

Risk Register - Service Team Plan 2010-11

IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD				
	NEGLIGIBLE 1	RARE 2	UNLIKELY 3	POSSIBLE 4	PROBABLE 5
EXTREME 5					
CRITICAL 4	2				
MAJOR 3			1	7	8
MINOR 2		4/5	3		6
INSIGNIFICANT 1					

Key	1- 4 Low Risk	5-15 Moderate Risk	16-25 High Risk
------------	----------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Risk Ref No	Risk Category (Strategic) (Operational) (Financial) (Hazard)	Risk Name	Risk Description	Risk Owner	Inherent			Existing Control Measures including any contingency measures currently in place and working effectively.	Mitigation Plan	Residual		
					Impact	Likelihood	Score			Impact	Likelihood	Score
1	Strategic	Unitary Status	Unitary Status may be required under the LGR and as ARP operate currently in 3 different districts there may be a threat to the partnership if one of the areas wants all Revenues Services in that area under another banner.	Sharon Jones	3	4	12	Ensuring consistent high levels of performance are maintained/exceeded and no damage to the ARP's reputation will make the ARP more likely to be the service provider of choice for the unitary authority.	None	3	3	9

Risk Ref No	Risk Category (Strategic) (Operational) (Financial) (Hazard)	Risk Name	Risk Description	Risk Owner	Inherent			Existing Control Measures including any contingency measures currently in place and working effectively.	Mitigation Plan	Residual		
					Impact	Likelihood	Score			Impact	Likelihood	Score
2	Strategic	Loss of Partner	The loss of a partner to the ARP due to, for example a breach of trust between the partners, change in political nature of host authority, competitive disadvantage, may damage the Council's reputation, result in financial loss and increase the work in severing the existing links in technology and various strategies	Sharon Jones	4	3	12	Monthly reporting mechanisms, nurturing of good relationships via open communication, active seeking of new partners. Deliberate avoidance of combining databases on core systems thereby negating the need to 'split' out the data of the leaving partner	None	4	1	4
3	Operational	Loss of Resources	Failure to recruit and retain key staff may result in reduced performance, customer dissatisfaction and potential damage to the ARP reputation.	Rod Urquhart	2	4	8	Degree of resilience within current staffing, multi-skilled staff, succession planning promoted	None	2	3	6
4	Operational	Failure to uphold legislative changes	Failure to acknowledge & implement the changes in Council Tax, NNDR and Benefits legislation/practice could lead to inconsistent approach from staff resulting in poor performance/customer service. This could in turn lead to financial sanctions and loss of subsidy.	Sharon Jones	2	4	8	Dedicated training staff with training plans for each member of staff, participants in various consortia which give early warning of prospective changes, regular updates and guidance from Department of Work and Pensions, and weekly staff meetings to ensure this information is disseminated	None	2	2	4

Risk Ref No	Risk Category (Strategic) (Operational) (Financial) (Hazard)	Risk Name	Risk Description	Risk Owner	Inherent			Existing Control Measures including any contingency measures currently in place and working effectively.	Mitigation Plan	Residual		
					Impact	Likelihood	Score			Impact	Likelihood	Score
5	Operational	Drop in performance	Fail to maintain high performance levels may cause reputational damage to ARP, which could lead to the loss of a Partner which results in financial loss, reduced standing of each LA in aspiration to 'excellence' and potential loss of income from other potential partners. Additionally this would have an impact on the ability to recruit new partners and maximise potential income	Rod Urquhart	2	2	4	Regular daily/weekly/monthly monitoring and reporting to ensure existing levels are maintained/exceeded. Forward planning exists to ensure future changes are handled well. Ensuring staffing levels are monitored and maintained.	None	2	2	4
6	Operational	Reduced Council Tax collection	There is a risk to the authority if the Council Tax Collection Rate does not achieve the current profile target. The current economic climate has caused difficulties in the previous year.	Rod Urquhart	2	5	10	Regular daily/weekly/monthly monitoring and reporting to ensure existing levels are maintained/exceeded. Forward planning exists to ensure future changes are handled well. Ensuring staffing levels are monitored and maintained In order to mitigate this risk we are actively pursuing debtor cases & have increased Direct Debit take levels to 70% +. This risk to be reviewed on a monthly basis.	None	2	5	10

Risk Ref No	Risk Category (Strategic) (Operational) (Financial) (Hazard)	Risk Name	Risk Description	Risk Owner	Inherent			Existing Control Measures including any contingency measures currently in place and working effectively.	Mitigation Plan	Residual		
					Impact	Likelihood	Score			Impact	Likelihood	Score
7	Operational	Accuracy of processing	Risk of LA error overpayments due to input error. There is a financial implication to each authority if this exceeds a certain percentage of all overpayments	Rod Urquhart	3	4	12	Implementation of Quality Assurance software module enabling greater percentage of checks. New Quality Control team to be formed from within existing staffing and development of procedures to better monitor accuracy and reduce overpayments.	None	3	3	9
8	Operational	Business Rates Revaluation 2010	Failure to implement will lead to financial and reputational loss.	Rod Urquhart	3	5	15	Department resourced to cater for changes and software supplier aware of requirement for updated solution	None	3	5	15