# Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

Annex 1 **Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
L1 Page 277	ASC2, 29 BUS01 CAC2 CSF4, EAI1, 3 FR72, 85	<ul> <li>Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2015-20</li> <li>Failure to achieve the MTFP, which could be as a result of: <ul> <li>not achieving savings</li> <li>additional service demand and/or</li> <li>over optimistic funding levels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>As a consequence, lowers the council's financial resilience and could lead to adverse long term consequences for services if Members fail to take necessary decisions.</li> </ul>	High	<ul> <li>Monthly reporting to Continuous Improvement and Productivity Network and Cabinet on the forecast outturn position is clear about the impacts on future years and enables prompt management action (that will be discussed informally with Cabinet)</li> <li>Budget Support meetings (Chief Executive and Director of Finance) continue to review and challenge the robustness of MTFP delivery plans and report back to Cabinet as necessary</li> <li>Clear management action reported promptly detailing alternative savings / income if original plans become non deliverable or funding levels alter in year</li> <li>Monthly formal budget reports focus on funding levels comparing actual spend to forecasts</li> <li>Budget planning discussions with Cabinet and Select Committees</li> <li>Formal review of MTFP (2015-20) planned for summer 2015 once the new Government is formed.</li> </ul>		Director of Finance	High
L6	CSF2,3	Safeguarding – Children's Services Avoidable failure in Children's Services, through action or inaction, including child sexual exploitation, leads to serious harm, death or a major impact on individual well being.	High	<ul> <li>Working within the frameworks established by the Children's Safeguarding Board ensures the council's policies and procedures are up to date and based on good practice.</li> <li>ASC and CSF are working as key stakeholders in the further development of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub at Guildford Police Station.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Timely interventions by well recruited, trained, supervised and managed professionals ensures appropriate actions are taken to safeguard and promote the well being of children in Surrey.</li> <li>Robust quality assurance and</li> </ul>	Strategic Director for Children's Schools and Families	High

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office

CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

#### Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
Page 278	ASC31, 32	Safeguarding – Adult Social Care Avoidable failure in Adult Social Care, through action or inaction, leads to serious harm, death or a major impact on individual wellbeing.	High	<ul> <li>Working within the framework established by the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board ensures that the council's policies and procedures are up to date and based on good practice.</li> <li>A revised safeguarding structure is being put in place following a Peer Review.</li> <li>Implications of the Care Act 2014 are being consulted on.</li> <li>Adult Social Care and Children, Schools and Families are working as key stakeholders in the further development of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub at Guildford Police Station.</li> <li>Close involvement by Associate Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care in safeguarding functions.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>management systems in place to identify and implement any key areas of learning so safeguarding practice can be improved.</li> <li>The Children's Safeguarding board (chaired by an independent person) comprises senior managers from the County Council and other agencies facilitating prompt decision making and ensuring best practice.</li> <li>Continue to work with the Independent Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board to ensure feedback and recommendations from case reviews are used to inform learning and social work practice.</li> <li>Agree and imbed agreed changes resulting from Care Act 2014 consultation.</li> <li>Recruitment to vacancies in area safeguarding and Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub roles February 2015.</li> </ul>	Strategic Director for Adult Social Care	High
L2	ASC24,	Central Government policy	High	Effective horizon scanning to ensure	- Working in partnership with	Strategic	High

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure FR = Fire and Rescue

12

## Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
Page 279	29	development Central Government policy changes, in particular the Care Act, may put additional pressure on demand for all public services leading to an erosion of financial resilience and ability to deliver statutory and essential services.		<ul> <li>thorough understanding of intended policy changes</li> <li>Implementation of a welfare reform programme including districts and boroughs covering: <ul> <li>Advice and information</li> <li>Financial resilience</li> <li>Emergency assistance</li> <li>Localisation of council tax support</li> <li>Housing and homelessness</li> <li>Employment training and support</li> </ul> </li> <li>Taking opportunities to influence central Government policy development e.g. via the Local Government Association.</li> <li>The Welfare Reform Task Group is monitoring the implementation of its recommendations, which are intended to manage the implementation of reforms on Surrey Residents. The Task Group reports regularly to the Council Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>other statutory partners (e.g. Clinical Commissioning Groups CCG's) to maximise opportunities for communities</li> <li>Members take the opportunities and make the necessary decisions to influence central Government</li> <li>Care Act Implementation Board in place and project programme set up to support ongoing discussion with partners. Through Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), SCC leading best practice model in relation to financial management and working closely with Department of Health in the development of regulations that underpin the Care Act.</li> </ul>	Director for Adult Social Care	
L4	ASC9 CEO13	Integration of health and social care Failure in partnership working reduces our ability to: - co-ordinate/integrate health and social care services; - improve health outcomes; and - develop a financially sustainable model.	High	<ul> <li>Governance arrangements:</li> <li>robust partnership governance arrangements are in place through the Better Care Board, Public Sector Transformation programme and Surrey's Heath and Wellbeing Board</li> <li>regular monitoring of progress and risks against key H&amp;SC integration workstreams and agreed financial governance framework (including the Better Care Fund)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>National approval of Surrey's Better Care Fund plan (which includes agreed financial plans, metrics to measure progress and risk sharing arrangements).</li> <li>Progress discussions with Clinical Commissioning Groups in Surrey about plans</li> </ul>	Assistant Chief Executive	High

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

#### <u>Annex 1</u>

#### Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk		Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
Page 280				<ul> <li>prioritisation of resources and clear senior leadership across Council directorates to support the development of H&amp;SC workstreams.</li> <li>continued focus on building and maintaining strong relationship with partners through regular formal and informal dialogue</li> <li>Surrey Better Care Fund plan now approved by Surrey's Health &amp; Well-Being Board and has been submitted to Department of Health for approval</li> <li>Formal pooling agreements (section 75 agreements) being developed for the operation of the Better Care Fund, for approval by the County and each CCG ahead of the start date from April 2015.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>for integration beyond the Better Care Fund.</li> <li>Inclusion of key partners in local whole systems planning.</li> <li>Members continue to endorse approaches to integration across the County (and formally approve Sec 75 agreements for BCF).</li> </ul>		
L5	BUS02	<ul> <li>Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 2015</li> <li>Risk that CSR 2015: <ul> <li>reduces further the total public sector funding available, and</li> <li>introduces a revised distribution mechanism</li> </ul> </li> <li>which lowers the councils financial resilience.</li> </ul>	High	<ul> <li>Contribution to Local Government Commission to review LG Funding and development of scenarios for budget planning process is ongoing and will continue throughout 2015.</li> <li>Officers (Finance and Policy in particular) to sustain pro-active horizon scanning for insight into potential funding change.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cabinet fully consider the implications of CSR in budget planning and agree an MTFP that reflects likely impacts.</li> </ul>	Director of Finance	High
L3	EAI2	Waste Failure to deliver the key elements of the waste strategy leads to negative financial and reputational impact.	High	<ul> <li>Implementation monitored by the Waste Programme Delivery Board with strategic overview provided by the Strategic Waste Board</li> <li>All major decisions are reported to Cabinet on a regular basis</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strong resourcing and project management regime in place to ensure prompt resolution of any issues that may hinder progress.</li> <li>Collaborative work with</li> </ul>	Director of Environment and Infrastructure	Medium

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office

CSF = Children, Schools and Families

EAI = Environment and Infrastructure



## Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk		Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
Pag				<ul> <li>Cabinet paper in November outlined a strategy to work towards a single waste authority.</li> <li>Joint strategic partnership reinforces collaboration and will, if successful, strengthen the ability to deliver the key elements of the waste strategy</li> <li>Support from external strategic advisors assists senior officers in management and mitigation of key technical, financial and legal risks.</li> <li>Senior officers working closely with Government departments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Districts and Boroughs is delivered through the Surrey Waste Partnership with close involvement of all Surrey Chief Executives</li> <li>The Waste Programme Delivery Board comprises senior managers from the service together with Procurement and Finance and is chaired by the Assistant Director Environment facilitating prompt decision making.</li> </ul>		
ge 281	ASC2 BUS07, 11,12 CSF4 EAI1	Future Funding The council is highly dependent on Council Tax for funding, and the ability to increase that in real terms is constrained (by current Government policy). This could lead to a reduction in the council's financial resilience with the consequence that funding for key services will be seriously eroded.	High	<ul> <li>Structured approach to ensuring Government understands the council's Council Tax strategy and high dependence</li> <li>Targeted focus with Government to secure a greater share of funding for specific demand led pressures (in particular School Basic Need)</li> <li>Continued horizon scanning of the financial implications of existing and future Government policy changes</li> <li>Development of alternative / new sources of funding (e.g. bidding for grants)</li> <li>Review how systems and processes can lead to greater efficiencies.</li> <li>Notwithstanding actions above, there is a significant risk of Central Government policy changes /austerity measures impacting on the council's long term financial resilience.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Members make decisions to reduce spending and or generate alternative sources of funding, where necessary, in a timely manner.</li> <li>Officers unable to recommend MTFP unless a credible sustainable budget is proposed.</li> </ul>	Director of Finance	Medium

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

#### <u>Annex 1</u>

### Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

		Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months) Owner: David McNulty								
Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)			
L8 Page	ASC31, 32,34 BUS01 CSF3,4 CEO7 EAI2,14	<b>Reputation</b> A significant failure to deliver within the organisation (caused by an event or individual), could lead to a loss of trust and confidence in the organisation by external stakeholders (e.g. residents, Government, Partners) or internal staff, affecting our ability to deliver services effectively and harming our freedoms and flexibilities from Government controls.	High	<ul> <li>Processes in place that minimise the likelihood of organisational failure include:         <ul> <li>Active learning by senior leaders from experiences / incidents outside the council inform continual improvement within the council</li> <li>Strong corporate values</li> <li>Robust Governance framework (including codes of conduct, health &amp; safety policies, complaints tracking).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Regular monitoring of effectiveness of processes is in place and improvements continually made as a result of learning.</li> </ul>	Chief Executive Officer	Medium			
e 282	ASC9, BUS06 CEO8	Staff resilience to change and demand pressure Low morale leading to loss in productivity, increased sickness and staff turnover.	High	<ul> <li>Communication, consultation and engagement is a priority for the council with an emphasis placed on thoroughly addressing the concerns of staff and their representatives</li> <li>Currently eight training courses available that address various aspects of change. Trained coaches who are available in all services to support staff.</li> <li>High Performance Development Programme being offered across the organisation to support leaders to develop their own and the organisations behaviours.</li> <li>Comprehensive range of surveys and focus groups provide a measure of the staff satisfaction with the council and its management of change.</li> <li>The smarter working framework and flexible working policy are in place to support</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Decision by members on pay and reward system taken in timely manner and combine with staff and union consultation.</li> <li>Communications engagement plan to promote the benefits of working for Surrey and help to support engagement across the organisation to be delivered.</li> </ul>	Strategic Director Business Services	Medium			

12

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

### Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
				<ul> <li>managers and their teams to work differently.</li> <li>Promotion of support mechanisms for staff (eg. employee assistance).</li> <li>Staff are encouraged to get involved in finding innovative solutions to redesign services.</li> <li>Better Place to Work outcomes are implemented</li> <li>Training of managers in effective engagement of their staff to roll out over 2015.</li> </ul>			
Page 283	CEO3 EAI4,5 FR06	Business Continuity, Emergency Planning Failure to respond effectively to a known event or major incident results in an inability to deliver key services.	High	<ul> <li>The Council Risk and Resilience Forum reviews, moderates, implements and tests operational plans.</li> <li>Close working between key services and the Emergency Management Team to update plans and share learning</li> <li>Continued consultation with Unions and regular communication to staff.</li> <li>External risks are assessed through the Local Resilience Forum.</li> <li>Combined Environment &amp; Infrastructure and Communities Select Committees Task Group agreed to identify improvement and best practices during the recent flooding.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Business Continuity Plans are in place and signed off (by Local Resilience Board) in timely manner</li> </ul>	Assistant Chief Executive	Medium
L11	ASC12, 30, 33 BUS13 CEO7 CSF5	Information Governance Loss of protected data by the council leads to financial penalties, safeguarding issues and erosion of public trust.	Medium	<ul> <li>Encrypted laptops – 100% coverage for our 5,500 Laptop estate</li> <li>Secure environment through the Egress encrypted email system</li> <li>Internal Audit Management Action Plans in</li> </ul>	Information governance controls work effectively overseen by IG and Caldecott boards and audited annually Cabinet have reviewed IT	Strategic Director Business Services	Medium

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office

CSF = Children, Schools and Families

EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

#### <u>Annex 1</u>

#### Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk		Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
Page 284				<ul> <li>place that are monitored by Audit &amp; Governance Committee and Select Committees</li> <li>Twice-yearly communications campaign linked to known peaks for breaches, and a refreshed and re-launched information security e-learning package.</li> <li>SCC has received GCSx accreditation certificate</li> <li>introduction of the Information Governance Board and the launch of the data classification project, both of which commenced in the first quarter of 2014/15, and will help to manage this risk.</li> <li>continuation of training for staff to improve awareness and ensure adherence to procedures</li> <li>Implement learning from feedback where breaches occur.</li> <li>Directorates and Digital Delivery Team to engage with partners to deliver a platform that will enable appropriate sharing of information between agencies.</li> <li>Despite the actions above, there is a continued risk of human error that is out of the council's control.</li> </ul>	security policy and as result the security policy, Code of conduct and social media policies are being updated to reflect changes agreed		
L12	ASC21 BUS10	Supply chain / contractor resilience Supply chain failure, lack of business continuity arrangements in place leading to increased costs, time delays	High	<ul> <li>Supply chain business continuity plans for strategic/critical contracts to meet required standards.</li> <li>Consistent management of supply chain risks across all key suppliers through common reporting.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Supplier selection policy decision made to include financial resilience and business continuity arrangements</li> <li>Needs strong support from</li> </ul>	Strategic Director Business Services	Medium

Key to references:

ASC = Adult Social Care

BUS = Business Services

CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office

CSF = Children, Schools and Families

EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

FR = Fire and Rescue

12

## Leadership risk register as at 31 January 2015 (covers rolling 12 months)

**Owner: David McNulty** 

Ref	Dir. RRef.	Description of the risk	Inherent risk level (no controls)	Processes in place (ie the 'how' risks are being mitigated)	Controls (i.e. decisions needed)	Lead risk owner	Residual risk level (after existing controls)
		or reputational damage and failure to promote service delivery.		<ul> <li>Regular supplier intelligence reporting in place to track industry and supplier news.</li> <li>Risk management training provided to contract managers to enable a consistent approach.</li> <li>Mitigating actions are less effective for small/medium suppliers due to reduced business continuity.</li> </ul>	ELT (Extended Leadership Team) to ensure contract resilience and business continuity is in place and regularly up-dated		

Key to references: ASC = Adult Social Care BUS = Business Services CAC = Customers and Communities

CEO = Chief Executive's Office CSF = Children, Schools and Families EAI = Environment and Infrastructure

## **Movement of risks**

Ref	Risk	Date added	Current inherent risk level	Current residual risk level	Moveme residual level	risk
L1	Medium Term Financial Plan	Aug 12	High	High	-	-
L2	Central Government policy development	Feb 13	High	High	-	-
L3	Waste	May 10	High	Medium	Jan 15	Û
L4	Integration of health & social care	June 13	High	High	-	-
L5	Comprehensive Spending Review 2015	Sep 14	High	High	-	-
L6	Safeguarding – Children's Services	May 10	High	High	Jan 15	Û
L7	Future funding	Aug 12	High	Medium	-	-
L8	Reputation	Oct 14	High	Medium	-	-
L9	Staff resilience to change and demand pressures	May 10	High	Medium	Jan 12	Û
L10	Business Continuity, Emergency Planning	May 10	High	Medium	Aug 12	Û
L11	Information governance	Dec 10	Medium	Medium	Oct 14	Û
L12	Supply chain / contractor resilience	Jan 14	High	Medium	-	-
L13	Safeguarding – Adult Social Care	May 10	High	High	Jan 15	仓

# Risks removed from the register

Risk	Date added	Date removed
IT risk	May 10	Oct 14
Resource Allocation System in adults personalisation	May 10	Aug 12
Integrated Childrens System	May 10	Feb 11
NHS reorganisation	Sep 10	May 13
2012 project management	Sep 10	Aug 12
LLDD budget transfer	May 11	Mar 12
2012 command, control, coordination and communication	Dec 11	Sep 12

#### Leadership level risk assessment criteria

Due to their significance, the risks on the Leadership risk register are assessed on their residual risk level ie. the level of risk after existing controls have been taken into account, by high, medium or low.

Risk level	Financial impact	Reputational impact	Performance impact	Likelihood
	(% of council budget)	(Stakeholder interest)	(Impact on priorities)	
Low	< 1%	Loss of confidence and trust in the council felt by a small group or within a small geographical area	Minor impact or disruption to the achievement of one or more strategic / directorate priorities	Remote / low probability
Medium	1 – 10%	A sustained general loss of confidence and trust in the council within the local community	Moderate impact or disruption to the achievement of one or more strategic / directorate priorities	Possible / medium probability
High	10 – 20%	A major loss of confidence and trust in the council within the local community and wider with national interest	Major impact or disruption to the achievement of one or more strategic / directorate priorities	Almost certain / highly probable

Page 288

This page is intentionally left blank