

### Risk Register - Service Team Plan 2009-10

| IMPACT             | LIKELIHOOD       |           |               |               |               |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                    | NEGLECTIBLE<br>1 | RARE<br>2 | UNLIKELY<br>3 | POSSIBLE<br>4 | PROBABLE<br>5 |
| EXTREME<br>5       |                  |           |               |               |               |
| CRITICAL<br>4      | 2                |           |               |               |               |
| MAJOR<br>3         |                  |           | 1             |               |               |
| MINOR<br>2         |                  | 4/5       | 3             |               | 6             |
| INSIGNIFICANT<br>1 |                  |           |               |               |               |

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

| Risk Ref No | Risk Category<br>(Strategic)<br>(Operational)<br>(Financial)<br>(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     |

|   |             |                                       |  |              |   |   |    |   |      |   |   |   |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|---|---|----|---|------|---|---|---|
| 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 |

|   |             |                                |   |              |   |   |    |   |      |   |   |    |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------|---|---|----|---|------|---|---|----|
| 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. At present this indicator is showing as amber i.e. slightly below profile and it is increasingly difficult to get payers to pay in the current economic climate.                                | 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 |