

Strategic Risk Register - 31st March 2013

No	Rating	Risk	Consequence	Risk Owner
3b	B2	<p><u>Joint Services</u> The Council is involved in joint service arrangements with public and private sector organisations around areas, including Revenues and Benefits and Regeneration.</p> <p>Risk of partner withdrawing or unwilling to deliver</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of service falls • Strain on people working in partnership • Impact on day to day involvement • Don't produce savings • Drain on resources • ICT impact 	Jonathan McDonald
4a	B2	<p><u>Organisational Resilience</u> Post restructure there are fewer 'boots on the ground' but expectations around delivery are the same. There is a reliance on key individuals with much less resilience in the organisation. There is a degree of senior people needing to act down into the day to day, which impacts on ability to act strategically. Need for succession planning to be embedded within the organisation.</p> <p>Risk of not having sufficient organisational capacity / resilience to achieve objectives and deliver services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased stress and strain • Impact on morale • Increased reliance on key people • Focus on operational to detriment of strategic • Unable to resource key service areas • Service failure • Mistakes made • Legal action • Adverse publicity • Damage to reputation 	Val Green
4b	B2	<p><u>Information & Communication Technology</u> The Council is increasingly reliant on ICT to deliver services. There is a drive to continue to invest in ICT to improve provision and Council performance but this needs to be balanced with finances.</p> <p>Risk ICT fails or is not fit for purpose, or we are unable to fully exploit new technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot deliver services • Service failure • Fall back on manual processes and workarounds • Mistakes made • Legal action • Adverse publicity • Damage to reputation 	Andrew Cole
1	C2	<u>Growth</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borough shuts up shop 	William

		<p>There is a perception of the local area being 'happy as we are' however there are areas of growth needed to ensure the future prosperity and vitality of the local area.</p> <p>Risk the Council does not get sufficient support for growth politically and within the community</p>	<p>against growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic delay • Loss of income streams • Social problems • Lack of local opportunities • Increased inward / outward commuting • Greater pressure on local infrastructure • Loss of market share • Unable to house local community sufficiently - imbalance • Local people move away for work • Narrow age range locally • Become a 'slumber town' • Piecemeal and ad-hoc approach to regeneration 	Benson
2	B2	<p><u>Funding Streams</u></p> <p>There have been changes to government funding, which has reduced funding levels. Increasingly there is a more incentive based approach to funding, which could leave the Council more exposed e.g. around new homes bonus. The central government approach to public could potentially include taking control of reserves and assets in future.</p> <p>Risk we don't have sufficient funding to deliver required level of service and achieve priorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot deliver strategic plan • Need to revisit priorities • Difficult decisions needed • Questions future viability of organisation • Perception of not delivering to the community • Possible impact on choice and non legislative services 	Lee Colyer
3a	C3	<p><u>Partnerships</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of relationships 	Nazeya

		<p>There have been significant changes to the partnership landscape, nationally and locally, including move from local to centralised. Partnerships have become more focused on the short term and more inwardly focused.</p> <p>Risk that partnership working does not deliver effectively for the Borough</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes wind out of sails • Lose ability to make 'local decisions' • Money tending to go east in the region • Resources directed in the wrong way for Tunbridge Wells • Limited resources not effectively utilised 	Hussain
5	B2	<p><u>Political Environment</u></p> <p>There is a potential disconnect between what is being promised by Government, for example through the Localism agenda and Big Society, and what is delivered to local communities. There is increased expectation and need to help people to interpret this. There is also a trust issue around how reasonable expectations are and whether we can deliver while maintaining our reputation.</p> <p>Risk that the broader political aspect sets expectations that cannot be delivered locally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion from delivering core services • Dissatisfied customers • Increased complaints • Mischievous questions • Drain on resources • Don't deliver to service levels • Damage to reputation 	William Benson
6	D3	<p><u>Local Authority Mortgage Scheme</u></p> <p>Insufficient mortgage approvals are given making use of the £2 million indemnity.</p>	LAMS - risk of mortgage default resulting in call on the indemnity and the scheme not meeting its objectives.	Lee Colyer