




## Risk Register 2011/2012 : Quarter 4 / Year End

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 3 31 Dec 2011				Controls	Quarter 4/YE 31 Mar 2012				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		
<b>Strategic Risks</b>													
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 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RS.01a Long term approach to support (people/communities) as many issues can only be addressed so</li> <li>RS.01b Multi agency action with clear and common objectives</li> <li>RS.01c Additional funding from Government grants to supplement current resources</li> <li>RS.01d LSP focus on Brighter Futures in Banbury programme</li> <li>RS.01e Contingency fund made available in CDC budget</li> <li>RS.01f Programme co-ordination role in place</li> <li>RS.01g Quarterly performance management in place</li> </ul>	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	→	Ongoing multi agency activities in the targeted wards. All local government tiers councillors workshop held for activity and performance update and to provide future direction. OCC's Early Intervention Hub opened at Woodgreen. Changes in theme lead and other personnel requiring review of structure and programme organisation
RS02 Bicester Eco Town	Calvin Bell	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"> <li>RS.02a Planning policy development through Local Development Framework</li> <li>RS.02b Eco Bicester Town Project plan &amp; related partnerships with private/public sector partners</li> <li>RS.02c Dedicated Project Team</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	→	<p>A Strategic Delivery Board is in place which is effectively managing the Eco Bicester initiative. Phase 1 (exemplar) planning application has been approved and the 106 agreement is due to be finalised shortly. A number of key demonstration projects in the town have been completed including the John Paul II Centre (largest known non-residential building built to passiv haus standards in Europe), the sixth form eco-extension to Cooper School, and the provision of affordable housing to Code for Sustainable Homes levels 4 and 5 through development at the former Bryan House site.</p> <p>There has been a significant take-up by Bicester residents of the subsidised insulation scheme (approx 1200 completed installations)</p> <p>Other innovative approaches are progressing, which complement the Eco Town development, such as the setting up of a Local Management Organisation for NW Bicester (and potentially wider Bicester) and the feasibility of a local community bulk purchasing energy and a solar photovoltaic scheme.</p> <p>A Masterplan for Bicester Town is also nearing completion which will ensure a clear and coordinated approach to growth in the town over the next 20 years. DCLG funding has been allocated where it can make the most impact in the delivery of NW Bicester which has included:</p> <p>Identification of funding to gap fund the primary school on the exemplar application – the funding can be recouped from later phases of development that will be able to take advantage of the existing school provision;</p> <p>Identification of funding for the provision of the eco business centre on the exemplar – the funding can be recouped either through the sale of the capital asset in the future or revenue from the lease of the asset; and</p> <p>Investment in a site wide energy company (ESCO) Energy Service Company or (MUSCO) Multi Utilities Company – Investment in an ESCO/MUSCO would ensure low cost energy to the development and provide a return on investment.</p> <p>Seed funding for the Bicester Reuse and Sustainable Living Centre</p>
RS03 Local Development Framework	Adrian Colwell	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 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RS.03a Liaison with CLG regarding appropriate procedures</li> <li>RS.03b Take legal advice as necessary, to further inform our position</li> <li>RS.03c Ask our MP to raise questions to Govt. Ministers if clarity is required on Localism Bill</li> <li>RS.03d Engage in public consultation on new population figures that informs emerging Core Strategy</li> <li>RS.03e Work with LDF Advisory Panel in formulating revised policies &amp; Councillor involvement</li> </ul>	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	→	The Local Plan/Core Strategy is coming to a conclusion at a time of major planning reforms. The Bicester and Brackley Masterplans are informing its conclusion. Final draft for submission is 2012 and adoption in early 2013.
RS04 Economic & Social Changes	Adrian Colwell	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"> <li>RS.04a Service and financial planning process</li> <li>RS.04b Sustainable Community Strategy, Economic Development Strategy, related partnership activities</li> <li>RS.04c Service specific plans &amp; strategies</li> </ul>	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	→	In the past 12 months the Economic Development team completed the "Resilience Report" as the foundation for the Economic Development Strategy and associated actions. A series of studies have also been commissioned to ensure that the Local Plan/Core Strategy is clearly based on 'sound evidence' - a critical requirement of the forthcoming public examination.
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"> <li>RS.05a Support to the PCT in challenging ORHT proposals</li> <li>RS.05b Providing evidence of deliverability of consultant delivered services elsewhere</li> <li>RS.05c Gaining consensus locally that this is important</li> <li>RS.05d Ensuring local Councillors are briefed &amp; engaged to play a community leadership role</li> <li>RS.05e Support local stakeholder group with ORHT/GP/OCC representation</li> </ul>	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	→	Community Partnership Network in transition to examine a range of new roles regarding communication and public engagement in North Oxfordshire whilst the health and social care sector reforms are progressed. The Horton General Hospital still a very important part of that along with new clinical commissioning arrangements and changes in social care. Ongoing budgetary pressures at the Horton leading to further service changes but based on established principles through the Better Healthcare Programme.

Risk Register 2011/2012 : Quarter 4 / Year End

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 3 31 Dec 2011				Controls	Quarter 4/YE 31 Mar 2012				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		
<b>Strategic Risks</b>													
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 6	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RS.06a Environmental Strategy for a changing climate</li> <li>RS.06b Clear responsibility for delivery plans for the Environmental Strategy</li> <li>RS.06c Relevant delivery groups</li> <li>RS.06d Cherwell Climate Change Partnership</li> </ul>	High Medium 15	A !	Medium 6	A	➡	The Use of Natural Resources group are delivering reductions in energy use and consequently reductions in Carbon emissions.
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"> <li>RS.08a Budget 2011/12</li> <li>RS.08b Medium financial strategy and sensitivity analysis</li> <li>RS.08c Workforce planning</li> <li>RS.08d Dashboard - budget monitoring</li> <li>RS.08e Public promise of £1m cost reduction</li> <li>RS.08f Shared Senior Mgt team with SNDC</li> <li>RS.08g Executive Planning Workshops</li> <li>RS.08h Building Block Templates</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	Regular review through quarterly monitoring and 12/13 budget and MTFS review. Million pound public promise and procurement action plan delivered Joint Working with South Northamptonshire delivering savings from shared management and some shared services. Project set up to monitor impact of the Local Government Resource Review.
RS09 Shared Management Services with South Northamptonshire District Council	Martin Henry	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"> <li>Loss of key staff and declining morale</li> <li>Loss of organisational reputation</li> <li>Legal challenge</li> <li>Decline in organisational performance</li> <li>Failure of ICT system to be effectively integrated for shared management</li> <li>Political Change</li> </ul> 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.	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RS09a Joint Arrangement Steering Group and terms of reference in line with S113 agreement</li> <li>RS09b Steering group supported with professional legal and HR advice</li> <li>RS09c Steering group includes senior elected members and managers from both organisations</li> <li>RS09d Steering Group will provide regular reports and keep risk under review.</li> <li>RS09e Professional recruitment consultants appointed</li> <li>RS09f Communications briefings in place</li> <li>RS09g Business case developed and agreed</li> <li>RS09h Joint ICT work programme in place</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	
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. 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.	High 16	R	Medium 6	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RS.10a CIP identifies areas of emerging policy &amp; allocates additional support via Improvement Team</li> <li>RS.10b CIP monitored through the PMF system monthly</li> <li>RS.10c MT review policy &amp; legislative requirements on an ongoing basis</li> <li>RS.10d EMT consider policy changes at regular meetings</li> <li>RS.10e Emerging new policy requirements entered and monitored via Risk Register</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 6	A	➡	Controls in place and role undertaken by JMT. No changes to risk.








<b>Indicated by:-</b>	
<b>High</b>	<b>Requires Active Management</b> High impact / High Probability: this risk requires active management to manage down and maintain the exposure at an acceptable level. Escalate upwards.
<b>High Medium</b>	<b>Contingency Plans Required</b> A robust contingency plan is required, together with early warning mechanisms to detect any deviation from the profile. Escalate upwards.
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Monitoring Required</b> 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.
<b>Low</b>	<b>Review Periodically</b> This risk is unlikely to require further mitigating actions, but the status should be reviewed quarterly to ensure that conditions have not changed.
	<b>Risk rating stayed the same</b> Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating improved</b> Performance increased (risk rating decreased) Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating worsened</b> Performance declined (risk rating increased) Last quarter compared to this quarter

Risk Register 2011/2012 : Quarter 4 / Year End

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 3 31 Dec 2011				Controls	Quarter 4/YE 31 Mar 2012				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		
<b>Corporate Risks</b>													
RC01 Health & Safety	Andy Preston	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"> <li>rc.01a Wide range of health and safety policies and procedures</li> <li>rc.01b Training is given to all relevant staff undertaking manual work</li> <li>rc.01c Relevant safe working practice notes are issued as part of standard induction procedures</li> </ul>	High 20	R	High Medium 10	A !	➡	<p>The Health and Safety Manager also provides advice for South Northamptonshire Council</p> <p>The current arrangements are being reviewed in the first quarter of 2012/13</p>
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"> <li>rc.02a Treasury management</li> <li>rc.02b Annual investment strategy complies to CIPFA code</li> <li>rc.02c Minimise empty properties</li> <li>rc.02d Budget 2011/12</li> <li>rc.02e Medium term financial strategy</li> <li>rc.02f Asset Management Strategy</li> <li>rc.02g Dashboard - budget monitoring</li> <li>rc.02h Annual Treasury Management Strategy</li> <li>rc.02i Counterparty Lists</li> </ul>	High 16	R	High Medium 12	A !	➡	<p>Controls in place for the year appropriate to the level of risk and annually reviewed/update.</p> <p>Regular updates to members through quarterly budget monitoring.</p> <p>No treasury breaches in 11/12 and a balanced 12/13 budget delivered in Feb 2012</p>
RC03 ICT Systems	Karen Curtin	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"> <li>rc.03a 6 monthly testing of Disaster Recovery Plan</li> <li>rc.03b External quality assurance of architecture and implementation</li> <li>rc.03c Annual compliance with ISO 27001</li> <li>rc.03d construction of DR Site at Thorpe Lane Depot</li> <li>rc.03e All IT equipment relocated to new Server Room</li> <li>rc.03f Reinstallation of DR line</li> </ul>	High 20	R	Medium 6	A	✔	DR (Disaster Recovery) has successfully tested ICT infrastructure recovery and specific business system (express) as a test last month. BCP (Business Continuity Plan) and DR are being reviewed using BS 25999 Business Continuity Standard
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"> <li>rc.04a Equalities scheme</li> <li>rc.04b Mandatory equalities training</li> <li>rc.04c Equalities performance monitored through PMF</li> <li>rc.04d Equalities Officer Support for EQIA</li> <li>rc.04d IDEA peer assessment planned for 2010</li> <li>rc.04e Equalities steering group and communications plan</li> <li>rc.04f Network of consultative panels for EQIA</li> </ul>	High 20	R	High Medium 12	A !	➡	Risk reviewed and has remained stable. Controls are in place and looking forward the programme of equality impact assessments/analysis will continue
RC06 Civil Emergency	Andy Preston	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"> <li>rc.06a As a Category 1 Responder the Council has a duty to prepare and maintain an Emergency Plan</li> <li>rc.06b Annual testing and exercise schedule</li> <li>rc.06c Training to relevant staff</li> </ul>	High Medium 15	A !	High Medium 10	A !	➡	Risk reviewed and controls in place. Risk remains unchanged.
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 FO1 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"> <li>rc.07a Single trusted data source for all decision makers</li> <li>rc.07b Use external trusted &amp; reliable data source as the basis for our own information.</li> <li>rc.07c Internal audit programme for performance indicators</li> <li>rc.07d Clear Data Quality policy</li> <li>rc.07e Guidance issued to managers</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	Risk reviewed and controls in place. Risk remains unchanged
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"> <li>rc08.a Fraud Investigation Team to prevent, detect, investigate and sanction cases of fraud under the</li> <li>rc08.b Corporate and Benefit fraud awareness training to all staff</li> <li>rc08.c In-depth training, including Bribery Act to front line staff &amp; other staff as required</li> <li>rc08.d Participation in the National Fraud initiative &amp; Housing Benefits matching exercises</li> <li>rc08.e Application of Councils Policies (Anti-fraud &amp; Corruption, Sanctions, Bribery)</li> <li>rc08.f Networking/Benchmarking arrangements with other Councils &amp; DW&amp;P</li> </ul>	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A	➡	<p>Fraud investigation team have managed the investigation of any issues and provided substantial reports to Head of Finance and Director of Resources. All actions implemented appropriately.</p> <p>Awareness training delivered to JMT and members of Accounts Audit and Risk committee - with follow up training with services planned in 2012/13.</p>

Risk Register 2011/2012 : Quarter 4 / Year End

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 3 31 Dec 2011				Controls	Quarter 4/YE 31 Mar 2012				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		
RC09 Shared Information Services with South Northants Council	Karen Curtin	Restructure and increased service demand during transition may impact performance and service continuity at CDC	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rc.09a Fully policed change control to ensure all resources focus on insource work &amp; BAU</li> <li>rc.09b No unnecessary change work taken on during the transition.</li> <li>rc.09c Recruitment of additional transition resources, specified in the business case</li> <li>rc.09d Strong project management to limit unforeseen events</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	Project has maintained its own risk register which is regularly reviewed by the ICT delivery group and programme board. All mitigations in place to minimise impact.
RC10 Insource of ICT	Karen Curtin	Failure to manage the end of the existing outsourced IT contract and development of collaborative solutions with Cherwell effectively could lead to loss of key business systems and services.	High 16	R	Medium 09	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rc.10a Audit of existing (and CDC) IT estate</li> <li>rc.10b Contract negotiations with Capita and other suppliers.</li> <li>rc.10c Clear roadmap of future provision of IT services after the end of current Capita contract</li> <li>rc.10d Independent review of future proposed architecture (complete)</li> <li>rc.10e Procure new solutions as required with legal, financial, procurement input into process</li> <li>rc.10f Costed Business Case for consideration by Members</li> <li>rc.10g Regular reviews within SNC by portfolio holders</li> <li>rc.10h Regular review of shared service proposals by Joint Arrangements Steering Group IT Subgroup</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A	➡	<p>Project has maintained its own risk register which is regularly reviewed by the ICT delivery group and programme board. All mitigations in place to minimise impact.</p> <p>Regular briefings with Lead members and a communication plan that included "The Switch" which informed members and officers of progress.</p> <p>On track to meet projects outcomes, on time and within budget.</p>

<b>Indicated by:-</b>	
	<b>Requires Active Management</b> High Impact / High Probability: this risk requires active management to manage down and maintain the exposure at an acceptable level. Escalate upwards.
	<b>Contingency Plans Required</b> A robust contingency plan is required, together with early warning mechanisms to detect any deviation from the profile. Escalate upwards.
	<b>Monitoring Required</b> 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.
	<b>Review Periodically</b> This risk is unlikely to require further mitigating actions, but the status should be reviewed quarterly to ensure that conditions have not changed.
	<b>Risk rating stayed the same</b> Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating improved</b> Performance increased (risk rating decreased) Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating worsened</b> Performance declined (risk rating increased) Last quarter compared to this quarter

Risk Register 2011/2012 : Quarter 3

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	Quarter 3 31 Dec 2011				Controls	Quarter 4/YE 31 Mar 2012				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		
<b>Partnership Risks</b>													
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 !	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RP.02a Partnership governance review implemented</li> <li>RP.02b Performance Management Framework</li> <li>RP.02c Develop Partnership Handbook</li> <li>RP.02d Management Group to support implementation of LSP decisions</li> <li>RP.02e Annual self assessment of performance</li> <li>RP.02f Ongoing review &amp; information exchange to capitalise on emerging issues &amp; opportunities</li> <li>RP02.1 Develop a Partnership Development Plan</li> </ul>	High Medium 12	A !	High Medium 12	A !		Due to partnership changes likely during 2012/13 and the new management of the service this risk will need to be completely reviewed for 2012/13. Currently controls are in place and the LSP has effectively delivered its programme of LAA grants. As such immediate changes are not required but will be considered during quarter 1 of 2012/13.
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"> <li>RP.03a Bi-monthly monitoring of 4 Action Groups plans to deliver the priorities of the partnership</li> <li>RP.03b Quarterly reporting to Strategic Partnership meetings</li> <li>RP03c Monitored via Performance Management Framework</li> </ul>	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A		Significant work undertaken to align with the emerging structures for Police Crime Commissioner and Panel, and with partners across the Thames Valley
RP04 Local Enterprise Partnerships (Oxfordshire & South East Midlands)	Adrian Colwell	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"> <li>RP.04a Partnership Work Programme/Forward Plan</li> <li>RP.04b Resource provision for Partnership work</li> </ul>	High Medium 12	A !	Medium 9	A		Both Local Enterprise Partnerships are at an early stage of development. CDC is active in both to ensure they support the achievement of local economic priorities
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	Medium 9	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RP05.a Work with other collection authority partners to achieve greater voting power</li> <li>RP05.b Full partnership participation to address moved by County Council to reduce payments</li> </ul>	High 16	R	Medium 9	A		Discussions continuing regarding the financial arrangements with Treasurers being included. Chairman of the OWP passes from Oxfordshire County Council to South Oxfordshire in the new financial year'
RP06 Health & Wellbeing Partnership	Ian Davies	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RP06.a Strategic Director leadership role on health related issues</li> <li>RP06.b Participation in county-wide partnership discussions</li> <li>RP06.c support local stakeholder group to hold service commissioners and providers to account</li> <li>RP06.d Communicate the health sector changes to the wider population</li> </ul>	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A		New Oxfordshire H&WB Board and partnership proposals in place. CDC representation on Health Improvement Board and Children and Young People's Board. Priorities under consideration. Concern re desegregation across the new structure of Supporting People budgets

Indicated by:-

	<b>Requires Active Management</b> High impact / High Probability: this risk requires active management to manage down and maintain the exposure at an acceptable level. Escalate upwards.
	<b>Contingency Plans Required</b> A robust contingency plan is required, together with early warning mechanisms to detect any deviation from the profile. Escalate upwards.
	<b>Monitoring Required</b> 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.
	<b>Review Periodically</b> This risk is unlikely to require further mitigating actions, but the status should be reviewed quarterly to ensure that conditions have not changed.
	<b>Risk rating stayed the same</b> Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating improved</b> Performance increased (risk rating decreased) Last quarter compared to this quarter
	<b>Risk rating worsened</b> Performance declined (risk rating increased) Last quarter compared to this quarter