

## Schedule of the council's underlying risks as at 27 June 2011

## Appendix D

Risk: taken from the council's risk register as at 27 June 2011	Score without controls			Outline of controls	Score with controls			Rank before control	Rank after control
	Impact	Likelihood	Total		Impact	Likelihood	Total		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious health and safety failure including food hygiene, involving an employee, service user or member of the public, resulting in costs/ fines, business disruption and loss of reputation.</li> </ul>	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and safety management system, certified to OHSAS 18001.</li> <li>• Regular Integrated Management System (IMS) audits.</li> <li>• Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points documentation, and training for staff.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	=1	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inability to deliver effective children's social care services arising from system or process failure.</li> </ul>	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Capture, Storage and Distribution project board will ensure all files are scanned and indexed.</li> </ul>	4	3	12	=1	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unexpected death or serious injury of an adult service user.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lancashire Safeguarding Adults Board, supported by governance arrangements.</li> <li>• Comprehensive risk assessments and health and safety procedures in place for in-house service provision.</li> <li>• Staff training programme.</li> <li>• Serious case review procedures.</li> </ul>	5	2	10	=3	=3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Death or serious injury of a staff member working with adult service users.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lone Worker Policy, risk assessments and health and safety procedures.</li> <li>• On-call arrangements, use of mobile phones, safety alarms, virtual whiteboard to track staff whereabouts, handover arrangements.</li> <li>• Risk assessment flag in ISSIS.</li> </ul>	5	2	10	=3	=3

Schedule of the council's underlying risks as at 27 June 2011

Risk: taken from the council's risk register as at 27 June 2011	Score without controls			Outline of controls	Score with controls			Rank before control	Rank after control
	Impact	Likelihood	Total		Impact	Likelihood	Total		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information quality is poor, and information is lost or mishandled, resulting in financial loss/ fines, service delivery failure, harm to individuals and reputational damage.</li> </ul>	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Information Governance Group.</li> <li>Directorate Information Champions.</li> <li>Guidance, policies and procedures available.</li> <li>Security controls and encryption.</li> <li>Statements of conformity, spot checks and security breach procedures.</li> <li>Publication Scheme.</li> </ul>	3	3	9	=2	=4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Death or serious injury of a child known to the council.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-agency Safeguarding Board, with supporting safeguarding procedures.</li> <li>Case review mechanisms in place.</li> <li>Monitoring of children subject to child protection plans.</li> <li>Training and support for staff.</li> <li>Panels assess lessons learned and disseminate learning to practitioners.</li> </ul>	3	3	9	=3	=4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An unplanned event occurs and adversely impacts the council's service delivery.</li> </ul>	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Contingencies Group, which oversees business continuity planning.</li> <li>Directorate Emergency Liaison Team.</li> <li>Reporting system established through directorate structures.</li> </ul>	3	3	9	=3	=4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure in schools' and other educational settings' performance.</li> </ul>	4	5	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early warning system, monitoring by School Improvement Challenge Board.</li> <li>Early years only: consultants use Quality Audit Tool.</li> </ul>	2	4	8	=1	5

Schedule of the council's underlying risks as at 27 June 2011

Risk: taken from the council's risk register as at 27 June 2011	Score without controls			Outline of controls	Score with controls			Rank before control	Rank after control
	Impact	Likelihood	Total		Impact	Likelihood	Total		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic and operational failures resulting from the failure of partnership working with the National Health Service.</li> </ul>	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint funded posts and integrated delivery teams.</li> <li>Work to maintain relationships.</li> </ul>	2	3	6	=2	=6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced choice in the market for service providers to older people leading to higher costs and poorer solutions for some service users.</li> </ul>	4	4	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robust commissioning and procurement system.</li> <li>Liaison with service providers to understand their business models.</li> <li>Use of a range of providers.</li> </ul>	2	3	6	=2	=6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver budget savings, due to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate project management procedures</li> <li>Legal challenge</li> <li>Demographic change.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial and performance monitoring by Management Team.</li> <li>Financial and performance monitoring by Directorate management teams.</li> <li>Directorate delivery plans.</li> </ul>	3	2	6	=4	=6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surface water flooding.</li> </ul>	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surface Water Management Plan, with prioritised action to reduce risk.</li> </ul>	2	3	6	=4	=6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to achieve the council's objectives related to children, young adults and families, arising from inspection failure.</li> </ul>	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plans monitored by Directorate Leadership Team and Safeguarding Steering Group.</li> <li>Service plan and performance management framework.</li> <li>Directorate compliance audit team undertakes a programme of compliance inspections.</li> <li>Inspection preparation group in place; mock inspections.</li> <li>Periodic peer reviews.</li> </ul>	3	2	6	=5	=6

Schedule of the council's underlying risks as at 27 June 2011

Risk: taken from the council's risk register as at 27 June 2011	Score without controls			Outline of controls	Score with controls			Rank before control	Rank after control
	Impact	Likelihood	Total		Impact	Likelihood	Total		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver the corporate strategy due to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of ownership</li> <li>Lack of performance management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring by the Performance Working Group Executive.</li> <li>Performance management framework identifies under-performance and ensures recovery plans are prepared and implemented.</li> </ul>	2	2	4	=5	=7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lancashire fails to influence national distribution of resources through the Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) because:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Its 'voice' is uncoordinated</li> <li>It fails to engage key business leaders in shaping and delivering the county's priorities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LEP governance arrangements.</li> <li>Shadow business leadership group.</li> <li>Economic Development Framework.</li> </ul>	2	2	4	=5	=7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver benefits to the council of working in partnership with BT plc, due to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate governance</li> <li>Management unfamiliarity with private sector partnership working.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cabinet Committee on the strategic partnership.</li> </ul>	2	1	3	=5	=8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of highway infrastructure due to flooding.</li> </ul>	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual general inspections of high risk structures.</li> <li>Principal Inspections of high risk structures every six years.</li> <li>Scour inspections of high risk bridges every 2-3 years, with superficial inspections of high risk bridges immediately following high rainfall events.</li> </ul>	3	1	3	=6	=8

Schedule of the council's underlying risks as at 27 June 2011

Risk: taken from the council's risk register as at 27 June 2011	Score without controls			Outline of controls	Score with controls			Rank before control	Rank after control
	Impact	Likelihood	Total		Impact	Likelihood	Total		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortages of key workforce skills, workers, and leaders resulting from inadequate workforce recruitment and retention relating to children and young people's services.</li> </ul>	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children's Workforce Strategy.</li> <li>Leadership development programme.</li> <li>Career pathways and Talent Pool programme.</li> <li>Work-based recruitment initiatives.</li> <li>Training and support opportunities provided.</li> <li>Flexible working and staff well-being programmes.</li> </ul>	2	1	2	=5	=9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial costs and reputational damage arising from the failure of the waste PFI contract.</li> </ul>	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close monitoring of performance against operational and financial targets.</li> <li>Use of service risk register for more detailed risk mitigation.</li> </ul>	2	1	2	=6	=9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ineffective engagement with the voluntary, community and faith sector (VCFS), leading to poor value for money from the funding provided and potential challenge where funding distorts competition in service provision.</li> </ul>	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessments panel assesses grant funding.</li> <li>VCFS commissioning framework.</li> </ul>	2	1	2	=7	=9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure of public transport contracts.</li> </ul>	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close monitoring of public transport operators.</li> </ul>	2	1	2	=7	=9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate manslaughter on the highway.</li> </ul>	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highway safety inspections at set intervals.</li> <li>Annual skid resistance surveys.</li> <li>Bi-annual bridge inspections.</li> <li>Annual review of highest risk routes.</li> <li>Monitoring of highway slopes and embankments.</li> </ul>	2	1	2	=7	=9