



Agenda Item 4

Corporate Risk Management Update

Falkirk Council

Subject: Corporate Risk Management Update

Meeting: Audit Committee

Date: 13 March 2017

Submitted By: Director of Corporate and Housing Services

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report provides an update on progress with embedding the Corporate Risk Management (CRM) Policy and Framework, and presents a revised Corporate Risk Register (CRR).

2. Recommendations

The Audit Committee is asked to:

- (1) Note the revised Corporate Risk Register and background information as detailed in appendices 1 to 4;**
- (2) Note the progress in embedding the CRM arrangements;**
- (3) Note that the next report, in Autumn 2017, will include the outcomes of the following reviews (agreed by Members in October 2016):**
 - a) Corporate Risk Register and Corporate Working Group reviews;**
 - b) West Lothian Council's Internal Audit Team CRM Follow-up Audit; and**
 - c) CMT and Members' Risk Workshop (to take place after the summer recess);**
- (4) Agree that a CRM update is provided to the Executive.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At their meetings in October 2016, the Audit Committee and Executive agreed to note that:
- a) the revised CRM Policy and Framework (agreed by the Executive in May 2015) is being embedded across the Council;
 - b) the CRM Group is reviewing all corporate risks on a cyclical basis;
 - c) West Lothian Council's Internal Audit Team will undertake a CRM follow up audit in early 2017;
 - d) Corporate Working Groups (CWGs) will undertake a review of their arrangements (including their remit, membership, and a self assessment of their effectiveness) during 2016;

- e) a CMT and Members' Risk Workshop (which was agreed by Members in April 2016) will take place in 2017;
- f) Services are embedding flexible risk management arrangements, as part of their Service Performance Planning processes; and
- g) Members will continue to receive 6 monthly CRM updates.

4. Considerations

- 4.1 This paper is provided in line with the CRM Policy and Framework, which confirms that Members will receive 6-monthly updates on CRM arrangements.
- 4.2 Since the last report, further work (via the CRM Group) has been undertaken to complete the actions outlined in section 3, and to embed CRM arrangements effectively. Actions taken include:
 - a) developing the risk details for each corporate risk, to ensure they include meaningful consequences, lessons learnt, and measurable actions (as set out in appendices 1 to 4);
 - b) completing a review of Corporate Working Groups, and integrating the Corporate Risk Register and Corporate Working Group reviews;
 - c) embedding CRM arrangements within the Council of the Future Program, and Members and officers' training and development programs; and
 - d) developing an assurance map, to inform the 2017/18 Internal Audit Plan, and improve scrutiny and assurance on corporate risks.
- 4.3 The CRM Group and CMT will continue to improve and embed CRM arrangements.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 CMT has been consulted, and has agreed the recommendations within this paper and the corporate risks at Appendices 1-3.

6. Implications

Financial

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. However, failure to manage corporate risks could have significant financial consequences.

Resources

- 6.2 There are no direct resource implications arising from this report. However, there is a need for on-going commitment to embedding the CRM Policy and Framework.

Legal

- 6.3 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. However, failure to effectively embed the CRM Policy and Framework and manage corporate risks could have significant legal consequences.

Risk

- 6.4 The key risks are failure to effectively implement the CRM Policy and Framework; and to identify, assess, mitigate, and report on the risks to delivering Corporate, Service, Partnership, and Project Plan outcomes.
- 6.5 Risks continue to be monitored as part of the Council's governance arrangements, including Service Performance Planning, Council of the Future reviews, (Service) self assessments, and reviews of incidents, audits, and lessons learnt.

Equalities

- 6.6 An Equality and Poverty Impact Assessment (EPIA) was not required for this report. However, equality and poverty implications are captured within the Corporate Risk Register.

Sustainability / Environmental Impact

- 6.7 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was not required for this report. However, sustainability and environmental implications are captured within the Corporate Risk Register.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 The CRM Policy and Framework is being embedded across the Council, and the CRM Group and CMT will continue to monitor and progress the actions outlined within this report.
- 7.2 A CMT and Members' Risk Workshop will be arranged after the 2017 summer recess.
- 7.3 Members will continue to receive CRM updates on a 6 monthly basis.

.....
Director of Corporate & Housing Services

Author(s) – Karen Algie, Head of Human Resources and Business Transformation - 01324 506223, karen.algie@falkirk.gov.uk; and Hugh Coyle, Corporate Risk Co-Ordinator, 01324 506 286, hugh.coyle@falkirk.gov.uk

Date: 3 March 2017

Appendices

1. Summary of High Corporate Risks.
2. Summary of Medium Corporate Risks.
3. Details of High Corporate Risks.
4. Corporate Risk Register Key.

List of Background Papers

The following papers were relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of the Local Governance (Scotland) Act 1973:

- None

Appendix 1: Summary of High Corporate Risks

Note: Abbreviations are shown at Appendix 4: Corporate Risk Register Key

Risk Category	Risk Title	Corporate Working Group	Portfolio Holder
Adult Services			
C	Health and Social Care Integration		HSC
C	Self-Directed Support Reforms		PP
G	Harm to Vulnerable People / Public Protection (Adults)	COPPSG	PP
Children's Services			
G	Closing the Gap in Attainment		EDU and PP
C	Criminal Justice Review		PP
G	Getting It Right For Every Child (GIRFEC) Change Program		PP and EDU
C	Integration of Education and Social Work Services to create Children's Services		EDU and PP
G	Harm to Vulnerable People / Public Protection (Children)	COPPSG	PP
Corporate and Housing Services			
C	Failure to recognise, and act upon, the need for transformational change and continuous improvement		LEA
C	Failure to monitor, measure, manage, and mitigate the impacts of Welfare Reform and Poverty	WRGG	LEA
F	Insufficient funding to deliver services and deliver outcomes		LEA
G	Failure to properly discharge equalities duties		LEA
H	Failures in workforce planning, including absence, vacancy management, and succession planning		RES
I	Compromised security, or inefficient use, of the Council's data and information asset	IMG	RES
I	Cyber security incident compromises data / information assets, corporate application, social media channel, or data / information	IMG	RES
P	Failure to undertake proper engagement and consultation with service users, stakeholders, and partners on the delivery of services		LEA
Development Services			
I	Development Projects		ED and ENV
I	Major Investment: Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) and Regeneration		ED and ENV
P	Employment and Training		ED and ENV

Appendix 2: Summary of Medium Corporate Risks

Note: Abbreviations are shown at Appendix 4: Corporate Risk Register Key

Risk Category	Risk Title	Corporate Working Group	Portfolio Holder
Chief Executive			
G	Failure to implement effective Leadership arrangements	BVWG / CRMG	ED and ENV
Children's Services			
G	Tackling Bureaucracy and Reducing Workload in Schools		EDU
G	Structural Failure to School Buildings		RES
G	Social Work – Risks Identified in CSWO Annual Report 15-16		PP
G	Bailie Gwynne Report		EDU
G	Failure to Deliver Scottish Government Early Years Expansion (by 2020)		EDU
Corporate and Housing Services			
A	Failure to provide a safe environment for employees and visitors	SWG	HOU
A	Failure to Comply with Scottish Housing Quality Standards (SHQS)	HOU	LEA
F	Failures in Financial Management Control and Assurance		LEA
G	Procurement and Commissioning arrangements fail to secure best value, and demonstrate compliance with Council standards or legal requirements	PB	LEA
Development Services			
A	Asset Construction and Design: All Asset Types	CAMG	LEA
A	Environmental Risks: Energy, Waste, and Sustainability	CSG	LEA
A	Assets (excluding Housing): Maintenance, Availability, and Reliability	CAMG	ENV
C	Resilience: Business Continuity Management		LEA
C	Resilience: Emergency Planning / Civil Contingencies	EoS RRP	LEA
G	Prohibitions and Loss of Licences, e.g. Operator Licence for vehicles	FFG	LEA
G	Regulatory Enforcement		ENV

Appendix 3: Details of High Corporate Risks

Target Risk and Additional Actions (Risk Tolerance):

A Target Risk Level and Additional Actions are only included on High Risks where the Current Risk Level is greater than the Council's risk tolerance, and the Lead Officer considers it achievable to reduce the level of risk to Medium.

In some cases, e.g. Public Protection, the Current Risk Level is High and cannot be reduced to Medium, despite robust controls being in place.

Adult Services

Health and Social Care Integration		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk Medium
Risk Statement	<p>The risk is that Adult Services fail to meet the commitments agreed by the Integration Joint Board (IJB), as set out within the IJB's Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The IJB's strategic risks are summarised as:</p> <p>Short-Term Priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial Stability and Commissioning, including capacity across all sectors, co-location / sharing of teams / assets; 2. Leadership, Decision Making, and Scrutiny, including governance arrangements / potential for adverse audits / inspections; and 3. Performance of the IJB, including a need to meet HEAT targets and Delayed Discharge / Waiting Times issues. <p>Medium-Term Priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Culture, behaviours, and values; 2. HR Management / Workforce Planning, including sustainable change skills and absence; 3. Service User and Unpaid Carer Experience, including engagement, feedback, and complaints; 4. Safety of a) Patients and Service Users, b) Staff and Volunteers, and c) Unpaid Carers; and 5. Information Management, including ICT systems / infrastructure and Information Governance, e.g. data sharing. <p>Long-Term Priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective Links with other Partnerships, e.g. Community Planning, Third/ Voluntary sectors, Criminal Justice, and Housing. 			
Worst Case Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial and Project: severe budget gaps and project delay / failures; 2. Harm: serious harm (death / injury) and disadvantage / inequalities; 3. HR: significant issues, including stress absence / claims; 4. Reputation: national media interest and / or loss of confidence; or 5. Service: opportunities to improve services, efficiencies, outcomes. 			
Controls / Mitigation	See IJB Risk Register.			
What more could we be doing?	1. Additional actions are included within the IJB Risk Register and will be further developed as part of service planning and risk reviews.			
Lessons Learnt	Lessons Learnt will be considered as part of future risk reviews.			
Lead Officer	Head of Adult Services			

Self-Directed Support Reforms		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	<p>There is uncertainty around the Council's capacity to deliver change due to resources, processes, skills and budgets, financial constraints, information and governance risks, including IT changes, loss of charging incomes, and potential increased fraud.</p> <p>If managed well the reforms will create opportunities for improved enablement / choice and flexibility of support.</p> <p>The risks and actions are detailed in the SDS Project Risk Register and summarised below.</p> <p>Context: Implementation of SDS will substantially impact on the Council, our partners and vulnerable people - in particular, older people, children and young people, and those with physical, mental, and learning disabilities.</p>			
Worst Case Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harm: death / injury and disadvantage / inequalities; 2. Financial: significant cost of service changes / SDS options and fraud potential; 3. Governance: increased Human Rights claims and (individual's) liabilities; 4. Reputation damage to Council and Partners; or 5. Stakeholder relationships breakdown. 			
Controls / Mitigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SDS Steering Group monitors the Programme Risk Register and plans; 2. Financial controls, linked to capacity / budget planning decisions; 3. Improved workforce skills and procurement capacity; and 4. The risk is monitored by the Public Protection Chief Officers' Strategy Group, and underpinned by policies, guidance, and inspections. 			
What more could we be doing?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Adult Services and partners' risk frameworks and eligibility criteria; 2. Develop risk resources (including guidance) for practitioners; 3. Implement Audit actions (Council and National); 4. Continued participation in national risk (enablement) review; 5. Continued engagement with partners, including providers, third sector, people with support needs, and carers; and 6. Work is currently taking place on Eligibility Policy / Assessment (with Members' involvement), Procurement, and Forward-Project Planning. 			
Lessons Learnt	Complaints relating to allocation of personal budgets are reviewed at Team level, but Adult Services will also consider a process for capturing these at Service level.			
Lead Officer	Head of Adult Services			

Harm to Vulnerable People / Public Protection (Adults)		Governance	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	<p>There is a risk of harm to vulnerable people if the Council fails to meet it's statutory public protection duties, including Adult Support and Protection (ASP), Child Protection (CP), and management of both sex offenders and violent offenders (Criminal Justice Service users).</p> <p>In relation to Criminal Justice Services, the risk is two fold: the protection of the community from the service user, and the protection of the service user from the community.</p> <p>The delivery of ASP services is also overseen by, and accountable to, the Integration Joint Board (IJB).</p>			
Worst Case Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Death or serious harm to a vulnerable person; 2. Significant Case Reviews; 3. Fatal Accident Enquiries, Court action, prosecution or other external legal interventions; 4. Compensation claims; 5. External criticism / intervention by the Care Inspectorate or Criminal Justice Authority; or 6. Reputational damage to the Council. 			
Controls / Mitigation	<p>Robust public protection and data sharing arrangements are in place with partners, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA); 2. Initial Referral Discussions (IRDs); 3. Child Protection (CP) and Adult Support and Protection (ASP) register; 4. CP and ASP Case Conferences; 5. Integrated / Single Shared Assessment (SSA); 6. Robust training programme for all Council and partner agency staff; and 7. Public awareness raising activities, including a Police run scheme for identification of sex offenders in local communities. 			
What more could we be doing?	<p>Further develop and embed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council strategies, including Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) and Corporate Parenting; 2. Strategic, Single Outcome Local Delivery (SOLD), Locality, and Service plans; 3. Core Social Work assessment and provision of care services; and 4. Self evaluation and Public Service Improvement Framework (PSIF) reviews. 			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Chief Social Work Officer and Head of Adult Services			

Closing the Gap in Attainment		Governance	Current Risk High	Target Risk Medium
Risk Statement	The risks specific to Children's Services include: 1. Increasing positive destinations/ outcomes; 2. Meeting attainment targets / closing the attainment gap; 3. Improving pupil attendance; and 4. Delivering zero tolerance strategy on illiteracy and innumeracy.			
Worst Case Consequences	1. Prosecution or other legal remedy; 2. Civil claims; 3. Criticism / external intervention by e.g. Care Commission or Criminal Justice Authority; 4. Damage to reputation; or 5. Breakdown in partners' communications leads to poor information sharing and decisions.			
Controls / Mitigation	Risks are monitored, scrutinised, and reviewed by: 1. Children's Services Senior Leadership Team; 2. Performance Panel; and 3. Scottish Government.			
What more could we be doing?	Progress the Curriculum for Excellence (CFE) tasks within the Children's Services' Service Performance Plan (SPP), including: 1. National Improvement Framework; 2. Address the CFE priorities set out in the Authority Expectations 2013-16; 3. Support the practical application in learning and teaching of mobile devices; 4. Ensure workforce planning and recruitment meets current and future needs; 5. Implement the Literacy Strategy; 6. Implement the Numeracy Strategy 7. Improve Business Process and System to support more efficient work-streams; and 8. Allocate attainment challenge funding to support identified schools.			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Head of Education			

Criminal Justice Review		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Offending happens on a daily basis. On occasion very serious crimes will take place and sometimes by people on criminal justice supervision.			
Worst Case Consequences	1. Death or significant injury to others or significant damage to property; 2. Poor communication and decision making, particularly if decisions are not based on defensible assessments; 3. External criticism and potential intervention; 4. High Court trials, Fatal Accident Enquiries, and significant Case Reviews; or 5. Reputational damage to Council.			
Controls / Mitigation	1. Following national and local guidance; 2. Acting carefully; 3. Ensuring Criminal Justice staff and managers have excellent training and support; and 4. Working in partnership within and out-with the Council.			
What more could we be doing?	Managing offenders is a multi-agency task, all areas of the Council and our partners should consider how they incorporate communication and capacity building in this regard.			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Chief Social Work Officer			

Getting It Right For Every Child (GIRFEC) Change Program		Governance	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	The risks / challenges include: 1. Implementing "named person" responsibilities (GIRFEC); 2. Regulatory compliance in regard to ASN (Additional Support Needs); 3. Completing the Inclusion Review; 4. Action plans from the joint Children's Services inspection; 5. information exchange and interface between Named Person and Lead Professional; and 6. Vacancy management - loss of senior management and associated knowledge through significant downsizing.			
Worst Case Consequences	1. Prosecution or other legal remedy; 2. Civil claims; 3. Criticism / external intervention by e.g. Care Inspectorate and Criminal Justice Authority; 4. Damage to reputation; or 5. Breakdown in partner communications leads to poor data sharing and decisions.			
Controls / Mitigation	1. Implementation Plan for Named Person; 2. Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) Resource Allocation Group (RAG); and 3. Implemented a Nurturing Programme and Nurturing Schools.			
What more could we be doing?	Progress the Curriculum for Excellence (CFE) tasks within the Children's Services Service Performance Plan (SPP), including: 1. Address the CFE Priorities set out in the Service Performance Plan; 2. Deliver the expansion in Early Years Provision in line with the Children and Young People's Bill; 3. Develop and implement the procedures for the Named Person, Team Around the Child, and Child's Plan; 4. Implement improvements identified by the Early Years Collaborative; 5. Track, monitor, and intervene to support Vulnerable Groups, especially Looked After Children. 6. Plan for and build community capacity in collaboration with relevant Stakeholders and Partners; 7. Review Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) Resource Allocation Group (RAG); and 8. Develop information protocol between Named Person Service and Lead Professionals.			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Head of Education			

Integration of Education and Social Work Services to create Children's Services		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	The risks / challenges include: 1. Ensuring that functional areas of service delivery are mapped out; 2. Senior management accountabilities are assigned; 3. Senior management is recruited; 4. Relationships with the IJB are embedded in the service delivery approach; and 5. Vacancy Management - loss of middle management and associated knowledge through significant down sizing.			
Worst Case Consequences	1. Prosecution or other legal remedy; 2. Civil claims; or 3. Damage to reputation.			
Controls / Mitigation	1. Children's Services Service Plan; 2. Financial / budgetary controls; 3. Child protection risk must be managed; and 4. Succession planning to accommodate loss of middle managers through downsizing.			
What more could we be doing?	Continue to develop management profiles, specifically reporting requirements.			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Director of Children's Services			

Harm to Vulnerable People / Public Protection (Children)		Governance	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	<p>There is a risk of harm to vulnerable children and young people if the Council fails to meet its statutory public protection duties. This includes Adult Support and Protection, Child Protection, and both sex offenders and violent offenders (Criminal Justice Service users).</p> <p>In relation to Children's Justice the risk is twofold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The protection of the community from the service user; and 2. The protection of the service user from the community. <p>The risk in terms of children is twofold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need to keep children safe and avoid child deaths; and 2. The reputational risk to the Council in this situation. 			
Worst Case Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Death or serious harm to a child/young person or vulnerable or Children's Services user; 2. Significant Case Reviews / Fatal Accident Enquiries / Court / Prosecution or other external legal interventions' 3. Potential compensation claims; 4. External criticism / intervention (e.g. Care Inspectorate or Criminal Justice Authority); or 5. Reputational damage to the Council. 			
Controls / Mitigation	<p>Current robust processes with partners including</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information sharing / protocols; 2. Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA); 3. Initial Referral Discussions (IRD)'s; 4. CP and ASP Case Conferences; 5. Child Protection (CP) and Adult Support and Protection (ASP) register; 6. Integrated / Single Shared Assessment (SSA); 7. Governance Structure in place - including risk, audit, performance monitoring, and Child Protection Committee; 8. Robust training programme for all Council and partner agency staff regarding CP/ ASP / MAPPA; and 9. Public awareness raising activities, including a Police run scheme for identification of sex offenders in local communities. 			
What more could we be doing?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council strategies (GIRFEC / Corporate Parenting); 2. Strategic, Single Outcome Local Delivery (SOLD), and Service Plans; 3. Core Social Work assessment and provision of care services; and 4. Self-evaluation and Public Service Improvement Framework (PSIF) reviews. 			
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Chief Social Work Officer			

Corporate and Housing Services

Failure to recognise, and act upon, the need for transformational change and continuous improvement.		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	The Council fails to plan for, and implement, appropriate transformational change, leading to missed opportunity and failure to deliver the right services, to the right people, in the right way, and within budget.			
Worst Case Consequences	The Council is unable to achieve the required savings in the required timescales, leading to service failure (including delivery of statutory services); external intervention in the running of the Council; and the Council does not have the required skills or expertise to deliver services.			
Controls / Mitigation	Council of the Future Board in place (comprising elected Members and Chief Officers); programme of Council of the Future work being progressed; Change Manager appointed, in conjunction with the Improvement Service, to ensure good practice and pace of change; and framework for future Council of the Future reporting, timelines, outcomes, and benefits being developed.			
What more could we be doing?	Continued oversight and scrutiny by CMT, Audit Committee, Executive, and Council; external audit of the Council's Financial Statements, and internal audit of processes and controls; and reviewing the change programme through Council of the Future proposals.			
Lessons Learnt	Review of change programme through work on Council of the Future. Consideration has been given to best practice, lessons learnt by other Councils, feedback from Audit Scotland, and programmes in place elsewhere.			
Lead Officer	Head of HR and Business Transformation			

Failure to monitor, measure, manage, and mitigate the impacts of Welfare Reform and Poverty.		Change	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	The Council fails to recognise the impacts of the Welfare Reform programme, and the outcomes for stakeholders, leading to increased poverty within communities, higher arrears, and unplanned and unbudgeted impacts / demands on Council services (including housing).			
Worst Case Consequences	Impact on citizen's ability to pay bills, leading to health and mental health issues for our communities, and unsustainable pressure on Council services; significant negative impact on to the economy in Falkirk; and fall in rents and Council Tax collection rates and impact on Council finances.			
Controls / Mitigation	Provision of advice services; refocussing of Fairer Falkirk Fund; and refocussing of Poverty Strategy.			
What more could we be doing?	Three significant work-streams in place – Advice and Support Hubs, Services to Tenants, and Rent Improvement. The objective of these reviews is to provide more accessible support services to help mitigate financial difficulties for our residents.			
Lessons Learnt	The work-streams have identified that more direct face to face contact, coupled with single designated points of contact and case ownership are considered by our residents to provide improved means of support and assistance.			
Lead Officer	Head of Policy and ICT Improvement, and Head of Housing Services			

Insufficient funding to deliver services and deliver outcomes.		Financial	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Budgetary, economic, or demographic pressures and failure to properly manage and allocate resources to deal with these, mean that the Council is unable to deliver services and meet its statutory and other obligations.			
Worst Case Consequences	The Council is unable (or unwilling) to take the actions and difficult decisions needed to live within its revenue budget; service failure, resulting in inability to deliver statutory services; threat to lives and significant negative impact on the wellbeing of the citizens of Falkirk if services not delivered; and external intervention in the running of the Council.			
Controls / Mitigation	Medium term financial planning, scenario modelling, and horizon scanning; robust and inclusive budget preparation process; ongoing budget monitoring by managers, and expert advice from Service Accountants; gathering and considering network intelligence via, e.g. COSLA, CIPFA Directors of Finance Group; and implementing and enforcing Financial Regulations and other good practice guidance and processes.			
What more could we be doing?				
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Chief Finance Officer			

Failure to properly discharge equalities duties.		Governance	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Failure to comply with equalities duties may lead to disadvantage, poverty, inequality, or harm, and associated reputational, safety, legal, and financial implications.			
Worst Case Consequences	Challenge under Equalities Act and consequences of this.			
Controls / Mitigation	Duty to publish equalities information; assessing and reviewing Policy; considering award criteria and conditions in relation to public procurement; and materials published in an accessible manner.			
What more could we be doing?	The Community Planning Partnership focus on equalities and fairness; and progress reports are provided to CMT and Executive.			
Lessons Learnt	A report is prepared for CMT to review the achievement of our equality outcomes and the equality impact assessment process annually.			
Lead Officer	Head of Policy and ICT Improvement			

Failures in workforce planning, including absence, vacancy management, and succession planning.		Human Resources	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Failures in workforce planning adversely and significantly impact on the quality and consistency of service delivery, and compromise on-going availability.			
Worst Case Consequences	Failure to deliver services, including statutory services; more staff employed than required and / or staff with the wrong skill set; no clear plan to achieve savings that impact on staff; and industrial relations issues.			
Controls / Mitigation	Workforce Strategy agreed by Members, and monitoring of implementation by Human Resources; Workforce Planning Framework in place and being implemented by Services; and Workforce Plans are being developed across all Services.			
What more could we be doing?	Ensuring workforce plans form part of day to day workforce considerations, Budget Strategy and change programme.			
Lessons Learnt	Research of best practice undertaken to develop the Workforce Strategy and the Workforce Planning Framework.			
Lead Officer	Head of HR and Business Transformation			

Compromised security, or inefficient use, of the Council's data and information asset.		Information	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Failure to properly secure data and information may lead to data breach, legal recourse, and reputational damage. Equally, failure to maximise the value of the data and information asset may lead to disjointed and inefficient service delivery, and adverse impact on clients' experience of interacting with the Council.			
Worst Case Consequences	Significant data breach leading to personal harm and / or Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) investigation, fine, and reputational damage; loss of data that compromises people's safety; loss of personal information that compromises individuals' privacy; loss of confidence in Council; and ineffective / inefficient service delivery through failure to join up relevant information.			
Controls / Mitigation	Information Governance Manager appointed, with recognition of risk at corporate level; Information Governance and Security Policies in place; Data Protection Training regime in place and monitored; framework of policies including Acceptable Use Policy and Record Retention Policy; Public Services Network compliance; and working to further develop strategy and practice for appropriate sharing of information across Services.			
What more could we be doing?				
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Chief Governance Officer and Head of Policy and ICT Improvement			

Cyber security incident compromises IT infrastructure, corporate application, social media channel, or data / information.		Information	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	A targeted cyber attack may impact on the availability, integrity, and confidentiality of Council systems and data / information, with associated impact on service delivery and financial loss.			
Worst Case Consequences	Significant data breach, leading to personal harm and / or Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) investigation, fine, and reputational damage; loss of data that compromises people's safety; loss of personal information that compromises individuals; and significant impact on stakeholders' ability to interact electronically with the Council; and loss of confidence in the Council.			
Controls / Mitigation	Annual Public Services Network accreditation; network security, including firewalls, network segregation, penetration testing; and Information Security and Acceptable Use Policies, and supporting processes and procedures.			
What more could we be doing?				
Lessons Learnt				
Lead Officer	Head of Policy and ICT Improvement			

Failure to undertake proper engagement and consultation with service users, stakeholders, and partners on the delivery of services.		Partnerships	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Failure to appropriately engage and consult with service users, stakeholders, and partners on the design and delivery of Council services could lead to flawed decision making, services that do not meet people's needs, poorly targeted expenditure, and adverse impact on communities or individuals.			
Worst Case Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uninformed (or un-evidenced) decision making; Resources not allocated to meet need; or Failure to deliver statutory obligations. 			
Controls / Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively responding to the requirements of the Community Empowerment Act 2015; Active and responsive Citizen's Panel; Participation Strategy and supporting guidance and processes; Development of a locality planning model and priorities; and Development of Local Delivery Plans and Risk Registers, to support Strategic Plan. 			
What more could we be doing?				
Lessons Learnt	Community Planning Audits – outcomes from audits of Falkirk and other Councils.			
Lead Officer	Head of Policy and ICT Improvement			

Development Services

Development Projects		Assets	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	This includes roads, flood prevention works, town centre regeneration and crematorium refurbishment. Failure to deliver projects and achieve income targets (or benefits) on time and cost could have an impact on the Council and communities.			
Worst Case Consequences	Extended project delay and service / economic interruption; severe contractor failures and unplanned costs / budget gaps; sustained media interest, complaints, and loss of confidence; multiple harm (injury / death / assets damage); and civil claims.			
Controls / Mitigation	Project boards have implemented project risk registers (PRRs) and risk / performance/budget monitoring frameworks and contingency plans; construction health and safety arrangements meet statutory duties; and working groups monitor strategies and plans – including Corporate Asset Management (CAM) Capital Planning and Review (CPR) groups, project working groups, the Procurement Board, and the Executive.			
What more could we be doing?	Develop project schedule; develop, review and monitor Project Risk Registers (PRRs) more formally using Red, Amber, Green (RAG) indicators; and review CAM Strategy and asset / project risk framework. Provide Post Project Review reports to CMT and reports to Development Services Divisional Management Team (DMT) twice a year.			
Lessons Learnt	Project officers have Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programmes.			
Lead Officer	Development Services DMT			

Major Investment: Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) and Regeneration		Financial	Current Risk High	Target Risk Medium
Risk Statement	Failure to deliver project on time and cost as set out in Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) and Town Heritage Initiative (THI) Delivery Plans.			
Worst Case Consequences	Major loss of funding, inward investment and /or budget gaps presents harm to assets, the economy, and individuals and serious project delay, criticism, and national media interest.			
Controls / Mitigation	Economic Development Strategy; TIF programme management e.g. capital investment plan; Portfolio Management Plan and construction plans; performance monitoring and reporting to Council Executive; monitor outcomes from progress; and consultation and engagement.			
What more could we be doing?	Key reports / audit actions, e.g. Business Gateway Internal Audits, and Economic Partnership. Review and monitor Project Risk Registers more formally using Red, Amber, and Green (RAG) indicators. Provide post project review reports to CMT and reports to Development Services DMT twice a year.			
Lessons Learnt	Project officers have Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programmes.			
Lead Officer	Head of Economic Development and Environmental Services			

Employment and Training		Partnerships	Current Risk High	Target Risk
Risk Statement	Need to retain sufficient levels of funding to meet the objectives agreed with Council partners and funders.			
Worst Case Consequences	Major loss of funding and/or budget gaps; major harm to the economy, business and individuals; increase in inequality and demand for welfare; and serious project delay, criticism, and national media interest.			
Controls / Mitigation	Employability Action Plan, Strategic Community Plan, Economic Strategy, Unit Operating Plan, performance and budget monitoring and reporting.			
What more could we be doing?	Formalise review and monitoring of risk registers, e.g. twice a year to Development Services Departmental Management Team (DMT) and the Corporate Risk Management Group (CRMG).			
Lessons Learnt	Project officers have Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programmes.			
Lead Officer	Head of Economic Development and Environmental Services			

Appendix 4: Corporate Risk Register Key

Risk Categories		Corporate Working Groups		Portfolio Holders	
A	Assets	BVWG	Best Value Working Group	CLT	Culture, Leisure, and Tourism
C	Change	CPR	Capital Planning and Review	ED	Economic Development
F	Financial	COPPSG	Chief Officers' Public Protection Strategy Group	EDU	Education
G	Governance	CPP LB	Community Planning Partnership Leadership Board	ENV	Environment
H	Human Resources	CAMG	Corporate Asset Management Group	HSC	Health and Social Care
I	Information	CSG	Corporate Sustainability Group	HOU	Housing
P	Partnerships	CRMG	Corporate Risk Management Group	LEA	Leader of the Council
		EoS RRP	East of Scotland Regional Resilience Partnership	PP	Public Protection
		IMG	Information Management Group	RES	Resources
		PB	Procurement Board		
		SWG	Safety at Work Group		
		SHG	Strategic Housing Group		
		WRGG	Welfare Reform Governance Group		

Target Risk and Additional Actions (Risk Tolerance):

A Target Risk Level and Additional Actions are only included on High Risks where the Current Risk Level is greater than the Council's risk tolerance, and the Lead Officer considers it achievable to reduce the level of risk to Medium.

In some cases, e.g. Public Protection, the Current Risk Level is High and cannot be reduced to Medium, despite robust controls being in place.