

APPENDIX B : CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

RISK NO	DESCRIPTION	RANKING	CONSEQUENCES	COUNTER MEASURES	TIMELINE	OWNER	ACTION PLAN CROSS REFERENCE	DATE UPDATED	CURRENT STATUS
1	<p><b>Risk:</b> An external project (the relief road) is fundamentally linked to the goals of the Council. The project starts significantly slipping in the next couple of years.</p>	<p>Significant and Critical</p> <p><b>TARGET D3</b></p> <p><b>DOWN-GRADED</b></p> <p><b>7 SEPT 09</b></p> <p><b>REVIEWED &amp; DOWN-GRADED 28 MARCH 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No offset of impact on transport/town centre through growth</li> </ul>	<p>LDS – revised timetable (approved REEA March 2011). Project Management of programme.</p> <p>Regular monthly corporacy updates</p> <p>Communication – with County Council and partners through partner arrangements for masterplanning of SUE</p> <p>Ongoing negotiations with County Council.</p> <p>Documents drafted July 2011</p> <p>Counsels advice on issues experienced</p> <p>Masterplan consultants appointed July 2011</p> <p>Draft options for SUE developed March 2012</p> <p>Stakeholder/Public consultations taken place Spring 2012</p> <p>Preferred Option being developed, whilst consulting with Developers.</p>	<p>2011/2012</p> <p>2011/2012</p> <p>Preferred Option October 2012</p>	<p>CMT</p> <p>(HR)</p> <p>(CAM)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LTP</li> <li>LLITM</li> <li>LDS</li> <li>Detailed project plan and vigorous monitoring underway, currently 4-6 weeks behind schedule</li> </ul>		Amber

RISK NO	DESCRIPTION	RANKING	CONSEQUENCES	COUNTER MEASURES	TIMELINE	OWNER	ACTION PLAN CROSS REFERENCE	DATE UPDATED	CURRENT STATUS
2	<b>RISK</b> : LDF/Core strategy exceeds time framework/risk to land supply/ infrastructure delivery	High and Critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unwelcome and non strategic developments proposals</li> </ul>	<p>LDS – revised timetable (approved REEA March 2011). Project Management of programme.</p> <p>Regular monthly corporacy updates</p> <p>CS draft for publication approved and issued for consultation (Feb 2012)</p> <p>CS programme developed</p> <p>Meeting with PINS to understand impact of NPPF</p> <p>Statement of consultation being developed</p> <p>Meetings to reach common ground initiated</p> <p>LDF working group/Full council Sep 2012 Examination Dec 2012</p> <p>Adoption March/April 2013</p>	<p>LDF working group early Sep 2012</p> <p>Full council Sep 2012</p> <p>Examination Nov/Dec 2012</p> <p>Adoption Mar/April 2013</p>	CMT (HR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LDS</li> <li>CS programme</li> </ul>	22 July 2012	Amber
RISK NO	DESCRIPTION	RANKING	CONSEQUENCES	COUNTER MEASURES	TIMELINE	OWNER	ACTION PLAN CROSS REFERENCE	DATE UPDATED	CURRENT STATUS

3	<p><b>Risk:</b> The Council is currently delivering a wide variety of projects as part of achieving its overall goals. This requires having the correct skills, resources and robust programme management. The risk is that a key project significantly under-delivers in terms of time, cost or quality.</p>	<p>Significant and Critical</p> <p><b>TARGET D3</b></p> <p><b>NO CHANGE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs increase</li> <li>• Resources diverted from service delivery</li> <li>• Reputation damage</li> <li>• Efficiencies not secured</li> <li>• Failure or delay in the delivery of the "Turning the Tanker" initiatives</li> </ul>	<p>Programme management implemented. (revised approach.)</p> <p>Monitoring regime through PMB</p> <p>Assess difficulties through monthly monitoring – plan to deal.</p> <p>Monitoring reported to Policy Committees</p> <p>Annual Review of Capital Programme undertaken.</p> <p>- Refresh of Project Management System to ensure Programme Board has overview and robust governance and reporting methods for individual projects</p> <p>- Updating of Committee process for authorisation of new projects</p> <p>Focus on delivery through projects (as part of 'Turning the Tanker')</p>	<p>Nov 2008</p> <p>Monthly (PMB)</p> <p>Monthly (PMB)</p> <p>Quarterly (Policy Committees)</p> <p>Annual (Policy Committees)</p> <p>July 2012</p> <p>September 2012</p> <p>June 2012</p>	<p>CMT (JW)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAPITAL PROGRAMME</li> <li>• SERVICE PLANS</li> <li>• MTFS</li> <li>• TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE</li> <li>• DEVELOPMENT PLAN</li> <li>• TURNING THE TANKER</li> </ul>	<p>July 2012</p>	<p>Green</p>
---	---	---	---	---	--	-----------------	---	------------------	--------------

				<p>The "Turning the Tanker" approach involves a wider range of staff to 'task and finish' projects will embed understanding and use of system.</p> <p>Project Team membership to exploit skills and interests outside of job roles (see above re "Turning the Tanker" approach)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Capacity managed to allow project Teams to complete project roles</li></ul>	<p>September 2012</p> <p>September 2012</p> <p>September 2012</p>					
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

RISK NO	DESCRIPTION	RANKING	CONSEQUENCES	COUNTER MEASURES	TIMELINE	OWNER	ACTION PLAN CROSS REFERENCE	DATE UPDATED	CURRENT STATUS
4	Risk: The Council's requires and IT service that meets business needs and is affordable	High and Critical  <b>TARGET D3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology supporting new ways of working is inadequately supported</li> <li>• Partners IT expectations and needs not met</li> <li>• IT failure impacting on business performance</li> <li>• Increased resources required to resolve problems</li> <li>• Future business transformation projects not adequately supported</li> <li>• Lack of clarity by IT and Business of service levels that can be delivered</li> </ul>	<p>Review undertaken of the current IT service and the gap between the IT service required. This concluded that an in house team in a small council would not have the resilience to meet the needs of the business. A range of options for alternatives provision was drafted. PFA approved pursuing a full shared service with LCC. Extension of current LCC helpdesk contract until long term service delivery options determined and in place</p> <p>In house team strengthened in interim whilst alternative provision pursued</p> <p>Discussions held with LCC to pursue a wider shared service determined this was unaffordable July 2012 Decision taken to pursue alternative outsourced options. Scoping exercise to be commissioned in preparation for outsourcing. IT strategy and development plan defining business needs for IT approved</p>	<p>Business decision made September 2011</p> <p>Part implemented Sept 2011 remaining post to be recruited Sept 2012</p> <p>July 2012 PFA</p>	CMT (DG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOCITM Review</li> <li>• IT Strategy</li> <li>• IT programme</li> <li>• Council development plan</li> <li>• Central Services Service Plan</li> <li>• Turning the tanker</li> <li>• Project management system</li> </ul>	August 2012	Amber

				<p>Report on outcome of scoping exercise and further LCC discussions. Determine the preferred options and the range of services to be retained in house and those to be outsourced</p>	<p>Sept 2012 PFA</p>				
				<p>Review current external contracts and budgets in order to inform decision making Ensure all processes/system set ups are documented</p>	<p>Completed and ongoing maintenance. Package of data to be established during scoping exercise Sept 2012</p>				
				<p>Implement the use of role profiling to complement staff appraisals to enhance IT skills</p>	<p>December 2011</p>				
				<p>Determine financial implications and timetable for preferred option. Determine route and timetable for implementation</p>	<p>Ongoing through process</p>				
				<p>Turning the tanker to assist with implementation of IT projects and business projects requiring IT support complemented by revised project management process</p>	<p>August 2012</p>				
				<p>Regular reporting to programme board</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>				

