

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
ELT	<b>Government Spending Cuts and impact on LCC resources</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>Financial scenario taken into account as part of financial planning process.</p> <p>All budget options risk and service impact assessed on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Regular reports to Executive Leadership Team (ELT) and cabinet on budget options, ensuring frontline services are protected.</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<p>On-going 'horizon scanning' of likely financial scenarios.</p> <p>Continued robust financial and performance monitoring at ELT and Cabinet.</p>	ELT	Quarterly
ELT / RES	<p><b>Strategic Partnership with British Telecommunications plc</b></p> <p>- Unprecedented partnership working with a private sector organisation.</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>Joint governance arrangements in place prior to commencement.</p> <p>Staff at a senior level from both LCC and BT have been involved to date and will continue to be involved to establish, develop and provide continuity around relationships.</p> <p>LCC Cabinet Committee on the Strategic Partnership established.</p>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<p>Joint Venture Company Board meetings to be held quarterly.</p> <p>Annual Review process to be followed, as contractually agreed.</p>	Eddie Sutton, Director of Special Projects	Quarterly
ELT	<p><b>Effective delivery of the corporate strategy</b></p> <p>- failure to measure stated outcomes</p> <p>- no ownership of the corporate strategy</p> <p>- no plans in place to highlight and address poor performance</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>A council-wide executive performance group chaired by a member of ELT has been established to oversee the delivery of the corporate strategy.</p> <p>A basket of indicators has been established to measure the delivery of the corporate strategy (and Corporate Scorecard).</p> <p>A performance management framework which identifies under performance and leads to recovery plans being developed and discussed by ELT and the Cabinet Committee for Performance Improvement (CCPI)</p>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>		ELT	Quarterly
OCE	<b>Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	Economic Development Framework agreed.	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	Continue to engage positively with private sector business leaders.	Martin Kelly, Director of	Ongoing

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	(LEP) - Need to establish a single economic voice for Lancashire  - Need to engage key business leaders in shaping and delivering agreed economic priorities			Shadow business leadership group in place.  Majority of local authorities in support of Lancashire LEP.  Draft LEP governance arrangements to be agreed.				Economic Development	
	<b>Public Health White Paper</b>  Part of fundamental NHS reforms.  Significant additional responsibilities for LCC from 2013 for public health and health improvement outcomes, ring fenced PH budget, establishing Health and Wellbeing as statutory committee, conducting joint strategic needs assessment, developing high-level strategy for health, wellbeing, social care, service integration and joint commissioning.	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	Influencing final proposals via robust and detailed responses to current consultations.  Identifying implications for LCC, including financial, legal and constitutional.  Working regionally and locally to ensure transition plans for systems to be completely in place by April 2013 are fit for purpose and reflect LCC position.	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	Develop options for Public Health Lancashire, future PH service for which LCC will be responsible with PCTs, districts etc. Consider models from other, similar counties.  Develop and deliver detailed transition plan for LCC, within an overall partnership PH transition plan.  Undertake more detailed work to identify implications, including HR.  Confirm / identify member lead for transition to new health system, including Public Health.  Work towards "early implementer" status for Health and Wellbeing Board.	ELT	Ongoing
ELT / CCG	<b>The Authority to effectively manage the consequences of an emergency, thereby impacting on the delivery of services.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	The Authority has established a governance mechanism through the Corporate Contingencies Group (CCG) to oversee the strategic issues relating to Business Continuity Planning (BCP).	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	Complete the roll-out of Business Continuity Planning to all services within the Authority and complete the establishment of Directorate Emergency Liaison Team to increase the ability of Directorates to respond to, and manage,	CCG / ELT	April 2011

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
				<p>There is a planned roll-out of BCP throughout the Authority in order to build resilience within services.</p> <p>A reporting system has been established through the Directorate structures to enable the Authority to capture the impacts from Emergencies on Service delivery and to take the appropriate actions to mitigate the effects on service users (i.e. public).</p> <p>Directorate Emergency Liaison Team established within ACS, OCE/RES &amp; ENV and currently being developed for CYP &amp; LCCG.</p>			emergencies which affect service delivery.		
OCE / PU	<p>Review of Locality Working</p> <p>Uncoordinated integrated working initiatives with District Councils</p> <p>Not capitalising on opportunities to work across tiers of local government in Lancashire to achieve efficiencies and/or improved service outcomes</p> <p>Financial, legal or reputational implications not fully considered or addressed</p> <p>Frontline county councillors feel disengaged when carrying out their role</p>	3	3	<p>Strategy Group established by Executive Director of Policy including Senior Directorate and District Council representatives; now operates as a virtual group.</p> <p>On-going liaison with Leadership and facilitation of Leader – Leader discussions.</p> <p>On-going negotiations with District Councils, including offer to hold joint discussions at Leader/Executive Member level in all 12 districts; 8 meetings held to date.</p> <p>Legal and Financial advice to the Strategy Group</p> <p>Package of measures developed to enhance the role of County Councillors, in liaison with the Member development Working Group.</p> <p>Recommendations made by Cabinet 4/11/10 on key elements of way</p>	2	2	<p>Need to successfully conclude current round of joint member meetings to agree joint working priorities in each district – by February 2011.</p> <p>Two districts have postponed until their budget discussions are concluded - we will meet with them early in the new financial year. (A further two districts do not wish to meet, but wish to focus on public realm). 8 districts have met with us.</p> <p>Arrange initial meetings of the pilot "Three Tier Forums" in Burnley, South Ribble and Wyre by February 2011. Meetings have been held in Burnley and Wyre (Feb 2011). South Ribble continue to work with us on the commissioning pilot but discussions are ongoing in relation to governance.</p> <p>Roll out of Three Tier Forums by April 2011 - This target has</p>	Deborah Ashton Executive Director of Policy	Quarterly

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	<p>Lack of clarity around direction of travel with locality working</p> <p>The pace of this work, to a significant degree, will reflect the enthusiasm and capacity of the districts to engage with us.</p>			<p>forward, (including governance and engagement of all tiers of local government) now being implemented. Package of internal and external communications measures implemented (and ongoing).</p>			<p>changed through agreement with the leadership, and should read "roll out of three tier forums in non pilot areas once integrated joint working agreements are developed"</p>		
OCE / PU	<p><b>Voluntary Community Faith Sector</b> (VCFS) Sustainability of Third Sector Lancashire (VCFS consortium): no structure through which to facilitate strategic engagement of the sector</p> <p>Breach of compact principles leading to a challenge for breach resulting in bad reputation and time and resources responding to challenge</p> <p>Increased involvement of the sector in public service delivery: the risk is not yet clear and is dependent on the extent to which coalition expect to see evidence of more third sector commissioning</p> <p>Uncoordinated approach to funding leading to the possibility of double funding and missed opportunity for joint</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<p>The Principal Policy officer from Corporate Policy Team (CPT) continues to support and advise Third Sector Lancashire (TSL).</p> <p>Event held in October 2010 for representatives of commissioning, finance and procurement teams across the authority. Attendees will now form an internal network to ensure that all appropriate staff are kept informed of changes to compact agreements and other relevant VCFS issues.</p> <p>Improvements to the oracle database is an ongoing process. We continue to identify gaps in information and consult with the oracle team to find solutions.</p> <p>The directors of commissioning from across the directorates are currently considering a corporate approach to commissioning. A VCFS commissioning framework will follow and capacity and capability building will be integral to the framework.</p> <p>The criteria for gateway grant funding have been revised to reflect a new approach to core funding particularly where organisations requesting core</p>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<p>Principal Policy Officer CPT continues close relationship with Chair TSL.</p> <p>Information sharing event to be held in October 2010. Event held November 2010. Now awaiting publication of revised national compact prior to further internal review and communication.</p> <p>Information sharing event to be held in October 2010. Core network of relevant officers identified via attendance at information sharing event November 2010. Directors of commissioning across authority now agreeing a general approach to commissioning prior to developing a VCFS commissioning framework</p> <p>Process for tagging VCFS organisations is in progress, but there is still work to do in the accounts payable area. This work is continuing and will be considered as part of the review of commissioning as described above.</p> <p>Undertake a full review of investment in capacity building and</p>	Adrienne Banks	Ongoing

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	<p>commissioning and efficiency savings</p> <p>Increased involvement of the VCFS in public service delivery – risk = lack of capacity/capability within the sector to respond</p> <p>Competition aid i.e. giving core grants to organisations who are tendering for services – risk possible legal challenge from other VCFS or private sector organisation on the grounds of unfair advantage in competitive market</p>			<p>funding are delivering multiple contracts. This new approach has now been applied by a newly introduced assessments panel.</p>			<p>develop proposals for how capability can be developed. This review is continuing and has led to changes to the central gateway programme in relation to funding infrastructure groups. Capacity building will be an integral element of the VCFS commissioning framework.</p> <p>Undertake a critical analysis of current core funding grants and then consult across the authority on the implications of withdrawing this kind of support. This analysis has been carried out and the outcome is reflected in a new approach to core funding VCF organisations via the Central Gateway grants programme.</p>		
ACS	<p><b>Failure of the working partnership between Adult Community Services and health:</b> strategic and operational failures and negative publicity</p>	4	4	<p>Working more closely with partner organisations in light of changes in government policy, introducing stronger Partnership agreements and looking at joint Project Governance arrangements.</p> <p>Collaborating on service delivery with, for example, joint funded posts and integrated delivery teams and the introduction of Public Health within the authority.</p> <p>Collaborating on projects with shared project plans and objectives.</p> <p>Prioritising strategic work with new working arrangements in health to maintain ongoing relationships.</p>	2	3	<p>Commissioning to prioritise areas where health funding is crucial to delivery of our priorities, secure senior management support within health for the priority areas and develop contingency plans in the event of failure.</p> <p>Reach agreement about government funding stream with regard to Reablement.</p> <p>Agree the Public Health governance and funding arrangements.</p>	Steve Gross (Tony Pounder)	May11
ACS	<p><b>Market failure of Adult and Older People</b></p>	4	3	<p>Developing robust commissioning and procurement planning systems and</p>	4	2	<p>Using and evaluating an information framework to improve intelligence</p>	Ann Mylie	May 11

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	<b>provider services</b> – market withdrawals and take-overs leading to reduced capacity for choice.			<p>strategies which ensure the current and future market is understood and themes are identified for development.</p> <p>Working with providers in identifying their service offer and costs, changes in requirements and areas which might lead to business failure. Development of a preferred supplier list and provider engagement strategy.</p> <p>Framework agreements set up with providers providing a broad market across small, medium and large providers which mitigates some of the risks if a provider ceases business.</p>			<p>on market changes, budgetary issues and use of monitoring information.</p> <p>The development and monitoring of more flexible contracting arrangements which assist the use of individual budgets and cut out unnecessary costs from the system</p>		
ACS	<b>Recession combined with increased call on budgets on Older People and changing demographic profile (ageing population) leading to increased requirements for services.</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<p>Medium Term Financial planning in place.</p> <p>Robust forecasting tools. Robust and regular Budget monitoring.</p> <p>Well developed financial reporting systems.</p> <p>Careful monitoring of work programmes. Redirection of resources where necessary.</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<p>This risk is now an issue as the Comprehensive Spending Review significantly reduced the council's budget.</p> <p>Regular reporting and monitoring by ACS and up to SMT.</p> <p>Budget reductions proposals presented to cabinet for consideration.</p> <p>Projects and programmes started to plan and achieve each of the budget cut proposals, Each has a senior lead.</p> <p>Consultations with the public ongoing on the service cut proposals.</p>	Roger Hulme	May 11
ACS	<b>Unexpected death or serious injury of service user with Adult Community Services</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>Safeguarding Board and Governance in place, Safeguarding Project established, with an Action Plan.</p> <p>Safeguarding Procedures have been refreshed. This project has completed and a Service Improvement Plan</p>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<p>Continue roll out of Safeguarding and Awareness Training. E-Learning package available April 2011.</p> <p>Complete the Safeguarding Service</p>	Olive Carroll (Mike Banks)	May 11

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
				<p>developed.</p> <p>Procedures in place should something happen, including Communications unit available to deal with any public information / communication issues.</p> <p>In House-Providers: comprehensive set of Risk Assessments and Health and Safety Procedures in place.</p> <p>Staff training programme in place to raise practice standards in safeguarding and familiarise with procedures.</p> <p>DoL work, like restraint etc training courses, procedures well established Arrangements to review serious cases, including domestic homicide reviews safeguarding on a multi agency basis, so that we can all learn when things go well.</p> <p>Item approved: Principals of the MCA and Dols need to be embedded for people living in their own homes or supported tenancies. The financial envelope around this work is now agreed.</p>			<p>Improvement Plan to further improve Safeguarding arrangements and responses.</p> <p>Serious case review procedure in place to learn lessons from serious incidents.</p>		
ACS	<b>Death or serious injury of staff member working within Adult Community Services</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>For work with service users: Lone Worker Policy, Risk Assessments and Health and Safety Procedures in place. Robust on call arrangements, use of mobile phones and safety alarms. Use of virtual whiteboard to track staff whereabouts and monitor returns. Handover arrangements to brief staff of potential problems.</p> <p>Personal Social Care (PSC) Quality Framework project has embedded</p>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<p>Review of framework for all Service User related risk assessments to be undertaken as part of PSC work programme: an interim review has been done, but once Self Directed Service (SDS) and the PSC restructure is complete, they will be reviewed and updated again.</p> <p>All PSC team lone-worker policies to be reviewed in the context of Agile Working and restructuring -</p>	Olive Carroll (Barbara Lewis)	May 11

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
				changes and improvements into PSC working practices. This project completes Jan 2011.  Risk Assessment flag in ISSIS.  For worker self harm: Use of Occupational Health Unit (OHU) assessment where medical conditions exist, return to work procedures for staff who have medical problems.			on-going.		
LCCG	<b>Public sector spending cuts leading to threats to workload within the county commercial group services</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	Being flexible to reduce fixed costs. Good capacity mgt. Review of options.	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	Awareness, cost reduction and efficiency measures. Development of options.	Nigel Finnamore	Ongoing
LCCG	<b>Sustainability post Equal Pay Review within Commercial Services</b> - increased costs - disaffected employees - impact on costs and competitiveness	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	Sustainability and affordability for LCCG is being considered.	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	Identify measures to be taken and other options for service delivery where applicable.	Nigel Finnamore / Bernard Noblett	Ongoing
LCCG	<b>Serious Health and Safety Service Failure</b> (including food hygiene) potentially involving:  - employee - someone in our care - member of public  <b>Costs associated with accidents</b> (fines,	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	Existing Integrated Management System with areas of the organisation 3rd part registered to OHSAS 18001.  Other part of the organisation operating management systems in accordance with OHSAS 18001.  Audits by IMS team.  Competency based training in	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	Review of Integrated Management Systems to simplify, integrate and to reduce bureaucracy and increase accessibility via the intranet. Action By MDS (Dec 2012).  Revision of Catering procedures to determine suitability. Action By Janette Mason / IMS (Jan 2011).	Nigel Finnamore  Catering SMT	Quarterly  Quarterly



Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	litigation, insurance costs), business disruption, LCCG's reputation. Resulting in reduced profitability e.g. impact of Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act – Larger fines, publicity orders and impact on future business.			<p>Operations.</p> <p>Health and Safety Performance reported at all Senior Management Teams.</p> <p>Greater emphasis on incident reviews and lesson learned. IMS team's audit schedule with increased audits and non conformance close outs monitored and trends analysed. Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point for School and Care Catering.</p>			IMS Business Plan to address main health and safety issues Action By MDS (Apr 2011).	Nigel Finnamore	Monthly
	<p><b>Adverse impacts of weaknesses in quality or security of information, information systems or information handling within the organisation, in electronic and paper forms.</b></p> <p>Adverse impacts may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial cost</li> <li>• Service delivery failures</li> <li>• Damage to individuals</li> <li>• Reputation damage</li> <li>• Effect on legal proceedings</li> </ul>	4	4	<p>Corporate Information Governance Group.</p> <p>Directorate information Champions.</p> <p>Guidance, policies and procedures on Intranet and in e-Learning Course.</p> <p>Management processes in place and in business planning process.</p> <p>Security controls and encryption protection.</p> <p>Statements of conformity, spot checks and security breach procedures.</p>	3	3	<p>Annual Information Risk Review underway.</p> <p>External review of all governance documentation.</p> <p>Technical infrastructure review underway plus penetration testing.</p> <p>Data Quality Strategy Statement of Conformity returns being collected.</p> <p>Large intranet site full of guidance: <a href="http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=4305">http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=4305</a>.</p>	SIRO + CIGG	June 11
	<p><b>Failure to comply with Information Governance requirements</b> e.g. Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act</p> <p><b>Legal penalties in the event of breaches of</b></p>	4	4	<p>Management controls, including effective logging and tracking, complaints and appeals procedures</p> <p>Effective use of technology</p> <p>The Publication Scheme has been reviewed and updated, and the model publication scheme approved by the Information Commissioner adopted.</p>	3	3	<p>Some staff training and awareness sessions have taken place with many more still to take place.</p> <p>The work load of the Access to Information Team continues to increase due to the growing number of Freedom of Information requests and Data Protection enquiries/subject access requests.</p>	SIRO + CIGG	June 11

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	<b>Data Protection Act</b> e.g. Civil Monetary Penalty, potentially up to £0.5million						Additional resources for the team are being considered Directorate IG champions to be vigilant looking for examples of data misuse in particular that data is: 1. Fairly and lawfully processed 2. Processed for limited purposes 3. Adequate, relevant and not excessive 4. Accurate 5. Not kept longer than necessary 6. Processed in accordance with the data subject's rights 7. Secure 8. Not transferred to countries without adequate protection. CIGG to review security breach records from security breach procedure and look for trends and issue action plans and guidance accordingly		
CYP	<b>Death or serious injury of a child known to us, or who have been known to us as a result of systemic failure</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	Multi-agency safeguarding children Board Arrangements in place and safeguarding children procedures updated.  Mechanisms in place.  Closely monitor referrals and assessments and children subject to Child Protection Plans.  Provide training and support to staff including multi-agency training Child death and Serious Case Review.  Panels in place to learn lessons and disseminate learning to practitioners and managers.  Monitor Educational Visits and policy and guidelines in place.	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	Continued implementation of service and post inspection action plans Multi-agency conferences disseminating lessons from Serious Case Reviews both within Lancashire, regionally and nationally. The roll out of Contact, Referral and Assessment Team to improve responses to referrals and improve assessments has been completed. Continue to improve information sharing between agencies via training and agreed procedures and protocols. Continue to explore integrated and co-located multi-agency teams to improve assessments and information sharing between agencies.	Tony Morrissey Head OF Safeguarding Inspection & Audit	Ongoing

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
							Through the Directorate Corporate Electronic Records Management System (CERMS) Lead and Data Capture Storage and Distribution Project Board, address current system issues that may prevent frontline staff from accessing information required to provide effective help to vulnerable children and young people		
CYP	<b>Failure in performance in schools and other educational settings</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	Quality Audit Tool used by Early Years (EY) consultants with EY settings. Early warning system identifying schools/settings at risk of failure on wide range of factors. Settings where there are concerns are monitored and supported by the Directorate Special Support Group. Schools where there are concerns relating to Finance, Personnel, Governance, Standards, Quality of Education are reported to, monitored and supported by the Directorate Special Support Group. Contracts of support are provided for schools in difficulty including school to school support. Review the Early Warning systems in the light of the new Ofsted Framework for Inspection (Head of QCI March 2010).	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	Develop the Early Years Workforce so that all settings have an accredited Early Years Professional in post by 2015 (Head of QCI). Further develop the support/challenge/monitoring arrangements for Children's Centres (Head of QCI July 2011). Review early warning systems in the light of reduced funding and the loss of the School improvement partner role and further develop school to school support programmes through: collaborations/federations, the work of National and Local leaders in Education, Teaching Schools and consultancy support (Head of QCI/D&I September 2011).	Bob Stott Director for Universal and Prevention Services	Ongoing
CYP	<b>Workforce recruitment and retention</b> within Children's services-capacity to undertake workforce planning; shortages of key skills/workers/leaders; low levels of workforce well-being & poor retention; lack of key leadership competencies; lack of training & development	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children's Workforce Strategy in place. Implementation underway</li> <li>• Common workforce data collection undertaken</li> <li>• Leadership development programme underway</li> <li>• Development of career pathways across sections of the Directorate</li> <li>• Range of initiatives in place for work-based recruitment – teachers (GRTP), social workers, apprentices &amp; graduate trainees</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue development and implementation of Children's Workforce Strategy</li> <li>• Implement change programme projects</li> <li>• Managing budget/staffing reductions through a managed process of restructuring</li> <li>• Transition CYP Change Programme to Continuous Improvement Programme</li> </ul>	Dave Carr, Head of Efficiency and Business Support	Ongoing

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	opportunities			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range of training &amp; development opportunities to support retention and progression</li> <li>• Flexible working arrangements in place</li> <li>• Range of staff well-being schemes across Directorate</li> <li>• Talent Pool programme in place.</li> </ul>					
CYP	<b>Inspection failure</b> in limiting judgement area relating to services to children, young people and families which leads to failure in performance of the County Council as a whole	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<p>Post inspection action plans in place monitored by Directorate Leadership Team.</p> <p>Inspection preparation groups in place.</p> <p>Mock inspections being undertaken</p> <p>Service plan and performance management framework in place.</p> <p>Audit team established.</p>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	Multi-agency partnership board now in place and consideration is being given to a peer review by C4EO (The Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services)	Tony Morrissey Head of Safeguarding , Inspection and Audit	Ongoing
OCE	<b>Equal Pay Review</b>  leading to:  - serious industrial action;  - significant numbers of tribunal claims;  - difficulties in retaining staff;	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<p>A Collective Agreement has now been signed by the main trade unions agreeing to most of the new terms and conditions introduced wef 1 August 2010.</p> <p>On-going dialogue with trade unions and continuing communication with staff.</p> <p>Ongoing communications with schools to keep them engaged and informed.</p>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<p>Continue communication with staff groups affected and trade unions.</p> <p>Continue engagement of senior managers to ensure consistent messages are given and communicated to staff.</p> <p>Continue and complete the JE appeals process.</p> <p>Complete JE for special and chief officer grades.</p> <p>Complete JE for other staff groups e.g. soulbury grades.</p>	Deputy County Secretary and Solicitor	Quarterly
ENV	<b>Surface water flooding.</b>  LAs now responsible for surface water management (Flood and Water Management Act	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	Ongoing development of Surface Water Management Plan for Lancashire. Development of prioritised and targeted action to reduce risk.	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	Re-prioritise capital funding. Develop in-house expertise.	Jo Turton, Executive Director	Six - Monthly

Dir	Potential risk areas	Score without controls		Summary of existing controls and mitigations	Score with controls		What else do we need to do? By whom and by when?	Lead officer on actions	Review date
		Impact	Likelihood		Impact	Likelihood			
	April 2010)								
ENV	<b>Loss of highway infrastructure due to flooding</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	Regular inspections currently being undertaken on all highway bridges. "Structures at Risk Register" being developed with increased frequency of inspections on these highway structures. Special Inspections of "at-risk" highway structures being undertaken immediately following localised high rainfall events.	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	Close monitoring of risk via service risk register (ongoing).	Jo Turton, Executive Director	Annually
ENV	<b>Failure of Waste PFI Contract</b> - financial and reputation risk.	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly and Annual monitoring and reconciliation of data and performance against both diversion and financial targets. Maximising throughputs and exploring commercial opportunities from various sectors will aid in the challenge to effectively manage baseline costs.	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	Close monitoring of risk via service risk register (ongoing).	Jo Turton, Executive Director	Six - Monthly
ENV	Corporate Manslaughter on highway	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	Highway safety inspections (3,6 or 12-monthly as appropriate) .Annual skid resistance surveys. Bi-annual bridge inspections. Monitoring of highway slopes and embankments.	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	Close monitoring of risk via service risk register (ongoing).	Jo Turton, Executive Director	Six - Monthly
ENV	Failure of Public Transport Contracts - financial and reputation risk	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	Public transport operators closely monitored. Where appropriate, contingency measures are put in place allow us to replace contracts quickly and efficiently should the need arise.	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	No further action proposed.	Jo Turton, Executive Director	Six - Monthly

## CORPORATE RISK ASSESSMENT

### Impact

Score	What's the worst that could happen?
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insignificant disruption with no loss of service to citizens</li> <li>• No harm to life or limb</li> <li>• No reputation damage</li> <li>• No or insignificant environmental damage</li> <li>• Low financial loss</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some disruption to non-critical citizen service</li> <li>• LCC liable for disruption to key partner but no loss of service</li> <li>• Minor injury to third parties (requiring first aid treatment)</li> <li>• Minimal reputation damage (minimal adverse coverage in local press)</li> <li>• LCC responsible for minor damage to local environment</li> <li>• Medium financial loss</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noticeable disruption to critical service not exceeding 48 hours</li> <li>• LCC responsible for disruption to key partner resulting in loss of their service not exceeding 48 hours</li> <li>• Violence or threat of serious injury (medical treatment required)</li> <li>• Adverse coverage in national tabloid press and/or extensive front page coverage in local press or TV</li> <li>• LCC liable for moderate damage to local environment</li> <li>• High financial loss</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious disruption LCC's ability to provide a critical service to citizens (loss of service between 2 and 7 days)</li> <li>• LCC responsible for major disruption to key partner resulting in a loss of their service lasting between 2 and 7 days</li> <li>• Adverse coverage in national broadsheet press and/or low level national TV reporting</li> <li>• Extensive and multiple injuries</li> <li>• LCC liable for major damage to local environment</li> <li>• Major financial loss</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Government intervention in running of LCC / Directorate</li> <li>• Loss of critical citizen service for more than 7 days</li> <li>• Business failure of partner or loss of service delivery of over 7 days</li> <li>• Multiple injuries including loss of life</li> <li>• Extensive coverage in national press and broadsheet editorial and/or national TV item</li> <li>• Significant local, national or international environment damage</li> <li>• Enormous financial loss</li> </ul>

### Likelihood

Score	Descriptors
5	Almost Certain. Expected to occur in most circumstances or more than a 75% chance of occurrence.
4	Likely. Potential of occurring several times in 10 years or has occurred recently. Between 50% and 75% chance of occurrence.
3	Moderate. Could occur more than once in 10 years. History of occurrence or near miss. Less than a 50% chance of occurrence.
2	Unlikely. May occur over a 10 year period. Less than 10% chance of occurrence.
1	Rare. Has not occurred. May occur in exceptional circumstances. Less than 2% chance of occurrence.

### Impact / Likelihood matrix

		Impact				
		1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	5	1/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	5/5
	4	1/4	2/4	3/4	4/4	5/4
	3	1/3	2/3	3/3	4/3	5/3
	2	1/2	2/2	3/2	4/2	5/2
	1	1/1	2/1	3/1	4/1	5/1

Level of Concern	Action Required
Very concerned	Urgent attention required at senior level to ensure risk is reduced to an acceptable level. Action planning should start without delay. Progress on actions should be reported to ELT.
Concerned	Minimum of robust contingency plan plus early warning indicators. Some control measures likely to be necessary. Progress on actions should be reported on at directorate senior management team.
Uneasy	Acceptable with some mitigation and contingency planning. Routine reviews should be carried out to ensure there has been no change which will make them more severe.
Content	Acceptable, but keep under review. No further action required unless risk becomes more severe.