




Risk Register 2011/2012													
Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 1 30 June 2011				Controls	Quarter 2 30 Sept 2011				Direction of Travel	Comments this quarter
			Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		
Strategic Risks													
RS01 Deprivation & Health Inequalities	Ian Davies	The risk in not breaking the cycle of deprivation and addressing inequalities across the District is that the life opportunities of residents in the greatest need will not be improved. As a result the reputation of the Council will suffer. The risk is particularly acute in areas such as the Neithrop, Ruscote and Grimsbury wards in Banbury where there is a high level of deprivation as measured by the Government's indices of multiple deprivation.	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 6	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.01a Long term approach to support (people/communities) as many issues can only be addressed so RS.01b Multi agency action with clear and common objectives RS.01c Additional funding from Government grants to supplement current resources RS.01d LSP focus on Brighter Futures in Banbury programme RS.01e Contingency fund made available in CDC budget RS.01f Programme co-ordination role in place RS.01g Quarterly performance management in place 	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A		
RS02 Bicester Eco Town	John Hoad	The risks are that national and local policy support and resources will be inadequate to support the development of the NW Bicester Eco-Town. As a result the Council may fail to fully exploit the Eco-Town as an opportunity to develop a centre of excellence in terms of sustainable living.	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.02a Planning policy development through Local Development Framework RS.02b Eco Bicester Town Project plan & related partnerships with private/public sector partners RS.02c Dedicated Project Team 	High 16	R	Medium 9	A		
RS03 Local Development Framework	Philip Clarke	The risks are that the Local Development Framework is not prepared adequately, in time, or is found unsound at public examination. Such outcomes would result in further risks arising from speculative planning applications, undesirable major developments and / or expense for the Council in contesting planning appeals. An unsound plan would mean that the Council would have to repeat 2 to 3 years work at high cost.	High 20	R	High Medium 15	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.03a Liaison with CLG regarding appropriate procedures RS.03b Take legal advice as necessary, to further inform our position RS.03c Ask our MP to raise questions to Govt. Ministers if clarity is required on Localism Bill RS.03d Engage in public consultation on new population figures that informs emerging Core Strategy RS.03e Work with LDF Advisory Panel in formulating revised policies & Councillor involvement 	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !		
RS04 Economic & Social Changes	John Hoad	The risk is that the Council does not identify and respond to general economic and social changes and as a result would not fulfil its role as a community leader and a provider of top quality services driven by a clear understanding of community and individual needs.	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.04a Service and financial planning process RS.04b Sustainable Community Strategy, Economic Development Strategy, related partnership activities RS.04c Service specific plans & strategies 	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !		
RS05 Horton Hospital	Ian Davies	The risks to maintaining the Horton Hospital as a facility that meets community aspirations for local health provision are the deliverability and affordability of a revised consultant delivered service model for paediatrics and obstetrics. Failure of either will jeopardise current service provision and could result in a service reduction from the Horton.	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.05a Support to the PCT in challenging ORHT proposals RS.05b Providing evidence of deliverability of consultant delivered services elsewhere RS.05c Gaining consensus locally that this is important RS.05d Ensuring local Councillors are briefed & engaged to play a community leadership role RS.05e Support local stakeholder group with ORHT/GP/OCC representation 	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !		New consultant delivered service models in place. CPN set up to consider wider health sector changes including the Horton. Ongoing changes at the Horton due to financial pressures at the ORHT and the need to offer same or similar services at lower cost. Changes to gynaecology services under scrutiny - service improvements proposed but an a net loss of beds.
RS06 The Natural Environment	Ed Potter	The risk is that the Council does not take the necessary actions to meet its obligation, as set by National Government, to ensure its own operations and that of its District's residents and businesses reduce their carbon footprints.	High Medium 15	A !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.06a Environmental Strategy for a changing climate RS.06b Clear responsibility for delivery plans for the Environmental Strategy RS.06c Relevant delivery groups RS.06d Cherwell Climate Change Partnership 	High Medium 15	A !	Medium 9	A		

Risk Register 2011/2012													
Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 1 30 June 2011				Controls	Quarter 2 30 Sept 2011				Direction of Travel	Comments this quarter
			Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		
Strategic Risks													
RS08 Financial Resources	Karen Curtin	The risk is that in an uncertain economic and financial climate the Council will not have the resources to deliver its corporate priorities. Poor economic conditions also tend to produce increased demand on services. As the Council's income from capital reduces our dependency on interest to support revenue expenditure must also reduce and capital assets will need to be rebuilt to fund future infrastructure investments. Failure to do either will result in budgetary shortfall, service reductions, above inflation increases to council tax and lack of capital to fund future community schemes.	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.08a Budget 2011/12 RS.08b Medium financial strategy and sensitivity analysis RS.08c Workforce planning RS.08d Dashboard - budget monitoring RS.08e Public promise of £1m cost reduction RS.08f Shared Senior Mgt team with SNDC RS.08g Executive Planning Workshops RS.08h Building Block Templates 	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	
RS09 Shared Management Services with South Northamptonshire District Council	Ian Davies	The risk that the shared management arrangements fail to be effectively managed and implemented and will adversely impact upon the Council's financial position and ability to balance its budget with further cutting service budgets. Other potential adverse affects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of key staff and declining morale Loss of organisational reputation Legal challenge Decline in organisational performance Failure of ICT system to be effectively integrated for shared management Political Change <p>There is a comprehensive list of risks established in the development of the shared management business case and these are detailed in Appendix 6 of the business case and contain details of risk, controls and mitigations.</p>	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS09a Joint Arrangement Steering Group and terms of reference in line with S113 agreement RS09b Steering group supported with professional legal and HR advice RS09c Steering group includes senior elected members and managers from both organisations RS09d Steering Group will provide regular reports and keep risk under review. RS09e Professional recruitment consultants appointed RS09f Communications briefings in place RS09g Business case developed and agreed RS09h Joint ICT work programme in place 	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	➡	Internal recruitment to new joint senior management structure completed as per the agreed timescale.
RS10 Managing Policy & Legislative Change	Claire Taylor	The risk that the Council fails to implement the requirements of new legislation or policy change. In addition there is a risk that the council does not capitalise on new opportunities. Key areas of change are the impact of the localism bill, the big society agenda, peer assessment, changed models of service delivery, new financial requirements etc. <p>Failure to address policy change could result in the council not being legally compliant, failing to maximise new opportunities such as new funding streams or pathfinder projects, a negative impact on the council's reputation as a high performer and a community leader, possible damage to local partnerships.</p>	High 16	R	Medium 6	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RS.10a CIP identifies areas of emerging policy & allocates additional support via Improvement Team RS.10b CIP monitored through the PMF system monthly RS.10c CMT review policy & legislative requirements on an ongoing basis RS.10d EMT consider policy changes at regular meetings RS.10e Emerging new policy requirements entered and monitored via Risk Register 	High 16	R	Medium 6	A	➡	JMT meets fortnightly keeping policy changes under review.
Corporate Risks													
RC01 Health & Safety	David Marriott	The risk is that a failure to comply with health and safety and welfare legislation and policies could lead to injuries and death, high sickness absence and claims and litigation against the Council.	High 20	R	High Medium 10	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC.01a Wide range of health and safety policies and procedures RC.01b Training is given to all relevant staff undertaking manual work RC.01c Relevant safe working practice notes are issued as part of standard induction procedures 	High 20	R	High Medium 10	A !	➡	
RC02 Capital Investments	Karen Curtin	The risk is to the Council's ability to fund its activities because of a reduction in investment income or income from other capital assets such as buildings.	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rc.02a Treasury management rc.02b Annual investment strategy complies to CIPFA code rc.02c Minimise empty properties rc.02d Budget 2011/12 rc.02e Medium term financial strategy rc.02f Asset Management Strategy rc.02g Dashboard - budget monitoring rc.02h Annual Treasury Management Strategy rc.02i Counterparty Lists 	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	➡	
RC03 ICT Systems	Pat Simpson	1) ICT unable to provide Disaster Recovery Services as required by the Business Continuity Plan. 2) Loss of ICT systems that would have a significant negative impact on service delivery and cause exceptional costs to the Council.	High 20	R	Medium 8	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rc.03a 6 monthly testing of Disaster Recovery Plan rc.03b External quality assurance of architecture and implementation rc.03c Annual compliance with ISO 27001 	High 20	R	High Medium 12	A !	⚠	A Data Recovery test will be scheduled for Q4 with the Business Continuity Plan officer

Risk Register 2011/2012													
Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 1 30 June 2011				Controls	Quarter 2 30 Sept 2011				Direction of Travel	Comments this quarter
			Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		
Corporate Risks													
RC04 Equalities Legislation	Claire Taylor	The risk is the Council may be open to litigation and loss of reputation if it is not compliant with equalities legislation.	High 20	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rc.04a Equalities scheme rc.04b Mandatory equalities training rc.04c Equalities performance monitored through PMF rc.04d Equalities Officer Support for EQIA rc.04d IDEA peer assessment planned for 2010 rc.04e Equalities steering group and communications plan rc.04f Network of consultative panels for EQIA 	High 20	R	High Medium 12	A !	➡	risk reviewed, need to retain focus on ensuring management decisions, especially with regards to service budgets are subject to the appropriate equality analysis.
RC06 Civil Emergency	Paul Marston-Weston	The risk is that Civil Emergency arrangements are not adequate, leading to loss of property, personal injury or death, civil unrest and loss of confidence in local authority leadership.	High Medium 15	A !	High Medium 10	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rc.06a As a Category 1 Responder the Council has a duty to prepare and maintain an Emergency Plan rc.06b Annual testing and exercise schedule rc.06c Training to relevant staff 	High Medium 15	A !	High Medium 10	A !	➡	
RC07 Managing Data & Information	Claire Taylor	The risk is that unreliable data sources are used to support decision and policy making putting the Council at risk of making poor decisions. Decisions are made on the basis of information about the population and the nature of the district. If data is out of date, incomplete or inaccurate, those decisions may turn out to be inappropriate and they could be challenged. Lack of effective information management means that the Council will not be able to effectively respond to FOI or EIR requests putting CDC at risk of a complaint to the Information Commissioner. Poor information will also mean that the Council is unable to deliver against the transparency agenda.	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC.07a Single trusted data source for all decision makers RC.07b Use external trusted & reliable data source as the basis for our own information. RC.07c Internal audit programme for performance indicators RC.07d Clear Data Quality policy RC.07e Guidance issued to managers 	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	risk reviewed no changes this month
RC08 Corporate Fraud	Karen Curtin	As with other large organisations the size and nature of our services puts us at risk of loss due to fraud both from within and outside the Council. We have always taken this risk seriously and have many structures and control mechanisms in place to counter fraud. According to research, fraud in the workplace is likely to accelerate during the global economic downturn. This is because managers may falsify figures to make performance look better and debt-strapped employees are more likely to commit fraud.	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC08.a Fraud Investigation Team to prevent, detect, investigate and sanction cases of fraud under the RC08.b Corporate and Benefit fraud awareness training to all staff RC08.c In-depth training, including Bribery Act to front line staff & other staff as required RC08.d Participation in the National Fraud initiative & Housing Benefits matching exercises RC08.e Application of Councils Policies (Anti-fraud & Corruption, Sanctions, Bribery) RC08.f Networking/Benchmarking arrangements with other Councils & DW&P 	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	➡	
Partnership Risks													
RP02 Local Strategic Partnership	Claire Taylor	The risk is the failure of the Local Strategic Partnership to deliver its objectives having a negative impact on service delivery to the public, the Council's reputation with other local agencies and this being reflected in national reputation. There is also a risk that with the reduced focus on partnership working, opportunities for increased efficiency and improved services are lost due to less effective networks and relationships	High Medium 12	A !	Low 4	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RP.02a Partnership governance review implemented RP.02b Performance Management Framework RP.02c Develop Partnership Handbook RP.02d Management Group to support implementation of LSP decisions RP.02e Annual self assessment of performance RP.02f Ongoing review & information exchange to capitalise on emerging issues & opportunities RP02.1 Develop a Partnership Development Plan 	High Medium 12	A !	High Medium 12	A !	✖	Risk reviewed and membership gaps being filled currently. Risk impact has increased due to additional LAA funding that is now available to the Board. The Board has agreed a protod for allocating funds.
RP03 Cherwell Community Safety Partnership	Chris Rothwell	The risk is the failure of the Community Safety Partnership to work collaboratively to deliver safer communities and achieve reduction in crime and fear of crime	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RP.03a Bi-monthly monitoring of 4 Action Groups plans to deliver the priorities of the partnership rp.03b Quarterly reporting to Strategic Partnership meetings RP.03c Monitored via Performance Management Framework 	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	➡	
RP04 Local Enterprise Partnerships (Oxford City & South East Midlands)	John Hoad	The risk is the failure of the Local Enterprise Partnerships to establish themselves as effective bodies locally and in relations with National Government. The consequences may be reduced funding for the local area and failure to fully exploit economic growth, development and infrastructure provision opportunities. A related risk is the ability/inability of Cherwell District Council to influence the work of the Partnerships to the benefit of the District.	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RP.04a Partnership Work Programme/Forward Plan RP.04b Resource provision for Partnership work 	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	➡	
RP05 Oxfordshire Waste Partnership - Financial Arrangements	Ed Potter	Financial arrangements exist to regulate funds flowing between the collection authorities in Oxfordshire and the disposal authority (Oxfordshire County Council). These are legally binding. However Oxfordshire County Council have indicated that they are not prepared to continue all these payments (landfill diversion payments) in the future. This could threaten the future of the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RP05.a Work with other collection authority partners to achieve greater voting power RP05.b Full partnership participation to address moved by County Council to reduce payments 	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	➡	

Risk Register 2011/2012													
Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 1 30 June 2011				Controls	Quarter 2 30 Sept 2011				Direction of Travel	Comments this quarter
			Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		Gross Risk Rating	Gross RAG	Net Risk Rating	Net RAG		
Partnership Risks													
RP06 Health & Wellbeing Partnership	Paul Marston-Western	The risk is that failure to effectively participate in and influence new county wide partnership arrangements will put CDC at risk of not meeting its Safe, Healthy and Thriving Strategic Objective. The potential role of County Councils as the public health authority under new legislation will require effective partnership arrangements to ensure Cherwell's priorities are reflected and issues around health inequalities are addressed	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A	RP06.a Strategic Director leadership role on health related issues • RP06.b Participation in county-wide partnership discussions • RP06.c support local stakeholder group to hold service commissioners and providers to account • RP06.d Communicate the health sector changes to the wider population	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A	→	New H&W Board and Partnership proposals recently issued for consideration which include specific roles for District Councils via an Oxfordshire Health Improvement Board

Indicated by:-	
High	Requires Active Management High impact / High Probability: this risk requires active management to manage down and maintain the exposure at an acceptable level. Escalate upwards.
High Medium	Contingency Plans Required A robust contingency plan is required, together with early warning mechanisms to detect any deviation from the profile. Escalate upwards.
Medium	Monitoring Required This risk may require some additional risk mitigation to reduce the likelihood (if it can be done cost effectively), but good housekeeping to ensure that the impact remains low should be adequate. Monitor to identify any change in the risk.
Low	Review Periodically This risk is unlikely to require further mitigating actions, but the status should be reviewed quarterly to ensure that conditions have not changed.
	Risk rating stayed the same Last quarter compared to this quarter
	Risk rating improved Performance increased (risk rating decreased) Last quarter compared to this quarter
	Risk rating worsened Performance declined (risk rating increased) Last quarter compared to this quarter