**Appendix 3 – Risk Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk ID** | **Risk** | | | | | | **Corporate Objective** | **Gross Risk** | | **Residual Risk** | | **Current Risk** | | **Owner** | **Date Risk Reviewed** | **Proximity of Risk (Projects/ Contracts Only)** |
| **Category-000-Service Area Code** | **Risk Title** | **Opportunity/Threat** | **Risk Description** | **Risk Cause** | **Consequence** | **Date raised** | **1 to 5** | **I** | **P** | **I** | **P** | **I** | **P** |  |  |  |
| CEB-001-PS | Reputational risk (Annual Monitoring Report) | T | Failure to achieve planning policy targets | There could be a range of causes, some of which may be external (e.g. the state of the economy) and some internal (failure to properly implement policies) | Reputation of the City Council could be adversely affected in the eyes of the community and stakeholders | 2 November  2020 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | Head of Planning Services |  |  |
| CEB-001-PS | Reputational risk (Infrastructure Funding Statement) | T | Funding of infrastructure via developer contributions could be perceived as inadequate | There could be a range of causes, some of which may be external (e.g. the state of the economy) and some internal (failure to appropriately assign funding) | Reputation of the City Council could be adversely affected in the eyes of the community and stakeholders | 2 November  2020 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Head of Planning Services |  |  |