<u>Strategic risks</u> – have the potential to significantly disrupt or destroy the organisation

| Ref | Risk ref. | 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 393 | ASC1 CSF7 EAI1 FN1 ORB10 | Financial outlook Further reductions in funding, due to constraints in the ability to raise local funding and/or distribution of funding, results in significant adverse long term consequences for sustainability and service reductions leading to significant implications for residents. | High | Structured approach to ensuring Government understands the council's Council Tax strategy and unsustainable impact of current funding mechanism. Targeted focus with Government to secure a greater share of funding for specific demand led pressures (in particular Adult Social Care). Proactive engagement with Government departments to influence core Government policy direction (specific areas to be developed as Government priorities become clear). Continued horizon scanning of the financial implications of existing and future Government policy changes. Development of alternative / new sources of funding (e.g. bidding for grants where economically advantageous). Cabinet Members induction programme to ensure continuity of informed decision making and service delivery. New Members induction programme in place (May to July) to introduce them to the council and thereby facilitate informed decision making. Notwithstanding actions above, there is a significant risk of Central Government policy changes /austerity measures due to changes in ministerial responsibilities impacting on the council's long term financial sustainability. | Members make decisions to stop new spending, reduce spending and or generate alternative sources of funding, where necessary, in a timely manner. Officers only able to recommend MTFP where credible, sustainable budget is proposed. Members proactively take the opportunities to influence central Government. Officers continue to analyse events and create budget scenarios. The council pro-actively seek to participate in consultations and other opportunities to engage with Government as it develop future funding policies. | Director of Finance | High |

Owner: Julie Fisher

| | Leadership risk register as at 10 January 2018 (covers rolling 12 months) Owner: Julie Fisher | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Ref | Risk ref. | 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 394 | 9 | 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 well being. | High | Children's Improvement Board, with partnership membership, in place which has set improvement objectives for children through an Improvement Plan and regularly reviews impact for children and whole system capability and capacity. In addition to the Improvement Board there is scrutiny and quality assurance across the partnership through for example the Children's Safeguarding Board, Corporate Parenting Board, the Council's Select Committees and other scrutiny functions. Regular quality assurance and review within CSF, including feedback from regulators, peer review, quality and performance insight, and feedback from children and families. CSF Assistant Director roles and responsibilities have been reshaped to strengthen leadership and governance. Work now underway to strengthen practice leadership at all levels. Focus on improving practice and practice leadership. | Timely interventions by well recruited, trained, supervised and managed professionals ensures appropriate actions are taken to safeguard and promote the wellbeing of children in Surrey. Quality assurance and management systems in place to identify and implement any key areas of learning so safeguarding practice can be improved. Actively respond to feedback from regulators, partners and service users. The Surrey Safeguarding Children Board (with an independent chair) is the key statutory mechanism to ensure agencies, including the council, work together effectively to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. An Improvement Board (chaired by the Leader) sets direction and reviews progress on the Improvement Plan and agrees any areas of action as required. | Strategic Director of Children's Schools and Families | High | | | |

| Ref | Risk ref. | Description of the risk | Inherent risk level (no controls) | January 2018 (covers rolling 12 mo 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 395 | | Safeguarding – Adult Social Care Avoidable failure in Adult Social Care, through action or inaction, leads to serious harm, death or a major impact on wellbeing. | High | 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. The Adult Social Care and Children, Schools and Families Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub went live on 5 October 2016 facilitating the sharing of good practice. Established a locality safeguarding advisor role to assure quality control. Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board has undertaken external auditing of adult safeguarding enquires in 2016 and 2017 and we have acted on the learning from these. We have improved our process including our case recording system and our internal quality assurance process. In addition to the work of the Safeguarding Adults Board, there is further scrutiny of the function through the activities of the Council's Adults and Health Select Committee. | 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. Actively respond to feedback from regulators. We are working with Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board and our partners to revise our adult safeguarding policies, procedures and guidance, associated tools such as the competency framework and our learning and development offer to support these. It is anticipated that these will be completed by April 2018. | Strategic Director of Adult Social Care & Public Health | High |

Owner: Julie Fisher

Leadership risk register as at 10 January 2018 (covers rolling 12 months)

<u>Cross cutting risks</u> – high level risks that can be mitigated more effectively through cross working.

| Ref | Risk ref. | 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) |
|-----|--|---|--|--|---|---------------------|---|
| L4 | ASC1,2, 12,16,17 C&C4 CSF1,2, 7 EAI1,3 FN2 ORB01, 10 | Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2017-20 Failure to achieve the MTFP, which could be a result of: • Not achieving savings • Additional service demand and/or • Over optimistic funding levels. 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. | High | 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). Weekly review of the in year financial position at Chief Executives Direct Reports meeting and strong focus on development of plans for delivery of the 2017/18 service efficiencies and reductions – to enable early management action as relevant. Budget planning discussions held with Cabinet and Select Committees. Early conversations are undertaken with all relevant stakeholders to ensure consultations about service changes are effective and completed in a timely manner (savings tracker developed for use during 2017/18 to identify necessary consultations, milestones, Equality Impact Assessments). Cross service networking and timely escalation of issues to ensure lawfulness and good governance. Increased challenge and rigour on cost control. Cabinet Members induction programme to ensure continuity of informed decision making and service delivery. Ongoing Members development programme in place to ensure that all Members have the skills and information they need to understand the challenges facing the Council and to perform their roles effectively. | Prompt management action taken by Directors / Leadership Teams to identify correcting actions for any in year overspends or failure to deliver service reductions (evidenced by robust action plans). Members (Council, Cabinet, Select Committees) make the necessary decisions to implement action plans in a timely manner. Members have all the relevant information to make necessary decisions. | Director of Finance | High |

| | Leadership risk register as at 10 January 2018 (covers rolling 12 months) Owner: Julie Fisher | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Ref | Risk ref. | 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) | | | |
| | | | | Induction programme for New Chief Executive to introduce them to the council and provide insight to all relevant issues. Significant focus on income generating activities through an enlarged property investment programme and the optimisation of the existing property assets. | | | | | | |
| | ASC2, 16 CSF1,2, 5,6,8 ORB01, 02,07, EMT3, 12, EA13 | New ways of working Failure to work effectively as part of a multi-agency system leads to severe service disruption and reputational damage. | High | Shared and aligned strategies to ensure no unintended consequences. Robust governance arrangements (e.g. Inter Authority Agreements, Health and Social Care Integration Board, Health and Wellbeing Board, financial governance framework) in place with early warning mechanisms. Robust and effective local oversight and challenge, e.g. Children's Improvement Board. Effective transition arrangements with continuous stakeholder engagement. Continuous focus on building and maintaining strong relationships with partners through regular formal and informal dialogue. Close liaison and communication with customers, partners, inspectorates and regulators. Self-assessment continually refreshed in line with Ofsted inspection framework to inform Children's improvement work. Regular reviews with DfE, feedback from Ofsted and listen to feedback from partners and practitioners, all informs our Children's improvement work. | Working closely with DfE and Ofsted to inform future Children's improvement strategy. Leadership and managers recognise the importance of building and sustaining good working relationships with key stakeholders and having early discussions if these falter. Continue to nurture strategic partnerships to affect better outcomes for residents. Work with Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships (including Clinical Commissioning Groups) on models of integrated care. Members continue to endorse approaches for integration across the council. | Acting Chief Executive | Medium | | | |

| | Leadership risk register as at 10 January 2018 (covers rolling 12 months) Owner: Julie Fisher | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Ref | Risk ref. | 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) | | | |
| Lage 398 | ASC4, 5,8 CSF5 EAI2, 3,4 ORB 02,03, 08 LD6 EMT1, 10,11 | Organisational resilience Failure for the organisation as a whole to plan for and/or respond effectively to a significant event and or strains on workforce capacity or resilience, results in severe and prolonged service disruption and loss of trust in the organisation. | High | Developing an employment framework that supports flexibility in service delivery and organisational resilience. Robust governance framework (including codes of conduct, IT cyber resilience and information assurance policies, health and safety policies, complaints tracking). Information Governance Board monitors information governance requirements and changes and reviews information governance risks. Review of third party information governance risks. External risks are regularly assessed through the Local Resilience Forum and reviewed by the Statutory Responsibilities Network. Active learning by senior leaders from external experiences / incidents informs continual improvement within the council. Close working between key services and the Emergency Management Team to proactively update and communicate business continuity plans and share learning. Leadership and management development programme in place to increase skills, resilience and effectiveness of leaders, focusing on communication and setting clear expectations. Career conversations built into appraisal process looking forward five years Robust management networks in place including CEDR and CRRF. Ongoing Members development programme in place to ensure that all Members have the skills and information they need to understand the challenges facing the Council and to | Statutory Responsibilities Network review business continuity plans at least twice annually. Regular monitoring of effectiveness of processes is in place and improvements continually made and communicated as a result of learning. Robust change management processes. Refresh staff awareness for IT security and information management. All externally hosted IT solutions should be considered by Security Working Group (IT&D and Information Governance), with contract approval via IT&D. Senior management annual assurance statement provides assurance that business continuity is well planned and staff are all aware. Mutual aid arrangements set up to provide support to other SE7 Authorities in the event of an emergency. | Acting Chief Executive | Medium | | | |

| | Lea | adership risk register | r as at 10 | January 2018 (covers rolling 12 mg | onths) Ow | ner: Julie Fis | sher |
|--------|--------------|--|--|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| Ref | Risk ref. | 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) |
| L7 Pag | | Senior Leadership Succession Planning A significant number of senior leaders leave the organisation within a short space of time and cannot be replaced effectively resulting in a reduction in the ability to deliver services to the level required. | Medium | Enhance distributed leadership by focus on organisational goals and scorecard for organisational performance. Workforce planning linked to business continuity plans. | Transparent and effective succession plans. Interim arrangements put in place will be kept under review pending the start of a new Chief Executive on 5th March 2018. | Acting Chief Executive | Medium |

Leadership level risk assessment criteria

Due to their significance, the risks on the Leadership risk register are assessed on their inherent risk level (no controls) and their residual risk level (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 |

 $\text{Page}^{\text{EAI}}\bar{\overset{\text{Environment and Infrastructure risk}}{400}}$