

| Risk 10 | Failure to commission the right services with limited future risks to the Council. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| CP | Improving VFM and Service Performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Actions | | | | | | | | | |
| Missed Opportunities | Management distraction | Service Disruption | Impaired Performance | Breach of Contract/asset loss | Staff morale | Govt. Intervention | Financial Cost | Damaged Reputation | Health and Safety | Inefficiency | Strategy change | Initial Impact Score | Initial Probability Score | Lead Officer | Effectiveness of control | Action/Mitigation | Required outcome | milestone date | accountable officer | position q1 | position q2 | position q3 | position q4 | |
| ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 3 | 4 | HOS Procurement and Shared Service | | Ongoing review of actions and mitigations | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact Score: 1 = Insignificant; 2 = Minor; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Major; 5 = Catastrophic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Effectiveness of actions/assurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Probability Score: 1 = Rare; 2 = Unlikely; 3 = Possible; 4 = Likely; 5 = Almost Certain | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Mitigating Controls | | | Control Owner | Grade | Actions/Assurance | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff lack key skills to commission services effectively | | Member of procurement team involved in all key projects and all procurement activity over 100K. additional guidance given to all staff increasing number of quotes to be obtained for spend of less than 100k to widen market opportunities. | | | Strategic Procurement Manager | High | New tendering and contract management workshops to be held in 2009 | Includes joint procurement courses with County | Nov-09 | Strategic Procurement Manager | ☺ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contracts are put in place without an agreed contract management plan. | | Ensure all key contract and commissioning documents include performance indicators which are regularly monitored. All contract managers identified and trained in contract management. | | | Strategic Procurement Manager | Medium/High | Contract management framework to be put in place. Contract monitoring score cards to be developed to enable future effective contract management. System for monitoring to be developed | Copntract management protocol and training in place | Nov-09 | Strategic Procurement Manager | ☺ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of understanding of the marketplace and range of service providers | | Market intelligence activity to be carried out through procurement network for all key tenders | | | Strategic Procurement Manager | Medium/High | Procurement network very active and well known across the sector | Ensure all officers are aware of the service. | | Strategic Procurement Manager | ☺ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waste and Recycling market Test does not achieve desired outcomes. | | Managed Competitive Dialogue Procurement in place. Key criteria established. Key service provider information known. | | | Strategic Procurement Manager / Executive Director City Services | Medium/High | Tender in place | | | | ☺ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net risk score after mitigating actions | | | | | Net probability score | | 2 | Revised risk score based upon effectiveness of action and assurances | | | | revised probability score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Net impact score | | 3 | | | | | revised impact score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |