

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

Risk Title IPP Formulation and Delivery	Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
<p>Risk Description</p> <p>Trigger 1: Failure to have clear political direction, priorities, vision and values. Organisation not sufficiently aligned to face challenges.</p> <p>Trigger 2: Failure to plan effectively (with partners) in order to deliver against approved Integrated Plan in terms of efficiency savings or transformation.</p> <p>Trigger 3: Assumptions in Integrated Plan regarding the wider economic situation are inaccurate</p> <p>Result:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council does not meet the needs of its communities • The Council is unable to achieve required savings and fails to meet statutory responsibilities or budget targets; • Need for reactive in-year savings. 	1	Leader / Chief Executive	Probability 2 Impact 4 8
<p>Reason for change in Direction of Travel</p> <p>Probability reduced</p>			
<p>Controls in place</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Robust political leadership, strong vision, clear priorities and policies 2. Full consultation with public, partners and businesses during planning process, including thorough use of data research and business intelligence to inform the planning process 3. Robust service planning; priorities cascaded through management teams and through appraisal process 4. Strategy in place to effectively communicate vision and plan throughout the organisation 5. Performance Management 6. Strengthened governance framework to manage transformation agenda <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Integrated portfolio of programmes and projects b. Routine portfolio review to identify and address dependencies, cross cutting opportunities and overlaps c. Transformation Board to review and recommend priorities d. Directorate Management Teams/Programme Governance Boards to ratify decisions 7. Rigorous risk management discipline embedded in all transformation programmes/projects, with escalation process to Transformation Board 			

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

<p>8. Integrated performance and resource reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Monthly progress against savings targets b. Corporate Scorecard monitors performance against priorities c. Budget holders monthly meetings with LGSS Finance Partner/External Grants Team, producing BCR d. Regular meetings with Director of Finance/s151 Officer, Portfolio Holders and relevant Directors to track exceptions and identify remedial actions <p>9. Rigorous treasury management system in place plus ongoing tracking of national and international economic factors and Government policy</p> <p>10. Limited reserves for minor deviations</p> <p>11. Routine monitoring of savings delivery to identify any required interventions</p>			
Action		Responsibility	Implementation Date
1	Review the Transformation Board's TOR in the light of experience to date, and reinforce the governance process where necessary	Head of Service Transformation	Complete
2	Establish 3 month cross-organisational review group to address predicted overspend within Adult Social Care (see risk 18)	Executive Director Community and Adult Services	January 2012 - Complete
3	Deliver training within LGSS on how councils can cope with a double dip recession	Director of Finance	June 2012
<p>Progress with actions <Indicate whether actions are complete or give progress update>></p>			
1	October 2011 - The Board membership has changed with Cllr Reynolds taking up the chair. The terms of reference were re-presented to the board for review which the board accepted and recognise that these will need to be robustly applied		
2	August 2011 – Review Group established with representation from CCC, NHSC, CCS and initial financial analysis and diagnostic work begun October 2011 - Action plan agreed by partners for taking forward Adult Social Care Review. Detailed bottom up costing work underway January 2012 – The work of the review team has been incorporated with work as part of the IPP process and the work of the Health and Well-Being Board, focusing on use of resources, investing in prevention, and managing demand. The review has considered a range of factors relating to the overspend, reviewing finances and costs in Adult Social Care, and has helped both to realign the budget for 2011/12 and develop a more robust budget for 2012/13. It is suggested that this action is closed.		
3	January 2012 – LGSS held the first in a series of workshops for LGSS managers at the end of 2011, equipping officers to support the rest of the organisation through a double dip recession.		

Risk Title Procurement and Contract Management		Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
Risk Description		4	Cabinet Member Resources and Performance / Director of Finance	Probability 2 Impact 2 4
Trigger: Insufficiently strong and consistent procurement and contract management arrangements				
Result: poor value for money, legal challenge, and wasted time and effort in contractual disputes				
Reason for change in Direction of Travel				
Probability reduced from 3 to 2 and Impact reduced from 4 to 2.				
Controls in place				
1. Contract regulations; procurement and contract management guidance and support located within the Procurement Team				
2. Procurement Policy				
3. Strategic Procurement Advisor				
4. Contract Management and Procurement Learning Forum				
5. Contract Management Board				
6. Category management model				
Action		Responsibility		Implementation Date
5	Rolling out Web based contract register in CCC	Director of Finance		December 2011
Progress with actions				
5	January 2012 – The central contracts register is now live and is in the process of being populated by service contract owners. The importance and benefits of populating the register with both current contracts and entering details of new contracts has been widely promoted both directly with contract owners and via briefing notes on Camweb.			

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

Risk Title Housing Growth	Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
<p>Risk Description</p> <p>Trigger: General economic downturn (reduced market liquidity and credit availability) and the dismantling of the regional planning structure and constraints placed on growth by the A14.</p> <p>Result: Housing growth fails to meet housing need, shortfall in affordable housing, re-emergence of unsuitable sites made subject to planning applications, and a lack of co-ordinated strategic planning. New communities cannot be delivered in their totality, undermining their suitability, viability and the provision of necessary infrastructure.</p>	8	Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning / Executive Director, Environment Services	Probability 3 Impact 4 12
<p>Reason for change in Direction of Travel Probability reduced from 4 to 3</p>			
<p>Controls in place</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint planning and delivery arrangements for major growth sites and strategic issues relating to growth. These arrangements allow joint solutions to be identified and implemented to address development financing and to respond to strategic issues affecting development finance. 2. The New Communities Service ensures effective leadership and coordination of the County Council's work in preparing for growth and communicates in a timely fashion with our key stakeholders, South Cambridgeshire District Council, City Council, Cambridgeshire Horizons as well as the developers, and advises the Joint Development Control Committees and Cabinet. The work has included mechanisms to provide funding to help ensure development will start – for example securing Cabinet approval for the use of prudential borrowing for secondary education at Cambridge Southern Fringe. 3. A Section 106 deferrals policy is in place to unlock housing sites where cashflow issues are preventing commencement of house building. 4. Joint statement by the County Council and District Councils committing in principle to the 2003 Structure Plan Strategy following the government's localism bill, which announced plans to withdraw the Regional Spatial Strategy. This statement is a necessary step in reaffirming that growth in Cambridgeshire continues to progress. 5. The Local Development Framework policy of obtaining 40% affordable housing where viable remains despite the intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy. 			

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

<p>6. The Department for Transport has pledged (Ministerial sign-off has been received) to make resources available to lead a study into the current issues relating to the whole A14 corridor. Ministerial sign-off has been received. It is hoped that this work will be concluded by mid-2012 in order for any proposed schemes to be considered in the next comprehensive spending review.</p> <p>7. New joint planning arrangements are being developed through the Public Services Board to agree the strategy for housing delivery in the area going forward.</p>			
Action		Responsibility	Implementation Date
1	Maximise investment in infrastructure and services from alternative sources of Government funding (e.g. Housing Growth Fund).	Cambridgeshire Horizons (lead body)	Ongoing
2	Work with the Highways Agency to continue to progress the key schemes	Gerry Corrance	Ongoing
3	Plan for managing increased congestion on the surrounding network due to the withdrawal of the A14 improvements scheme	Jeremy Smith	Ongoing
Progress with actions			
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan 2012, The Homes and Communities Agency was expected to respond to the Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan by the end of summer 2011. Informal discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency suggest that no money will be available for infrastructure, although this issue remains live until formal word has been received. Key transport infrastructure has been able to be delivered as part of the Southern Fringe growth site through the use of Housing Growth Funding and Equity investment, and work on the construction of housing has now commenced. Cambridge Southern Fringe will deliver over 4,000 homes, 40% of which will be affordable. 		
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County Council, District Councils and the Highways Agency have produced a brief for the traffic modelling needed to progress individual development sites along the Cambridge to Huntingdon corridor. Key points are to secure funding for the technical work and identify the necessary improvements and other measures that allow developments to continue in this corridor. A number of development promoters are developing mitigation measures in conjunction with the Highways Agency, which could result in a satisfactory 'nil detriment' situation. Detailed discussions have started between the Highways Agency and the County Council with regard to Northstowe. Department for Transport resources have been pledged to lead a study into the possible solutions to the current issues relating to the whole A14 corridor. Ministerial sign-off has been received. The Department for Transport hope to have the work concluded by mid-2012 in order for any proposals schemes to be considered in the next Comprehensive Spending Review. 		
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Cambridge Area Transport Strategy (CATS) is currently being drawn up. The intention is for this to be adopted in 2012. Jan 2012, The County Council is in the process of submitting detailed applications for short-term schemes to the Department for Transport. 		

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

Risk Title Infrastructure Funding Shortage		Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
Risk Description Trigger: Insufficient funding is obtained from a variety of sources, including Government growth funds, Section 106 payments and other planning contributions, e.g. CIL, to deliver required infrastructure. This is exacerbated by the recession and increased requests for deferral of developer contributions. Result: Key infrastructure, services and developments cannot be delivered, with consequent impacts on transport, economic, environmental, and social outcomes. Issues with repayment where investment has already been made.		9	Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning / Executive Director, Environment Services	Probability 3 Impact 4 12
Reason for change in Direction of Travel Probability reduced from 4 to 3				
Controls in place 1. Maximisation of securing developer contributions is achieved through County Council input to Section 106 negotiations. 2. A prudential borrowing strategy 3. Section 106 deferrals policy 4. External funding for infrastructure and services (e.g. from Government grants) primarily through partnership working led by Cambridgeshire Horizons. 5. Framework for bidding for transport funds under LTP				
Action		Responsibility		Implementation Date
1	Pursue the 'Single Conversation' with the Homes and Community Agency	Service Director Growth and Infrastructure		Ongoing
2	Jan 2011 - Assist District Councils in investigating and trialling the applicability of the Community Infrastructure Levy.	Service Director Growth and Infrastructure		Spring 2012
3	Develop strategy and investment priorities for Cambridge City and the surrounding area, taking into account the Government's cancellation of the Transport Innovation Fund.	Service Director Growth and Infrastructure		2012

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

4	Investigate the potential for use of Tax Increment Financing (working with Cambridgeshire Horizons).	Service Director Growth and Infrastructure	Ongoing
5	Arrangements to be formalised and implemented for a Greater Cambridge-Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	Executive Director, Environment Services	September 2011
Progress with actions			
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 2011 – The Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan was approved by the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board 23rd March 2011. The bid is in the region of £690m, of which £100m is for County Councils projects (agreed by Cabinet 22nd February 2011). The level of available HCA funding and whether it will all be used for affordable housing grant remains uncertain. HCA expected to respond to the bid by July 2011. Informal discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency suggest that no money will be available for infrastructure. 		
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan 2012 - Huntingdonshire District Council aim to adopt CIL by April/May 2012 with a Planning Obligations Strategy being implemented in the meantime. The County Council has two main concerns with the Levy – the presence of a £120m funding gap; and the County Council's expected share of revenue. Jan 2012 - East Cambridgeshire District Council aim to adopt CIL in October 2012. A draft CIL Charging Schedule has been circulated for consultation. The consultation runs from December 21st to February 2nd. County Council comments will be considered by Cabinet on 31st January before being sent to ECDC Baker Associates and Roger Tym Partners have been appointed to work with Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire and CCC and have commenced work to determine infrastructure requirements by Sep 2012. This will form the basis of the Community Infrastructure Levies for each of these districts. 		
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Cambridge Area Transport Strategy (CATS) is currently being drawn up. The intention is for this to be adopted in 2012. 		
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan 2011 - Government has confirmed that it is investigating the possibility of implementing TIF, although this is only conceptual at the moment and pilot areas are being sought by Government. The CLG Business Plan sets a date of April 2012 for proposals to implement local retention of business rates and TIF to be developed and introduced – no other dates are yet known. 		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan 2011 - Government approved the bid in the local growth white paper. Consideration is being given to the exact form and function of the LEP. 		

Risk Title Major Fraud or Corruption		Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
Risk Description				
Trigger: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non compliance with the internal control framework and lack of awareness of anti-fraud and corruption processes. 2. Increased personal financial pressures on individuals as a result of the current economic climate Result: The Council encounters reputational damage and financial loss.		New risk	Leader / Chief Executive	Probability 3 Impact 3 9
Reason for change in Direction of Travel				
New risk				
Controls in place <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Financial Procedure rules 13. Anti Fraud and Corruption Strategy 14. Whistle blowing policy 15. Codes of conduct 16. Internal control framework 17. Fraud detection work undertaken by Internal Audit 18. Staff awareness campaigns 19. Anti Money Laundering policy 20. Monitoring Officer/Democratic Services role 21. Publication of spend data in accordance with Transparency Agenda 				
Action		Responsibility		Implementation Date
1	Update of LGSS Anti Fraud and Corruption Policy	Head of Internal Audit & Risk Management		March 2012
2	Introduction of Anti Bribery Policy	Head of Internal Audit & Risk Management		March 2012

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

3	Update of LGSS Anti Money Laundering Policy	Head of Internal Audit & Risk Management	April 2012
4	Preparation of LGSS Fraud Response Plan	Head of Internal Audit & Risk Management	March 2012
5	Fraud awareness campaign to accompany issues of new and revised policies	Head of Internal Audit & Risk Management	April 2012
Progress with actions <Indicate whether actions are complete or give progress update>>			
1			
2			
3			

Risk Title Information Management	Risk Number	Risk Owner	Risk Score:
Risk Description Trigger: 1. Failure to equip staff and managers with the training, skills, systems and tools to enable them to meet the statutory standards for information management; 2. Failure to act appropriately when handling information held in any form to ensure it is secure, safeguarded and actively managed 3. Failure of systems and processes to support and ensure a coherent approach to information management (policy, responsibilities, procedures, tools and training) and information sharing. Result: 1. Adverse impact on Council's reputation. 2. Adverse impact on service delivery, as unable to make informed decisions 3. Reputation undermined 4. Financial penalties 5. Increase in complaints and enquiries by the ICO	New risk	Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing/ Corporate Director, Customer Service & Transformation	Probability 3 Impact 3 Risk score 9
Reason for change in Direction of Travel			
Controls in place Governance: SIRO, CIO, Corporate Information Management Team encompassing Information Management, Information Governance, Records Management, policies confirming responsibilities (see below) Data protection registration requirements Policies: Data Protection, Freedom of Information, Information Security Incidents, Mobile Devices, Code of conduct, Retention schedules, IT security related policies (computer use, email) Procedures: FOI, Subject Access Request Handling, Records Management, service level operational procedures, Tools: Encrypted laptops and USB sticks, secure email and file transfer solutions, asset registers (USB sticks, encrypted laptops) Training and awareness: Data Protection, information security, information sharing, Freedom of Information and Environmental Information			

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

Requests Advice: Information Management advice service (IM, IG, RM, security), Information Management addressed via the Gateway project assessment process.			
Action		Responsibility	Implementation Date
1	Development of an information management strategy.	Sandra Taylor	April 2012
2	Establishment of an information governance structure, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities and escalation routes (including system ownership).	Joanna Leung	April 2012
3	Information asset catalogue, including information asset owners, created via an organisation wide information audit to identify critical information assets and information flows and correlate with business continuity plans, system owners, responsibilities and accountabilities.	Sandra Taylor / Susan Rooke	April 2012
4	Define and embed information sharing protocols both internally, with partners and the public.	Sandra Taylor	July 2013
5	Development of audit/QA check of IG accountabilities across teams.	Sandra Taylor	July 2012
6	Roll out of EDRM to manage the information lifecycle (including information standards).	Sandra Taylor	December 2013
Progress with actions <Indicate whether actions are complete or give progress update>>			
1.	In progress – outline strategy developed. Requires input and refinement before presenting to SMT for approval.		
2.	In progress.		
3.	Additional resource recruited, audit designed, approval obtained from SMT, catalogue set up in SharePoint to manage the information, audit in progress. Timely completion of this exercise requires the active participation of information holding services.		
4.	For personal and/or sensitive information sharing: Data sharing partnership across Cambs partners set up and finalising the Cambridgeshire Information Sharing Framework. Accompanying Information Sharing Agreement template and Guidance written. List of active information sharing agreements compiled. Ongoing activity to agree info sharing protocols, based on information type.		

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

	In support of the transparency agenda: Open data working group set up to increase publication of Council data for reuse.
5.	Ongoing activity. Increased awareness through communications. Regular reporting to management teams on IG issues. Training continues in FOI, DP, information security and information sharing. This is now business as usual.
6.	Good progress against the EDRM project plan.

Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Risk Register
Detailed Risk Register extract for risks showing significant change and new risks – February 2012

Appendix 2

Risk Probability

Description	Descriptor	Scale
May only occur in exceptional circumstances, highly unlikely	Very Low	1
Is unlikely to occur in normal circumstances, but could occur at some time	Low	2
Likely to occur in some circumstances or at some time	Moderate	3
Is likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	High	4
Is highly likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	Very High	5

Risk Impact

Description	Descriptor	Scale
Insignificant disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Little or no loss of front line service No environmental impact No reputational impact Low financial loss <£100k	Negligible	1
Minor disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Minor disruption to front line service Minor environmental impact Minor reputational impact Moderate financial loss >£100k <£500k	Marginal	2
Noticeable disruption to internal business and corporate objectives Moderate direct effect on front line services Moderate damage to environment Extensive reputational impact due to press coverage Regulatory criticism High financial impact >£500k < £1m	Significant	3
Major disruption to corporate objectives or front line services High reputational impact – national press and TV coverage Major detriment to environment Minor regulatory enforcement Major financial impact >£1m <£2.5m	Critical	4
Critical long term disruption to corporate objectives and front line services Critical reputational impact Regulatory intervention by Central Govt. Significant damage to environment Huge financial impact >£2.5m	Catastrophic	5