

Project Name: Shared Management  
 Project Manager: Roger Wilkin

### Risk Log

ID	Risk Raised	Last Updated	Risk Source	Description of Actual Risk	Information on Risk Impact	Impact	Likely	Proximity	Countermeasure(s)	Impact	Likely	Risk Owner	Risk Status
1	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Economic/financial/market	Poor budget control will lead to an overspend	<b>Cost:</b> Overspend may have to be recovered from other cost centres <b>Quality:</b> Loss of confidence in project teams <b>Benefit:</b> Loss of confidence in the change management process	2 Med.	3 Low	Dec-10	<b>Prevention:</b> Strict and regular financial reporting as part of project governance arrangements. A Section 151 officer is a key member of the project team.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Manager	Monitoring
2	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Key officers not available	<b>Time:</b> Key elements of the project delayed <b>Cost:</b> Resulting delays extend revenue costs of project. Additional resource costs may impact on project. <b>Quality:</b> Lack of highly skilled staff may reduce quality of outputs <b>Scope:</b> Key areas may not be adequately covered e.g. innovation in IT <b>Resources:</b> Additional resources may be required to meet project deadlines.	1 High	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Prevention:</b> Both councils fully commit key staff to the project. <b>Reduction:</b> Suitable substitutes for key staff identified and kept fully briefed.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
3	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Divergence in priorities or approaches between the Authorities	<b>Time:</b> Significant delays to project milestones <b>Cost:</b> Funding milestones could be missed. Project costs incurred without achieving the desired outcome. <b>Quality:</b> Loss of confidence in project <b>Benefit:</b> Delays in benefit realisation <b>Resources:</b> Key staff moved to other priorities	1 High	2 Med.	Dec-10	<b>Prevention:</b> Both councils have formally signed up to the joint management project within a limited timescale. A Memorandum of agreement will be drafted for formal adoption by both Councils. <b>Reduction:</b> Key elected members from both councils represented on the project board. Joint Chief Executive in place. Project plan includes reports to both councils at key milestones.	1 High	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
4	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Staff lose morale / suffer from stress leading to reduced levels of performance	<b>Benefit:</b> Staff within both councils do not understand or recognise the benefit of the project and see the project as a threat and not an opportunity. <b>Resources:</b> Turnover of key members of staff increases. Increased incidents of Stress Related Illness as a result of the restructuring process and/or due to increased workloads and responsibilities following restructuring. Increased risk of staff grievances and/or tribunal claims.	1 High	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> Project communication strategy in place and delivered. HR is a key workstream within the project, effective and genuine consultation will form a key element of the project plan.	1 High	2 Med.	Project Manager	Monitoring
5	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Activities of the project team fail to achieve some or all of the key project outcomes	<b>Time:</b> Key milestones missed <b>Cost:</b> Revenue costs of project increase / funding milestones breached resulting in loss of funding <b>Benefit:</b> Key benefits of project not achieved in full.	1 High	3 Low	Ongoing	<b>Prevention:</b> Project team made up of key relevant staff from both organisations. Project structure includes key senior managers and executive members from both organisations. <b>Reduction:</b> Progress on the project will be regularly reported to members of the project board and members of both councils.	1 High	3 Low	Project Manager	Monitoring
6	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Key decisions are not taken in a timely fashion during the course of the project	<b>Time:</b> Delayed implementation of the change plan <b>Cost:</b> Delayed in achievement of savings and possible increased revenue costs to the project <b>Benefit:</b> Loss of confidence in the effectiveness of the project team and/or change plan <b>Resources:</b> Key officers tied up on project for longer than anticipated	2 Med.	2 Med.	Dec-10	<b>Prevention:</b> Project plan constructed around key decision dates. <b>Reduction:</b> Project board ensuring the project has all necessary resources and priority	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring

**Risk Log**

ID	Risk Raised	Last Updated	Risk Source	Description of Actual Risk	Information on Risk Impact	Impact	Likely	Proximity	Countermeasure(s)	Impact	Likely	Risk Owner	Risk Status
7	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Day job suffers as a result of project commitment	<b>Time:</b> Other key activities are delayed <b>Quality:</b> Other work is rushed or neglected <b>Resources:</b> Key project members maybe required to deal with crisis in their normal role if key activities are neglected.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Prevention:</b> Other staff within in home departments are delegated to cover key activities <b>Reduction:</b> Reprioritise other work programme to delay projects until shared services project is delivered. <b>Acceptance:</b> Councils accept that some reduction in effectiveness of day job for the duration of the project.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
8	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Strategic/commercial	Negative impact upon stakeholders / partners	<b>Benefit:</b> The impact of negative relations with stakeholders and partners outweigh the benefits of the project.	2 Med.	3 Low	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> Include key stakeholders in communication strategy	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Manager	Monitoring
9	13-Sep-10	13-Sep-10	Technical/operational /infrastructure	Delays in integrating IT systems lessen the efficiency of shared management	<b>Time:</b> IT systems cannot be changed in time for implementation of the change plan. <b>Cost:</b> Systems development costs may reduce the cost benefit of the project. <b>Quality:</b> Use of dual systems may impact on quality outputs of joined up services <b>Scope:</b> Complexity of systems may delay sharing of some services <b>Benefit:</b> See "Cost" above. <b>Resources:</b> May require additional IT expertise to resolve technical issues.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> IT expertise on project leading on IT workstream. <b>Acceptance:</b> Planning for an interim phase of using dual systems	2 Med.	1 High	IT Department	Prioritised
10	27-Sep-10	27-Sep-10	Economic/financial/market	Financial costs of the project	<b>Cost:</b> High costs associated with redundancies impact on the success of the project and do not deliver the necessary savings for both authorities. <b>Benefit:</b> High costs impact on the realisation of project benefits and may lead to savings targets not being achieved.	1 High	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Acceptance:</b> Effective and thorough planning and understanding of costs upfront and working them into budgets. Memorandum of Agreement to detail how costs will be apportioned between the two authorities. Make members aware at an early stage via Cost Modelling of anticipated costs of delivering the project.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Manager	Monitoring
11	27-Sep-10	27-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Project scope is unclear or project scope changes	<b>Time:</b> Delays caused to overall project timetable <b>Scope:</b> Reputational damaged caused by the change of scope <b>Benefit:</b> Delay caused in the realisation of the expected benefits that will be delivered from the project <b>Resources:</b> Loss of morale within the project team.	1 High	3 Low	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> Clear steer to be received from the project board. Project board signs up to the terms of reference agreed by the Project Team, this continues to guide the project.	1 High	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
12	29-Sep-10	29-Sep-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Affected persons appeal against the restructuring process	<b>Time:</b> Time required to resolve grievances and tribunal issues may cause delays to the overall project timescales <b>Cost:</b> High costs associated with any potential appeals against the restructuring process, in particular if appeals are upheld by tribunal.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> Strict adherence to employment legislation and best practice. Support mechanisms in place for staff. Careful planning of job descriptions and responsibilities. Pre-agreement of processes with trade unions and staff representatives. <b>Reduction:</b> Attenti Executive Recruitment Services will be used to help manage the recruitment process and provide impartiality with regards to decision making. <b>Reduction:</b> The process will be checked by lawyers.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Project Manager	Prioritised

Project Name: Shared Management

Project Manager: Roger Wilkin

## Risk Log

ID	Risk Raised	Last Updated	Risk Source	Description of Actual Risk	Information on Risk Impact	Impact	Likely	Proximity	Countermeasure(s)	Impact	Likely	Risk Owner	Risk Status
13	8-Oct-10	8-Oct-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Appeals made on the basis that persons from the authority with the less costly severance arrangements has made them more likely to be made redundant	<b>Time:</b> Time required to resolve grievances and tribunal issues may cause delays to the overall project timescales <b>Cost:</b> Cost impact if any appeals are upheld by tribunal <b>Resources:</b> Impact upon morale of successful candidates	1 High	2 Med.	Feb-11	<b>Reduction:</b> Ensure recruitment process is transparent and demonstrably fair, and agreed with appropriate representatives.	1 High	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
14	15-Oct-10	15-Oct-10	Organisational/management/human factors	No clear plan in place for Phase 2 (i.e. sub-management structure) of the Shared Services project.	<b>Time:</b> Challenge concerning lack of plan for Phase 2 may delay project <b>Quality:</b> Phase 1 structure is not suitable for the effective delivery of Phase 2.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Reduction:</b> Initial planning for Phase 2 due to commence December 2010.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Project Board	Monitoring
15	27-Oct-10	27-Oct-10	Organisational/management/human factors	The structural and job proposals are not sufficiently well defined or have insufficient capacity to ensure delivery of quality services.	<b>Quality:</b> Deterioration of service quality has a negative impact on the reputation of one or both Councils	1 High	2 Med.	Nov-10	<b>Reduction</b> - Proposals will be health checked by a volunteer group of service managers from both authorities. Project manager will advise the project board if the structural proposals are likely to be insufficient to provide effective management for both councils. <b>Reduction</b> - Capacity reserve to be created to backfill lost capacity.	1 High	3 Low	Project Manager	Prioritised
16	3-Nov-10	3-Nov-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Insufficient communication with external partners could lead to a deterioration in relations	<b>Quality:</b> Reputational damage suffered by both Councils <b>Benefit:</b> Loss of benefits of partnership working through reduction in goodwill. <b>Resources:</b> Potential withdrawal of support and resourcing from external partners.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Ongoing	<b>Reduction</b> - Partnership meeting to be held with all key external partners. To include a presentation on the Council's plans for shared management and how this is expected to function in the future.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Manager	Monitoring
17	12-Nov-10	12-Nov-10	Economic/financial/market	Financial proposals for the project are not sufficiently robust and are not approved by the Section 151 Officer	<b>Time:</b> If proposals are not accepted this could cause delays to project timescales <b>Cost:</b> Delays to project timescales could impact on savings realisation <b>Quality:</b> Potential reputational impact on Councils and the project,	1 High	3 Low	Dec-10	<b>Reduction</b> - A qualified finance manager is a member of the project team, Independent deputy Section 151 officers, who are not in scope of the project will have financial oversight of project proposals and will advise each council accordingly.	1 High	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring
18	25-Nov-10	25-Nov-10	Economic/financial/market	Cost saving proposals for the project are not considered satisfactory by the District Auditor.	<b>Time:</b> Cost sharing proposals may need to be rewritten causing delays to the project. <b>Quality:</b> Final accounts would not be signed off by DA. <b>Scope:</b> District Auditor suggest cost sharing proposal may not be acceptable to both Councils. <b>Reputational:</b> Damage reputation for both Councils if poor audit report received.	1 High	3 Low	Dec-10	<b>Reduction</b> - District Auditor(s) to review proposals prior to final report being drafted.	1 High	3 Low	Project Manager	Prioritised
19	25-Nov-10	25-Nov-10	Organisational/management/human factors	There could be potential conflicts of interest during the recruitment process and other implications if in scope managers are directly involved.	<b>Time:</b> Appeals could delay recruitment process. <b>Cost:</b> Possible costs of compensation if appeals are successful. <b>Quality:</b> Best people for jobs may not be recruited.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Jan-11	<b>Reduction</b> - Independent external recruitment model will lead on recruitment process	2 Med.	3 Low	Chief Exec.	Monitoring

Project Name: Shared Management

Project Manager: Roger Wilkin

## Risk Log

ID	Risk Raised	Last Updated	Risk Source	Description of Actual Risk	Information on Risk Impact	Impact	Likely	Proximity	Countermeasure(s)	Impact	Likely	Risk Owner	Risk Status
20	26-Nov-10	26-Nov-10	Political	Risk of call in by one or other Scrutiny Commissions	<p><b>Time:</b> Delays to implementation of structure</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> New structure not implemented by start of new financial year.</p> <p><b>Benefit:</b> Delayed benefit realisation</p> <p><b>Resources:</b> Project resources tied up.</p>	2 Med.	2 Med.	Dec-10	<p><b>Reduction</b> - Details of project progress taken to both scrutiny commissions during its course. Chairman of both scrutiny commissions have been observers at project board meetings.</p> <p><b>Contingency</b> - Lag time to built into project plan to allow for possibility of call in.</p>	2 Med.	2 Med.	Project Manager	Monitoring
21	3-Dec-10	3-Dec-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Statutory officers within the scope of the project may be perceived as having a conflict of interest	<b>Quality:</b> Loss of confidence in statutory officers assessment of proposals.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Dec-10	<b>Prevention</b> - Deputy Statutory Officers who are not in the scope of the project to be appointed for the purposes of project oversight.	3 Low	3 Low	Chief Exec.	Monitoring
22	3-Dec-10	3-Dec-10	Organisational/management/human factors	Having generic job descriptions for managers may result in the loss of key technical and professional skills for both organisations	<b>Quality:</b> Loss of key technical and professional skills may have a detrimental impact on service delivery.	2 Med.	2 Med.	Apr-11	<b>Reduction</b> - SDG reviewing key skills for managers. Project board to consider feedback and ensure that structure proposals account for all necessary key skills.	2 Med.	3 Low	Project Board	Monitoring