

REPORT TO AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW PANEL

Title: **COUNCIL'S KEY RISKS UPDATE REPORT**

Date: **18th February 2010**

Member Reporting: **Councillor Duncan McBride**

Contact Officer(s): **Catherine Hickman, Head of Audit and Review
tel: 01628 796233
Steve Mappley, Insurance and Risk Manager
tel: 01628 796202**

Wards Affected: **All Wards**

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report makes Members aware of the Key Council Risks as at 5th February 2010, in compliance with the requirements of good Corporate Governance.

2. RECOMMENDATION:

That the findings of this report on the Key Council Risks are noted.

What will be different for residents as a result of this decision?
--

Due to specific actions to identify and manage the Council's significant business risks, with mitigations and controls in place as far as reasonably practicable, residents will benefit from the Council's improved operational stability and consistency, which will result in improved Customer satisfaction.
--

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 3.1 Risk Management is a key element in the Council's governance arrangements and control environment. Risk Management is fundamentally about taking the appropriate actions to reduce the barriers to achieving objectives.
- 3.2 The Corporate Risk Register records the risks that relate to the achievement of the Council's objectives. This tool is accessible to all Risk Owners who have various updating and viewing privileges, depending on their position in the Council hierarchy and with regard to the management of the risk/s in question.
- 3.3 The purpose of the Risk Register is twofold:
- To highlight those risks that Directors identify as 'overarching' which require a corporate response. Some 'Directorate' risks can potentially be included in the Key Strategic Risk report, where it is felt that failure could seriously compromise the whole Council.

b) To highlight those risks specific to Operational activities of Service Areas within Directorates where failure carries High Risk impacts.

3.4 Strategic risks are those risks which need to be taken into account in judgements about the medium to long-term goals and objectives of the Council. These typically impact across the entire or significant portions of the organisation. Strategic risks are by their very nature best identified by those in the most senior positions, whose role entails policy and strategic decision-making.

3.5 A named Council Officer and a Lead Member own all key risks jointly to ensure sufficient priority and attention is given towards controls. Risk Owners have been apprised of the methodology used to determine these risks.

3.6 Lead Members are regularly notified of the Key Risks where they are named as Risk Owner. Lead Members are asked to confirm the date of their review of these risks with the Officer Risk Owner and those Officers are tasked with ensuring that any comments are agreed and reflected in the assessment of the risk captured on the appendices to this report.

Update to Risk Register Following Meeting of This Panel 16th December 2009

3.7 The Council's Risk Register contains the Council's Key Strategic and Operational risks. The reports detailing the Key Strategic and Directorate Operational Risks were presented to the previous meeting of the Panel held 16th December 2009.

3.8 These reports were subsequently reviewed by CMT, Directorate Management Teams and Lead Members as follows. These sessions have successfully brought together managers to discuss risk at team, departmental and corporate levels.

Directorate/Team	Most recent review date by Officers	Most recent review date by Lead Member
CMT (Key Strategic Risks)	20/01/10	Various Lead Members - see Appendix A
Environmental Services	11/02/10	30/11/09 – Cllr Rayner 02/12/09 - Cllr Bicknell 02/12/09 – Cllr Mrs Knight
Children's Services	11/02/10	26/11/09 – Cllr Mrs Quick 02/12/09 – Cllr Mrs Knight
Adult & Community Services	04/02/10	30/11/09 - Cllr Dudley
Resources	10/02/10	30/12/09 – Cllr Kellaway
Planning and Development	27/01/10	06/01/10 – Cllr Mrs Knight

- 3.9 Only the Key Strategic Risks are included with this report as Appendix A. The Key Operational Risks are as circulated to Members of the Panel 17th September 2009 as the annual review of Risk Management. There are several amendments to note to the Key Strategic and Key Operational risks which are described in Appendix B.
- 3.10 CMT's suite of risks reflecting those risks arising from the objective of determining and setting the strategic approach for the Council's delivery of services were reviewed 20th January 2010 with any outputs regarding Key Strategic Risks captured in Appendices A and B.
- 3.11 The same approach to reviewing and, where appropriate, completing Service Area risk profiling as a result of the restructure will be taken to ensure the Risk Register is up to date. Each Service Area is allocated a Risk Priority Rating of between 1 and 4, where 1 represents low risk and 4 represents high risk. It should be noted that the number and/or quality of controls in place do not affect this Rating. The Rating is a measure to ensure that those service units deemed as inherently higher risk are closely monitored and reviewed.

Audit Board

- 3.12 The recently formed Audit Board contains within its Terms of Reference the following responsibilities:
- a. Annually consider the Risk Management Strategy to ensure that it is properly focussed.
 - b. Receive quarterly reports on the management of the key operational and strategic risks facing the Council and progress on the completion/review of the Corporate Risk Register to enable scrutiny and challenge.

This is expected to further embed the demonstrable management of risk as part of the Council's business. The impact of the current restructuring of Council departments will mean that the completion/review aspect of the Corporate Risk Register will be held in abeyance until the restructuring consultation period is complete. The Audit Board have been presented at their most recent meeting, 26th January 2010, with an example of the present outstanding areas of the Corporate Risk Register in anticipation. The Audit Board chose not to action these until the new Council structure is in place.

4. OPTIONS AVAILABLE AND RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Options

	Option	Comments	Financial Implications
1.	Accept the findings of this updated report on the Council's Key Risks.	The Council must demonstrate that it complies with Regulations ¹ in relation to the publication of an Annual Governance	Revenue Officer time in dealing with operation of Risk Management

¹ Regulation 4(2) of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003, as amended by the Accounts and Audit (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2006.

	Option	Comments	Financial Implications
		Statement. One of its core principles is a requirement for the Council to demonstrate how it manages risk and ensure that it has a system of controls that are key in mitigating those risks that may affect the achievement of the Council's objectives.	Strategy. Capital None
2.	Accept the findings of this updated report on the Council's Key Risks with amendments.	This may expose the Authority to unnecessary risks by not having an adequate internal control framework leading to poor performance, poor outcomes for service users/citizens and a specific attributable negative impact on the Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment / Corporate Area Assessment.	Revenue Inappropriate expenditure on aspects of business with uncontrolled risks attached to them. Capital None
3.	Reject the style of report on the Council's Key Risks.	The report structure has been arrived at after proper and suitable consultation with Members on the most appropriate amount of detail required. However, in order to make quarterly reports manageable in terms of paperwork, future reports will be on an exception basis.	Revenue None Capital None

4.2 Risk Assessment

4.2.1 If Risk Management is not made part of "business as usual" for Council officers, this is likely to lead to significant adverse impacts in terms of cost, reputation and service delivery.

4.2.2 An absence of Member support for Risk Management would be viewed as disappointing by external auditors. The regular reporting structure and scrutiny process thus ought to provide a robust framework for managing risk. Risk Management is a component of the Comprehensive Area Assessment, both from a Use of Resources rating perspective and in relation to the implementation of the area assessment. A key requirement of the assessment is around risk management in partnerships.

4.2.3 There is the general risk that if the Council fails to make good use of the management of risk processes it is likely to lead to uncontrolled exposure to many high level strategic and operational risks. As Risk Management becomes a management competency, part of staff skills set and part of Council business as usual the regular reporting and assessment structure ought to provide a robust framework for managing risk.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

5.1 Consultations have taken place with the Audit Commission, Audit and Performance Review Panel, Chief Executive's Management Team, Services Management Team, Audit and Review Unit and Heads of Service through Directorate Management Teams.

5.2 Significant parts of the Council's "Risk Managed" process guide for managers were included in the Alarm² national Risk Management process, which is now utilised by the majority of UK public sector bodies.

6. IMPLICATIONS

The following implications have been addressed where indicated below.

Financial	Legal	Human Rights Act	Planning	Sustainable Development	Diversity & Equality
None	None	N/A ⁵	N/A	N/A	N/A

Background Papers: None

² The national body responsible for promoting best practice in the management of risk within the public sector.

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners ¹
<p>KSR1. Inadequate Retention and Recruitment of quality Staff and especially senior and specialist staff.</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: REC0001, 3</p>	<p>a. Pay and Workforce Development Plan incl. Senior Managers pay review, Allowances review, expansion of Menu of Benefits, EqIAⁱⁱ of Equal pay issues and action plan.</p> <p>b. Recruitment Strategy incl. RBWM image as Employer of Choice, collaborative working</p> <p>c. Staff engagement with RBWM vision including activities focussing on customer relationship management</p> <p>d. Staff development inc key skills/competencies</p> <p>e. Succession planning including Future Leaders programme</p> <p>f. HR support for managers in undertaking staff performance management and capability proceedings.</p> <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <p>a. Senior Managers' pay review implemented July 09. Working group for allowance review in place, programme in place for modelling. Market testing of additional benefit options completed. EqIA partially completed.</p> <p>b. Strategy drafted in October 2009</p> <p>c. Started in October 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>d. Appraisals inform PDPⁱⁱⁱ's, corporate training plan to address overall generic requirements, competencies to be integrated into recruitment assessments.</p> <p>e. Succession Planning template to be rolled out to all service areas, continuation of Future Leaders development activities- started on June 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>f. Bite size for managers in managing performance including capability, redundancy</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Moderate/Very Likely Legislation: Moderate/Very Likely Reputation: Major/Very Likely Service Delivery: Major/Very Likely</p> <p>Current Score: LOW Financial: Minor/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Minor/Unlikely Service Delivery: Minor/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Minor/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Minor/Unlikely Service Delivery: Minor/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carol Naismith, Head of Human Resources • Councillor Burbage <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 27th November 2009</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 2nd December 2009. No comments beyond what is now captured.</p>

	<p>and project management.</p> <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <p>Performance Measures: HR B/S</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EF9 - Top 5% of earners that are women.^{iv} – on target • VFM10 - % of workforce made up of Agency staff – on target • VFM13 - Appointment rate - % of advertised posts appointed to – on target • Appraisal outcomes in Trent reported via scorecard from Jan 2010. <p>Performance Measures: Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of staff turnover • Gender split 		
--	---	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR3. Business Continuity Planning failure.</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: EMRES'15. EMRES'9</p>	<p>Failure to continue to develop, review and update the Council's strategic and operational business continuity plans and ensure a regular programme of testing, could lead to severe disruption to Council services in the event of a crisis.</p> <p>i. Business Continuity Planning (BCP) Board created for monthly review on progress and chaired by Strategic Director of Environmental Services</p> <p>ii. "Battle Baton" Software to support BCP procured.</p> <p>iii. Council functions risk-profiled to identify "Must do Critical Services". 57 such functions identified.</p> <p>iv. All Council Contractors have been written to for status of their own BCP's.</p> <p>v. Reports to CMT on progress for "iii" and "iv" and their specific contents where appropriate.</p> <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <p>i. Ongoing Monthly</p> <p>ii. Final contract wording being sorted between Legal Services and Software Suppliers. Training for specified Officers undertaken in October 2009.</p> <p>iii. Complete.</p> <p>iv. 388 Contractors identified of which 38 are rated as "Business Critical" by Service Heads.</p> <p>v. Ongoing on a weekly basis.</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Catastrophic/Likely Legislation: Catastrophic/Likely Reputation: Catastrophic/Very Likely Service Delivery: Major/Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Likely Reputation: Major/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Moderate/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Perkins, Head of Operations • Councillor Rayner <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 2nd November 2009</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 2nd November 2009.</p> <p>Lead Member comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk is reviewed monthly. • LM comments incorporated. • No major concerns. • Swine Flu update regularly discussed. • Winter Maintenance and

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Base data being entered onto Battle Baton system. ii. Key Portal users identified prioritised. <p>Performance Measures: Environment B/S No indicators</p> <p>Performance Measures: Other % of Critical Services with BCP Plans / Mitigation measures in place.</p>		<p>flood response risks covered.</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR5. Failure to successfully plan and deliver 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games in the form of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main rowing 2. Flat water canoeing 3. Adaptive rowing 4. A compelling and identifiable “legacy”. <p>Risk Register Ref: OLYMPI’5</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Involvement with specific Strategic Sector Groups with various focuses to ensure direct management of key aspects. b. Undertake Risk Assessment of RBWM role. c. LOCOG^v to be adequately engaged to ensure their expectation on the hosting Local Authorities is clear. d. Seek Member and Senior Officer buy-in to specific resources necessary to achieve successful planning/delivery. <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sector Groups aligned to national arrangements established with chairperson and co-ordinator leading on delivery of draft 2012 strategy desired focus and priority outcomes. SEEDA^{vi} are the lead stakeholder for planning and securing the best benefit of being Olympic hosts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups contain (external) Chairs and (internal) co-ordinators. b. Initial Risk Assessment completed but due to be revised in conjunction with review of Olympic Strategy development including role of and relationship with Sectoral Group and respective focus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve Visitor Manager and Windsor and Maidenhead Town Managers for suitable spread of expertise. c. Ongoing d. ODA^{vii} will increase their resources to 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: catastrophic/likely Legislation^{ix}: moderate/unlikely Reputation: catastrophic/likely Service Delivery: major/likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/likely Legislation: Moderate/unlikely Reputation: Major/likely Service Delivery: Major/likely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Major/Very unlikely Legislation: Minor/Very unlikely Reputation: Major/Very unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Very unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Oram, Strategic Director of Environmental Services <p>Cllr involvement: Cllr Simon Dudley</p> <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 25th October 2009</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 6th November 2009. Comments and measures endorsed.</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>reflect scale of preparation and make expectations of the Local Authorities. Presently these are not well defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal is for the Chief Exec's from the Local Authorities involved^{viii} to meet with ODA to ensure a joint focus and deliver opportunities with partners. • David Oram to meet with Cllr Dudley to ensure appropriate Elected Member involvement. <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific actions to ensure (i) Highways, including meeting local with ODA director, (ii) Sports/Leisure infrastructure engagement from RBWM. Meetings with SEEDA and Govt Olympic Executive Attendance at meeting with Local Chamber. <p>Performance Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Local PI's or National Indicator Sets (NI's) yet specified 		
--	--	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR6. Failure to manage Partnership working</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: PARTNE'12</p>	<p>a. Active Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Partners involved in policy setting.</p> <p>b. Well-established Partnership arrangement with Health and Housing Associations.</p> <p>c. A training programme for staff including working with Partners to develop bids for additional resources has been initiated.</p> <p>d. Regular monitoring of LAA targets and other relevant PIs through Ambition Groups and Community Partnership.</p> <p>e. Development of a governance protocol for Royal Borough Partnerships.</p> <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Strategy currently being refreshed and endorsed by Cabinet 28th January 2010. All Key Partners have signed up to this Strategy. • LSP Partners continue to be extensively involved in policy setting including working toward joint programmes / initiatives. • Actions arising out of an internal audit of the Governance of Partnerships currently being implemented including the establishment of a partnerships register. • Internal Officer Group established to monitor and manage LAA PPG & achievement of LAA reward targets to 2010 <p>Performance Measures: None</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Very likely Legislation: Moderate/Likely Reputation: Major/Very likely Service Delivery: Major/Very likely</p> <p>Current Score: LOW Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Moderate/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Moderate/Unlikely Legislation: Moderate/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harjit Hunjan, Community & Business Partnerships Manager • Councillor Mrs Bateson <p>Frequency of review: quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 28th January 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 2nd November 2009, no comments</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KSR7 Projects fail to deliver planned benefits. <p>Risk Register Ref: POLPER0002</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure named Officer is explicitly tasked for executing each task. b. Project management to ensure deadlines and other time boundaries that make sure things get done. c. Undertake analysis of SPRUCE to determine suitability for Council use. d. Performance Management accountable to close scrutiny e. 14 actions arising out of Overview and Scrutiny being put into place with Project Managers f. Further guidelines being produced for Project Managers regarding the reporting of projects re: risks, issues, state and budget. <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures a. – f. In place</p> <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management training has now been sourced and will start in January 2010 for all Project Managers. QA report has been considered by CMT and a Project Management Office is to be established during 2010 to improve processes and procedures <p>Performance Measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All projects being managed to timetable and where not, corrective action is being taken to address the overrun. 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Very Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Major/Very Likely Service Delivery: Major/Very Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Likely Service Delivery: Moderate/Likely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Minor/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Minor/Unlikely Service Delivery: Minor/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Elkington, Head of Policy and Performance Councillor Liam Maxwell <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 4th January 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 2nd November 2009, no comments</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR9. (a) Loss of data or inadequate data security leads to delays and errors in business processes.</p> <p>(b) Inadequate data to inform business decisions/data quality insufficient to inform decisions.</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: BID0008</p>	<p>Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ICT perform backups to enable retrieval of systems data. Data is replicated daily to secondary data centre. b. All key critical documents retained as paper records. c. Secure data backup facility developed at Tinkers Lane premises. d. Move to encrypted memory sticks. e. CD/DVD burning restricted to Officers with Manager’s authorisation. f. Migration of all RBWM applications to run in a virtual environment. g. Bulk data shredding for confidential documents h. New policy to reduce risks from receipt of external data i. Protective Marking Assessment Tool j. Deployment of protective marking and secure data handling project k. Security of External Data policy <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Undertaken daily b. Ongoing c. In place from 22/07/09 d. In place from 06/02/09. e. In place f. Completed 01/09/09 g. In place h. In place. Scheduled for review September 2009. i. – k Complete and part of Security 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Major/Likely Reputation: Catastrophic/Likely Service Delivery: Major/Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Moderate/Unlikely Legislation: Moderate/Unlikely Reputation: Major/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Minor/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Clark, Head of ICT) • Cllr Liam Maxwell <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 3rd December 2009</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 3rd December 2009, no issues raised</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>procedures available on Hyperwave</p> <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review None</p> <p>Performance Measures: ICT B/S 3.8 - Security Management Risk Tracker – on target</p>		
--	--	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR10. Economy operates outside Council's MTFP.</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: HOF'6</p>	<p>Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to economic and emerging policy signals. Ensure sufficient revenue reserves to enable suitable action. Forward planning of budget <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Established as an annual Council process. Monthly monitoring of targeted income against actual income. This is part of the budget setting process and part of the Head of Finance's annual assessment of the need to retain reserves and ensure the Economic Contingency Reserve is sufficient. <p>Member comments: Current risks revolve around:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low interest rates reducing revenues in short/medium term Erratic movements in inflation from abnormally high in September 2008 to abnormally low in September 2009. Current RPI inflation likely to move to +3% within months. Reductions in cost for next budget cycle critically dependent on successful staff re-organisation. Main current pressure on costs is coming from child safeguarding which is (largely) out of our control Ability to fund capital from asset sales is restricted by poor property market Central government grant is unknown factor from 2011 onwards due to end of three year cycle in 2010/11 and new Government being formed in May/June 2010. <p>Performance Measures: Other In development: a set of Performance Indicators to effectively measure the Impact and Likelihood of change</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Catastrophic/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Major/Likely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/unlikely</p>	<p>Andrew Brooker. Head of Finance, Cllr Richard Kellaway</p> <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 29th September 2009</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 30th November 2009</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR12. Project Management Failure</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: HPLAND0006</p>	<p>Failure to deliver Maidenhead Regeneration Programme on time and/or on budget. The Financial Risk is around the state of the economy and ability of developers to fund some of the schemes / improvements.</p> <p>Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of the “Vision for Maidenhead Town Centre” as the strategy for the town centre. Broadway Triangle Planning Brief Agree timescale for delivery of the Masterplan for the town centre Discuss and finalise Local Development Scheme with GOSE in order to provide firm basis for progressing with Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) Ensure budget and financial controls in place to support programme. <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation 30/09 – 14/11/08 and again Jan – Feb 2010. Cabinet approval obtained January 2009. Adopted in December 2008 and informing negotiations on that site which are leading to an agreement with the site owners to enable a major planning application to be prepared. Now agreed by PRoM^x, with consultants DTZ/BDP leading. Project inception process began at PRoM meeting 16th March 2009. Progress on other areas including 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Catastrophic/Very Likely Legislation: Major/Very Likely Reputation: Major/Very Likely Service Delivery: Major/Very Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Catastrophic/Unlikely Legislation: Major/Unlikely Reputation: Major/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Moderate/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tim Slaney, Head of Planning and Development Cllr David Burbage <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 3rd February 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 3rd February 2010, no comments beyond what is already captured</p>

	<p>Public Realm Strategy, Traffic Model and Waterways Framework in accordance with project plan. Further reporting and approval of Cabinet programmed for March 2010 as per work programme.</p> <p>d. Timetable for preparation of AAP to co-ordinate with programme for all planning policy work submitted to Government for ‘adoption’. Formally accepted and GOSE advising on robustness of plan and how to make it sound – a significant step forward.</p> <p>e. Financial support for programme 09/10 established and planned spend on track. Bid for Capital funding together with use of existing resources planned for 10/11.</p> <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government Offices agree with doing plan first before Core Strategy • Resource from Planning Policy team being used to augment Consultancy to ensure more ‘localism’ approach and enable timetable to be maintained. • Delivery of traffic model to timetable for PRoM to consider and endorse early Feb 2010 • Commitment to Council’s role evidenced through the Capital programme and capital provided toward Maidenhead Environmental Initiatives. <p>Performance Measures: Balanced Scorecards - Planning: 20 - Maidenhead Rejuvenation & PRoM</p>		
--	---	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>working in partnership - on target</p> <p>Balanced Scorecards- Policy & Performance:</p> <p>15 - External Funding attracted By Maidenhead Town Centre Partnership – on target</p> <p>25 - Additional Businesses in Maidenhead Town Centre actively engaged in Maidenhead Town Partnership – on target</p> <p>Performance Measures: Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings of project team (Programme Board) to precede meetings of PRoM who oversee works as a mini LSP for the Town Centre. Report to CMT in April 2009 on progress and Cabinet in August 2009. • Other officers with relevant detailed technical skills work on individual projects and invited to Project Board to report progress/seek advice or assistance as detailed project work progresses. • Regular monthly meeting with accountants to ensure finances underpinning programme are in place and that expenditure is taking place as planned or being managed for the future. 		
--	---	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR13. Failure to deliver socially inclusive services to all areas across the Royal Borough</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: DAE0003</p>	<p>Breach leads to Government intervention in the form of Equality and HR Commission.</p> <p>Involvement can result from random inspection or a complaint. Council obliged to provide assistance to Commission. Refusal to respond based on resources or rationale would lead to intervention, consequent wasted resources and potential reputation damage.</p> <p>Treatment Measures Undertake external health check of work in this area and implement the actions arising.</p> <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following a review of the council's equalities framework North Harbour Consulting (an established supplier in the Equality and Diversity field) delivered their report in November 2009. • Work is now being lead by Policy and Performance to refresh and update the council's Equality Action Plan (EAP). • The Equality Champions Group comprised of staff across the council has been re-established to drive this programme. • An updated EAP is expected to be completed by May 2010. <p>Performance Measures. The Equality Standard has five levels, with 5 being outstanding. We are currently at Level 2 and it is our ambition to raise this to Level 3.</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Moderate/Likely Legislation: Catastrophic /Likely Reputation: Major/Likely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p> <p>Current Score: HIGH Financial: Moderate/Likely Legislation: Catastrophic /Likely Reputation: Major/Likely Service Delivery: Moderate/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: LOW Financial: Moderate/Very unlikely Legislation: Catastrophic/ Very unlikely Reputation: Major/Very Unlikely Service Delivery: Moderate/ Very unlikely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Elkington, Head of Policy and Performance • Councillor Liam Maxwell <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 1st February 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 2nd November 2009, no comments</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR14 Failure to define and co-ordinate suitable strategies and delivery plans across the Borough</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: CMT0001</p>	<p>Treatment Measures</p> <p>a. Several key plans are in place. Strengthen MTFP/MTFS with focus on the long term and greater dovetailing with corporate strategy and service plans. Ensure Members are involved in the above.</p> <p>b. Local Transport Plan (LTP)</p> <p>c. Local Development Framework (Local Plans)</p> <p>d. Production of corporate plan.</p> <p>e. CMT Standardisation and simplification of processes ought to drive this.</p> <p>f. Children and Young People Plan</p> <p>g. Adult Plan and Transforming Social Care</p> <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <p>a. In progress</p> <p>b. In progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: LTP II, Cllr Rayner has been well-briefed on this. The Plan is being driven by the LTP Board comprising David Oram and Tim Slaney amongst others. • LTP Project Team chaired by Transport Policy & Implementation Group Manager, Gail Kenyon. • Management of Delivery responsibility to Technical Team Manager (Highways and Engineering), Chris Wheeler with monthly reporting upwards. • LTP 3 is required by Mid-2011 and is currently (December 2009) out to 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Major/Likely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/Likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/Unlikely</p> <p>Controlled Score: MEDIUM Financial: Moderate/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/Unlikely</p>	<p>CMT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Brooker, Head of Finance • David Oram, Director of Environmental Services • Tim Slaney, Head of Planning and Development • Andrew Elkington, Head of Policy and Performance • Cllr David Burbage <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 1st February 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 7th January 2010</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>Consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. In progress d. Corporate Plan for 2009/10 has now been produced and published. Work has now commenced to produce the 2010/11 document. e. In progress f. In progress g. In progress <p>Performance Measures. Awaited</p>		
--	---	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR15 Failure to Improve Services</p> <p>Risk Register ref: CMT0009</p>	<p>Failure to link and co-ordinate the various programmes/borough organisations and community partners re: families and young people, reduces effectiveness of response to residents, including Total Place^{xi}.</p> <p>Failure to effectively engage with third parties and miss opportunities for collaboration and cost savings.</p> <p>Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Link to Health service programmes (Adult Services) Link to Health service and DCFS programmes (Children’s Services) Take an overview of new government policy and signpost to relevant departments. Cross party meetings with Police and NHS Ensure Total Place is enshrined within Community Strategy <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 25% complete – some work with PCT^{xii},s undertaken 25% complete – links established with DCSF Estimated 15% towards Total Plan solutions Ongoing In place. Work is now taking place around the supporting Local Families Initiative. <p>Performance Measures.</p> <p>Awaited</p>	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Likely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p>	<p>CMT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christabel Shawcross, Director of Adult and Community Services Cliff Turner, Director of Children’s Services Andrew Elkington, Head of Policy and Performance Cllr Mrs Bateson <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 1st February 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: None (new risk from 2nd December 2009, notified 29th December 2009)</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

Key Risk	Detail and Treatment Measures	Risk Assessment	Risk Owners
<p>KSR16 Failure to manage partnership relations</p> <p>Risk Register Ref: CMT0011</p>	<p>Failure to engage with health agenda priorities leads to a mismatch of services provided to residents.</p> <p>Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Build relationship with Health sector Build relationship with Police Build relationships with Voluntary orgs and 3rd sector. Develop a Voluntary Sector Compact. Build relationships with schools Build relationships with people and organisations that support children including Youth Organisations Take an overview of new government policy and signpost to relevant departments <p>Current Status of Treatment Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Progressing, 40% complete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures and processes being put in place to ensure more effective working between 2 partners and early identification of issues. RBWM Health and social care executive chaired by RBWM director with director of PCT local commissioning. Partnership boards for client groups have health representation to jointly develop services in line with agreed priorities. Learning Disability Partnership Board has joint framework set by Dept. of Health and reporting mechanism on meeting targets to SE Dept. of Health region. 	<p>Uncontrolled Score: HIGH Financial: Major/Likely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Likely Service Delivery: Catastrophic/likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/likely</p> <p>Current Score: MEDIUM Financial: Major/Unlikely Legislation: Minor/Unlikely Reputation: Moderate/Unlikely Service Delivery: Major/Unlikely</p>	<p>CMT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christabel Shawcross, Director of Adult and Community Services David Oram, Director of Environmental Services Andrew Elkington, Head of Policy and Performance Cllr Mrs Quick <p>Frequency of review: Quarterly</p> <p>Date of last Officer review: 20th January 2010</p> <p>Date of last Member review: 29th December 2009</p> <p>Member comments: Ensure consideration is given to relevance of private care homes, housing associations, Healthy Schools and Youth Organisations in Treatment Measures. This consideration actioned by CMT members and results notified to Cllr Quick.</p>

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drug and alcohol board also monitored by government department Communities and Local Government (CLG). • East Berkshire Commissioning board, a joint board of unitary directors and PCT directors to identify strategies and issues to action. To take forward priorities for joint strategic needs assessment. <p>Areas of weakness and concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCT priorities do not always align with RBWM as has to relate to 3 unitaries with different levels of need. • Acute Trust^{xiii} is in financial turnaround. Impact being considered through overview and scrutiny with some difficulty in getting information in advance. • Mental Health Trusts having to develop significant service redesign to achieve 3 year savings. Joint commissioning poorly developed so risk that local services will be diluted. The Chief Executive is proactively offering to meet with local members and scrutiny prior to formal options coming forward. • Schedule maintained of “Activities and services which either are in partnership or liaison with Police, Health or Voluntary Sector”. <p>b. Progressing, 70% complete – Cross party meetings involving Police in place.</p> <p>c. Progressing well through the refreshed Community Partnership Strategy which Voluntary and 3rd sector organisations contributed to. Work has commenced regarding refreshing the Voluntary Sector</p>		
--	--	--	--

Appendix A - Current Key Strategic Risks as at 3rd February 2010

	<p>Compact^{xiv}. Overall, estimated 70% complete.</p> <p>d. All schools working towards the National Healthy Schools Standard (over 80% achieved), including travel to school and children's physical and mental well-being.</p> <p>e. 35% complete, mostly through use of Sports and RBWM Youth Forum.</p> <p>f. Ongoing.</p> <p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, ensure that priorities are aligned between these partners as far as possible. • Identify any missing partners e.g. fire service <p>Performance Measures Awaited</p>		
--	---	--	--

ⁱ Risk Owner: an individual Officer and Member who is closely involved with the risk, is able to monitor the risk and has sufficient authority to initiate action if the risk becomes more serious.

ⁱⁱ EqIA – Equality Impact Assessment; a tool for identifying the potential impact of a council's policies, services and functions on its residents and staff. By carrying out EqIAs, the council can also ensure that the services that it provides fulfil the requirements of anti-discrimination and equalities legislation.

ⁱⁱⁱ PDP – Personal Development Plans

^{iv} This is a PI set by the Audit Commission for all local authorities as an equality measure

^v The London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games is responsible for preparing and staging the 2012 Games.

^{vi} The South East England Development Agency, as the Regional Development Agency for the South East, is responsible for the sustainable economic development and regeneration of the South East of England

^{vii} Olympic Delivery Authority - the single delivery body responsible for creating the infrastructure for the Olympic and Paralympic Games in London in 2012.

^{viii} RBWM, South Bucks District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Slough Borough Council

^{ix} Legislation in the form of the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006, Olympic Symbol etc. (Protection) Act 1995

^x PRoM - Partnership for the Rejuvenation of Maidenhead. Established in 2007 representing a partnership to promote the improvement and regeneration of the town centre with membership drawn from local organisations, business interests and cross party Council representation together with professional Officer support.

^{xi} Total Place is an initiative that looks at how a 'whole area' approach to public services can lead to better services at less cost. It seeks to identify and avoid overlap and duplication between organisations

^{xii} Primary Care Trusts (PCT's) were introduced in 2002 to manage and lead the provision of most community-based health services. PCTs control approximately 90 per cent of the NHS budget. They work with hospitals and other health and social care providers, including local councils and the independent sector, to make sure local communities get the right treatment and care to meet their needs. This includes having contracts in place for the right number of GPs, dentists and opticians.

^{xiii} Acute trusts manage hospitals and work closely with primary care trusts to provide the right hospital-based services (sometimes called secondary care) to meet patients' needs. Acute trusts usually manage services across a number of different hospital sites, making sure that high quality healthcare is provided and money is spent efficiently. They also decide on strategies for how the hospitals will develop and continue to improve their services.

^{xiv} Established in 1998, the Compact is an agreement between Government and the voluntary and community sector in England. It recognises shared values, principles and commitments and sets out guidelines for how both parties should work together.

Appendix B: Notes of amendments to Key Strategic and Operational Risks Reports since Audit and Performance Review Panel 16th December 2009

Key Strategic Risks	
Reference	Amendment
KSR6 Failure to manage Partnership working	<p>Current Risk Assessment Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced from Medium to Low following improvements to Governance arrangements, specifically Key Partners now all signed up to Community Strategy, reflected in lower scores for Current Financial (Major to Moderate) and Current Service Delivery (Major to Moderate) criteria assessments.
KSR7 Projects fail to deliver planned benefits.	<p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management training has now been sourced and will start in January 2010 for all Project Managers. QA report has been considered by CMT and a Project Management Office is to be established during 2010 to improve processes and procedures
KSR12 Failure to deliver Maidenhead Regeneration Programme on time and/or on budget.	<p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure budget and financial controls in place to support programme. Financial support for programme 09/10 established and planned spend on track. Bid for Capital funding together with use of existing resources planned for 10/11. Consultation of Vision document continues through Jan/Feb 2010. Progress made with site owners to enable a major planning application to be prepared re: Broadway Triangle Planning Brief. Masterplan for Town Centre – approval of Cabinet programmed for March 2010 as per work programme. Town Centre Area Action Plan timetable formally accepted and GOSE advising on robustness of plan and how to make it sound – a significant step forward. Government Offices agree with doing plan first before Core Strategy. Resource from Planning Policy team being used to augment Consultancy to ensure more ‘localism’ approach and enable timetable to be maintained. Delivery of traffic model to timetable for PRoM to consider and endorse early Feb 2010. <p>New Performance Measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular monthly meeting with accountants to ensure finances underpinning programme are in place and that expenditure is taking place as planned or being managed for the future.
KSR13 Failure to deliver socially inclusive services to all areas across the Royal Borough	<p>Progress of Treatment Measures re: Undertake external health check of work in this area and implement the actions arising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following a review of the council’s equalities framework North Harbour Consulting (an established supplier in the Equality and Diversity field) delivered their report in November 2009. Work is now being lead by Policy and Performance to refresh and update the council’s Equality Action Plan (EAP). The Equality Champions Group comprised of staff across the council has been re-established to drive this programme. An updated EAP is expected to be completed by May 2010.

<p>KSR16 Failure to manage partnership relations with regard to health agenda priorities</p>	<p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, ensure that priorities are aligned between these partners as far as possible and identify any missing partners e.g. fire service. • Build Relationship with Health Sector progressing, 40% complete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structures and processes being put in place to ensure more effective working between 2 partners and early identification of issues. ○ RBWM Health and Social Care Executive chaired by RBWM Director with Director of PCT Local Commissioning. ○ Partnership boards for client groups have health representation to jointly develop services in line with agreed priorities. ○ Learning Disability Partnership Board has joint framework set by Dept. of Health and reporting mechanism on meeting targets to SE Dept. of Health region. ○ Drug and Alcohol Board also monitored by government department Communities and Local Government (CLG). ○ East Berkshire Commissioning board, a joint board of Unitary Directors and PCT directors to identify strategies and issues to action. To take forward priorities for joint strategic needs assessment. <p>Areas of weakness and concern – Health Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PCT priorities do not always align with RBWM as has to relate to 3 unitaries with different levels of need. ○ Acute Trust¹ is in financial turnaround. Impact being considered through overview and scrutiny with some difficulty in getting information in advance. ○ Mental Health Trusts having to develop significant service redesign to achieve 3 year savings. Joint commissioning poorly developed so risk that local services will be dilated. The Chief Executive is proactively offering to meet with local Members and Scrutiny prior to formal options coming forward. ○ Schedule maintained of “Activities and services which either are in partnership or liaison with Police, Health or Voluntary Sector”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building relationships with Voluntary orgs and 3rd sector and develop a Voluntary Sector Compact. This is progressing well through the refreshed Community Partnership Strategy which Voluntary and 3rd sector organisations contributed to. Work has commenced regarding refreshing the Voluntary Sector Compact. Overall, estimated 70% complete. • All schools working towards the National Healthy Schools Standard (over 80% achieved), including travel to school and children’s physical and mental well-being. • Expanded Partners to include Youth Organisations to recognise RBWM Youth Forum.
<p>Environmental Services</p>	
<p>Reference</p>	<p>Amendment</p>
<p>To follow from review 11/02/2010</p>	

¹ Acute trusts manage hospitals and work closely with primary care trusts to provide the right hospital-based services (sometimes called secondary care) to meet patients’ needs. Acute trusts usually manage services across a number of different hospital sites, making sure that high quality healthcare is provided and money is spent efficiently. They also decide on strategies for how the hospitals will develop and continue to improve their services.

Children's Services (any additional changes to follow from review 11/02/2010)	
Reference	Amendment
CS2 Failure to address maintenance problems in schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changed Member risk owner from Cllr Mrs Alison Knight to Cllr Mrs Eileen Quick.
CS7 Failure of Headteachers to demonstrate competence in application of building regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised current status of Treatment Measures to capture progress towards completing Headteacher and Site Controller training. Once complete, this will demonstrate a satisfactory level of knowledge and competence in the relevant regulations.
CS8 New Holyport Manor School "Manor Green"	<p>Performance Measure Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presently three weeks ahead of schedule on the school itself, on track with the Respite Unit for delivery in August, and onsite with the Leisure Centre which will be ready by September. Expected to complete on time and within budget.
Adult and Community Services	
Reference	Amendment
AC1 Failure to properly staff Residential Care Homes.	Performance Measures – removed NI's as felt not to be representative of effectiveness of risk controls. Replaced by reference to CQC ² Inspection Reports for the homes in question.
AC2 Failure to arrange safe and speedy discharge of people from hospital.	Added new performance measure, "Annual Performance Assessment "excellent" rating for transfers".
AC3 Failure to provide Day Care services for people with a Learning Disability and Older People.	Removed performance measure "NI131 – delayed transfers of care from hospitals" as not felt to be relevant to this risk.
AC4 Failure of In-House Home Care service causes significant harm or mortal danger to a client.	Noted that from November 2010 the Authority can be prosecuted for non-compliance in arranging for staff to be CRB checked.
AC5 Failure of domiciliary care service from external providers.	<p>New Treatment Measure</p> <p>Use of Contracts Review Board to advise CMT and Cabinet (as appropriate) on contract letting or contract performance issues.</p>
AC8 Failure to provide Housing Options Service and react to economic signals.	<p>New Treatment measures and Modifications following last review</p> <p>Requirement by Govt for lenders to notify the Local Authority if they are considering eviction/repossession of properties. However it should be noted there have been no actual evictions since this requirement came into play and no increase in homelessness since the last update of this report 30/11/09.</p>
AC10 Death or serious	<p>New Treatment Measure</p> <p>ISA³ checks to be included with CRB checks from July 2010</p>

² Care Quality Commission is the health and social care regulator for England. Their Inspection Reports' Quality Ratings provide information about what quality of care a service provides.

³ Independent Safeguarding Authority. Any person undertaking a regulated activity must be registered on the ISA list. This will be a legal requirement. It will be the employer's responsibility to enrol someone who is not on the list, or check an entry of someone who claims they are already on the list.

injury to a service user as a consequence of using a Council facility.	Performance Measures Now include annual statistical analysis of incidents and accidents from the three main Centres - Windsor, Charters and Magnet - with detail on the main messages arising.
AC11 Failure to make substantial progress regarding Transforming Social Care Agenda	Performance Measures improved to refer to Key Strategic Risk ref: KSR7 "Ensure Projects deliver planned benefits".
AC12 Demographic change affects demand for Council Services.	Detail extended to include financial implications of the Government's Personal Care Bill.
Planning and Development	
Reference	Amendment
PD1 Changes to S106 Supplementary Planning Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Financial and Service Delivery likelihoods reduced from "Very Likely" to "Likely" based on enhancements in management data provided by improved performance measures. • Current risk assessment score consequently reduced from High to Medium. • Cllr Alison Knight included as a Risk Owner with Cllr Kellaway.
PD2 Failure to deliver planning services across the Borough in a sustainable and robust way that is clearly understood by residents and users of the service.	Improved Treatment Measures regarding "Dialogue with users and residents": Major Parish Planning Meeting held Jan 2010 with issues addressed via Parish agenda. No material impact on Risk Assessment.
Resources (any additional changes to follow from review 10/02/2010)	
Reference	Amendment
RES1 Health and Safety skills development failure	<p>Several amendments to status of Treatment Measures. No changes to Risk Assessment scores:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Health & Safety Committee Terms of Reference agreed including requirements for each Directorate and Key Service Area to nominate an Officer to take a joint H&S Committee & Safety Champion role. b. Updated statistics on progress for Corporate Manslaughter training for School Governors and Senior Managers. c. Top 10 Practical Measures for Managers agreed and issued.