zero-based’ review of the SRR in March 2013, the use of a ‘Concern Rating’ was implemented. This qualitative assessment gives the Risk Owner, or SMT collectively, the opportunity to consider the following dynamic elements of the risks, rather than focusing on the traditional probability and impact based assessments:

Concern Rating	Description
<b>1 - Red</b>	Little confidence the Risk can be improved; Unachievable Objective; Difficult to Influence; or, Out of Tolerance.
<b>2 - Red</b>	Concern is between Rating 1 and Rating 3.
<b>3 – Amber</b>	Some confidence the risk can be improved; Moderately achievable Objective; Possible to Influence; or, Barley Tolerable.
<b>4 – Amber</b>	Concern is between Rating 3 and Rating 5.
<b>5 – Green</b>	Confident the Risk can be improved; Achievable Objective; Easily Influenced; or, Tolerable.
<b>6 – Green</b>	Concern Rating is less than 5.

- **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, on a similar basis as the Risk Concern rating. Risk mitigation action owners are asked to provide an assessment as to the overall progress and achievement of each of these 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 risk 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* it.

Similarly, some risks may be logged as having a ‘Concern Rating’ of ‘green’, with actions logged as being ‘amber’ or in some circumstances, ‘red’. 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 which is included within the register.



- **Consideration of Future Council Activity:**

As part of the current review, SRR Risk Owners were asked to consider the implications of the transition to the Future Council model, in terms of the ownership and positioning of the risk, along with any issues arising that may affect the delivery of risk mitigation actions.

2.3 Consideration was also given during each update meeting with Risk Owners regarding any new or emerging risks that should be considered, or any risk areas that may be developing that could influence the consideration of exiting risks.

## Appendix Two: Improved SRR Risks

Risk Number	Risk Name	Reason for Improvement
3023	Failure to engage with Stakeholders	Reflects revised Community Engagement Strategy that has been approved by Cabinet
3514	Failure to be able to deliver the ambitions and outcomes associated with the Customer Strategy Implementation Programme	Reflects improved confidence to deliver the CSI programme

### Appendix Three: Direction of Travel / Trend Report

Risk Number	Risk Title	Mar 2017	Oct 2016	Mar 2016	Sept 2015	Feb 2015	Sept 2014	Feb 2014	Oct 2013	June 2013
3021	Failure to build the Economy of Barnsley	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 -
3022	Inability to direct Corporate Strategy	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	2 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 -
3023	Failure to engage with Stakeholders	4 ↑	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↑	2 ↓	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 -
3024	Lack of Educational Attainment	4 ↔	4 ↑	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↑	3 -
3025	Failure to Safeguard Vulnerable Service Users	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↑	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 -
3026	Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 -
3027	Failure to manage Organisational Change ('Risk of destabilisation of the Organisation')	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 -
3028	Workforce planning issues	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 -
3029	Failure to Safeguard Information	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↑	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 -
3030	Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 ↓	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 -
3031	Strategic Performance, Governance or Compliance failure	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 -
3032	Failure of Partnership Working / Supply Chains	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 -
3033	Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation ('Failure to maintain current Services')	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↑	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 -
3034	Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Strategy ('Failure of the Future Council to be able to deliver the required level of savings')	4 ↔	3 ↑	3 ↓	4 ↓	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 ↔	5 -
3035	Loss of assets and resources as a result of one-off incident of fraud / corruption / bribery or a sustained or widespread occurrence	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↓	4 ↔	4 ↓	5 -
3047	Failure to protect the population from preventable health threats	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 -
1630	Equal Pay Claims	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	Closed -	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↔	3 ↑	2 -
3514	Failure to be able to deliver the ambitions and outcomes associated with the Customer Service Organisation (CSO) Programme	5 ↑	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 -	-	-	-	-
3543	Failure to ensure the adequate supply of land for housing and commercial property growth	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↑	3 -	-	-	-	-
3699	Failure to ensure the Council's commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 ↔	4 -	-	-	-	-	-
3792	Failure to be prepared to assist in the event of an emergency resilience event in the region	2 ↔	2 ↔	2 -	-	-	-	-	-	-

Risk Number	Risk Title	Mar 2017	Oct 2016	Mar 2016	Sept 2015	Feb 2015	Sept 2014	Feb 2014	Oct 2013	June 2013
3793	Failure to ensure that appropriate disaster recovery arrangements are in place to ensure the Council is able to recover in the event of a business continuity threat or incident	2 ↕	2 ↕	2 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
3794	Failure to ensure the governance arrangements underpinning and controlling the emerging City Region Deal Devolution Deal enable an appropriate blend of risk and reward for the Council	4 ↕	4 ↕	4 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
3842	Failure to ensure the transfer of 0-19 services that are coming back into Council control ensure customers remain safe, there is continuous service and that during and after the transition period customers remain safe	Closed -	2 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Appendix Four: Completed / Closed Risk Mitigation Actions

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3024	Lack of Educational Attainment	<p>Barnsley Alliance Plan being developed prior to submission to Cabinet in November 2016</p> <p>Development of SEND strategy to meet the Council's accountability requirements – to be discussed at TEG – strategy in final stages of development</p> <p>Corporate Parenting Panel – delivery of service improvement plan which is monitored by the Safeguarding Governance Board and reported to Education Steering Group chaired by Cllr Cheetham – governance structures for 'virtual school' in place – monitor and review arrangements 16/17</p>
3047	Failure to protect the population for preventable health threats	<p>Monitoring of Health Protection Board (HPB) to ensure any system issues associated with working with CCG and partners are identified and addressed - ongoing discussions with CCG regarding Health Protection arrangements. HPB established – good engagement from partners and proportionate systems are in place. Emerging links with Emergency Planning developing</p>
3027	Failure to manage organisational change - 'Risk of Destabilisation of the Organisation'	<p>Talkabout sessions being developed for November 2016 with Chief Executive and Leader</p>
3028	Workforce planning issues	<p>Refresh of Corporate Plan to align it to 2020 outcomes - will also include a review of the Future Council Strategy which will join up the Future Council Strategy to the Workforce Development Strategy and also ensure the Future Council Improvement and Growth Strategy is more aligned to resourcing and financial influences</p>
3029	Failure to safeguard information	<p>Programme of activity to assist in achieving Baseline Personnel Security Standard (BPSS) - 2015 round of BPSS compliance included 1500 employees - specification moving - full time developer in place to work on scheme for 6 months</p>
3033	Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation - 'Failure to maintain current services'	<p>Development of new Corporate Plan 2017 - 2020</p> <p>Refresh of Future Council Strategy and Workforce Development Plan to align them to the Corporate Plan 2017 - 2020 (will include merging FC Strategy and FC Workforce Development Plan)</p> <p>Development of Talkabout sessions for Chief Executive and Leader regarding MTFS, Service and Financial Planning and Business Plans - November 2016</p>

## Appendix Five: New Risk Mitigation Actions

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3024	Lack of Educational Attainment	<p>Development of plans to ensure Barnsley Schools are in a strong position to implement the Progress 8 framework which is designed to encourage schools to offer a broad and balanced curriculum with a focus on an academic core at key stage 4, and reward schools for the teaching of all their pupils, measuring performance across 8 qualifications. This will also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Developing a Communications Strategy to ensure stakeholders understand the framework;</li> <li>▪ Continued liaison with schools via the Barnsley Alliance construct to ensure Progress 8 is embedded in BMBC maintained schools and,</li> <li>▪ Use of limited capacity within BMBC in terms of Schools Improvement activities.</li> </ul> <p>Development of School Places Plan which will be designed to influence and build external markets - plan gone to SMT</p>
3025	Failure to safeguard vulnerable service users	Safeguarding Awareness Week - ambitions include embedding Safeguarding into community activities via significant liaison with South Yorkshire partners to allow and enable them to learn from us
3027	Failure to manage organisational change - 'Risk of Destabilisation of the Organisation'	<p>Talkabout sessions being developed for May and June 2017 to be led by Executive Directors aiming to link new Corporate Plan to Business Plan via 'golden thread' and focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accelerating Growth</li> <li>▪ Marshalling Resources</li> <li>▪ Local Devolution and Area Council arrangements</li> <li>▪ Support behavioural change within communities</li> <li>▪ Dealing with the implications of Brexit</li> <li>▪ Using technology to maximise impact</li> <li>▪ Using Improvement and Growth fund to drive innovation; and,</li> <li>▪ Making decisions on what we will do more of, continue, do differently or stop altogether</li> </ul>
3028	Workforce Planning Issues	Delivery of Future Council Workforce Development Strategy
3029	Failure to Safeguard information	Training of new Caldicott Guardian – Head of Public Health
3033	Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation - 'Failure to maintain current services'	<p>Talkabout sessions being developed for May and June 2017 to be led by Executive Directors aiming to link new Corporate Plan to Business Plan via 'golden thread' and focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accelerating Growth</li> <li>▪ Marshalling Resources</li> <li>▪ Local Devolution and Area Council arrangements</li> </ul>

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support behavioural change within communities</li> <li>▪ Dealing with the implications of Brexit</li> <li>▪ Using technology to maximise impact</li> <li>▪ Using Improvement and Growth fund to drive innovation; and,</li> <li>▪ Making decisions on what we will do more of, continue, do differently or stop altogether</li> </ul>
3035	Loss of assets and resources as a result of a one-off incident of fraud / corruption / bribery or sustained or widespread occurrences.	<p>E) Communication of arrangements via training and awareness sessions regarding anti-fraud and corruption arrangements to publicise these throughout the Council</p> <p>F) Reinstatement of annual Fraud Risk Self-Assessment at Business Unit level</p>
3699	Failure to ensure the Council's commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation	Development of ILAH Action Plan to identify lessons to be learnt