

Details of Risk					Key Controls/Mitigation	Residual Risk			Actions					Action Owner Acronyms explained
Risk No.	Risk Description	Trigger	Result	Owner		Probability	Impact	* Score	Description	Action Owner	Target Date	Revised Target Date	Action Status	
1a	Failure to effectively plan how the Council will deliver services over the 5 year Business Plan	1. Failure to have clear political direction, vision, priorities, and outcomes in the Business Plan. 2. Failure to plan effectively to achieve necessary efficiency savings and service transformation. 3. Failure to identify sufficient additional savings in addition to existing plans, in light of forthcoming CSR. 4. Worsening Pension Fund deficit 5. Legislative changes add unforeseen pressures to Council savings targets	1. The Council lacks clear direction for resource use and either over-spends, requiring the need for reactive savings during the life of the plan, or spends limited resources unwisely, to the detriment of local communities.	CD CS&T	1. Robust political leadership, strong vision, clear priorities and policies, developed through councillor engagement 2. Robust engagement with members of CLT and Councillors through the Business Planning process timetable, to ensure greater cross-organisational challenge and development of options. 3. Full consultation with public, partners and businesses during planning process, including thorough use of data research and business intelligence to inform the planning process 4. Stronger links with service planning across the Council seeking to transform large areas of spend. 5. Business Planning process requires early identification of possible impacts of legislative changes, as details emerge	4	4	16	1. Senior Officer exploration of transformative solutions to future budget challenges, in line with Council motion on 14 October.	SMT	Apr-15		G	
9	Failure to secure funding for infrastructure	1. Insufficient funding is obtained from a variety of sources, including growth funds, section 106 payments, community infrastructure levy and other planning contributions, to deliver required infrastructure. This is exacerbated by the recession and reduced government funding for local authorities 2. Significant reduction in school infrastructure funding in 2016/17 from £34m per annum to £4m	1. Key infrastructure, services and developments cannot be delivered, with consequent impacts on transport, economic, environmental, and social outcomes. This could also result in greater borrowing requirement to deliver essential infrastructure and services which is unsustainable.	ED ETE ED CFA	1. Maximisation of developer contributions through Section 106 negotiations. 2. Prudential borrowing strategy is in place. 3. Section 106 deferrals policy is in place. 4. External funding for infrastructure and services is continually sought. 5. Implementation of Community Infrastructure Levy 6. Strategic development sites dealt with through S106 rather than CIL and S106 7 Planning Obligation document in place for district's and CCC use 8. Lobby with LGA over infrastructure deficit 9. On-going review, scrutiny and challenge of design and build costs to ensure maximum value for money 10. Coordination of requirements across Partner organisations to secure more viable shared infrastructure 11. Local plan policies with District Councils	4	4	16	1. Assist Cambridgeshire City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy regime and setting charges 2. Assist Hunts DC in implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy regime. 3. Assist East Cambs District Council in implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy regime. 4. Assist Fenland District Council in implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy regime and setting charges 7. Investigate the potential for use of Tax Increment Financing and other innovative forms of funding. 8. Respond to District Council Local Plans to address infrastructure policy deficit at all stages of the Local Plan process. 9. Assist service areas define their infrastructure requirements to be pulled together within one policy document for use 10. Scope out potential for a more joined up approach to CIL and investment in infrastructure 12. Seek to maximise potential Basic Need capital allocations through submission of a robust evidence-based School Capacity Annual Return to the Department for Education. 13. Develop working groups with district councils to source external funding opportunities in growth sites (e.g. Big Lottery) 14. Develop a New Communities Strategy to provide clearer arrangements for planning for new communities across CFA	HoTIPF HoTIPF HoTIPF HoTIPF Exec Director, ETE HoGE HoTIPF HoTIPF Exec Director, CFA HoS&P SD S&C	Feb-15 Feb-15 Ongoing Summer-2014 Ongoing Ongoing End 2014 End 2014 Aug-15 Dec-14 Sep-14	2014 2014 Dec-14	G G G A G G G G G G G	HoTIPF - Head of Transport Infrastructure Policy and Funding HoGE - Head of Growth and Economy HoS&P - Head of Strategy and Planning SD S&C - Service Director, Strategy and Commissioning ED CFA - Exec Director, Children, Families and Adults
		1. Failures of Busway bearings or movement of foundations continue and increase	1. Significant and ongoing costs to maintain the Busway or restricted operation of the Busway to the extent that it will no longer be attractive to operators or passengers.		1. Monitoring and inspection regime in place 2. Defects have been notified to Contractor in accordance with Contract. The Contractor has failed to investigate the defects or correct the defects within the defect correction period.				1. Initiate negotiations with the Contractor to seek a settlement 2. Initiate legal proceedings against Contractor for the recovery of the assessed cost of correction in accordance with the pre-action protocol	ED ETE LGSS D of L&G	Nov-14 Nov-14		G G	LGSS Director of Law & Governance

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Version Date: October 2014

Details of Risk					Key Controls/Mitigation	Residual Risk			Actions					Action Owner Acronyms explained
Risk No.	Risk Description	Trigger	Result	Owner		Probability	Impact	* Score	Description	Action Owner	Target Date	Revised Target Date	Action Status	
26	Increasing manifestation of Busway defects			ED ETE	3. Causes of defects have been investigated and identified by the Project Manager	2	5	10	3. Prepare a strategy for the procurement of a contract to rectify the busway defects	SD S&D ETE	Feb-15		G	Service Director, Strategy & development, ETE.
					4. The Project Manager has assessed the cost of correcting the defects. Under the terms of the Contract this is payable by the Contractor.				4. Engage with bus operators, Busway users and prospective contractors to identify working methods that minimise disruption during the defect correction works.	SD S&D ETE	Oct-15		G	
					5. Independent Expert advice has been taken confirming that the defects are defects under the Contract and that a programme of preventative remedial action is required and will be cheaper overall and less disruptive in the long run than a reactive response.				5. Continue to manage defects on a case by case basis until the contractual issues are resolved, minimising impact on the public.	SD S&D ETE	Oct-15		G	
					6. Legal Advice has been taken confirming that the defects are defects under the contract and that the Council has a good case for recovering the cost of correction from the Contractor								G	
					7. Retention monies held under the contract have been withheld from the Contractor and used to meet defect correction and investigation costs.									
					8. Funds have been set aside from the Liquidated Damages withheld from the Contractor during construction, which are available to meet legal costs									
					9. General Purposes Committee have resolved to correct the defects and to commence legal action to recover the costs from the Contractor									
					10. Initially defects are being managed on a case by case basis until the contractual issues are resolved, minimising impact on the public.									

SCORING MATRIX (see Risk Scoring worksheet for descriptors)

VERY HIGH (V)	5	10	15	20	25
HIGH (H)	4	8	12	16	20
MEDIUM (M)	3	6	9	12	15
LOW (L)	2	4	6	8	10
NEGLIGIBLE	1	2	3	4	5
IMPACT LIKELIHOOD	VERY RARE	UNLIKELY	POSSIBLE	LIKELY	VERY LIKELY

* RAG RATING

RED rated risk
AMBER rated risk
GREEN rated risk

RISK SCORES

16 - 25
5 - 15
1 - 4

RISK F

[illegible]

REGISTER VERSION HISTORY

[illegible]

RISK SCORING MATRIX

VERY HIGH (V)	5	10	15	20	25
HIGH (H)	4	8	12	16	20
MEDIUM (M)	3	6	9	12	15
LOW (L)	2	4	6	8	10
NEGLECTIBLE	1	2	3	4	5
IMPACT LIKELIHOOD	VERY RARE	UNLIKELY	POSSIBLE	LIKELY	VERY LIKELY

Red scores - excess of Council's risk appetite – action needed to redress, quarterly monitoring

Amber scores – likely to cause the Council some difficulties – quarterly monitoring

Green scores – monitor as necessary

Descriptors to assist in the scoring of risk impact are detailed below

Likelihood scoring is left to the discretion of managers as it is very subjective

IMPACT DESCRIPTORS

The following descriptors are designed to assist the scoring of the impact of a risk:

	Negligible (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	Very High (5)
Legal and Regulatory	Minor civil litigation or regulatory criticism	Minor regulatory enforcement	Major civil litigation and/or local public enquiry	Major civil litigation setting precedent and/or national public enquiry	Section 151 or government intervention or criminal charges
Financial	<£0.5m	<£1.0m	<£5m	<£10m	>£10m
Service provision	(a) Insignificant disruption to service delivery	(a) Minor disruption to service delivery	(a) Moderate direct effect on service delivery	(a) Major disruption to service delivery	(a) Critical long term disruption to service delivery
People and Safeguarding	No injuries	Low level of minor injuries	Significant level of minor injuries and/or instances of mistreatment or abuse of an individual for whom the Council has a responsibility	Serious injury and/or serious mistreatment or abuse of an individual for whom the Council has a responsibility	Death of an employee or individual for whom the Council has a responsibility or serious mistreatment or abuse resulting in criminal charges
Reputation	No reputational impact	Minimal negative local media reporting	Significant negative front page reports/editorial comment in the	Sustained negative coverage in local media or negative	Significant and sustained local opposition to the Council's policies

			comment in the local media	negative reporting in the national media	policies
--	--	--	-------------------------------	--	----------