

	<p>London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p>AUDIT PENSIONS AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE</p> <p>5th December 2013</p>
<p>Combined Risk Management Highlight report</p>	
<p>Report of the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</p>	
<p>Open Report</p>	
<p>For Review & Comment</p> <p>Key Decision: No</p>	
<p>Wards Affected: None</p>	
<p>Accountable Executive Director: Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</p>	
<p>Report Author: Michael Sloniowski, Bi-borough Risk Manager</p>	<p>Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 2587 E-mail: michael.sloniowski@lbhf.gov.uk</p>

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report updates the Committee of the risks, controls, assurances and management action orientated to manage Enterprise Wide risks.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The committee consider the current h&f Sovereign Strategic, Change and Operational risks as outlined in the report.
- 2.2. The committee note the Tri-borough and Bi-borough risks such as they may affect h&f as outlined in the report.
- 2.3. The committee approve the Bi-borough Enterprise Wide Risk & Assurance register (**Appendix 1**).
- 2.4. The committee note the proposal to establish a Tri-borough risk management Officer forum to meet quarterly tasked to deliver objectives set out in the Tri-borough risk management strategy.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1. This report updates Members on the risk management issues identified across council services and follows changes in the reporting process to Committee to meet Corporate Governance requirements for Enterprise Risk Management as outlined in the 2012 guidance 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government'. Effective risk management continues to help the council to achieve its objectives by 'getting things right first time' and is a key indicator of the 'Corporate Health' of the council.

4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 4.1. Local government has been undergoing significant change and the environment in which it works is increasing in complexity. In addition to the continuing economic and financial challenge, the Localism Act and other key legislation has brought new roles, opportunities and greater flexibility for authorities.
- 4.2. Local authorities are changing the way in which they operate and undertake service provision. Public services are delivered directly, through partnerships, collaboration and through commissioning. Shared services and partnership boards have come into existence. The introduction of new structures and ways of working provide challenges for managing risk, ensuring transparency and demonstrating accountability.
- 4.3. Good governance enables an authority to pursue its vision effectively as well as underpinning that vision with control and the management of risk.

5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 5.1. In the Bi-borough work environment, people have to be stretched in their decision making and "doing" role. If there is no allowance for taking managed risks in an appropriate control environment, this stifles the whole process, prevents innovation and breeds poor morale. So a balanced approach to Enterprise Risk Management should allow for risk taking in a managed environment.
- 5.2. **TriBorough Risk Management approach.** Following a period of consultation with Officers of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea it is proposed that a TriBorough Risk Management forum of Officers is established. The operating model to be adopted follows the successful Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Risk Management Group. This operated with the purpose to encourage services to own, discuss and manage risk on an approach based on the risks in hand.
- 5.3. The responsibilities of the Tri-borough Risk Management Group will include;

- 5.3.1. To share risk management issues across Tri-borough services highlighting those that others may have missed. It would act as a hub where best practice is shared.
- 5.3.2. To agree final reports on risk for the Audit Committees at each Council, involving departments directly in the scrutiny of risks.
- 5.3.3. To assist in responding to issues where risks had been identified but not given sufficient priority or those which require review or closure. It would focus on strategic, portfolio and business as usual risks by department which would include those defined as common risks across the organisations. There would be a process of moderation in terms of those that were reported to Audit Committees.
- 5.3.4. To determine the appropriateness of the Risk Management Policy and methodology and keep this under review.
- 5.3.5. The previous board in existence at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea met quarterly and each meeting was scheduled for a one hour slot to ensure time was effectively managed.
- 5.3.6. The key success of the Royal Borough group was that each management board had to have an agenda item on their Management Team meeting on at least a quarterly basis which ensured risk management was more embedded.
- 5.3.7. Attendees will be invited to attend to represent Tri-borough, Bi-borough and or Sovereign borough services and Officers whom have some risk management responsibility for Portfolio or Programme Management, Business Continuity, Health & Safety and the Tri-borough Insurance Officer.
- 5.3.8. **Risk Management Lunch and Learn.** A representative of Legal and General has been invited to present a session to Officers on their experience of innovation and opportunity risk management and managing change in a major organisation. The presentation will be an open invitation to Officers across the three boroughs.
- 5.3.9. **Tri-borough methodology.** A single Risk Management methodology has been agreed with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster City Council. This completes the harmonisation of 3 differing approaches to how risks are identified, scored and reported.
- 5.3.10. It was agreed that the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham's methodology was the 'best fit' and most practical approach. Westminster City Council are comfortable with its adoption as this gives them greater sensitivity within their risk

assessment scoring. Risks will continue to be rated on a 5x5 matrix resulting in a scale of risk exposure of 1-25. (25 being the highest exposure). Key risks are to be 'rolled-up' and consolidated into the Bi-borough Enterprise Wide Register attached as Appendix 1.

5.3.11. Risk Management Intranet development.

A Bi-borough Risk Management Intranet site on TriBnet is being developed. The purpose of the site will be to bring all elements of Risk Management into one area. The site will include;

- A central hub for all risk registers.
- Practical guidance.
- Access to agenda items and minutes of a Tri-borough Risk Management Group.
- Access to training.
- A shared workspace between the 3 councils.

5.4. The Council has a number of significant change and transformation programmes each managed by a programme board. The majority of programmes relate to the Tri-borough agenda. The individual programme boards produce a risk register identifying significant risks to the delivery of the specific programme.

5.5. Where appropriate, risks identified in the risk registers have been incorporated into the Bi-borough annual audit planning process to enable audit resources to be directed to the most appropriate areas that may affect business assurance.

5.6. ENTERPRISE WIDE RISK AND ASSURANCE REGISTER

5.6.1. The Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register has been updated following the review of Tri-borough, Bi-borough and Departmental submissions and has been reviewed by the Management Boards of Hammersmith and Fulham and The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Councils. It remains an indicator of 'Corporate Preparedness'. The full version accompanies this paper for Members information at **Appendix 1.**

5.7. H&F - STRATEGIC RISKS PERSPECTIVE

5.7.1. **Unplanned risk exposures.**

5.7.2. Unplanned risk exposures could be considered as those which require Emergency Planning, Business Continuity or Insurance. These areas can be contained through co-ordinated risk management, information sharing, analysis and

reporting. There have been no significant issues to report in these areas in the past quarter. A separate report on the progress of Health and Safety risk management forms is being presented to the Audit, Pensions and Standards Committee for consideration.

5.8. H&F - OPERATIONAL PERSPECTIVE.

Key risks.

5.8.1. Tri-borough Adult Social Care Services.

5.8.2. The Key Risk Profile for Adult Social Care remains unchanged. Departments are responsible for the self-regulation of their departmental risk management arrangements, including identification, measurement and reporting. Adult Social Care is making improvements to its approach to strategic risk management. The service is in the process of establishing improved governance linked tightly into its substantial transformation and efficiency planning processes, as well as business as usual boards.

5.8.3. To develop a greater awareness and ensure good practice in relation to risk management amongst both senior and middle managers, the department is undertaking a number of sessions with the Corporate change management team.

5.8.4. In addition the service is introducing a more dynamic risk register which is updated in real time by nominated risk owners detailing the current assessment of the scale of each risk and detailing current planned mitigations.

5.8.5. The service will be in a position to provide a comprehensive updated strategic risk report on by the end of quarter 3 as the new approach will be fully implemented by that time.

5.8.5.1. **Key risks (High risks only).**

Unplanned cuts to services as a result of further reductions in government grant for social care.

5.8.5.2. Unplanned cuts to services as a result of loss of funding from health.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Out of Hospital Strategies in place; Community budgets, sharing whole systems savings;
- 2. Operational integration with health will deliver staffing savings; review skill mix etc.
- 3. Hold reserves or balances to manage better.
- 4. Develop exit strategies for one off services.
- 5. Develop prioritisation strategy for all services.

5.8.5.3. Impact of proposed changes to long term funding of social care .

Mitigating action.

- 1. Work is being undertaken by the Director of Adult Social Care Finance and Resources to assess the magnitude of this risk.

5.8.5.4. Increasing demand for social care services.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Community budgets – sharing savings from acute sector.
- 2. Develop new model of personalisation to reduce costs.
- 3. Prevention / Info and Advice /signposting – deflect demand, enable individuals.
- 4. Reablement/rehab to reduce residential care admissions.
- 5. Review charging policies.

5.8.5.5. Not effectively establishing ASC 3 B personalisation model.

5.8.5.6. Risks of negative service outcome; lack of consistency across boroughs; reputation; negative impact on capacity and increased financial.

Mitigating action.

- 1. New common model of personalisation needs to be developed and agreed across 3B ASC and inform the next phases of TAS programme.

5.8.5.7. Not developing effective integrated commissioning with Clinical Commissioning Groups.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Out of Hospital Strategies agreed.
- 2. Community budget project, sharing savings.
- 3. ASC linked to Whole Systems workstream across the local health sector.
- 4. ASC involvement in review of contracts/commissioning plans re joint services reporting back to CCG OoH boards.

5.8.5.8. Unable to share information at necessary level with health partners to plan and evaluate.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Update information sharing and information processing agreements.
- 2. Explore shared access/stakeholder with CCGs and CLCH in NWL NHS data warehouse.
- 3. Shared consent process.

5.8.5.9. Death or serious injury of vulnerable residents.

Mitigating action

- 1. Effective safeguarding adults processes in place across tri borough.

5.8.6. Tri-borough Childrens Services risks (Medium risks only).

5.8.6.1. There is a Tri-borough risk that LAC numbers start to rise, increasing demand for placements. Even without a rise in overall numbers, ongoing or even increased demand for high cost placements, particularly for adolescents, will put pressure on placements budget.

Mitigating action.

- 1. The LAC numbers are rising in the rest of the country. Plans need to be put in place to monitor numbers and need.

5.8.6.2. There is a CHS Project risk that there is insufficient contingency time between the valuation of bids and political process to the award of contract. Also a tight time scale after award of contract to mobilise in time for start date.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Contract award processes have been planned.

5.8.6.3. There is a difficulty of using multiple systems for current combined systems for current combined services. If common ICS and processes are not developed, then there will be a risk to delivery for the next wave of combined services – one provider may pose a quality / time issue.

Mitigating action.

- 1. It is clear that a number of projects are dependent on ICS convergence. Work has started on what this might look like. PID has been developed.
- 2. The Project Board which was scheduled to take place on 2nd May was intended to highlight some of the key

dependencies in relation to "family view" being available.

- 5.8.6.4. There is a CHS Portfolio risk of limited financial contingency to meet new unanticipated demands this will led to potential budget overspends.

Mitigating action.

- CHS Finance to monitor closely. Maintain sight of risk on register.

5.8.7. Bi-borough Environment, Leisure and Resident Services risks (Medium and Borough specific risks only).

- 5.8.7.1. There is a medium risk that increasing financial pressures and uncertainty leads to loss of staff, skills and knowledge, increase in workplace stress, high levels of sickness and ultimately affecting service delivery.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Communications with Tier 4 managers have begun; some reviews are still in progress, a few are at the start of implementation phase .
- 2. Workforce Development Working Group and Talent Management Plan in place.

- 5.8.7.2. There is a risk that contamination levels to the recycled waste stream continues to increase. Resulting in a potential financial implications running into hundreds of thousands of pounds. This means that the boroughs would pay twice for disposal, once at the recycling gate fee rate, and a second time at the higher incineration gate fee. Increased residual waste tonnages and falling recycling rates can also impact on disposal costs and recycling.

Mitigating action.

- 1. An action plan is in place and close monitoring of contamination levels is being undertaken.
- 2. April 2013 , Cory has reduced its gate fee for recycled waste. Research has been undertaken and service managers have developed action plans and communications appropriate for each borough in light of the research findings.

- 5.8.7.3. There is a H&F specific medium risk that the Trade Waste Income target will not be achieved - The shortfall in the invoiced amount, has created a gap of over £200k from the income target.

Mitigating action.

- 1. The new process that will be implemented, as part of the sales plan should have the following impact: Increased sales, robust debt recovery, focused sales activity and monitoring. The income will be monitored on a monthly basis.

- 5.8.7.4. There is a H&F specific medium risk that a 6% increase in Cemeteries income target is not met.

Mitigating action.

- 1. The department is working with QSL to mitigate the risk

- 5.8.7.5. There is a H&F specific medium risk that if Fulham Palace Trust are given additional funding including the transfer of emergency £250,000 fund as a loan for their reserves, they may not be able to balance their budget and come back to the council for more funds.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Regular meetings.
- 2. Financial monitoring of Fulham Palace Trust and attendance at their finance board meetings. Quarterly monitoring with the Chief Executive.

5.8.8. Tri-borough Libraries risks (Medium and low risks only).

- 5.8.8.1. There is a medium risk of failure to realise Archives savings and inability to re-provide a service as part of tri-borough.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Regular meetings.
- 2. Monthly meetings with tri-borough and regular meetings with stake holder groups.

- 5.8.8.2. There is a low risk that the number of Library issues continue to decline.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Regular meetings.
- 2. Close monitoring of issue figures and analysis by customer and item type.

**5.8.9. Bi-borough Transport and Technical Services risks
(Medium risks only).**

- 5.8.9.1. Tri/Bi-borough working - Pace and scale of change may adversely affect service delivery.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Regular communications.
- 2. Nigel Pallace Divisional briefings (floorwalks).
- 3. Ongoing programme of engagement.

- 5.8.9.2. Tri-Borough working arrangements.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Tri Borough Programme Boards.
- 2. Environment Family Programme Board.
- 3. TTS Programme Board.
- 4. Staff Forums held and service reviews underway. HR input and Union dialogue integrated into review process.

- 5.8.9.3. Adverse consequences of recession/downturn in economic environment.

Mitigating action.

- 1. BC Workload planning.
- 2. Planning Workload planning.
- 3. Corporate revenue monitoring.
- 4. Staffing to match workload.
- 5. Review of debt.

- 5.8.9.4. Adverse budget variances.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Regular finance & trading accounts monitoring.
- 2. Work with policy and planning to bring in funds .
- 3. Financial reporting by Quantity Surveyors, BTS, QA system, use of contingencies. Training plan for staff.
- 4. New criteria introduced to prevent blue badge fraud.
- 5. Review budget staffing level.
- 6. MTFS planning process.
- 7. Parking Control Board.
- 8. Recovery plan in place.
- 9. Recruitment approval restricted.
- 10. Review adverse variances and report action plan to DMT.

- 5.8.9.5. Health and Safety breaches affecting staff and others.

Mitigating action.

- 1. Safety audit.
- 2. Contractors managed.
- 3. CDM.
- 4. QA.
- 5. Learning and Development Plans.
- 6. Monitoring.
- 7. Maintenance and inspection schemes underpin the engineering response to risk
- 8. Ongoing training programme.
- 9. Established H&S Committee.
- 10. Departmental Policy.
- 11. Divisional PR.
- 12. Statutory responsibilities audit.
- 13. Guidance issued with respect to cross borough working and duty of care for both sets of employees.
- 14. Corporate Health & Safety currently under review in the bi-borough programme and protocol signed.

5.8.10. Risk indicators are an important tool within operational risk management, facilitating the monitoring and control of risk. In so doing they may be used to support a range of operational risk management activities and processes, including: risk identification; risk and control assessments; and the implementation of effective risk appetite, risk management and governance frameworks.

Health and Safety.

5.8.11. HFBB review a quarterly health and safety performance report for the organisation produced by the Corporate Safety Team. It includes recommendations for improvements, identified weaknesses, Corporate Safety activity and building performance information.

Information Management.

5.8.12. Information security incidents are recorded by the Information Management team and are reviewed periodically by the cross departmental Information Technology Security Operations Group (ITSOG). A security incident is an event that has an actual or potential adverse effect on the computer, network or user resources, compromises data or where there has been damage or loss of equipment.

Procurement.

5.8.13. The Bi Borough Procurement Board is apprised of key risks and issues as part of the new reporting format to the Board. Cabinet

reports include a provision for comment on risk management.
Key risks identified include;

- Not all procurement projects maintain risk logs.
- Separate Governance decision making processes.
- Separate Contract Standing Orders, although an exercise to harmonise them where appropriate is underway.
- Differing approaches to procurement exist in that a category management approach is the preferred WCC method.
- Optimum timing of contracts extensions to co-ordinate three borough procurement exercises.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

6.1. *Not applicable as the report is a representation of the business risks and opportunities to H&F council.*

7. CONSULTATION

7.1. *Not applicable as the report addresses the business risks to H&F council.*

8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1. *The responsibility to complete Equality Impact Assessment in relation to policy decisions is the responsibility of the appropriate departmental officer. The report highlights some of the risks and consequences of risk taking over a broad landscape and as such specific Equality and Diversity issues are referred to in the councils Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register.*

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1. *Failure to manage risk effectively may give risk to increased exposure to litigation, claims and complaints. As such the report contributes to the effective Corporate Governance of the council.*

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

10.1. *Exposure to unplanned risk could be detrimental to the ongoing financial and reputational standing of the Council. Failure to innovate and take positive risks may result in loss of opportunity and reduced Value for Money. There are no direct financial implications with the report content.*

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

11.1. *It is the responsibility of management to mitigate risk to an acceptable level. Appropriate and proportionate mitigating actions to known risks are expressed in the Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register and*

subject to review as part of planned Audit work and the Annual Governance Statement.

11.2. Implications verified/completed by: Michael Sloniowski, Principal Consultant Risk Management. 020 8753 2587

12. PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

12.1. *Failure to address risk in procurement may lead to a reduction in the expected benefits (Value for Money, Efficiency, Resilience, Quality of Service) and leave the council exposed to potential fraud and collusion as identified in the Bribery Act.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**


No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	Association of Local Authority Risk Managers & Institute of Risk Management, 2002, A Risk Management Standard	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
2.	The Orange Book, Management of Risk Principles & Concepts – HM Treasury	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
3.	Departmental Risk Registers, Tri borough Portfolio risk logs	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
4.	Tri-borough Programme report updates	Michael Sloniowski 2587	TriBnet
5.	BS 31100 Code of Practice for risk management	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith

[Note: Please list only those that are not already in the public domain, i.e. you do not need to include Government publications, previous public reports etc.] Do not list exempt documents. Background Papers must be retained for public inspection for four years after the date of the meeting.


LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix 1
Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance register

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant application is incorrectly calculated • Unplanned growth • Accruals & reconciliations • Planned savings not implemented • Insufficient budgetary provision and/or budgetary under/overspend * • Incomplete/inaccurate accounting records • Overestimation of potential revenue streams 		<p>effectiveness of the financial management arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership activity now includes a VAT trace and has been raised at FSB • Grant Claims & returns record is tracked at FSB • Monthly corporate revenue & capital monitoring to cabinet • Reports to the Leader identify where spend levels exceed a tolerable level during the year • Credit check of contractors is being undertaken through the Bi-borough Procurement Strategy Board (RBKC & H&F) • Disposal of Assets • Sponsorship and advertising opportunities risk & reward exercise 	<p>Audit Pensions and Standards Committee, External Audit, Financial Strategy Board</p> <p>Overview and Scrutiny Board</p>						
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
2.	Strategic	Bi-borough	Managing the Business Objectives (publics needs and expectations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Public or section of the public may not receive the service that they need or to the quality they expect Reputation of the service may be affected Services are delivered in an unplanned way Services start to do their own thing - Maverick decisions Inconsistencies in service delivery start to emerge Lack of transparency Duplication of effort Communication of objectives and values is lost Target and Objective setting is diminished reducing the effectiveness of the performance management regime for officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tri-borough Business Plans have been issued for 2013 Implementation of Lean Thinking principles putting the voice of the customer at the heart of service design Performance monitoring and feedback through local media Customer experience and satisfaction surveys 	Cabinet Members Scrutiny Cttee review performance Ofsted Care Quality Commission	3	3	9	Low 	All Executive Directors	Review November 2013


					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultation with other boroughs• Project managing the process• Separation or joining of projects to maximise benefit potential• Realistic timetables agreed and reviewed at Bi-borough Procurement Board (RBKC & H&F)• Market Testing progress report to HFBB• Programme & Project Management – Risk Logs being maintained, periodic risk reviews• Revenue estimated from the contract to be included as a risk in the MTFS							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--


No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
4.	Change.	Tri-borough.	Managing Portfolios Programmes, and Projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change environment became ever more complex with single, bi and tri-borough programmes of work requiring management alongside business as usual; Senior Managers of combined teams became responsible for managing risks over a wider geography; New risks emerged both as a result of and as a by-product to Tri-borough working; Changing type or level of risk resulting from external pressures such as devolved responsibilities from Central Government and new legal requirements; Governance has become ever more complex i.e. understanding who is responsible for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common reporting tools for key Tri-borough programmes- this included highlight reports identifying identification and documentation of key risks and issues. A Portfolio Delivery Group consisting of a cross section of Directors and designated Tri-borough lead specialists. This group was tasked with ensuring the successful set up of shared working arrangements and played a key problem solving and mitigating key risks experienced by both programmes and corporate support functions. 	<p>A fortnightly Chief Execs' Portfolio Management Board to oversee and manage portfolio delivery including managing key strategic risks and resolving operational risks where escalated.</p> <p>A Tri-borough Leaders' Board to oversee the delivery and development and to manage Political opportunities and risks.</p>	3	3	9	Low 	<p>Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance (The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham).</p> <p>Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive</p> <p>Martin Nottage (Tri Borough Innovation and Change Management Division).</p>	Review November 2013.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful delivery of the Tri-borough Managed Services Programme. 	<p>managing some risks has been challenging.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chief Executives Briefing to Managers. • Subject Matter Experts, Ambassadors appointed • 4 Workstreams agreed (Change Management/ Enablement - Testing/ User Acceptance Testing -Service Design and Service Delivery - ICT Readiness/ Interfaces/ Data Migration) • Managed Services Programme Director and Management Resources in place • Managed Services Roadmap published • Detailed Tri-b requirements for the Agresso system and BT service agreed by July 2013 • Build Agresso system to the Tri-b specification by September 2013 • Complete system build and recruit and train the staff ready to provide the service by January 2014 • Sort snags and post-go-live appraisal of service and levels and quality by April 2014 	<p>Joint Management Team (RBKC and H&F)</p> <p>Strategic Executive Board (WCC)</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Internal Audit</p> <p>WCC RSM Tenon Internal Audit</p> <p>Bi Borough Procurement Board</p> <p>Transformation Board</p> <p>Audit and Transparency Committee (RBKC)</p> <p>Audit Pensions and Standards Committee (H&F)</p>						
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful delivery of the Tri-borough ICT Programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers' needs and expectations are not fully met when projects are delivered • Benefits of investment in creating toolkit not realised • Threat of overspend on projects • Benefits are not fully realised • Delays in mobilisation of services through revised contracts • Impact of staffing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC in conjunction with H&F and RBKC intends to create a pan-London framework agreement. The intention is WCC entering into it immediately from contract award in January, moving straight into transition to have the new service providers in place from October 2014. • H&F have a contract with HFBP which terminates 31st October 2016 so it plans to move to the new suppliers at that time. • RBKC will move to the new service providers, either in whole or in part, which is an option, wherever there is a compelling business case. 								
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful delivery of the Tri-borough Total Facilities Management Programme 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small Tri-borough client side team has been set up to manage the TFM contract. An appointment has been made for the Head of the Client Side Team. The Client Side Team will be made up of roughly 22 staff and will be hosted by the Royal Borough Kensington and Chelsea 								


			<p>Sub-risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects do not consider enough time to mobilise in the event services are awarded to the private sector • Project implementation is delayed due to protracted discussions regarding pensions transfers • The risk of challenge to contract awards may increase during the harsher economic climate • Large scale high risk high return projects are not led by a qualified or experienced project manager. • Too many projects are undertaken with unrealistic or unachievable targets 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Innovation and Managing Change Team brings together portfolio and programme management skills from H&F and RBKC. • Portfolio ,Programme and Project management is supported by a recommended decision-making and governance process. • Projects and programmes are managed through the context of the Transformational portfolios. • Further training and capability is being advanced with RBKC and WCC. • Standard documentation is to be provided to support Portfolio, Programme and Project Management. • Monthly reporting to Transformation Board (dashboard) • Bi-borough Procurement Strategy Board (RBKC & H&F) monitor aspects of project management compliance • Procedures for TUPE transfer have been included in project management instructions 							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
5.	Change	Sovereign	Public Health Service and NHS Provision Sub-risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacts of proposals to change the hospital arrangements in North West London The transfer of the Public Health Service from the NHS to local government may not go well 	<p>The Council is remaining active in debate with NHS decision-makers to ensure the best possible deal for residents. The Council could face unexpected spending pressures from new responsibilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new Director of Public Health will attend Housing, Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee Dedicated officers implementing the setting up of a Health & Well Being Board The Council has no obligation to cross subsidise Public Health Tri-borough Public Health service should be hosted at Westminster as agreed by the Leaders of the three councils 	<p>HFBB</p> <p>Education & Childrens Services Select Committee</p> <p>Cabinet</p>	4	3	12	<p>Medium</p> 	<p>Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive</p> <p>Director of Public Health</p>	<p>Review</p> <p>November 2013</p>


No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
6.	Operational	Sovereign	Business Resilience Sub-risks	If an event occurs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers face delays in service provision. • Non-compliance with statutory duties – indirectly. • Threat to life – indirectly. • Time to recover power and IT Services could be between 6 & 8 weeks. • Loss of information. • Loss of productivity. • Increased cost of resurrecting services (only partially insurable). • Wasted resources & staff duplication in recovery phase. • Cost of additional data storage capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Councils generic Contingency Management Plan and Business Continuity Plans are designed to be 'scaleable' in response to any size of incident, and linkages with the and neighbouring local authorities ensure that central government and local government mutual aid assistance will be forthcoming in the event of a large-scale attack. • Corporate Incident Management Procedures incorporate Business Continuity • Training has been delivered to local service plan leaders • A corporate service resilience group has been formed and meet periodically • Directors of Resources have been appointed as Departmental contact leads • Local Service Plans 	HFBB The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Internal Audit The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Audit Pensions and Standards Committee The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Audit and Transparency Committee Service Resilience Groups for both Councils ELRS DMT London Regional Resilience Forum	4	3	12	Medium 	Lyn Carpenter (Corporate Business Continuity) Bi Borough Director for Environment, Leisure and Resident Services with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance (The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham) for HFBB. Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive Jackie Hudson Tri Borough Information and Communications Technology Lead Advisor	Review November 2013

			<p>IT resilience (RBKC)</p>		<p>have been compiled, reviewed and refreshed and quality checked by Emergency Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TriBorough IT Programme • The Corporate Firewall restricts and regulates network connections and communications on the perimeter of the RBKC private network with the public internet. • Request For Change process in use by Hammersmith and Fulham is being adopted under the Tri-Borough shared services initiative. • Business Continuity Recovery Group allocates resources between business groups for recovery 						<p>Barry Holloway Head of RBKC ISD.</p> <p>Tony Redpath Director of Strategy and Local Services (The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea)</p>	
			<p>IT resilience (H&F)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed move of the H&F IT from the East London site. • Systems not joined up and connected in the event of a H&F, Royal Borough or Tri-Bi Borough event. • Lack of top tier response plans. • Electronic information storage capacity. • Mobile Communications technology provider service failure. • Information Governance during the development of major programmes (Managed Services, FM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays/ interruption to the service as a replacement is found. • Cost and time of re-procuring the service. • Protection of contributions to the H&F Pension fund as more outsourcing is undertaken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H & F Bridge Partnership have submitted a Local Service Recovery, a major incident process has been established by HFBP as part of Data recovery is insured under the councils corporate insurance package (but limited) • The Service Desk Manual • A threat assessment has been compiled • Some ITC service 							

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prevent aims to stop people from becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism by focusing on supporting and protecting those who might be vulnerable to radicalisation. <p>NOTE Please refer to BCP Risk Assessment for highlighted risks and controls</p>								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--


No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
7.a	Operational	Bi-borough	Managing statutory duty Sub-risks Non-compliance with laws and regulations Breach of duty of care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-compliance may result in prosecution or a Corporate Manslaughter charge • Financial compensation may be claimed • Injury or death to a member of the public or employee • A breach of information security protocols may result in fines, harm to reputation and personal liability of Executive Directors • Inadequate level of service • Poor satisfaction with statutory services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Royal borough Stock Conditions Surveys. • Capital Programme • Nigel Pallace is lead Sponsor on HFBB for Health & Safety • Pro-active Health, Safety and Welfare culture across the council. • Tri-borough - The Total FM contractor will manage a number of statutory and regulatory Health & Safety procedural, record and management processes. • Tri-borough Health & Safety protocols are being discussed and established. • Contractors are managed within CHAS regime. • Insurance cover is in place in the event of a claim for breach of duty of care and in respect of financial claims. • Legislative changes 	<p>Annual Assurance process</p> <p>Assurance requires that actions are being taken to ensure compliance with the law and regulations</p> <p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p> <p>H&F Safety Committee</p> <p>Tri-borough Safety Committees CHS and ASC</p> <p>Internal Audit 2012 2013 Review of Health & Safety Statutory & Regulatory compliance</p>	4	3	12	Medium 	Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive Responsibility for Health & Safety, Debbie Morris (The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea) Nigel Pallace Bi-Borough Executive Director of Transport and Technical Services All Executive Directors	Review November 2013


					<p>are adopted and reflected in amendment to the council's constitution, budget allocation through MTFS (Now unified business & financial planning process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training and guidance packages and newly agreed performance management indicators.• Periodic reporting to HFBB.• Health & Safety campaign on slips, trips and falls.• Tri-borough Health & Safety guidelines have been reviewed, refreshed and communicated.• Promotion of the Occupational Health Service and Workplace Options Employee Assistance Scheme.• Housing and Regeneration have rolled out personal safety training to over 130 staff through the Suzy Lamplugh Trust Training.• FSB reviewed and approved a process to harmonise the Management Assurance process at Director and Divisional level with that of RBKC.	<p>FSB, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance, Chief Executive and Leader of the Council</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
			<p>Equalities (public sector equality duty or 'PSED') and Human Rights</p> <p>(a budget challenge could be in whole terms or of a single line)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased complaints, Ombudsman involvement, judicial review which can result in; quashing order, prohibiting order, mandatory order, declaration, injunction, damages, and potential further challenge to a budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIA's or Equality Statement (where applicable) must accompany all Cabinet, Full Council and Key Decision reports, KPI's EIA's and Equality Statements address Human Rights where applicable HFBB signed off actions that included a Policy for completion of Service Delivery EIA's (April 2012) and guidance for equality impacts of budget proposals to be drawn up and disseminated. 	<p>Limited Assurance report April 2012 H&F Application of the Equality Act 2010</p> <p>Officer Working Group</p>						
7.b	Operational	Tri-borough	<p>Standards and delivery of care</p> <p>Sub-risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach in standard and delivery of care – caring and care homes The Executive, and Management Teams may not have been apprised of significant controls weaknesses that appear in the service area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-compliance may result in prosecution or a Corporate Manslaughter charge. Injury or death to a member of the public. Financial compensation may be claimed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insurance cover is in place in the event of a claim for breach of duty of care and in respect of financial claims. Legislative changes are adopted and reflected in amendment to the council's constitution, budget allocation through 	<p>ASC Tri-borough Management Team (TMT).</p> <p>ASC CoCo, the Home Care Board, TAS programme, Whole Systems review board</p>	4	3	12	<p>Medium</p> 	Liz Bruce Tri-borough Executive Director of Adult Social Care	<p>Review</p> <p>November 2013</p>


			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A breach of information security protocols in relation to an individual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to the professional or personal reputation of the Council or individual Officer. • may result in fines, harm to reputation and personal liability of Executive Directors. • Inadequate level of service. • Poor satisfaction with statutory services. • Increased complaints. 	<p>MTFS (Now unified business & financial planning process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and guidance packages and agreed performance management indicators. • Periodic reporting to HFBB and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Management Board. 	<p>H& F Housing, Health And Adult Social Care Select Committee</p> <p>Annual Assurance process</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Internal Audit</p> <p>The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Audit and Transparency Committee</p> <p>Education & Childrens Services Select Committee</p> <p>Local Safeguarding Childrens Board, Unannounced Safeguarding Inspection, Ofsted , Local and London Child Protection Procedures</p>					<p>Andrew Christie Tri-Borough Executive Director of Childrens Services</p>	
			<p>Corporate Parenting</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All child protection cases have remained allocated to a social worker despite of the high demand. • A detailed action plan has been implemented in response to the increased numbers of children with child protection plans, to safely manage the demand and reduce activity in line with that of our statistical neighbours. • The number of qualified social workers delivering a child protection service has increased by two over the past year. 							

		Sovereign	<p>Sub-risks (RBKC) Service quality of the short breaks services for people with learning disabilities. Kingsbridge Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medication errors. • Quality of reporting and recording. • Poor quality support plans and risk assessments. • Resource availability • Application of shift protocols 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract Management • Scrutiny by Officers in Contracts, Commissioning and Safeguarding. • The contractor has committed to self-funding immediate additional management and support staff for a minimum 6 months until the Royal Borough is satisfied with the service. 	<p>Officer Working Group</p> <p>Kingsbridge Road Care Quality Commission inspection 29th May 2013.</p>						
--	--	------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
8.	Operational	Bi-borough	<p>Successful partnerships & Major Contracts</p> <p>Sub-risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnering activity with other boroughs and the NHS may blur the lines of responsibility, accountability, governance or liability in the event of service failure Local Housing Company Differing procurement processes Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders across Tri-borough services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint objectives are not met Community expectations are not met A business plan may not be concluded Decisions may be made which contradict or challenge the Contract Standing Orders or Financial Regulations of H&F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance arrangements are in place Performance monitoring reports reported to Select Cttee's The Cabinet Member will be closely involved in business plan discussions Financial creditworthiness checks at Bi-borough Procurement Board (RBKC & H&F) 	<p>H & F Bridge Partnership Assurance process</p> <p>Internal Audit Substantial Assurance report 2011/12 Partnership Governance</p> <p>Bi-borough Procurement Board (RBKC & H&F)</p> <p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p>	4	3	12	<p>Medium</p> 	<p>Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive</p>	<p>Review</p> <p>November 2013</p>


No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
9.	Operational	Sovereign (H&F)	Maintaining reputation and service standards Sub-risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiplicity of external forces and initiatives • Breach of Officer or Member code of conduct • Information Management and Governance • Inappropriate Data released • Poor data quality internally or from third parties, breaches of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to the status of the council • Failure to deliver plans & savings. • Ability to effectively lead and resource the transformation agenda is diminished • Service delivery deteriorates • Harm to the council's reputation • Potential adverse media reporting • Potential fines or action from the Information Commissioner • Quality and integrity of data held in support of Performance Management & 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Annual Residents Survey • A review of the corporate governance arrangements has been conducted by Internal Audit • Annual Complaints review report April 2010 to March 2011 produced to Committee • Combined Finance & Service Planning processes • New Standards procedures are in place • Standards issues now covered under the Audit Pensions and Standards Committee • Information governance forms part of the Tri-borough ICT Programme • New Information Management Security Protocols published on the Intranet 	Cabinet Ofsted, Care Quality Commission, Annual Audit letter HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Board Tri-borough Information Management Project Board ITSOG Management Letter has been issued (based	4	3	12	Medium 	Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance (The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)	Review November 2013

			<p>information protocols, information erroneously sent to third parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auto forwarding of information (Information control and threat of leakage) • Local information interconnectivity and data storage (hosting) 	<p>Financial systems leads to under or over estimation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data management 'without boundaries' could be more sensitive to local, national or geographical service interruption, theft, loss or duplication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular reporting on Security Incidents by the Information Management Team • Performance statistics are scrutinised by Select Committees, HFBB & DMT's • Corvu Performance Management System is able to pick up anomalies • Data Quality E-Learning module has been released • From Wednesday 1st August 2012, the Council is introducing a new contractor (industry specialists) for the collection and destruction of confidential waste from all Council offices in the H&F. • Webmail has now been banned across H&F • New Egress system introduced to protect confidential e-mails going outside of Tri-borough 	<p>on comparison to requirements under the Data Protection Act)</p>						
--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
10.	Operational	Bi-borough (Tri-borough) (from April 2013)	Managing fraud (Internal & External) Sub-risks Misappropriation of assets Appointee ship/custodian or guardian Contracting Gifts & Benefits Manipulation of performance data, collusion, billing, non-compliance with Financial and or Contract Standing Orders Misrepresentation of Personal or Commercial Circumstances NNDR Payroll Cheque Grant award Treasury Housing and Tenancy Fraud Benefit Fraud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of reputation • Financial loss • Loss of asset • Loss of revenue • Adverse regulatory /audit report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adaptable Bi-Borough corporate fraud function now exists which responds through a single professional and effective team to the challenging and changing range of fraud, both internally and externally executed. • CAFS teams use a risk assessment to assist in targeting and workload prioritisation • Literature, web presence and training is being reviewed to deliver to all levels of the authority • Information and guidance is available on the corporate intranet • Level of fraud is being tracked through FSB • Close working relationship is established with the Police, DWP and other enforcement agencies • Bribery Act Policy and Risk Register • Money laundering 	Both H&F and RBKC Audit Committees receive biannual reports on Fraud HFBB receive quarterly summary information on anti-fraud activity	4	3	12	Medium 	Tri-borough Nicholas Holgate, Interim Bi-Borough Chief Executive H&F Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance (The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham) All Executive Directors Bi-borough Director of Internal Audit, Risk, Fraud and Insurance	Review November 2013


					policies recently reviewed and amended.							
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

OPPORTUNITY RISKS (Where the is in excess of £3Million Benefit to H&F)

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Opportunity Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
3.	Change	Sovereign (H&F)	Regeneration of King Street and Civic Offices Sub-risks GLA do not approve the proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town Hall extension has come to the end of its life and needs to either be demolished or refurbished. An estimated cost of around £18m in temporarily accommodating staff through a relocation to facilitate repairs New office accommodation at no cost is being provided in exchange for land A new modern building is also expected to save around £150,000 in energy costs Jobs will be created in King Street A new community-sized supermarket and a range of new restaurants and other retailers, alongside a council 'One Stop Shop', will draw more people down King 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Leader of the H&F Council announced revised proposals regarding the height of buildings in the residential blocks. King Street Development will be reviewing the scheme over the coming months and a further consultation with residents' and amenity groups will follow later in the year. Exhibition of 3 bid schemes 2007 Statement of Community Involvement – Two public consultation exercises Private meetings with residents Stakeholder Forums Flyer to 15,000 homes Pre application meetings with GLA and local amenity groups 1800 letters sent to individual properties 	Cabinet Planning Applications Committee Mayor of London Greater London Authority Port of London Authority English Heritage	2	4	8	Low 	Nigel Pallace Bi-Borough Executive Director of Transport and Technical Services	Review November 2013

				<p>Street and encourage more investment in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful redevelopment would enable the council to terminate contracts for various costly leased buildings around the borough savings around £2 million a year. 	<p>in the wider area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with statutory groups; GLA, HAFAD, Port of London Authority, LFEPA, Metropolitan Police, English Heritage & Archaeology, Natural England, CAA, BAA Airports, Thames Water, Environment Agency, TfL • Residents Groups & Landowners; Thomas Pocklington Trust, Tesco, Quakers, Amenity Groups, Brackenbury Residents Assoc. The Georgian Group, HAMRA, the Hammersmith Soc. H & F Historic Buildings Group, Ravenscourt Action Group, Ashchurch Residents Assoc. Old Chiswick Protection Soc. Digby Mansions 39-58a Residents Assoc. <p>Submitted by the Planning Applicant;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Statement, Energy Statement, Flood Risk Assessment, • Air Quality Assessment, Environmental Noise Assessment, Lighting Strategy • Phase 1 Habitat Survey & ecological 							
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					database search • Telecommunications assessment							
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	Tri-borough Bi-borough or Sovereign risk	Opportunity Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
4.	Change	Bi-borough	Earls Court regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mayor of London has given his consent to the redevelopment of Earls Court and the surrounding area, paving the way for a £8billion investment enabling the creation of thousands of new homes and jobs. Comprehensive redevelopment allows existing housing stock to be replaced on a "new for old" basis and 16% of existing tenants who are overcrowded can be re-housed in homes with enough bedrooms to meet their need. Proposed guarantees for tenants and leaseholders include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brand new replacement homes, one move only within the local area. - Tenants remain secure Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earls Court Regeneration Team supported by high quality advisory team comprising Jones Lang LaSalle, SNR Denton and PWC. All major decision reports reviewed by Tim Kerr QC in relation to Judicial Review challenge risk. Workshops in August 2012 to cover procurement, risk, finance, housing redevelopment, planning, legal and communications. Comprehensive report submitted to and approved by Cabinet 3rd September 2012. The council received £15m from Capital and Counties (CapCo) for signing an exclusivity agreement relating to the Earl's Court Regeneration site. Of this receipt, £10m is refundable should completion of the CLSA not occur, the 	<p>Project Group chaired by Executive Director</p> <p>HFBB and the Royal Borough Management Board</p> <p>Cabinet</p> <p>Housing, Health And Adult Social Care Select Committee</p> <p>Planning Applications Committee</p> <p>The Royal Borough Major Planning Development Committee</p> <p>The Royal Borough Planning Applications Committee</p>	2	4	8	Low 	Mel Barrett Executive Director of Housing	Review November 2013





				<p>tenants and continue to pay Council rents – there is no stock transfer and therefore no requirement for a ballot.</p> <p>- Phased approach allows communities to be moved together.</p> <p>Comprehensive regeneration offers opportunity to secure major estate renewal across the West Kensington and Gibbs Green estates as well as offering major regeneration benefits including 7,500 new homes, 36,000 construction jobs, 9,500 permanent jobs and £99.5 million per annum of additional local expenditure, together with additional community facilities comprising new schools, leisure and health facilities, new open and play space and a significant increase in job opportunities.</p>	<p>remaining £5m is not refundable under any circumstances</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note 1. All key risks have been extracted from(but not limited to) a number of sources for analysis by the Royal Brought of Kensington and Chelsea Management Board and Hammersmith & Fulham Business Board . The sources include;

- i. Previous models of the Corporate Risk & Assurance Registers.
- ii. World Economic Forum Global risks 2012.
- iii. Information identified from Tri Borough Programme, Departmental Risk & Assurance Registers.

- iv. Officers Knowledge and experience.
- v. Tri-Borough & H&F Portfolio, Programme and Projects summary reports.
- vi. Procurement exercises.
- vii. Significant Weaknesses established from the Annual Assurance process.
- viii. Audit & Fraud Reports.
- ix. Knowledge and experience of public sector risks from the Bi-borough Risk Manager.
- x. Data Quality and Integrity.
- xi. Cabinet, Scrutiny and public domain reports.
- xii. WCC H&F and RBKC Risk knowledge pooled information.
- xiii. Zurich Municipal, Grant Thornton and Price Waterhouse Coopers reports.

Note 2. Categorised under the PESTLE methodology as published in the Hammersmith & Fulham Risk Standard. Compliant with BS31100/ ALARM/IRM/CIPFA best practice.

Score	Key
16-25	 RED - High and very high risk - immediate management action required
11-15	 AMBER - Medium risk - review of controls
6-10	 GREEN - Low risk - monitor and if escalates quickly check controls
1-5	 YELLOW - Very low risk - monitor periodically

