AUDIT COMMITTEE – 20ᵗʰ January 2016

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER – Full Review October 2015

1.   Purpose of the 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 the 13ᵗʰ January 2016.

1.2   This report forms part of the Audit Committee's assurance process where it was agreed that following the completion of each review of the SRR, the Audit Committee considers the latest iteration of the SRR, and where appropriate, provides comment.

2.   Recommendation

2.1   It is recommended that the Audit Committee:

   I.   Considers, and comments accordingly on the outcomes of the recent review of the SRR, in relation to the management, challenge and development of the SRR;

  II.   Considers whether any further information regarding the SRR review process is required from the Risk and Governance Manager;

 III.   Considers whether any further information is required from specific Risk Owners, or Risk Mitigation Action Owners regarding the progress towards managing and mitigating SRR risk; and,

 IV.   Confirms whether the Committee wishes to continues to receive periodic updates as to the progress of the actions taken and their impact on the SRR, or whether the Committee requires a deeper level of assurance that could be provided through the provision of a more detailed or focused report.

Contact Officer:	**Risk and Governance Manager**
Telephone:	**01226 77 3119**
Date:	**7ᵗʰ January 2016**

CABINET – 10th February 2016

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER – Full Review October 2015

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 February 2015, a further review of the SRR was undertaken in October 2015. 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;

3.2   During the update meetings with Risk Owners, the consideration of the following areas was also explored where appropriate:

- Child Sexual Exploitation, particularly in light of recent issues within South Yorkshire;
- The Customer Services Organisation (CSO) programme, which has now moved into delivering Phase Two of the programme; and,
- The developing city region devolution deal affecting leadership, skills, employment business support, transport and housing.

4. Risk Profile

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

Risk Concern Rating	Number of Risks (as at Oct 2015)	Percentage (as at Oct 2015)	Number of Risks (as at Feb 2015)	Percentage (as at Feb 2015)
1	0	0%	0	0%
2	2	12%	2	13%
3	6	35%	6	40%
4	8	47%	5	34%
5	1	6%	2	13%
6	0	0%	0	0%
Total	17	100%	15	100%

4.2 The total number of risks logged in the SRR has changed since the last review in February 2015. However, the current review identified one risk (risk 3034 – 'Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Strategy (Failure of the Future Council to be able to deliver the required level of savings)') that required upgrading. This increase relates directly to the uncertainties that surround the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review and Autumn Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in November. The subsequent Local Authority settlement will identify a clearer financial position for the Council.

4.3 The inclusion of the new risk 3699 ('Failure to ensure the Council's commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation') has influenced the risk profile for the SRR.

4.4 The assessment for risk 3514 ('Failure to be able to deliver the ambitions and outcomes associated with the Customer Services Organisation Programme (CSO)') is now included within the Risk Profile for the SRR.

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

	Period					
	Mar 2013	Oct 2013	Feb 2014	Sept 2014	Feb 2015	Oct 2015
Average Risk Concern Rating	3.70 ➔	3.47 ↓	3.47 ➔	3.35 ↓	3.5 ↑	3.47 ↓

4.6 The slight variance in the average concern rating is directly attributable to the changes to risk 3034, detailed in section 4.2 of this report and the inclusion of new risks, as detailed in sections 4.3 to 4.4 and 5.3 of this report.

5. Outcomes of the October 2015 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:

Risk:	Risk Owner:
Risk 3026 – Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough.	Director of Public Health
Consequences:	
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. *For more information, see Appendix Eight.*	

As per previous reports, this risk is currently logged as have 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 demanding to change.

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Monitoring of the Public Health distributed Model;
- Development of the Public Health Strategy to ensure Service Directors are held to account for public health outcomes vested with Business Units;
- Development of internal governance and assurances arrangements regarding the use of the Public Health Grant; and,
- Investigation into issues raised by the CCG regarding pooled budgets.

Risk:	Risk Owner:
Risk 3030 – Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat.	Director, Human Resources, Performance and Communications
Consequences:	
The emerging risk environment is increasingly making continuity or 'resilience' a significant focus for all organisations. Reduced employee numbers, service rationalisation, third party service delivery models and on-going budget cuts may challenge the Authority's ability to fulfil its Civil Contingencies Act 'Category One' responder duties to an extent expected by residents and their political representatives. In addition, the transition to Future Council will lead to established emergency response arrangements no longer reflecting the Council's operational structure. *For more information see Appendix Eight.*	

Despite significant activity regarding the development of business continuity and reliance plans, there are concerns regarding the volume of volunteers available to delivery these plans.

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Reviewing the Corporate resilience Plan following the transition to Future Council;
- Seeking assurances from Business Units regarding their business continuity arrangements;
- Testing of plans;
- Development of a business case regarding a new Emergency Resilience role;
- The development of community flood plans; and,
- The development of community resilience plans with Ward Alliances.

Risk:	Risk Owner:
Risk 3022: Inability to direct corporate strategy	Director, Legal and Governance
Consequences:	
The Authority may be challenged by internal friction between Elected Members and appointed leadership, especially with regard to challenging decisions with significant political consequences or local repercussions. *For more information see Appendix Eight.*	

The Director, Legal and Governance has requested SMT considered the risk concern rating allocated to this risk, in light of particular activities within a Ward Alliances which has required the direct intervention by the Director. The risk *was* allocated a 'Concern Rating' of 3, and SMT have been asked to consider the upgrading of this risk to a 'Concern Rating' of 2.

For the purposes of reporting within section 6 of this report, this risk has been considered with its original 'Concern Rating' of 3.

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- Monitoring and reviewing Area Council activity relating to the Area Council Coordinating Group, the Area Council Commissioning Group and the Area Council Chairpersons Group.

5.3 New / Emerging Risks:

Risk:	Risk Owner:
Risk 3699: Failure to ensure the Council's commercial / trading arm (such as Independent Living at Home Services Ltd.) is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation	Director, Legal and Governance

A risk regarding the sustainability and effectiveness of the Council's commercial / trading arm been developed between the Executive Director Legal and Governance and the Risk and Governance Manger, to ensure this significant activity, closely linked to the Future Council programme is considered in terms of the Council's strategic risk profile.

The Risk Mitigation Actions for this risk focus on:

- The availability of commercial skills within the Council's workforce;
- Development of skills to produce and vet Business Cases;
- Development of internal control mechanisms;
- Development of the Shareholders role; and,
- Consideration of opportunities to 'pump-prime' activities to ensure the correct resources and infrastructure is in place.

During the review meeting with the Director (Finance, Property and Information Services), it was suggested that it would be prudent to consider developing a strategic risk regarding the emerging city regional devolution deal, which is envisaged to provide more opportunities to strengthen the sustainability of the organisation, by transferring a number of powers and policy levers from central Government to local leaders, including skills, employment, business support, transport and housing. It is likely this will also have a significant impact on the future of local government financing.

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

5.5   Details of the risks logged on the SRR that have worsened since the last review of the SRR are logged in Appendix Three to this report.

5.6   There are no risks logged on the SRR that are proposed to be closed since the last review of the SRR.

5.7   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 Four to this report.

6.   Risk Mitigation Actions

6.1   Appendix Five details the completed risk mitigation actions following the October 2015 review.

6.2   Appendix Six details those risk mitigation actions that have been allocated a 'red' status following the October 2015 review.

6.3   Appendix Seven details those risk mitigation actions that are either new, or have been significantly updated following the October 2015 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 Eight of this report.

8.   Assurance

8.1   This report and the SRR (which is attached to this report as Appendix Seven) itself will be submitted to the Audit Committee at their meeting of 9th December 2015, 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

Appendix One:	**SRR Introduction and Background**
Appendix Two:	**Improved SRR Risks**
Appendix Three:	**Worsened SRR Risks**
Appendix Four:	**Direction of Travel / Trend Report**
Appendix Five:	**Completed Risk Mitigation Actions**
Appendix Six:	**'Red' Risk Mitigation Actions**
Appendix Seven:	**New / Updated Risk Mitigation Actions**
Appendix Eight:	**Full SRR as at October 2015**

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:	**7th January 2016**

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 are then presented to the Council's Directorate Risk Champions, and 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 October 2015 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 October 2015 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' quantative 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
1 - Red	Little confidence the Risk can be improved; Unachievable Objective; Difficult to Influence; or, Out of Tolerance.
2 - Red	Concern is between Rating 1 and Rating 3.
3 – Amber	Some confidence the risk can be improved; Moderately achievable Objective; Possible to Influence; or, Barley Tolerable.
4 – Amber	Concern is between Rating 3 and Rating 5.
5 – Green	Confident the Risk can be improved; Achievable Objective; Easily Influenced; or, Tolerable.
6 – Green	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.

Risk Number	Risk Name	Reason for Improvement
3543	Failure to ensure the adequate supply of land for housing and commercial property growth	This risk was initially identified and developed during the February 2015 review of the SRR in liaison with the Director (Place) and the Risk and Governance Manager. During this initial session, the risk was allocated a concern rating of '3' (amber). Following this initial development, the draft risk was circulated to the Service Director Economic Regeneration, the Head of Economic Development and the Head of Planning, Policy and Building Control. Following their consideration of this risk, it was agreed to allocate the risk a revised concern rating of '4' (amber).

Risk Number	Risk Name	Reason for Improvement
3034	Failure to deliver the medium Term Financial Strategy ('Failure of the Future Council to deliver the required level of savings')	This increase from a concern rating of '5' (green) to '4' (amber) relates directly to the uncertainties that surround the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review and Autumn Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in November. The subsequent Local Authority settlement will identify a clearer financial position for the Council.

Risk Number	Risk Title	Sept 2015	Feb 2015	Sept 2014	Feb 2014	Oct 2013	June 2013
3021	Failure to build the Economy of Barnsley	Closed -	Closed -	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 -
3022	Inability to direct Corporate Strategy	3 / 2	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 -
3023	Failure to engage with Stakeholders	3 ⇔	3 ⇑	2 ⇓	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 -
3024	Lack of Educational Attainment	3 ⇓	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇑	3 -
3025	Failure to Safeguard Vulnerable Service Users	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 -
3026	Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough	2 ⇔	2 ⇔	2 ⇔	2 ⇔	2 ⇔	2 -
3027	Failure to manage Organisational Change ('Risk of destabilisation of the Organisation')	5 ⇔	5 ⇔	5 ⇔	5 ⇔	5 ⇔	5 -
3028	Workforce planning issues	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇓	4 -
3029	Failure to Safeguard Information	4 ⇔	4 ⇑	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇓	4 -
3030	Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat	2 ⇔	2 ⇔	2 ⇓	3 ⇔	3 ⇓	4 -
3031	Strategic Performance, Governance or Compliance failure	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 -
3032	Failure of Partnership Working / Supply Chains	Closed -	Closed -	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔	4 ⇔
3033	Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation ('Failure to maintain current Services)	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 ⇓	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 ⇓	4 ⇔	4 ⇓	5 -
3047	Failure to protect the population from preventable health threats	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 ⇔	3 -
1630	Equal Pay Claims	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	4 ⇔	4 -	-	-	-	-
3543	Failure to ensure the adequate supply of land for housing and commercial property growth	4 ⇑	3 -	-	-	-	-
3699	Failure to ensure the Council's commercial / trading arm is effective in its operations, and is a well governed organisation	4 -					

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3021	Failure to build the Economy of Barnsley	(1) Jobs and Business Growth Plan – approved by Cabinet April 2014.
		Development of visitor economy approach, including the development of the Visit Barnsley website in partnership with BEP.
		Skills Plan and Worklessness Plan to be amalgamated into the 'More and better Jobs' Plan – resources from People transferred into Place. Plans now being drafted and will be submitted to Cabinet in June 2015.
3025	Failure to safeguard vulnerable service users	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.
		Analysis of national guidance issued by College of Social Work includes recommendations regarding key posts and job families which may have consequences on grading, training and wider workforce. Report prepared and awaiting confirmation that it can be released and considered - full review now complete and new operating model is being developed.
3023	Failure to engage with stakeholders	Nesta Programme – development of volunteering capacity and capability in Barnsley.
		Formal review of third sector in Barnsley.
3022	Inability to direct corporate strategy	Area Council Officer Coordinating Group to unpick issues relating to Area Governance - developing Member Protocol to deal with potential tensions within Ward Alliances.
		Area Council Commissioning Group to unpick issues relating to procurement and commissioning.
		Area Council Chairperson Group to encourage cooperation and consensus amongst Area Councils.
3027	Failure to manage organisational change (Risk of destabilisation of the organisation)	(19) Equality Priorities / Groups (including oversight by Corporate Equalities group): SMT to look at the strategic needs of the Corporate Equalities group in order to support and drive progress - looking for greater overall consistency between Directorates; 'Excellence' now achieved.
3033	Failure to adapt the Authority into a sustainable organisation (Failure to maintain current services)	Development of new Corporate Plan
3034	Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Strategy	Enhance use of SAP desktop, and associated training (Performance Indicator

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
	(Failure of the Future Council to achieve the required level of savings)	CH22)
		Financial Monitoring (14/15) to ensure delivery is in line with plan
		Horizon Scanning with regard to general issues that may impact of LA funding (14/15)

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3026	Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough	Investigation into issues raised by CCG regarding pooled budgets and the potential impact on vulnerable groups such as 0-5 services, health visitors and substance misuse services as a result of funding voids
3030	Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat	Review of Corporate Resilience Plan to ensure it remains fit for purpose following FC activity - reinvigoration of Silver Team and options papers being developed for SMT regarding support required to attend and manage incidents

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3543	Failure to ensure the adequate supply of land for housing and commercial property growth	Delivery of SCRIF programme 15/16
		Developer Forums 15/16
		Progression of Devolution Deal - development of deal, consideration of impacts, strategic planning and governance issues and the duty to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to planning of sustainable development
		Consideration of funding opportunities regarding the delivery of the Local Plan
		Development of SCR infrastructure plan - draft due at end of November 2015
3024	Lack of educational attainment	Barnsley Alliance Board in place with representation at chair-person level from Primary and Secondary Schools - strategic view to be taken regarding opportunities to accelerate progress
		Development of a revised approach to assessing performance in schools
3026	Failure to safeguard vulnerable service users	Consolidation of Adults Social Care peer review Action Plan
3026	Failure to achieve a reduction in health inequalities within the Borough	Investigation into issues raised by CCG regarding pooled budgets and the potential impact on vulnerable groups such as 0-5 services, health visitors and substance misuse services as a result of funding voids
3023	Failure to engage with stakeholders	Community Offer now included in Community Wellbeing - **to include and bring together Think Family, Anti Poverty and Engagement themes. Need to build infrastructure and governance arrangements.**
		Building Community Capacity event in February 2015 - intended to provide support to fledgling companies and assisting in supporting communities to develop. **Community Capacity building is part of the VAB contract and this is being reviewed as part of the broader Voluntary Sector Review, which will be undertaken by 'Rocket Science'.**
3030	Failure to be prepared for an emergency response or business continuity threat	Development of a business case to recruit to the Humanitarian Assistance Officer role
		Development of Community Flood Plans - due for completion at end of September 2015 for river Dearne and Dove areas which link to EA flood warnings and will comprise escalating/incremental plans. These will be passed to relevant Area Councils for comment and will provoke further consideration regarding resourcing internally (flood liaison roles) and externally (community flood warden roles)
		Encouraging Ward Alliances to consider and develop Community Resilience Plans - Head of H&S visiting Ward Alliances

Risk Number	Risk Name	Risk Mitigation Action
3022	Inability to direct corporate strategy	Monitor and Review Area Council activity (in terms of Area Council Coordinating Group, Area Council Commissioning Group and Area Council Chairperson Group) 15/16
3029	Failure to safeguard information	Consideration of Cloud based infrastructure (on a case by case basis) to progress and enable a proportionate Electronic Content Management System
3034	Failure to deliver the Medium Term Financial Strategy (Failure to of the Future Council to deliver the required level of savings)	Use of BPC Business Objects by Executive and Service Directors (16/17)
		MTFS (16/17) – budget savings agreed, need to refer back to members for final approval
		Financial monitoring (16/17) to ensure delivery is in line with plan
		Full review of MTFS to be undertaken following Autumn Statement - to ensure relevance, materiality and appropriateness, such as the provision for Care Act implementation, Equal Pay claims and the impact of Digital Region along with assumptions regarding the Council's Capital Programme (16/17)