Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority		Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Scole	Initial Impact ( I) Score	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood	Res	
SR 19	Implementation of the Care Act  Executive Director Adult Social Care  Denise D'Souza	ALL	Background:  The Care Act is enacted but its detailed requirements through statutory guidance is still to be finalised - Safeguarding; - Funding of Social Care; - Contributions for Care costs (Dilnot report); - Increased duties in respect of carers  The Council needs to have processes and systems in place to support changes to safeguarding, care, information and advice functions by April 2015.  Risk Scenario:  If we fail to meet our new statutory duties under the Care Act then: * Service delivery for individuals will be affected * Reputational damage * Financial risk	)   	5	4		20 RED	S Adults Social Care Modernisation Board set up; Workstreams in place working across the South East and nationally to work to ensure capacity to respond to the changes and predict future demands; Local workstream identified and will link where possible to work on the Better Care Fund.	4	4	NEW As a separate risk

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority	better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Score	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood	Res Sco	Residual Risk Score
SR 21	Pressures  Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing  Geoff Raw	2. Creating a More Sustainable Ctiv	Background: The increasing demands for housing continues to outstrip new supply and as a consequence accommodation is becoming less affordable notably in central city areas relative to the local wage rates. Housing is particularly acute for low income families. There are also significant needs associated with an ageing population and more dependant households. Student numbers are also forecast to grow and have a significant impact on the existing residential communities and, in terms of affordable rents for non-student households, local character and impact on amenity arising from rapid 'studentification' of neighbourhoods, student residencies and competition for development sites.  Risk Scenario: The city is unable to accommodate economic growth and sustainable development objectives; and the ability of the council to meet housing demand is affected by displacement of family accommodation.	Social	4	4		16 RED	<ul> <li>Review of city Housing Strategy as presented to by City partners' Strategic Housing Partnership in Nov 13, has set objectives for next 4 years;</li> <li>Increased focus on housing delivery in City Plan submission Continued monitoring of population growth; affordability (prices v income); assessment of impact of housing tenure mix [owner/occupier renting; student housing; new family households;</li> <li>City Plan supports need for housing and delivery of affordable housing, eg extra care &amp; other housing;</li> <li>Continue to work with private sector landlords to increase the supply of affordable high quality private lettings;</li> <li>Continued work with Registered Social Landlords to support housing led regeneration initiatives</li> </ul>	ω	4	AMBER NEW

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Res Sco	
SR 20	Executive Director Adult Social Care Denise D'Souza	Background: The changes to funding for Adult Social Care introduced by the Better Care Fund affect how the whole system of social care, across the public and private sectors, works together. The impact of funding changes of the Better Care Fund combine with already significant changes to the NHS still being implemented and reduced budgets for, and increased savings required from Local Government.  Risk Scenario:  If parties do not work together as agreed at the Better Care Board, or organisation's priorities change, it will affect delivery of performance targets in relation to the Better Care Fund. Any failure of delivery over the longer term (3-5 years) will impact on the Acute Trusts' costs and our ability to release efficiency savings as a result of integrated working and a focus on prevention	Economic/Financial	4	4	16 RED	Fealth & Wellbeing Board reviewed and governance arrangements in place to help deliver and integrated approach including the oversight of the Better Care Fund;  Better Care Board established (high level and cross sector representation) and chaired by Executive Director Adult Social Care;  Partnership work agreed and submitted a Better Care Plan by the deadline in March 2014;  Agreement at Better Care Board to develop a Better Care implementation plan for delivery of Phase 1 from September 2014, based on an integrated model of delivery;  Already a small number of local authority staff working on 7 day contracts and work continues to incorporate into new contracts; some staff already involved in integrated primary care teams.	3	4	AMBER  NEW  As a separate risk

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Priority	Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)		Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Residual Impact ( I) Score	Residual Risk Score L x I
SR 18	Effective use of technology  Executive Director Finance & Resources  Catherine Vaughan	4. Modernising the council	Background: The Modernising the Council priority is dependent on a high quality of ICT infrastructure and service, and staff who are able to make the most of the technology available to them. Demand for ICT investment significantly outstrips available funding and ICT capacity. Customers' expectations of how they are able to interact with the council relies on effective use of technology.  Risk Scenario:  If we do not invest appropriately in technology and its effective use, we will be unable to deliver sufficient efficiency savings and meet customer expectations.	Customer/ citizen	5	4	20 RED	<ul> <li>ICT Strategy;</li> <li>ICT investment plan (partially funded;</li> <li>Investment in new network and roll out of new Microsoft Operating Suite is almost complete;</li> <li>ICT workforce planning ideas shared within council and SE7 partners;</li> <li>Improving Customer Experience Board includes focus on measures to enhance customers' experience and digital access to council services;</li> <li>New piece of work on Targeted ICT investment initiated alongside VFM Phase 4 programme to approve prioritisation of requests and resources.</li> </ul>	4	4	16  RED  ↔

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.		Council Priority		Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)		Initial Impact ( I)  Score	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Res Sco	
SR 10	Information Governance Management  Senior Information Risk Officer  Abraham Ghebre- Ghiorghis  and  Executive Director Finance & Resources  Catherine Vaughan	ALL	Background: The council must operate to a high standard of information governance within the overall context of openness and transparency. The Cabinet has implemented a "zero tolerance" policy for access to the national Public Services Network (PSN).  Risk Scenario: The council recognises that if it fails to manage data effectively then: * Individuals may suffer loss or damage * The council may suffer loss of reputation, financial penalties and/or other enforcement penalties * It may result in a loss of trust in the council by citizens and partners and sub-optimal decision making * The Council risks cut off from PSN if it does not meet the security requirements which would be business critical for many services.	Customer/Citizen	5	4	1	RED	<ul> <li>Information Management Board oversees this risk and provides leadership on Information Management good practice to ensure the council acts upon its legal obligations under the Data Protection Act and Freedom of Information Acts;</li> <li>Open Government Licence implemented to support open government agenda and records management;</li> <li>Code of Connection compliance was achieved in September 2013. Compliance is annually reassessed and additional security standards are brought into effect each year;</li> <li>Freedom of Information requests now available through What Do They Know national website;</li> <li>Review of training and communication requirements across the organisation underway.</li> </ul>	4	4	16

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I) Score	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood	I OD C	Residual Risk Score L x I
SR 12	Maintaining Seafront as an asset to the city  Assistant Chief Executive Paula Murray and Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing Geoff Raw	Background:  The seafront is a city asset which is iconic and contributes to the city's reputation. The council is the lead custodian of the seafront but the benefits are shared by many. At least 5 million people use our seafront every year. It is a very significant attraction in our visitor economy; provides a series of important public spaces for residents; many businesses in the city rely on the draw of the seafront to sustain their organisation's value and to provide an attractive place for stakeholders and employees. It is being used beyond its original design and, in many ways, is a victim of its own success and affected by the changing patterns and increased demands of usage.  Risk Scenario:  The heritage structures and infrastructure along the seafront require significant investment and ongoing revenue in order to maintain them for the purposes of modern use and preserve the reputation of the city and its offer.	Physical	5	4	20 RED	<ul> <li>Develop the investment plan to underpin the Seafront Strategy and long term viability of the sea front infrastructure;</li> <li>Continue to support financially viable investments in the seafront, e.g. i360;</li> <li>Seafront arch repair programme to be delivered over 10 years from 2012;</li> <li>Commissioned structural surveys, e.g. principal inspection of Madeira Terrace and a programme of structural surveys of arches and other seafront structures;</li> <li>Specialist functions involved in internal cross council working group to identify, prioritise and report issues;</li> <li>Works undertaken to stabilise West Street Shelter Hall and further collapsed arch supporting highway;</li> <li>Scrutiny panel established to identify recommendations for improved management and development of the Seafront.</li> </ul>	4	4	16

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.		Council Priority	Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Laitial Immand (1)	linitial Impact ( I) Score	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score Residual Risk Score Residual Risk Score L x I
SR 2	Financial Outlook for the Council  Executive Director Finance & Resources  Catherine Vaughan	ALL	Background: Reductions in central government funding are expected to continue well beyond the current Comprehensive Spending Review period through to 2020. The changes to local government funding introduced in 2013/14 will have changed the risks to the council, particularly in relation to Business Rates and Council Tax Reduction Schemes. There is a cumulative impact of reductions in government funding to other public agencies in the city.  Implementing the current budget strategy and devising budget plans for 2015/16 will be challenging and affected by uncertainty as both national and local elections are due in May 2015.  Risk Scenario: The council will need to continue robust financial planning in a highly complex environment. Failure to do so could impact on financial resilience and mean that outcomes for residents are not optimised.	Economic/ Financial	5	4	1	20 RED	S Ongoing review of the adequacy of risk provisions and reserves to support the budget strategy, to ensure financial resilience;  Close alignment of Corporate Plan priorities, Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and service and financial planning;  Ongoing review of the MTFS assumptions, the impact of legislative changes; cost and demand pressures; savings programmes, and income and grant assumptions;  Close monitoring of council tax, business rates and other income and regular updating of forecasts;  New VFM Phase 4 programme being initiated;  City Management Board and Finance Directors review city wide impact & opportunities for joint budget planning;  Consultation & engagement plan for budget setting continues to include staff, partners, businesses and Community & Voluntary Sector.  7

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Res Sco	
SR 17	School Places Planning  Executive Director Children's Services Pinaki Ghoshal	Background:  The Council has a statutory role to ensure primary and secondary school places meet future need. There has been an upturn in the birth rate so that since 2003, the number of school aged children living the city has been increasing year on year, therefore pupil places are increasingly challenged.  This is particularly acute in areas when in previous years pupil yield has previously been very much lower. While previously there has been a focus on primary school places in the next few years we will have a significant pressure on secondary school places.  Risk Scenario: Parents may not be feel able to secure a place for their child in the local community; there may be increased travelling.  Without identifying new sites, existing schools may become overcrowded or larger.	Customer/ citizen	4	4	16 RED	<ul> <li>© Cross party school place planning group chaired by Risk Owner and involving all schools, colleges and the two city universities;</li> <li>© Regular review of pupil number forecasting has made it clear that primary growth starts to reach secondary schools by 2014, with the issue becoming acute in subsequent years. The future need focus relates to secondary school places;</li> <li>© Work with Members on a crossparty basis and with partners to bring forward proposals and share understanding;</li> <li>© 465 new primary school places (15.5 classes) added in last five years;</li> <li>© Two new free schools opened in city;</li> <li>© Four class junior site to open on Hove Police Station site September 2014.</li> </ul>	3	4	12  AMBER  ↔

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority	better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Score	Risk Score L x I Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Res	
13	vulnerable adults safe from harm and abuse  Executive Director Adult Social Care  Denise D'Souza	1. Tackling Inequality	Background: Keeping vulnerable adults safe from harm and abuse is a responsibility of the council. Brighton & Hove City Council has a statutory duty to co-ordinate safeguarding work across the city and the Safeguarding Adults Board. This work links partnerships across the Police and Health and Social Care providers. Over 1400 concerns were raised last year about vulnerable people with over 1,000 going into investigation  Due to a national legal judgement in early 2014 in relation of Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) the council has seen a significant increase in requests for Best Interest Assessments (BIAs); numbers have increased significantly testing the council's capacity to deliver (eg numbers have increased over the last 3 months from 2 a month to 2 requests per day).  Risk Scenario:  Cases are more complex and demands can vary. The council is able to respond appropriately at a time of change and contact is vital to protect those most vulnerable.	Customer/Citizen	4	4		16 RED	<ul> <li>Awareness through messages and training;</li> <li>Safeguarding Board workplan;</li> <li>Learning from serious case reviews, coroners concerns and case review from national work;</li> <li>Good multi-agency work: Pilot role and access point from Police;</li> <li>Audit of Safeguarding investigations and alerts (to check as appropriate);</li> <li>Maintain the role and numbers of professional social workers through service redesign to ensure capacity;</li> <li>Agreed process for escalation with NHS Surrey/Sussex to ensure timelines of clinical investigations;</li> <li>Multi-agency training in place for better awareness, investigation management;</li> <li>Highly motivated social workers</li> <li>Assessment of need using agreed threshold policies and procedures;</li> <li>Staff provided with learning opportunities and undertake continuous professional development</li> <li>Working with ADASS (association of directors of adult social services) on the impact of recent legal judgement which is being seen nationally.</li> </ul>	3	4	12  AMBER  →

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority		Risk Category	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( 1)	Initial Impact (1) Score	Risk Score L x I Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood (L) Score	Res Sco	
SR 15	Keeping children safe from harm and abuse  Executive Director Children's Services  Pinaki Ghoshal	1. Tackling Inequality	Background: Keeping vulnerable children safe from harm and abuse is a legal responsibility of the Council. Legislation requires all local authorities to act in accordance with national guidance (Working Together) to ensure robust safeguarding practice. This includes the responsibility to ensure an effective Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) which oversees work locally and in partnership with Police, Health and social care providers. The numbers of children in care; with Child Protection; and Children in Need plans are significantly higher than similar authorities.  Risk Scenario: The complexity of circumstances for many children presents a constant state of risk which demands informed and reflective professional judgement, and often urgent and decisive action, by all agencies using agreed thresholds and procedures. Such complexity inevitably presents a high degree of risk. Children subject to abuse and neglect are unlikely to achieve and maintain a satisfactory level of health or development, or their health & development will be significantly impaired. In some circumstances, abuse and neglect may lead to a child's death.		4	4		16 RED	<ul> <li>S LSCB Work Plan and strong leadership by the Independent Chair with aligned LSCB sub-group work plans;</li> <li>S Serious Case, Local Management and Child Death Reviews identify learning and action for improvement;</li> <li>S Quality Assurance across key agencies monitored by the LSCB sub group;</li> <li>Reports delivered to LSCB following robust auditing of multi-agency case files and safeguarding practice;</li> <li>MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub) to be launched in September 2014 to provide robust risk assessments and information sharing between partner agencies which will lead to robust assessment of need using agreed Child Protection threshold document, policies and procedures;.</li> <li>Early Help Strategy in place</li> <li>Stronger Families, Stronger Communities work targets support to the most troubled families.</li> </ul>	3	4	12

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner	Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Categor	Initial Likelihood (L)	Initial Impact ( I)	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact ( I)	Residual Risk Score
SR 4	Economic Resilience and Sustainable Economic Growth  Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing  Geoff Raw	Background: The council has a significant role in championing the city economy and creating opportunities to attract inward investment. It uses its own land and property portfolio to contribute to this alongside a range of policy levers including: housing, planning, economic development, leisure, tourism, education performance transport and public investment powers Risk Scenario:  If the council does not do this effectively of difficulties in the national and international economy  * Business, community, employee and employment expectations and aspirations not met, impact on Corporate Plan objectives and reputation affected  * Failure to sustain local businesses an attract new investment in the city  * Adverse impact on city's Business Rate income.	/:	4	4	16 RED	<ul> <li>Greater Brighton City Deal initiative has established governance arrangements to support local economic growth and well being;</li> <li>The Council works closely with the Local Enterprise Partnership to influence the economic development strategy and has successfully bid for Growing Places Funding;</li> <li>Council is exploring a variety of policy and financial levers to unlock sustainable growth including housing led regeneration with the Housing &amp; Communities Agency and is bringing forward a number of infill site development opportunities;</li> <li>The City Plan will take account of new legislation affecting planning, including s106 requirements; changes to the classes order; and impacts on citizens, developers and businesses;</li> <li>City Regeneration Unit work to improve business rates, New Homes Bonus and other development and property related income.</li> </ul>	3	4	AMBER  ↔

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Risk No.	Risk Title and Owner				(L)	lct ( ))	( )	Risk Score L x I (Dot indicates RAG rating)	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)  Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)
Strategic		Council P	(including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Category	Initial	Initial Impact ( I)	Score		Residual I (L) Score Residual I Score Residual
SR 8	Becoming a more sustainable city  Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing  Geoff Raw	2. Creating a more Sustainable City	Dianat City	Environmental/ Sustainability	3	4		12  AMBER	S One Planet Living principles adopted for the city with One Planet Board to oversee implementation of One Planet Living action plan;  Actions and opportunities arising from gaining Unesco Biosphere status and becoming a world demonstrator for sustainability  Environmental performance reporting and improvement actions;  Targets and standards introduced as part of the sustainable and ethical procurement process.  The economic strategy & the emerging City Deal proposals for Eco Tech development provide opportunity to reduce the environmental footprint of the city's economic activity and develop products and services which can positively influence environmental management across global markets;  Continuing partnership with East Sussex County Council to reduce landfill as a result of the Energy Recovery Facility. Newhaven.  3   AMBER   AMBER

Brighton & Hove City Council Strategic Risk Register 2014/2015- reviewed by Executive Leadership Team 28 May 2014.

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact). See final page for information on risk scoring and terms used.

## **RISKS REMOVED/REPLACED**

The Executive Leadership Team reviewed the Strategic Risk Register and resolved to remove the following strategic risks for the reasons set out below:

SR16 - Health and Social Care Modernisation/Integration.

Risk removed and replaced as there are two components, i.e. the Better Care Fund; and implementing the Care Act, which are at different risk levels. SR16 is removed but it is replaced by two new risks SR19 Implementation of the Care Act; and SR20 Better Care Fund;

SR14 Pay & Allowances Modernisation.

Risk removed as pay and allowances modernisation has been implemented and achieved; and

SR11 Welfare Reform.

Risk removed as the council has put in place short-term mitigation measures to manage the impact of Welfare Reform at this time and has incorporated ongoing work as part of its usual operating procedures and plans. The council's Welfare Board continues to monitor the impact of reforms on an ongoing basis. It is possible that more is known about the rollout of universal credit, it could come back onto the Strategic Risk Register.

The next pages provide copies of the removed or replaced risks.

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	REMOVED/ REPLACED Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority	REMOVED/REPLACED Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Cat		Initia	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual	_	Residual Risk Score
16	Health and Social Care Modernisation Integration Executive Director Adult Social Care Denise D'Souza  RISK REMOVED	ALL	Background: The Care Bill is progressing through Parliament with implications for:  - Safeguarding; - Funding of Social Care; - Contributions for Care costs (Dilnot report) - Increased duties in respect of carers The changes to funding (the Integration Transformation Fund 'ITF') affect how the whole system of social care, across the public and private sectors, works together. This in a backdrop of already significant changes to the NHS still being implemented and reduced budgets for ,and increased savings required from Local Government.  Risk Scenario For ITF there is a short timescale which combines with the other significant challenges already being addressed and the need for the whole system of social care to work together to deliver the performance targets for ITF.  The current statutory duties of the council continue but more will be added; there will be different elements and responsibilities of partners so that the whole system of social care will need review and work to manage challenges such as capacity, set up time, need to quantify additional work, whilst meeting existing duties.	Economic/ Financial	5	4	<ul> <li>Meetings with Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to develop ITF plan to be submitted by March 2014;</li> <li>Review of Safeguarding Board to ensure that arrangements will be fit for purpose when the legislation comes into effect;</li> <li>Review of the fitness of purpose of Health and Wellbeing Board for new expectations and governance of the ITF (Integration Transformation Fund);</li> <li>Some project support available to supports Carers and implications of new bill;</li> <li>Modernisation Board set up to pull together many work streams and projects and will prioritise actions;</li> <li>Already a small number of local authority social care staff working on 7 days contracts, and work continues to incorporate into new contracts;</li> <li>Working with partners to inform and influence all parties involved in social care provision so that understanding, capacity and performance meets new requirements.</li> </ul>	4		RISK REMOVED and REPLACED

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	REMOVED/ REPLACED Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority	REMOVED/REPLACED Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)			Initial Risk Score	Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include (but are not limited to)	Residual	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
14	Pay & Allowances Modernisation Chief Executive Penelope Thompson  RISK REMOVED	4. Modernising the council	Background: The pay, terms and conditions of employees of Brighton & Hove City Council are constructed from a number of different sources. Key terms and conditions such as pension rights and entitlement to sick pay are agreed nationally. Basic pay is governed by the council's job evaluation and grading system which was implemented in January 2010 and the rates of pay are set in accordance with nationally agreed pay scales. In addition, a significant number of staff receive allowances and additional payments because of the nature and pattern of the work that they do. These allowances are locally determined but over time the current system has become complex, is based on historic requirements and is no longer fit for purpose. Pay Modernisation is designed to implement a new system of allowances that is fair, consistent, modern and transparent and takes into account relevant legislation and case law, in particular in relation to equal pay and broader employment law.  Risk Scenario:  Pay Modernisation is critical to ensure a fair, consistent, modern and transparent system of pay. Failure to implement an appropriate system of pay could lead to significantly greater legal and financial risks in future; service disruption during the implementation phase; and reputational damage.	Professional/Managerial	1 4	1	<ul> <li>Agreement from Policy &amp; Resources Committee to negotiate new allowances structure;</li> <li>Clear officer governance structure set up for communications, negotiations and decision-making;</li> <li>Clear communication strategy for members, staff and officers;</li> <li>Identified staff and other resources in Finance, Legal and HR to support negotiations, pay modelling and financial and legal implications;</li> <li>Refreshed Business Continuity Plans.</li> </ul>		4	RISK REMOVED

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact).

Strategic Risk No.	REMOVED/ REPLACED Risk Title and Owner	Council Priority	REMOVED/REPLACED Background and Risk Scenario and Potential Consequences A potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the Council's objectives (including contribution to the Sustainable Community Strategy)	Risk Cat	Initial L	Initial I		REMOVED/REPLACED  Mitigating Controls and Actions currently include  (but are not limited to)	Residual	Ř	Residual Risk Score
11	Welfare Reform  Executive Director Finance & Resources  Catherine Vaughan  RISK REMOVED	ALL	The government is implementing widespread welfare reforms and support for council tax has been localised. Introduction of the Universal Credit initiative and changes to housing benefits are expected to have a wide-ranging impact on the council and the city.  Risk Scenario:  There will be significantly less housing benefit funding in the city. It is complex to predict the impact on individuals and households. There may be increased risk of vulnerability, homelessness and an impact on income collection.	Economic/ Financia	-	4	16	<ul> <li>S Cross-council programme management approach to welfare reform, links with other strategies i.e. financial inclusion, digital inclusion, Stronger Families, Stronger Communities Partnership;</li> <li>S Additional funding to implement welfare reform included in the budget;</li> <li>Financial Inclusion Policy agreed;</li> <li>Additional discretionary funding identified and policies agreed;</li> <li>Monitoring framework developed to assess service and equalities impacts of welfare reform;</li> <li>Close monitoring of income collection from council tax, housing rents and corporate critical homelessness budget;</li> <li>Approach to implementation of social housing sector size criteria agreed at Housing Committee.</li> </ul>	3	4	RISK REMOVED

Note: this is an exception report. Only risks and opportunities that have a Red or Amber risks score and are of a strategic scope (beyond the direct control of one or more directorates/service areas) are recorded on this Strategic Risk Register. All other levels of risk are recorded in business and risk management plans at service (operational) or project level.

Risks are set out in order of new or increasing risks, then by Residual Risk Score (a combination of likelihood and impact). See final page for information on risk scoring and terms used.

	MOST LIKELY <b>IMPACT</b>										
LIKELIHOOD	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	4)	(5)						
Almost Certain (5)	5	10	15	20	25						
Likely (4)	4	8	12	16	20						
Possible (3)	3	6	9	12	15						
Unlikely (2)	2	4	6	8	10						
Almost Impossible (1)	1	2	3	4	5						

## **Risk Scoring**

The City Council uses this risk matrix to "score", i.e. assess the likelihood and impact of the risk scenario occurring and its potential consequences if it did, and how it would affect achievement of the council's objectives.

## **Terms Used**

- Strategic Risk Register a document which details the current prioritised issues which affect the achievement of the Council's objectives, including in relation to its work with others across the city to address city priorities
- Strategic Risk No. a unique number allocated to each strategic risk. As these risks are managed, these unique risks may be removed from the Strategic Risk Register and in that case, a gap in sequential numbering will arise
- Risk Scenario a potential or actual risk or opportunity which needs to be managed in order to better achieve the council's objectives
- Potential Consequences those which may arise if the risk scenario occurs
- Initial Likelihood/Impact Scores the initial score for the risk scenario before the current Mitigating Controls and Actions are considered
- RAG rating a way to colour code risks to prioritise them. "RAG" derives from the initials of Red, Amber, Green although for risk
  management it is common to have the extra colour of Yellow
- Mitigating Controls and Actions these are already in place and operating to reduce/mitigate the likelihood and/or impact of the risk scenario and potential consequences
- Residual Likelihood/Impact Scores assessed after taking into account the Mitigating Controls & Actions to provide a more "realistic" prioritisation of risks compared against each other
- Risk Category there is a standard list of risk categories which are designed to ensure a "rounded" consideration of risks from a number of different perspectives. By recording the Risk Category, it enables analysis across the risks contained in a risk register.