

Report to: Audit & Governance Committee Meeting 23.11.22

Director or Business Manager Lead: Matthew Finch – Communities and Environment

Lead Officer: Richard Bates – Safety and Risk Manager.

| Report Summary | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Report Title | Strategic Risk Review | | | |
| Purpose of Report | To provide an update to members on the status of the Council's 2022/23 Strategic Risk Register. | | | |
| Recommendations | Members of the Committee are asked to note the content of this report and to highlight any issues of concern. | | | |
| Reason for Recommendation | To ensure Committee members are aware of the status of the Council's strategic risks. | | | |

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Risk Management function is the process of identification and management of significant risks faced by the Council which have the potential to prevent it from achieving its key/agreed objectives. Proactively identifying potentially significant risks and implementing suitable control strategies help prevent these risks from being realised, or this is not possible, mitigate to a tolerable level.
- 1.2 Strategic risks are those risks that have the potential to halt or significantly interfere with the ability of the Council to achieve its core objectives, priorities and/or ambitions.
- 1.3 The contents of the Strategic Risk Register were reported to Members in April 2022. The content of the current risk register has not changed since this last report and continues to have 13 strategic risks. These are listed in the table below.

| | Strategic Risk Register – 2022/23 | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------|
| Title | Description | Owner(s) |
| SR201 | Ensuring financial sustainability of the general | Sanjiv Kohli |
| Financial | fund to allow the council to undertake its core | |
| sustainability – | functions, deliver services, meet its corporate | |
| General Fund | priorities and objectives | |
| SR202 | Financial sustainability of the HRA to ensure the | Sanjiv Kohli |
| Financial | council is able to provide, maintain and develop | Suzanne |
| sustainability - HRA | its housing stock. | Shead |
| SR203 Safeguarding | Preventing failures within safeguarding | Matthew |
| | arrangements to ensure protection of | Finch |
| | vulnerable persons. | |
| SR204 | Facilitating the provision of local infrastructure | Matthew |
| Failure to deliver | to ensure growth within the district to meet | Lamb |
| growth infrastructure | agreed plans & corporate priorities | |
| SR205 | Managing contracts with key suppliers, | Deborah |
| Contract/supply | including NSDC wholly own companies, to | Johnson |
| failure | ensure the continued delivery of an effective | Suzanne |
| | service and ensure delivery of the council's | Shead |
| cpace | priorities and objectives. | Dahasak |
| SR206 | Ensuring the council is able to recruit, maintain | Deborah |
| Workforce | and retain appropriate staffing resource to ensure it is able to deliver its services and meet | Johnson |
| | | |
| SR207 | its corporate objectives. The Council's ability to effectively respond as a | Matthew |
| Emergency response | category 1 responder to a major emergency and | Finch |
| Emergency response | maintain a suitable response without affecting | FILICII |
| | essential service delivery. | |
| SR208 | Risk of failure in systems of governance within | Sue Bearman |
| Corporate governance | the council, council owned/influenced | Suc Bearman |
| corporate governance | organisations and partnerships or other | |
| | collaborative arrangements. | |
| SR209 | Deliberate or unintentional loss/disclosure of | Sanjiv Kohli |
| Data management | personal, sensitive, confidential, business | , , |
| and security | critical information or breach of information | |
| • | governance legislation. | |
| SR210 | Managing performance and the relationship | John |
| Arkwood | between the Council and Arkwood | Robinson |
| Development | Developments in accordance with the | |
| | governance agreement. | |
| SR211 | Understanding trends in the local COVID | Matthew |
| Community Issues - | infection rates and its impact on local | Finch |
| Pandemic | communities | |
| SR212 | Ability to meet requirements of the | Matthew |
| Environment | government's green agenda and | Finch |
| | aspirations/expectations of the NSDC | |
| | community in delivering a greener/carbon | |
| | neutral service. | |
| | neadal service. | |

| SR213 | Implementation and maintenance of suitable | Sanjiv Kohli |
|----------------------|--|--------------|
| Regulatory and | statutory safety compliance management | Suzanne |
| Statutory compliance | systems. | Shead |
| management | | |

- 1.4 It has recently been identified that the current strategic risk register does not address the issues/risks posed by the current cost of living crisis to the council, its services, and the communities it serves. This risk has recently been considered by SLT, who have subsequently agreed to its inclusion within the current risk register. It is envisaged that a drafted version of this risk will shortly be considered by the newly assigned risk owner and supporting officers, with a view to include within the next quarter reviews.
- 1.5 All current risks have been fully developed and action plans produced.
- 1.6 The table below illustrates the current risk scores and location of each strategic risk within the agreed corporate risk matrix.

| | 4 Certain | | SR205 | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| | 3 Very likely | | SR201 | SR206, SR209, SR212, SR213 | SR204 |
| Likelihood | 2 Likely | | | SR202, SR203, SR207, SR208, SR210, SR211 | |
| Li | 1 Remote | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | | 1 Minor/ trivial | 2 Moderate | 3 Severe | 4 Critical |
| | | _ | _ | | - |
| Gree | en Risks - Gen | Minor/ trivial | Moderate Impact | | Critical |
| Yell | <mark>ow Risks -</mark> Pre | Minor/ trivial erally acceptable and | Moderate Impact I require only monitorisk /failure. They red | Severe ring with no further a | Critical ction. |

- 1.7 Strategic risks SR204, SR206, SR209, SR212 and SR213 are currently all identified as red risks. Whilst every reasonable effort will be made to reduce the risk to a level to ensure compliance with the corporate risk appetite, it should be noted that the very nature of strategic risks are complex and influenced by many outside factors/controls. Some actions can be very long term and in other cases the ability to reduce the risk further may not be in the control of the council.
- 1.8 All strategic risk identified above are owned by a member of SLT. Risk owners, with the assistance of lead officers and Safety and Risk Manager meet on a quarterly basis to review and develop the risk.

- 1.9 All strategic risks continue to be reported to SLT, via our agreed assurance process, on a quarterly basis. The purpose of this process is to identify those risks that are red, failing or not reviewed during the previous quarter, for consideration by SLT.
- 1.10 All thirteen strategic risk assessments have been appended to this report in full.

2.0 Proposal/Options Considered

2.1 It is proposed that a risk workshop will take place in January 2023. The workshop will lead SLT through the regional, national and international issues that may impact on the likelihood of a new risks developing. SLT will then review all the current risks to ensure they are still applicable to the Council and will identify any additional emerging risks that will need to be added to the register.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendation's officers have considered the following a range of implications. This report in itself does not have any implications. During the risk reviewing process any controls that are identified are considered in terms of the implications they may have before they are agreed as an appropriate control.

Background Papers and Published Documents

None for this report

APPENDIX 1 – Strategic Risks

| SR201 Financia | al sustainability | - General Fun | d | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Description | Ensuring financial sustainability of the general fund to allow the council to undertake its core functions, deliver services, meet its corporate priorities and objectives | | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Kohli, Sanjiv (SLT) | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Nick Wilson | | | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed | Impact | Likelihood | Risk Management | Target Risk Matrix | | |
| Likelihood | 02-Aug-2022 | 2 | С | Controlled | Likelihood | | |
| Impact | | | • | | | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Annual refresh of M Council approved C Financial implication given each time Financial strategies. Use of external Merica and project more corporate Projects. Director/Business L Approved Commerca Approved Investment Nottinghamshire Bustinghamshire Busti | red in line with the a ledium-Term Finan capital programme and budget review dium Term Financia e following year buanager for each material strategy to support to su | cial Plan including in ittee reports by Final red through Policy and Plan tool which and dget ajor project the Country in the Country object the Country in | ut in the Commercia pacts of reductions in rs cy and Finance Com ates pool | a unique reference tee annually ng future Business vice areas ncial position I Strategy n Business Rates. | | |
| Risk Categories | Financial Meeting corporate objectives Service delivery Reputation Governance Compliance | | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Unforeseen rise in Changes in national Banking crisis Over reliance and public Member priorities durcease CPI/RPI fill Failure of subsidiar Major contract failure of HRA Reduction in Busing Poor decision making contract failure of decision making public failure of decision making public failure of decision making fai | I policy e.g. fair fun poor decision makin iverging from corpo gures y companies re | ding review, chang g on investments orate priorities | e to government poli | itical parties | | |

Budgeted income levels not meeting target Impact on promised funding not as expected Change in government policy significantly reducing income/funding Changes in government policy/direction impacting resulting in additional costs Failure in compliance/ governance Fraud Global Pandemic Economic downturn Cyber-attack/fraud Utility price increase Supply chain – significant sudden increase in costs Levelling up Nottingham and Nottinghamshire project **Impact** Inability to deliver service Inability to meet corporate priorities/community plan Inability to meet legislative requirements External auditors review Government taskforce Negative media/reputation Loss of ability to make local decisions Division between members and officers Greater division between political parties Staff morale, loss of key staff and reduction in workforce Staff morale and loss of key staff Fines/ enforcement S151 officer issues S114 notice GF fails due to third party failure, i.e. HRA/subsidiaries Curtailment of activities of the subsidiaries/HRA/Major projects Impact on residents and communities Impact on income streams

Reduction/disposal of assets

| SR202 Financi | al sustainability | - HRA | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| Description | Financial sustainab its housing stock. | Financial sustainability of the HRA to ensure the council is able to provide, maintain and develop its housing stock. | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Kohli, Sanjiv (SLT); Shead, Suzanne (SLT) | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Nick Wilson | | | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Impact Likelihood Risk Target Risk Management Matrix | | | | | | |
| lmpact | 17-Oct-2022 | 3 | В | Control Pending | Likelihood | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Quarterly Capital monitoring meetings Investments approved in line with the annually agreed Treasury Management Strategy Annual refresh of HRA financial business plan Council approved Capital programme Financial implications added to Committee reports by Financial Services Financial strategies and budget reviewed through Policy and Finance Committee annually Use of external HRABP tool allows scenario planning Assigned project manager for each major project the Council is embarking on Director/Business Unit Manager quarterly meetings reviewing Directorate financial position Quarterly budget monitoring report tabled at SLT and Policy and Finance Committee Annual Financial Regulations training in place Current development programme ensuring growth in house numbers, over and above the offsetting disposals through Right to Buy Attendance at Housing related horizon scanning events, in order to feed future impacts into HRABP Review on housing management completed and housing service brought back in house. Efficiencies generated through budget review | | | | | | |
| Risk Categories | Financial Meeting corporate of Service delivery Reputation Governance Regulation Compliance | objectives | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Change in national Increase in interest Increased rent arrest Suitability of stock reduced Increase or change Current stock does Workforce issues Failing to ensure con Non-compliance with Meeting tenant prior Ineffective strategic Key HRA major profineffective manager | rates ars meeting future stand in standards requir not meeting housin mpliance with relev th RSH regulatory s rities decision making ar jects failure | dards ed g needs ant legislation caus tandards nd business plannir | | s to intervene | | |

Loss of critical income streams Failure to manage critical income streams/ invest Global Pandemic Supplier/contractor cost increases due to demand/supply issues changes in the economy Inability to secure sufficient external funding to regenerate existing stock to meet enhanced Conflicting strategic direction and lack of regular review of 30 year business plan Zero carbon works identifies significant increase in costs Stock condition survey identifies significant increases in costs **Impact** Inability to maintain stock to acceptable level including development of future stock Changes in national policy requiring internal funding above levels sustainable within business Increased requirement to use internal funding, Reprioritisation of service delivery Cash reserves used to right off rent arrears and voids Substandard housing stock Loss of morale and high staff turnover Fines, notices, court cases and legal fees Moratorium of services Stakeholder Dissatisfaction with service delivery Greater scrutiny on service slowing decision making Poor local housing policy Project failure Contract disputes S151 officer issues S114 notice Failure to service debt Legislative requirements not met

Impact on residents and tenants Increase in void properties

| SR203 Safegua | arding | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|--|-------------------|--|--|
| Description | Preventing failures within safeguarding arrangements to ensure protection of vulnerable persons. | | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Finch, Matthew (SLT) | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Alan Batty | | | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Impact Likelihood Risk Target Risk Management Matrix | | | | | | |
| Impact | 10-Aug-2022 | 3 | В | Controlled | Impact | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Countywide safege Annual Review an Corporate Safegue Corporate safegue Safeguarding Sup County Lines mult Local NSDC group Annual assurance Undertake domes Corporate stateme Notts wide networ Participating in se Learning from seri DBS notification pupdates thereafter Shared safeguard Annual completion Annual safeguard Internal Audi Disciplinary policy Key Staff undertal BMs and safeguard Member training PREVENT Introduction to saf Staff Induction trai Modern day slave | d Update of the Coarding group also a arding group meets port Officers in place i agency meeting less for County Lines report to committee tic homicide reviews ent re Modern Day Sk for referring informations case reviews rocess for key risk a sing email of Section 11 returning review and report to the committee of the committee | uncil's Safeguardin ssist in reviewing/d quarterly seed by Police e with exception reps as directed by CS Slavery nation relating to Plas required areas- at recruitment of the SLT | g Policy eveloping this risk. porting if required SP REVENT ht/prior to appointme | ent and at annual | | |
| Risk Categories | Compliance /Legisla Reputation Financial Resourcing Partnerships Governance Vulnerable persons | ation | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Competing demand Lack of provision of Turnover of staff res | suitable training | | | | | |

| | Failure to identify a serious case (including County Lines, PREVENT, Modern day slavery, Domestic abuse) Inappropriate response to a case or notification Resurrection of a historic case Lack of resources to respond to the safeguarding process (identification through to investigation and report) Lack of corporate awareness and culture (members and officers) Lack of communication with lead partner Partnership failure Non adherence to corporate policy |
|--------|--|
| Impact | Harm is suffered by a vulnerable person Serious case review by Nottinghamshire safeguarding board Litigation (criminal and civil) Disruption caused by targeting by groups/individuals - Pressure groups/family/individual(s) and other partner agencies Possible effect on future insurance costs depending on liability and claims history Personal Liability Staff Morale Radicalisation Reputational damage with community e.g. negative media Resourcing any additional works Child exploitation, domestic abuse, radicalisation, modern day slavery Organisational abuse (e.g. older people in Extra care homes) |

| SR204 Failure | to deliver growt | h infrastructure | <u> </u> | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| Description | Facilitating the prov | Facilitating the provision of key local infrastructure projects to ensure growth within the district to meet agreed plans & corporate priorities. | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Lamb, Matt (SLT) | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Lisa Hughes, Matthew Norton | | | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed Impact Likelihood Risk Target Risk Management Matrix | | | | | | |
| Impact | 08-Nov-2022 | 4 | С | Control Pending | Impact | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Infrastructure deliver CIL charging sched Development plan (DPD) Planning policy boat Cabinet and Full Complete Planning Committe High performing plantive Lobbying Engagement with Economic Growth Statistics Continued liaison with CIL Continued liaison with CIL | lule and infrastructu (Amended Core Strand ouncil e anning service Developers, Stakeho Strategy – Newark T vith National Highwa – Continued liaison | olders & Partners Town Investment plays to monitor progwith Homes Engla | ons and Development an & Visitor economy ression of SLR and A nd re funding packag | y strategy \1 overbridge. | | |
| Risk Categories | Inability to deliver infrastructure projects to support growth. Specific projects include: Direct NSDC influence A1Overbridge (and inter-relationship with A46 Newark northern bypass) Indirect influence Southern link road - completion (grant funding) (and inter relationship with A46 Newark northern bypass) A614 roundabout – indirectly funding via section 106 A46 improvement works – Influencing role Political Reputation Financial Partners and stakeholders Economy, business and residents | | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Government chang Partner funding with Funding reduced/co Funding bid failure Withdrawal of Partners Housing developmed Change in leadersh Poor strategic decis Failure of other relation Town fund delivery A46 Newark northed A1 Overbridge — Te | ndrawn posts increased hers hip priorities ent stalls hip sion making hted major infrastruc | y and timing | sts | | | |

| | Change in delivery method and/or partner Non-strategic major road network fund priority junctions(A614/A617/A6097 corridor) Lack of coordination of delivery |
|--------|--|
| Impact | Infrastructure not delivered/ delivery delayed Inappropriate infrastructure delivered Growth within district affected Inadequate service provision Government sanctions for inability to deliver housing growth Housing development stalls Social Inequality Large Employer relocating outside district Inward investment stalls Newark devolution agreement Impact on council's MTFP Increased congestion MTFP assumptions not realised |

| SR205 Contrac | t/supply failure | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Description | Managing contracts with key suppliers, including NSDC wholly own companies, to ensure the continued delivery of an effective service and ensure delivery of the council's priorities and objectives. | | | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Johnson, Deb (SLT); Shead, Suzanne (SLT) | | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Andrew Kirk, Nick V | Vilson, Caroline Wa | ngstaff, Dave Richa | rdson, Alan Batty | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed Impact Likelihood Risk Target Risk Management Matrix | | | | | | | |
| Like iihood Dood Dood Dood | 15-Aug-2022 | 2 | D | Control Pending | Likelihood | | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | populated or embed Contact renewal ear Procurement advice Call off contract arm SLA template devise SLAs all reviewed SLA register devises. Comprehensive au PROCUREMENT Fuse of joint procure Focus on local provuse of contract executed with the contract managers Regular contract | eveloped using Prodded yet see action arly warning provide provided through angements/templated for consistency and actively manual undertaken of constant service –Wellwiders for some servemption forms where a COMPANIES ements regularly revenamed for each anagement meeting approach embedded to BMs on contract resulting the constant of the constant | Contract and active) d by OD at quarterl Welland procureme e devised aged by OD ontracts and procurement rices e necessary riewed gs in place d | | eam (not fully | | | |
| Risk Categories | Service delivery Financial Compliance (Regul Governance Resources Reputational Procurement/lack of Project delivery | | ety, Legislative) | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | CONTRACT INCER Lack of understand Lack of commercial Inadequate/ambigu Inadequate/ambigu Inadequate/ambigu Failure to engage re Contract is not sign | ing of requirements approach and known ous specification ous control/perform ous exit arrangement elevant specialists i | wledge nance measures nts n contract design | sion mechanisms av | ailable | | | |

Limited market supply

Over reliance on single supplier(s)

Lack of competence in procurement

Lack of resource dedicated to procurement

Lack of preplanning for contracts

Lack of appropriate exit strategies

Limited availability due to emerging industries/concepts/technology/demand

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

No assigned contract manager

Contract manager is not appropriately trained/skilled

Contract manager resource is insufficient

Ineffective performance monitoring and reviews

Evergreen contracts in place

Change control/variations are not appropriately managed

Lack of ongoing challenge throughout the contract

Loss of key personnel/ key resilience

Relationship breakdown

Contractor fails to deliver/ isn't able to deliver (bankruptcy)

WHOLLY OWNED COMPANIES

Management agreement not robust

Governance and oversight not appropriate

Inadequate/ambiguous governance arrangement

Contract management resource is insufficient/ unsuitable

Inadequate/ambiguous control/performance measures

Relationship breakdown and – objectives do not align

Lack of ongoing challenge throughout the contract

Board directors do not perform within required parameters

Lack of appropriate review of purpose of contract

OTHER

Financial management not embedded as part of contract management process

Impact of Brexit (link to STRAT SR012 Brexit)

Business continuity/Emergency incident

Contracts not entered on contract register

Provision commences before contract is in place

Lack of appropriate overview of contract management

Pandemic

Impact of inflation

Impact

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Additional costs to council (hidden costs, increased costs)

Best value not achieved

Fines

Failure to utilise grant(repay grant because of failure to contract or contract failure)

SERVICE DELIVERY IMPACT

Provision is not timely/delayed

Poor/declining quality of service/provision

Increased unplanned demand

Inability to scale up/scale down provision to meet demand

Service failure

Not aligned to corporate objectives

Unable to procure

LEGISLATIVE IMPACT

Data loss/GDPR compromised

Council's legislative obligations not met

Providers are not able to be challenged as contract not in place when service is commenced

REPUTATIONAL IMPACT

Customer/service user complaints increase Member complaints increase Negative media coverage

RESOURCE

Contract manager resource requirement is increased (leading to impact on other duties)
Other officer resource required to manage impacts (leading to impact on other duties)
Re-procurement additional resourcing
Project delay

| SR206 Workfor | rce | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Description | | Ensuring the council is able to recruit, maintain and retain appropriate staffing resource to ensure it is able to deliver its services and meet its corporate objectives. | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | Johnson, Deb (SLT) | | | | | | |
| Support Officers | Sarah Lawrie | | | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Impact Likelihood Risk Target Risk Management Matrix | | | | | | |
| Likelihood | 16-Jun-2022 | 3 | С | Controlled | Like 1000 | | |
| In Place | Performance frame Managing absence Senior HR Officers sickness absence, Effective communic Rolling programme Selima system prova approval etc. and p support organisatio Partnership approa pandemic crisis (ar Counselling/therap) Visible inclusive lea Annual employee e Training and develor competencies and management and r Targeted training in succession manage Family friendly polic candidates includin services, health and Approved corporate Comprehensive provellbeing and below Annual staff reward Apprenticeships and | standards and guide provide support to le capability etc. cation arrangements of review for HR povides Business Man rovides corporate of nall change. It is compared to the co | dance Business Managers s are in place. blicies to ensure the agers with ownersh verview HR workin trade unions to sup extraordinary even ort services in place ing process. to support ongoing (i.e. change manager skills) ort individual emplo workplace entitleme exible working, employes). e Community Plan 2 as to embed our cul wards and a basker | e for staff. I development of skill ement, sickness and over development are ents to attract and reployee counselling are | issues, e.g. If fit for purpose. If sickness/Holiday ess Managers to change and current Is and If performance Indicate the facilitation of tain quality and therapy It sense of | | |
| Risk Categories | Service delivery and resources Financial Compliance Governance Reputational Competence and Capability Leadership Mobility and agility of workforce Safety of workforce Increased instances of mental health problems in workforce Culture – One council | | | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Key staff leaving e. professional body Number of staff lea | | | perience and memb | ership of | | |

Inability to recruitment to key posts

Lack of development opportunity

Lack of team cohesion

Lack of organisational culture/collaboration

Lack of alignment with corporate values/behaviours/culture

Pressure of work

External Demand in a specific skill set

Uncompetitive in the job market place

Poor industrial relations and ineffective people management processes

Working environment

Key member of staff goes on long term sick

Uncertainty and/or significant change

Aging workforce/retirement planning/succession planning

Pandemic or other significant emergency

Poor management/leadership

Inability to provide equipment/tools to allow staff to effectively perform their duties (e.g. shortage of laptops due to global microchip shortages)

Other external factors - cost of living, national shortages.

Projected national living wage increase leads to inability on pay structure to accommodate

National bargaining is protracted and leads to staff being disadvantaged

Current JE process is not fit for purpose – outdated.

Impact

Service delivery impact –inability to deliver services or delivering reduced services

Reputational impact through poor service delivery

Reputation as an employer resulting in inability to recruit staff

Loss of capacity/under resourced

Loss of expertise and corporate memory

High recruitment costs

Additional time required to support recruitment activity and the induction of new staff and their

development

Additional training costs

Impact on morale, culture and team performance

Increased levels of staff absence (ill health)

Increased levels of non-attendance in nominated workplace (lack of cohesion/culture)

Loss of opportunity through loss of networks

Increase in accidents

Impact of potential civil claim (e.g. employment tribunal, insurance) or criminal actions

Financial penalties/ombudsman decisions/other regulatory bodies

Increased demand on corporate services (e.g. HR,ICT)

SR207 Emergency response Description The Council's ability to effectively respond as a category 1 responder to a major emergency and maintain a suitable response without affecting essential service delivery. **Lead Officer** Finch, Matthew (SLT) Support Officers Dave Richardson, Alan Batty **Current Risk Target Risk Date Last** Risk **Impact** Likelihood **Matrix** Reviewed Management Matrix -ikelihood ikelihood. 10-AUG2022 3 В Control Pending Impact Impact

Controls/Actions In Place

Emergency Plan/ Business Continuity

- Emergency plans in place and securely stored on Resilience Direct
- Incident specific emergency plans in place.
- Periodic review of key services by EPO e.g. Emergency Planning and Business Continuity.
- Management shows support for BCM through regular discussions in key meetings. Business Continuity is a regular agenda item SLT Annual
- Management shows support to appropriately prepare, maintain and exercise a Business Continuity Plan by assigning adequate resources, people and budgeted funds.
- Periodic review of documents e.g. Emergency Plan, Business Continuity Plan.
- Business Continuity Audit Review.
- There is a Business Continuity Management (BCM) Policy and it is updated periodically.
- Managers and staff have been made aware of BCP and BCM and their responsibilities.
- BCM annual plan for BM and managers to attend training events on an annual basis
- Managers have been consulted in developing the plan and key individuals who input is more important than others have been identified.
- The Business Continuity Plan identifies all critical areas of the authority Regular BCP testing

Financial

- Corporate budget available to support existing flood alleviation schemes.
- Council maintaining budget figure and reserve up to Belwin amount and beyond to cover emergency incidents.
- Facilitation of government property level grant scheme in flood affected areas to enhance future resilience.
- Proactive partners of district wide flood alleviation schemes

Equipment/ Resources

- Flood stores in some communities with provisions to self help and therefore not be as reliant on council.
- Agile working arrangements.
- Cyber security arrangements (See SR110)
- Use and Audit of Resilience Direct as a Document Management System/repository
- Load key documents onto Resilience Direct
- Annual stock take of equipment in our Emergency Stores.
- Scenario testing at least one exercise every two years
- · exercise carried out gap analysis of the testing.
- Training & LRF Training
- Memorandum of Understanding for mutual aid.
- Local Resilience Forum and annual assessment and review of plans.
- BCP BCM training
- · Offering of Health & Wellbeing advice e.g. offering flu vaccinations, mental health etc.

Partners/Public

| | Work with EA (Environment Agency) on flood resilience work has mitigated/reduced the risk in some areas. Improved monitoring systems by EA for earlier warning for floods. Raised awareness of flood risk, therefore increased understanding self help and increasing resilience. Attendance of LRF multi agency meetings for partners East Midlands Group WARP group Emergency response data management tool move to correct location |
|-----------------|---|
| Risk Categories | Resourcing Reputation Expectations Partners Financial Suitability of response Service delivery |
| Trigger/Event | Extreme weather event of greater frequency and severity. Unpredictable district/regional/national emergency events. Council headquarters or key facilities are damaged. Pandemic Flu Cyber Attack Counter terrorist Attack Partners not playing part/full role Failure of resources / suppliers / supply chain Availability and resilience of key personnel Ineffective BCPs Concurrent events Loss of power/water to HQ Harder to draw on goodwill/reduced availability of staff |
| Impact | Drain on services and resources to provide an immediate and appropriate response/recovery. Managing and resourcing the longer term recovery process Business Continuity issues at Castle House and other council facilities - centres could be flooded, staff unable to get into work - loss of resources i.e. vehicles, premises. Reputational damage due to perceived failure to respond to emergency or maintain services Reputational damage to the District and attraction to place to live/work Failure to maintain critical services day to day Ceasing non-essential services Manage financial requirements of the emergency event Financial issues of being unable to claim back funding spent on assisting communities Financial implication of up front costs required during an emergency. Less likely to receive long term support to obtain government flood grants compared with high density areas due to cost benefit ratio. Effect on communities (commercial or domestic) Loss of key/ critical NSDC systems Inability to support critical projects and projects at a critical stage Impact on income generation/loss of income |

SR208 Corporate Governance Description Risk of failure in systems of governance within the council, council owned/influenced organisations and partnerships or other collaborative arrangements. **Lead Officer** Bearman, Sue (SLT) Support Officers Nigel Hill, Nick Wilson, Ella Brady, Deb Johnson **Current Risk Date Last** Risk **Target Risk** Likelihood **Impact Matrix** Reviewed Management Matrix -ikelihood ikelihood. 05-Oct-2022 3 С Control Pending Impact Impact

Controls/Actions In Place

- Code of corporate governance created, maintained and monitored in accordance with CIPFA guidance.
- Corporate Governance self-assessment against the code of Corporate Governance undertaken periodically.
- Periodic review of governance by 3 statutory officers.
- Annual review of Constitution which includes fit for purpose and up to date
- -Officer code of conduct
- -Officer registers of interests Related third party transactions.
- -Section 151 officer/Monitoring officer/Head of Paid Service.
- -Gifts and hospitality policy and register place.
- -Council Financial regulations and procedures,
- -Contract procedure rules
- -Whistle blowing policy
- -Anti-fraud and corruptions strategy
- Annual governance statement reviewed annually and reported to Audit and Governance Committee. Annual Governance Statement goes to November meeting of Committee
- Creation of annual combined assurance report in conjunction with SLT and BMs.
- Internal Audit work including risk-based Audit Plan.
- Effective use of External Auditor.
- Under executive arrangements with Cabinet structure and portfolio holders:
- -Publishing of forward plan and all delegated decisions
- -Mechanism for call in of all executive decisions
- -Overview by Audit and Governance Committee
- -Dedicated scrutiny committee under executive arrangements Policy and performance improvement committee
- -Tenant engagement board which ensures appropriate tenant involvement
- Staff and member training in place
- -Training on governance issues including anti-fraud and financial regulations.
- -Counter fraud training delivered
- -Member induction at the start of each new Council cycle.
- Complaints:
- -Localised standards framework and effective arrangements for dealing with complaints overseen by Audit and Governance Committee.
- -Internal complaints procedure.
- Fraud

-Annual internal review of the Fraud Risk register to carry out proactive work, check on internal controls and is reported to members -Participation with National Fraud Initiative process -Options appraisal for counter fraud and implementation of preferred option. -Appropriate insurance cover including Fidelity Guarantee. -Oversight of Active4Today, Newark and Sherwood Homes, Arkwood and East Midlands Building Control. -Appropriate monitoring of performance of the third party or alternative service delivery methods. HR policies in place -Recruitment process controls, e.g. References, Immigration, DBS. Horizon scanning at Business Manager briefings and effective communication between SLT and business managers. Measures in place to ensure IR35 compliance Schedules review of Corporate Governance (Q4 19/20 Governance review ongoing with support from change to Executive Arrangements completed in May 2022 - 6-month review of effectiveness of arrangements to be considered by Audit and Governance Committee in November 2022 • Internal Audit of governance arrangements for Council-owned companies in 2022-3 audit programme Risk Categories Service delivery Governance Fraud · Poor decision making/leadership Reputation Financial Legal compliance Partners/stakeholders Trigger/Event · Failure to communicate, define, review and uphold governance standards policies to ensure fitness for purpose. • Failure of staff and councillors to understand their governance roles and responsibilities. • Failure to observe good governance. Failure to adequately manage risk or monitor performance. • Failure in Policy adherence (All policies). Malicious event e.g., Fraud, money laundering, etc. Reduction in capacity and loss of key personnel and resources Failure to adequately oversee governance standards of partnerships and other entities that the Council is involved in. Failure of governance in wholly council owned companies • Failure of governance in partnership organisations Negative findings identified by other organisations/bodies – Ombudsman and External Audit Overuse of "Call-in", "Call for action" or "Urgency provision" Inexperience with new system – procedures set out in constitution not followed

Loss of opportunity and ability to meet corporate priorities

· Financial resource loss.

Service delivery issues.

Poor or inadequate decision making.

Impact

- Criminal or civil liability.
- Risk of successful judicial review
- Regulator finding fault e.g. Internal Audit, External Audit, Ombudsman.
- Government or peer intervention.
- Failure of Council owned companies
- Failure of partnerships
- Ombudsman findings Maladministration
- Significant Audit findings e.g. Public interest report
- Reputational risk to the Council.
- Negative media coverage.
- Policies could be open to challenge.
- Excessive legal costs incurred.
- Poor staff morale.
- High staff turnover.
- Community disengagement.
- Capacity redirected to address failures.
- Inappropriate use of public office
- Fraud and corrupt practice identified.
- Fraud and corruption practices not identified or dealt with leading to an incident of fraud and corruption.
- Slowing down of decision making

SR209 Data management and security Description Deliberate or unintentional loss/disclosure of personal, sensitive, confidential, business critical information or breach of information governance legislation **Lead Officer** Kohli, Sanjiv (SLT) Support Officers Jill Baker, Nick Wilson, David Price, Dave Richardson, Sue Bearman **Current Risk Date Last** Risk **Target Risk Impact** Likelihood **Matrix** Reviewed Management Matrix -ikelihood ikelihood. 3 С 17-Aug-2022 Control Pending Impact Impact

Controls/Actions In Place

Policy and Guidance

- Policy suite and supporting guidance including:
- a) Email Policy / Data Breach Policy
- b) Information management framework incorporating Security Policy and Security Breach Policy.
- c) Retention of document policy.
- d) Data Protection policy.
- e) Confidential waste handling procedure.

Training/ Guidance

- Training for all staff taking payments in line with PCI-DSS requirements.
- Training for ICT staff.
- Data protection training including a section on information security and targeted training ongoing for staff located elsewhere and forms part of the induction process.
- Information governance check on furniture that is being disposed of.
- Information E Training completed by all staff.
- Annual review of Information Asset Register.
- Annual mandatory GDPR, cyber and spear phishing online training for all staff and councillors.
- Guidance and training available for elected members. 3 GDPR sessions provided for newly elected members.
- Guidance on security breach procedures for Business Managers as Information Asset Owners.

Governance and Compliance

- CIO/SIRO/DPO appointed
- Compliance with the government's security arrangements.
- PSN compliant data & internet connections implemented
- Compliance with new Cabinet Office email standards achieved.
- Weekly review of ICO guidance.
- Periodic PCI/DSS compliance checks
- Data Privacy Impact Assessment.
- · Annual SIRO audit.
- Review of policies and procedures to ensure compliance with latest Payment Card Industry-Data Security Standard (PCI-DSS)
- Cyber Security now standing agenda item on monthly business unit management meetings.
- Governance arrangements established through CIGG with monthly review.
- CIGG meeting every quarter to review risks.

External Audit on ICT security annually.

ICT/Equipment specific controls

Encryption for mobile devices.

- VASCO tokens and Google Authenticator.
- Quarterly ICT security checks internally.
- Penetration test annually by external company monthly scans of servers for weaknesses, monthly server updates and monthly scans of Microsoft Office and Windows.
- Perimeter software eg. mailmarshall & webmarshall.
- · Hardening test on new virtual servers.
- Documents scanned reducing the need for paper.
- Secure server room.
- East Midlands WARP membership alerting networking facility regarding any breaches.
- Monthly updates of Adobe products.
- Program in place to ensure the continual maintenance & upgrade of the ICT environment.
- Secure portal for Members to access the Extranet.
- Airwatch MDM (Mobile Device Management) implementation for mobile devices.
- DMark, DKim SPF and TLS secure email authentication software.
- Cryptshare for encrypting secure emails and large files for email.
- Report & record all cyber-attacks/attempts and escalate to CMT where appropriate Users own devices cannot connect to network
- 'Consent' tick box on appropriate forms.

•

Partners and Stakeholder specific controls

- Non-disclosure agreements in place for third party access.
- Use of data processing and agreements with partners.
- Use of licensed confidential waste handler.
- Letters sent to all third parties who process personal data on behalf of NSDC advising of additional responsibilities under GDPR and data processing agreements in place.
- Actions arising from report to SLT on third party users implemented.

Risk Categories

Loss of vulnerable, personal, sensitive valuable data

Legal compliance

Reputation

Financial

Partners/stakeholders

Disruption of service from a cyber attack

Trigger/Event

- Personal, confidential or corporately sensitive/business critical information disclosed unintentionally or through error of judgement when responding to requests for information, data breach intentional (malicious) or unintentional.
- Theft or loss of equipment/papers/data belonging to the council, partners or third party companies.
- Cyber attack: (either targeted such as denial of service or unintentional access to link on another website.
- Agile Working i.e. mobile/remote/home working/home printing/disposal of printed data/Outreach posts.
- Reducing resources with less capacity for processing data.
- Loss of key resources/staff.
- Decommissioning of property
- Collaborative working, sharing, outsourcing and partnership working (including external printing and hybrid mail)/involvement in other peoples' data
- Partnership working and sharing new service locations/data sharing issues.

- Partner's/contractor's/host's poor data management and information security leading to data breach/loss.
- Government integration agenda e.g. Increased working between public bodies
- Use of BYOD (Bring your own device).
- Use of suppliers/third parties, etc.
- Local government reorganisation/Combined authority/change in service delivery model.
- Third party access to IT systems.
- New and inexperienced staff/elected members with access to data.
- Termination of PSN/GCSX standards by the Cabinet Office limiting options for securely sharing with some Public Sector organisations.
- Failure to comply with relevant standards and legislation including PCI-DSS/Cyber Essentials/NCSC best practice/PSN.
- Unsupported software/unforeseen loss of support
- Housing management re-alignment and integration of services
- Adoption of unsupported/dated systems from third parties
- Emergency event/Pandemic leading to increased reliance upon ICT systems
- · Accelerated delivery of digital agenda
- Failure to respond to subject access requests/information requests accurately and within statutory timeframes
- Failure to identify and respond to a data breach promptly and effectively
- Failure to protect information from accidental loss, corruption or disclosure or other non compliance with Data Protection Principles, by NSDC or a third party, involving large volumes of personal data or smaller volumes of sensitive personal data
- Failure to protect information assets from an internal malicious attack leading to a data breach, corruption of data assets, loss of asset or service.
- Failure to adopt appropriate technical security measures for keeping data secure within our systems and platforms which results in a significant data breach
- · Accidental data breach through any electronic source

Impact

- Individual loss/damage to an individual where the Council inappropriately released their personal data e.g. Civil claims.
- Damage to reputation of the Council/trust by the public.
- Breach of Access to Information legislation bringing about financial/legal damage imposed on the Council by the Information Commissioner and other Statutory Bodies.
- Financial/ resource impact of Information Commissioner investigation.
- Disciplinary action taken against a member of staff and elected members if a breach is found to be deliberate/malicious.
- Operational and resource issues eg. Service interruption where focus has to be taken away from service delivery to dealing with the breach.
- Individual loss/damage to an individual where the Council inappropriately released their personal data eg. civil claims.
- Drain on resources to process and enable conformity in legislation.
- · Greater demand on existing resource
- Impact on Agile working lack of ability to work remotely and available physical resource
- Cyber-attack leading to system downtime/damage/loss of data (Ransom Ware) and financial loss/ resource drain
- Loss of provision to customers and partners e.g. Active4Today, DWP, CCTV (under current arrangements) leading to disputes over SLAs and contracts and potential loss of income, e.g. partner rent for Castle House.
- Negative media coverage
- Less control over data as service delivery models become more complex

- Loss of partner data where the council is the data processor subsequent impact on partner's reputation.
- Loss of confidence with the Council
- Loss of confidence with partners and stakeholders
- Withdrawal of service from partners and stakeholder
- Increased demand on existing services
- Inability to deliver critical/key services
- Capability of infrastructure/system to deliver services i.e. increased demand during emergencies

| SR210 Arkwoo | d Development | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| Description | Managing performa accordance with the | | | Council and Arkwood | d Developments in |
| Lead Officer | Robinson, John (Sl | _T) | | | |
| Support Officers | Will Marshall, Nick | Wilson, Ella Brady | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed | Impact | Likelihood | Risk Management | Target Risk Matrix |
| Impact | 27-Jun-2022 | 3 | В | Control Pending | Likelihood |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Governance Trainir from May 2022. Company's Articles | ngs scheduled ittee Members train ng given to Member and shareholder ag ittee approve busin ontract meetings be rt giving substantial | ing session comples for when Sharehorderement in place ess plan for compactiveen Arkwood an assurance | eted on 17/1/18 blder will be taken to any and business cas ad council | · · |
| Risk Categories | Financial Reputation Service Delivery Conflict of interest | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | Company failure to Company failure to Company failure to Company failure to English failure to Reputational Poor leadership Company insolvend Poor quality develous Secretary of State of Compliance Issues Operational failure Compliance failure Lack of Delivery Failure to adhere to Lack of awareness | pay monies in a time manage cash flow by pment leading to cut call in planning decistleading to non complete the Company (ies business plan | usiness Plan Council e.g. land tra lely way stomer dissatisfact sions made by cou bliance/legislative fact legislative & police | ncil on company dev | |
| | Market & External F Brexit - market vola Downturn in econor Failure to understar Changes in local ar | tility my nd and develop to m | | traints in legislation fr | rom Council |

Lack of skills to deliver developments to quality and on time (e.g. skills shortage) Market and external construction prices leading to increased cost of build

Resource Demand

Insufficient resourcing (e.g. internal capacity to deliver)

Over resourcing

Incorrect or over demanding SLA's

Failure to deliver Council objectives due to increased amount of time spent by board of directors on company rather than substantive role

Relationship with Company

Lack of communication between Company and Council

Lack of regular updates/ assurance from company

Conflict of interest - failure of the council to demonstrate the company's independence

Impact

Financial

Return on investment to the council not realised

Lack of sustainability and viability of company

Council not achieving aims & objectives as set out in Council's Commercial strategy

Resource Demand

Substantive council roles of directors compromised

Council resource overstretched – poor quality service to council or company

Reputational

Adverse impact on reputation

Inability to contribute to local plan housing numbers

Impact on reputation with key partners and stakeholders

Market & External Factors

Lack of housing that meets market demand

Partners/Relationships

Relationship breakdown between council and company

| SR211 Commu | nity issues - Pa | ndemic | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Description | Understanding tren | ds in the local COV | ID infection rates a | and its impact on loca | l communities |
| Lead Officer | Finch, Matthew (SL | .T); | | | |
| Support Officers | Alan Batty | | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed | Impact | Likelihood | Risk Management | Target Risk Matrix |
| Likelihood | 7/11/22 | 3 | В | Control Pending | Impact |
| Impact | | | | | |
| Controls/Actions In Place | Monthly review of lo Regular discussion Monitoring of staff a Review of GOV gui Emergency plans ir Working from home Working group to b | with PHE absence dance as issued n place e plans in place | | | |
| Risk Categories | Financial Local economy Vulnerable persons Reputation Pressure on service | | | | |
| Trigger/Event | | d impact on key sec our as a result of the ality/entertainment/ on ovestment decisions | ctors e pandemic into the online/leisure/exerc | ncern e medium term i.e. ke cise preferences choi | |
| Impact | Financial impact - Impact on fees and Vulnerable persor Greater deprivation | charge - reduced in as/communities- in already vulnerabreas/workforces are lerance within our coto COVID and future | ole areas/sectors less able to be fle ommunities e restrictions | xible re working arrar | ngements |

| SR212 Environ | ment | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Description | Ability to meet requ | | | genda and aspiration | s/expectations of |
| Lead Officer | Finch, Matthew (SL | .T) | | | |
| Support Officers | Briony Ashton, Ella | Brady | | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed | Impact | Likelihood | Risk Management | Target Risk Matrix |
| Impact | 03-Nov-2022 | 3 | В | Control Pending | Impact |
| Controls/Actions In Place | 1) Climate emerger 2) Approved date for 3) Costed action pla 4) Appointed Enviro 5) Climate emerger 6) Project working of 7) Annual report to 8) Internal Audit 9) Urban tree challed 10) Developed busin 11) Financial planni 12) Elected member 13) Community plant 14) Bid to public se 15) Successful bido 16) 2 x posts agree | or net neutral – 203 an to support net ne commental Policy and ncy project working group for depot dev P&F – Activities ur enge grant – 4000 t ing – MTFP er working party utili n ctor de-carbonisatio ling - LAD2 funding | eutral date d Projects Officer group – meets qua elopment ndertaken and carb rees planted o side food and gla sed to develop clin on fund allocation (£750k) | oon footprint ss collection nate emergency strate | egy plan |
| Risk Categories | Financial Reputation Statutory compliand Disruption of servic Negative media/cor Capacity to deliver | e-Pressure groups nms | • | | |
| Trigger/Event | 2030 internal comb Budget pressure/pla Lack of financial su Availability/cost/ma Incentivising of tarif Legacy issues -hou Resident/User enga Active pressure gro Political influence Declaration of clima Impact of media/so Poor communicatio Partnership failure | s and legislation- i. ustion engine phas anning/demand - M pport from governn turity of technology fs – cost v return sing/fuels/infrastrue agement/participation ups ate emergency cial media events/in ns nts/competition – re o deliver | e out, national tree TFP nent to implement cture on - Behaviour cha | nge | |
| Impact | Not meeting govern Penalties -TBC | nmental targets/inte | rnal targets | | |

Reputation

Negative media

Political/public pressure for improvement/campaigns against

Increased scrutiny and workload

Budget gaps

Impact on other service provision

Lack of infrastructure to improve

Lack/loss of control in light of government mandated service provision

Increased costs arising from emerging technology, reduced tariffs and government policy

Unable to deliver due to access/obtain government funding/ technology

Unable to deliver on climate strategy

Customer disengagement

Greater demand on external expertise leading to greater costs lower internal expertise

| SR213 Statu | tory complian | ce managem | ent | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Description | Implementation a | | of suitable statu | utory safety compli | ance |
| Lead Officer | Kohli, Sanjiv (SL | T); Shead, Suzaı | nne (SLT) | | |
| Support Officers | Mark Plant, Mark | k Eyre, Caroline \ | Vagstaff | | |
| Current Risk Matrix | Date Last Reviewed | Impact | Likelihood | Risk Management | Target Risk Matrix |
| Impact | 27-Jun-2022 | 3 | С | Control Pending | Likelihood |
| Risk | Dedicated softs Contract mana Performance m Training and co Information/edi Enforcement or Assurance and Use of specialisity Competent/lice Auditing and in Reconciliation Complaints pro Tenant engage Maintenance/ir Pre let inspecti Business plann Compliance wi Legal/enforcen Civil claims Service deliver Negative media Reputation Customer satis Financial impage Increased reso | appliance teams and ware —asset compliance systems in an agement systems in an agement systems in a coverage in a | and compliance repliance/manage ems tenants/contract tenants t | eporting ment software ICT or nd committee leve ctors gement • H&S | ls |
| Categories | Civil claimsService deliverNegative mediaReputationCustomer satis | y - Loss of essen a coverage | | stem/equipment fa | ailure/out of use |

• Financial impact (rectification)

| | Increased resource demand |
|---------------|---|
| | |
| Trigger/Event | Poor management systems |
| | Failure to undertake statutory examinations |
| | Poor record keeping /management |
| | Remedial works not undertaken in a timely manner |
| | Contract management – controls to manage/address poor performance/contract |
| | exit arrangements, use of evergreen contracts (non-ending), poor procurement |
| | Poor contractor engagement |
| | Cyber-attack/Ransom ware –denied/denying access to records |
| | Data protection loss/GDPR |
| | Routine inspection/audit identifies failure |
| | • Incorrect response to an accusation, complaint or request for service |
| | Unauthorised repairs, Sabotage, maintenance, alterations and installations |
| | • Pandemic |
| | Emergency incident – fire, gas, flood, etc. |
| | Essential supplier chain failure/goes into administration. |
| | Incorrect sub-contracting procedures |
| | Change in legal/regulatory requirements |
| | Failure of ICT and associated support systems |
| | Recruitment – inability due to market demands |
| | Loss of key personnel |
| | Insufficient finance |
| | Insufficient Resourcing |
| | |
| | |
| Impact | Fines/enforcement action |
| Impact | |
| Impact | Fines/enforcement action Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff Inability to recruit the right staff |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff Inability to recruit the right staff Poor morale/stress of workforce |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff Inability to recruit the right staff Poor morale/stress of workforce Political engagement |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff Inability to recruit the right staff Poor morale/stress of workforce Political engagement Enforcement agency engagement |
| Impact | Unable to deliver a suitable service/essential service Resource demand/conflict Financial – budget overspend, income generation/protection, rent loss, MTFP, viability of HRA business plan. Effect on GF income Loss/reduction of service to Council, partners and tenants(commercial and domestic) Reputation Need to re home tenants Leaseholders litigate Negative local or national press coverage Increased scrutiny – customer, committees, etc. Self-referral to regulatory (co-regulation) Commercial viability of building/site Tenancy enforcement Contract failure/suspension Contract dispute Increase turnover of staff Inability to recruit the right staff Poor morale/stress of workforce Political engagement |