Central Bedfordshire Transition Programme Risks Log

Explanation of the model

Having identified the key programme established risks. method measuring risk has been followed. A simple 3 x 3 "risk model" has been used to score the risks in terms of likelihood and impact. A broad definition for each element of the grid is shown on the model to assist scoring. Although scores are necessarily judgemental, they have been carefully reached. In such a complex programme, the number of potential risks ≥ is substantial. This register, therefore, only identifies those risks that can and need to be monitored in order to help ensure that programme objectives are met. Separate risk registers will be set up as part of the arrangements for managing each project within the programme.

Risk model

High	Important risks - may	Key risk - may potentially	Immediate action needed -
	potentially affect provision	affect provision of key	serious threat to provision
	of key services and duties	services or duties	and/ or achievement of key
I			services or duties
	6	8	9
	Monitor as necessary - less	Monitor as necessary - less	Key risks - may potentially
Medium	important but still could	important but still could	affect provision of key
	have a serious effect on the	have a serious effect on the	services or duties
eq	provision of key services or	provision of key services or	
Σ	duties	duties	7
Σ	duties 3	duties 5	7
Σ	duties 3 No action necessary		7 Monitor as necessary - less
Σ	3	5	7 Monitor as necessary - less important but still could
_	3	5 Monitor as necessary -	,
_	3	5 Monitor as necessary - ensure being properly	important but still could have a serious effect on the
Low	3	5 Monitor as necessary - ensure being properly	important but still could
_	3	5 Monitor as necessary - ensure being properly	important but still could have a serious effect on the provision of key services or
_	3	5 Monitor as necessary - ensure being properly	important but still could have a serious effect on the provision of key services or

Low Medium High LIKELIHOOD

For Information: - Gross score is awarded without any actions taken; Residual score is awarded with current actions in place; Target score is what score would be acceptable.

Any difference between Residual score and Target score indicates an action is required. Risk register to be reviewed on a frequent basis, initially monthly. Previous scores are indicated within the brackets.

Last updated: 27.05.08 Page 1 of 6

APPENDIX B

Key to "Owner" initials						
JS = Jaki Salisbury	RE = Richard Ellis					
DS = David Sutherland	MEH = Marion Headicar					
TC = Tim Chaple	RW = Rob Wood					
PS = Peter Stabb	AA = Andy Allsopp					
MW = Martin Williams	Comms Partners = Comms Mgrs from BCC/MBDC/SBDC					

Last updated: 27.05.08 Page 2 of 6

Central Bedfordshire Transition Programme Risks Log

Ref	Date Identified	Date of Last Update	Risk description	Gross score	Residual score	Target score	Action required	Owner
1			Strategic / commercial					
1.01	July 07	02/05/08	The partnership arrangements which are necessary to deliver desired outcomes may suffer during the transition period.	8	3 (8)	3 (5)	Continue close involvement of key partners by means of the Central Bedfordshire Implementation Team (CBIT). Direct involvement of partners with Officer Service Groups (OSGs).	JS
1.02	July 07	21/05/08	Failing to achieve the right balance between minimising service disruption and taking the opportunities presented by reorganisation.	6	3	3 (1)	Robust debates and challenging questions to be encouraged by Members and officers to encourage opportunities and innovative ideas when designing services and delivery approaches.	JS
1.03	12/05/08		Local media mount anti- CBC campaign.	7	5	3	Watch out for, and monitor, early signs of such a campaign emerging and be ready with measures to head it off.	
1.04	12/05/08		Communications undermined by failure to forge 'one council' ethos early enough in the process.	5	3	2	With HR/OD put in place a plan to engender a 'one council' ethos amongst staff and measure its formation.	MW/ Comms Partners
2			Economic / financial					
2.01	July 07	21/05/08	Transitional costs not constrained / savings not achieved, and insufficient funds to deliver the services.	9	6 (7)	3 (4)	Officer Programme Board (OPB) to carry out tight monitoring at regular intervals.	DS

Last updated: 27.05.08 Page 3 of 6

APPENDIX B

Ref	Date Identified	Date of Last Update	Risk description	Gross score	Residual score	Target score	Action required	Owner
2.02	July 07	02/05/08	Liabilities for asset maintenance and repair could exceed expectation.	8	5	2	Work with BCC and BBC to establish which assets are to be transferred using the information already provided.	TC
3			Legal and regulatory					
3.01	July 07	12/05/08	County Council contract renewal deadlines could be missed due to added complexity of discussion on shared services with Beds Borough.	8	6 (8)	2	Full information provided by BCC as part of information packs – already hand. Officer Service Groups (OSGs) to review information urgently. Effective channels of dialogue between CB and BBC to be established.	PS
4			Organisational / management					
4.01	July 07	02/05/08	Loss of key staff during the transition period.	8	8	2	Thorough communication and involvement of key staff. Consideration of retention measures.	MW
4.02	July 07	02/05/08	There may be insufficient capacity to deal with both the transition and existing work commitments	8	5 (8)	2	All existing commitments to be reviewed in order to redeploy existing staff resources where possible. Additional resource to be brought in as required.	MW
4.03	July 07	02/05/08	There may be loss of motivation among staff due to uncertainty leads to reduced service levels.	8	5 (7)	2	Establish and implement effective internal communication strategy.	RE
4.04	12/05/08		Employees complain that they are not informed/engaged enough.	7	4	3	Create a flexible and responsive internal communications strategy and be ready to provide additional input when needed.	MW/AA

Last updated: 27.05.08

APPENDIX B

Ref	Date Identified	Date of Last Update	Risk description	Gross score	Residual score	Target score	Action required	Owner
4.05	21/05/08		Non-appointment of senior officers as planned.	6	3	3	Appointment of reputable consultants to manage the recruitment process, together with offering competitive and good going rates.	MW
5			Reputation					
5.01	July 07	02/05/08	Councils could become inward looking as a result of focusing on transition leading to loss of confidence among residents, businesses and partners.	8	5	2	Establish and implement effective external communication strategy. Ensure adequate staffing levels to maintain existing, high service standards	RE, MW
7			Technical / operational					
7.01	July 07	02/05/08	External requirements / pressures may prevent the introduction of VFM services, at least during the early years.	5	5	2	Value for money will be one of the key criteria for evaluating the options for service delivery.	MEH
7.02	July 07	21/05/08	Service failure due to alterations to IT systems e.g. SAP	8	6 (8)	2	Well qualified and adequately resourced teams to be established, with a clear plan and the authority to act swiftly. Robust plan to include 'pilot' before full big bang rollout into single IT systems.	RW
7.03	July 07	02/05/08	Lack of agreement on disaggregation / sharing services with BBC.	8	5 (8)	2	OSG leads and their equivalents in BBC to reach early agreement. Areas not resolved to be escalated to CX level and if necessary a joint meeting of Shadow Executives.	JS

Last updated: 27.05.08

APPENDIX B

Ref	Date Identified	Date of Last Update	Risk description	Gross score	Residual score	Target score	Action required	Owner
7.04	Oct 07	12/05/08	Inspection regimes in 2008/09 divert scarce resources from transition and existing work commitments.	8	6 (8)	2	Contact with Audit Commission with a view to minimising external inspection during the transition period	JS
7.05	29/04/08	12/05/08	Council Tax Rebilling causes knock on delays to other aspects of the transition implementation programme.	8	5 (8)	2	Contact with DCLG to emphasise the impact on the programme of re-billing during a very short transition period	CJ2
7.06	21/05/08		Lack of progress in the transition year	8	6	2	Keeping focused on priorities, getting early decisions on shared-services and systems infrastructure, and an openness to raise concerns early.	SR

Last updated: 27.05.08 Page 6 of 6