

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE

To: **General Purposes Committee**

Meeting Date: **10th January 2017**

From: **Director of Customer Services & Transformation**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **Not applicable** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To provide the General Purposes Committee with details of the current status of corporate risk.**

Recommendation: **It is recommended that the General Purposes Committee notes the position in respect of corporate risk.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Duncan Wilkinson
Post:	LGSS Head of Internal Audit
Email:	Duncan.Wilkinson@Milton-keynes.gov.uk
Tel:	01908 252089

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 In accordance with best practice the Council operates a risk management approach at corporate and directorate levels across the Council seeking to identify any key risks which might prevent the Council's priorities, as stated in the Business Plan, from being successfully achieved.

1.2 The risk management approach is encapsulated in 2 key documents:

- Risk Management Policy

This document sets out the Council's Policy on the management of risk, including the Council's approach to the level of risk it is prepared to countenance as expressed as a maximum risk appetite. The Risk Management Policy is owned by the General Purposes Committee.

- Risk Management Procedures

This document details the procedures through which the Council will identify, assess, monitor and report key risks. Risk Management Procedures are owned by Strategic Management Team (SMT).

1.3 The respective roles of the General Purposes Committee and the Audit and Accounts Committee in the management of risk are:

- The General Purposes Committee has an executive role in the management of risk across the Council in its role of ensuring the delivery of priorities.
- The Audit and Accounts Committee provides independent assurance of the adequacy of the Council's risk management framework and the associated control environment.

1.4 The Corporate Risk Register was reviewed by SMT on 15 December 2016.

1.5 This report is supported by:

- The Corporate Risk Profile (Appendix 1)
- Corporate Risk Register (Appendix 2)

2. CHANGES TO THE CRR FOR GPC TO REVIEW

2.1 Following the review of corporate risk by Strategic Management Team (SMT) on 15 December, SMT is confident that the Corporate Risk Register is a comprehensive expression of the main risks faced by the Council and that mitigation is either in place, or in the process of being developed, to ensure that each risk is appropriately managed.

This meeting of SMT, informed by the work of the Council's Corporate Risk Group, discussed and agreed a number of updates to the Corporate Risk Register:

Risk 9: Failure to Secure Funding for infrastructure

At the previous SMT Officers felt that the residual risk score could be reduced from a red to an amber risk. ETE Directors have approved reducing the residual score to Amber. Although the requirements for infrastructure remain very high and funding is likely to continue to not meet all needs, officers considered that the devolution deal and the funding opportunities that it provides, as well as the LEP growth deal, combined with the mitigating actions, justifies this risk being amber rather than red. This does not imply that funding for infrastructure will not be an issue but officers felt that the number of mitigating actions and potential funding sources meant that it was not appropriate to leave this as a red risk.

Risk 22: The Cambridgeshire Future Transport programme fails to meet its objectives within the available budget

This risk has been refreshed and renamed as 'The Total Transport project fails to identify and implement affordable solutions that allow service levels to be maintained' and has been approved by Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Directors.

General points from the Audit and Accounts Committee on 20th September 2016

As a general issue on risks, the Chairman highlighted three issues of concern that he had:

1. The risk that the lack of Council funds would lead to gaps in service provision and the inability to achieve the Council's aims.
2. The risk that the failure to recruit to low paid jobs could lead to serious issues, such as a lack of supply of care providers.
3. The need to look at not only the services the Council was providing, but also identifying those services that it ought to, but was not, or was no longer able to provide.

A response agreed by SMT is as follows:

1. The Business Plan sets out the Council's aims and objectives for the next 5 year period. Risk 1b, 'failure to deliver the current Business Plan 2016-2021', contains a number of controls and actions to ensure that the risk of not achieving the Council's aims is mitigated or avoided.
2. The Children, Families and Adults Directorate has a number of controls and actions focused on working with the care provider market to mitigate this risk, including working with the sector on recruitment, training and career development.
3. The business planning process looks at all services the Council provides, and, as noted in the controls for Risk 1a, includes full consultation with the public and the use of data, research and business intelligence to inform the planning process. All changes to services resulting from the planning process are supported by community impact assessments which are published alongside the Business Plan. The Council is now taking a transformational approach to its business planning, and in some cases is developing new services to meet need (for example the development of a

district-based delivery model in children's services, or the new Adult Early Help service in adult social care). The Innovation Fund has also been launched, to help people to stay safe, independent and well in their community, through this fund local organisations can bring forward proposals to respond to local need.

- 2.2 **Appendix 1** shows the profile of Corporate Risk against the Council's risk scoring matrix and illustrates that there are two red residual risks. Risk 1a '*Failure to produce a robust and secure Business Plan over the next five years*', and Risk 1b '*Failure to deliver the current 5 year Business Plan*' remains unchanged from the previous report to the Committee.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 Risk management seeks to identify and to manage any risks which might prevent the Council from achieving its three priorities of:

- Developing the local economy for the benefit of all
- Helping people live healthy and independent lives
- Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.2 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	N/A
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?	No Name of Officer: Tom Barden
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Mark Miller
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?	No Name of Officer: Tom Barden
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
Corporate Risk Register	Internal Audit and Risk Management OCT1108