Ref	Risk Level	Current Score	Recommended Score	Service	Risk	Risk Owner	Comment	Outcome
00003	Corporate	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 5 =15	People Team	Workforce sustainability	Gail Malkin	The risk owner would not score the impact at 5. We have not yet seen any impact from LGR but if this starts then the impact may shift to 5. At present we have stability with low employee turnover at 10% - and in areas where we do struggle to recruit, although not ideal, we have been able to recruit contractors or locums to provide cover. We have high employee satisfaction rates that help with workforce stability.	Retain existing score
00020	Service	2 x 3 = 6	3 x 3 = 9	Planning & Regulation	Unplanned Workload	David Butler	We have a good line of sight on major applications coming through the system, with good relations with landowners and developers and a good pipeline of pre-applications, SLAs and Pre Planning Agreements (PPAs) all of which, in the risk owners view, lead to the likelihood of unplanned workload being less than 40% and consequently a probability score of 2	Retain existing score
00021	Service	3 x 4 =12	3 x 3 = 9	Financial Services	ICT	Clare Paterson	The query listed the existing score as 2 x 3 = 6. This is incorrect, it is 3 x 4	Further clarification
00026	Service	2 x 4 = 8	3 x 4 = 12 or 3 x 5 = 15	Financial Services	Failure to recruit and retain key staff	Alistair Rush	A probability score of 2 represents 20% to 39%. This is considered reasonable because there is a relatively stable workforce, and the judgement is that this position will not deteriorate in the short term. The risk will be reviewed again as LGR unfolds. An impact score of 4 is a "major" impact to service quality, including long term disruption to operations. This is felt to be reflective of the current risk.	Retain existing score
00030	Service	2 x 5 = 10	3 x 3 = 9	Financial Services	Safety of investments	Bill Lewis	The query listed the existing score as 3 x 2 = 6. This is incorrect, it is 2 x 5	Further clarification
00031	Service	2 x 3 = 6	3 x 3 = 9	Communities & Citizens	Service standards and quality provision	Hagan Lewisman	The probability is assessed as low to moderate due to strong contractual controls, regular performance monitoring and generally stable service delivery. However, the potential impact remains moderate, as any sustained deterioration in service standards could affect customer satisfaction, participation, health outcomes and the Council's reputation. Whilst there have been some temporary operational issues in relation to staffing at Ferry Leisure Centre, the general performance of the contract in relation to service standards and quality provision across all of the sites has demonstrated good performance; this is supported by the regular client audits which include customer feedback.	Retain existing score
00040	Service	3 x 2 = 6	3 x 3 = 9	Communities & Citizens	Budget and Income	Paula Redway	The impact is scored at 2 because of the financial amounts at risk. A score of 2 represents a financial impact contained within the service area of between £50,000 and £250,000 per annum. The target for event income is £170,000.	Retain existing score

00053	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12	Law, Governance & Strategy	ICT	Emma Jackman	As all the major systems are now cloud-based, the residual risk is if our servers with Outlook, etc., go down, but they can be accessed by office.com – therefore, the risk owner does not consider that the impact is significant and feels that scores of 3 and 3 are reasonable	Retain existing score
00060	Service	1 x 2 = 2	3 x 4 = 12	Financial Services	Budget and Income	Scott Warner	The risk owner has agreed to the increase in risk score	Retain existing score
00061	Service	1 x 1 = 1	3 x 3 = 9	Financial Services	Failure to achieve service plan targets	Scott Warner	The risk owner has agreed to the increase in risk score	Current probability has been kept at 1, but current impact increased to 2
00062	Service	3 x 3 = 9	2 x 2 = 4	Law Governance and Strategy	Increase in the cost of postage by Royal Mail causing budget pressures	Martin John	This risk can be deleted from the risk register	Risk to be deleted
00066	Service	3 x 2 = 6	3 x 4 = 12	Communities & Citizens	Business climate	Paula Redway	The impact is scored at 2 because of the financial amounts at risk. A score of 2 represents a financial impact contained within the service area of between £50,000 and £250,000 per annum. The target for sponsorship income is less than £50,000.	Retain existing score
00070	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 5 = 15	People Team	Loss of key talent	Gail Malkin	This refers only to the People Team because it is a service risk. It is believed that the existing risk score is correct, having taken into account the control measures, the fact that employee satisfaction is high, and the impact on the whole organisation does not meet the risk impact criteria at 4 or 5. Other service areas also address this risk on their risk registers.	Retain existing score
00072	Service	2 x 2 = 4	2 x 3 = 6	Communities & Citizens	Budget pressures in Customer Services	Helen Bishop	The service savings have been made this year, although there will be just over a 3% adverse variance (circa £70K) at the end of year due in part to one-off staffing absences that have needed to be addressed. The impact according to guidance is classified as minor and as such attracts a score of 2.	Retain existing score
00074	Service	2 x 2 = 4	2 x 4 = 8	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Staff recruitment	Carolyn Ploszynski	The service is not suffering current issues with recruitment. It has recently had some recruitment successes and is not carrying lots of vacancies. Therefore, at the current time, the probability is “probably not” likely and the impact on the service is “minor” as per the risk scoring matrix. The suggestion to change the score of 4 “Major current impact” does not reflect the current situation. The scoring system says that this would be a “Significant disruption and inefficiencies that affect the Council’s ability to deliver a service or priority”.	Retain existing score

00075	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12 or 3 x 5 = 15	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Managing staff capacity	Carolyn Ploszynski	The service is not suffering severe issues with managing staff capacity. The service is busy, but the resource levels we have in place are managing with the mitigations we have. This is why we have the probability as possible and the impact as moderate. The suggestion to change the impact to major (4) or severe (5) would seem unnecessary when referring to the scoring system.	Retain existing score
00079	Service	2 x 2 = 4	2 x 4 = 8	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Staff Budget	Carolyn Ploszynski	The service has sufficient budget to cover its current staffing levels and has had some additional grant into the space, which is beneficial and it carries a healthy service reserve. We are therefore happy that the score for the impact of not having enough budget is minor at the current time. A score of 4 for impact on a budget risk like this, according to the scoring system would mean "some corporate budget realignment £500k - £750k per annum" which is not expected. A score of 2 as we have it according to the matrix means "Financial impact contained within the service area £50k - £250k per annum"	Retain existing score
00081	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Housing project delays	Dave Scholes	A score of 3 was used as this relates to programme slippage and delay – so the expectation is that delivery still happens (and we don't need a strategic shift to secure that). However, if a housing supply project slips, it is accepted that this involves a considerable amount of money and a large proportion of the capital budgets, so if Cllr Fry believes it should be a 4, then the risk owner is happy for that to be changed.	Change risk score
00089	Service	1 x 3 = 3	3 x 5 = 15	ICT	Retaining skilled ICT professionals	Rocco Labellarte	The risk is mitigated by the use of interim staff	Retain existing score
00090	Service	2 x 2 = 4	2 x 4 = 8	ICT	Addressing ICT staff skills gaps	Rocco Labellarte	The risk is mitigated by the use of interim staff	Retain existing score
00091	Service	4 x 3 = 12	4 x 5 = 20	ICT	Resources insufficient to meet demands of service	Rocco Labellarte	The risk is mitigated by the use of interim staff	Retain existing score
00093	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Capital Project Delays	Carolyn Ploszynski	Capital projects looked after by the service are not in significant delay and the current mitigations and governance are working well. Projects do suffer delay which is reflected in the impact score of 3 "moderate". This does not fit neatly in the matrix advice but we think looking across the categories moderate is a fair reflection of current impact of the delays seen in the capital projects.	Retain existing score

00099	Corporate	4 x 4 = 16	4 x 5 = 20	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	A utilities infrastructure that does not meet the needs of the city	Carolyn Ploszynski	This is a corporate rather than service risk so any change would need the agreement of the Corporate Leadership Team. We have this as a major current impact, given there are mitigations in place and being actively worked on. It does not fit neatly into the scoring system, but I think moving impact to 5 would need to represent a current actual failure in infrastructure where the ability of the city to function was threatened.	Retain the existing score
00100	Corporate	4 x 4 = 16	4 x 5 = 20	ICT	Cyber security and IT infrastructure resilience	Rocco Labellarte	Having reviewed the risk, The Chief Technology and Information Officer is leaning towards Councillor Fry's suggestion. Any Cyber security threat could be as high as a 5. Likewise the lack of infrastructure resilience could result in a level 5 impact. This is a corporate risk and a change of risk score would need to be agreed by Corporate Leadership Team	The current impact score has been increased from 4 to 5.
00102	Corporate	5 x 3 = 15	4 x 3 = 12	Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability	Addressing the causes and impacts of climate change	Carolyn Ploszynski	This is a corporate rather than service risk, so any change would need to be agreed by the Corporate Leadership Team. The probability of not addressing the causes and impacts of climate change is very high. It could probably be argued both ways as to whether it is a 4 or a 5, but given recent shifts nationally, the impacts that will be had on access to funding, and because time is passing, the risk owner thinks that this is an increased risk and red at the moment is appropriate.	Retain existing score
00103	Service	2 x 4 = 8	3 x 4 = 12	Planning and Regulation	Regulatory compliance	David Butlet / Richard Adams	There has been a significant budget increase in ASBIT, CRT and General Licensing and consequently it is believed that a probability score of 2 is correct.	Retain existing score
00105	Corporate	3 x 4 - 12	3 x 5 = 15	Housing	A failure to deliver housing priorities and business plans	Nerys Parry	The gross impact score has been increased from 4 to 5 to reflect that this would have a severe impact without the steps in place to reduce the impact. The current impact score is considered to accurately reflect that there would only be a major impact if this risk occurred with the existing controls in place including a suite of Housing strategies with clear priorities and mitigations for effectively arresting the increasing homelessness pressures in the General Fund and improved corporate governance arrangements in place on oversight of RSH/HRA improvement plans to ensure progress and viability.	Retain existing score
00108	Service	2 x 4 = 8	4 x 4 =16	Housing	Failure of Homeless Prevention Activities	Nerys Parry	The current probability score is considered to accurately reflect existing circumstances. Gross risk acknowledges the considerable baseline risk in this area, but through successful implementation of numerous mitigations with the controls in place around maintaining an enhanced prevention offer, expansion of staffing in teams, and further service development to meet demand this means the probability of this occurring has reduced.	Retain existing score

00109	Service	3 x 5 = 15	4 x 5 = 20	Housing	Failure to meet Homeless Temporary Accommodation Demand	Richard Wood	The probability of the Council not being able to meet TA demand is a 3, meaning "possible", because while demand remains very high, there is growing confidence that it can be met. This is because of the Council's comprehensive TA mitigation programme, which now has a proven track record of delivery. This includes a) The successful design and launch of a TA procurement framework, which has resulted in significant increased supply, cheaper prices and more accommodation being sourced within the City itself b) The continued progress of growing the Council TA stock, through private leasing, transfers from the HRA, and good progress in our work to decant two former sheltered blocks. c) The agreement of new mitigations this year, such as the purchase of a further 150 units, which allows the Council to forecast a TA stock in three years of 560 units, sufficient to meet modelled demand levels in that time period. A risk probability of 3 means we still believe there's a possible chance of this risk occurring, but we are sufficiently reassured by progress that we don't believe it's likely that the Council will fail to have sufficient TA accommodation to meet statutory demand. We continue to keep this rating under regular review, and will revise it up if new data or delays in mitigations require it.	Retain existing score
00110	Service	2 x 4 = 8	2 x 5 = 10	Housing	Delayed new build developments/acquisitions	Nerys Parry / Dave Scholes	The current impact score is considered to accurately reflect that there would only be a major impact if this risk occurred with the existing controls in place, including a well-governed and oversighted housing supply programme, where progress against targets is closely tracked.	Retain existing score
00114	Service	2 x 1 = 2	2 x 3 = 6	Housing	OCC fails to follow the statutory Section 20 consultation with leaseholders and shared owners	Nerys Parry	The gross impact score of 5 x 5 reflects the risk without controls in place to reduce the impact. The current impact assessment has been reviewed and changed to minor (2) to acknowledge this should be a little higher, even with the existing controls led by the Home Ownership Manager to mitigate this. The RAG rating remains green.	Change the current risk score to 2 x 2
00116	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12	Housing	HRA Investment and Management Controls fail to comply with the Social Housing Act/Consumer Standards	Nerys Parry	The gross impact score has been increased from 3 to 4 to reflect that this would have a major impact without the steps in place to reduce the impact. The current impact assessment of moderate (3) is considered to accurately reflect circumstances with the existing controls in place, including the capital works programme and development of a rolling 5-year programme to ensure work stays on track.	Retain existing score

00120	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 =12	Housing	Workforce, skills and capacity for service delivery	Nerys Parry	The gross impact score has been increased from 3 to 4 to reflect this would have a major impact without the steps in place to reduce the impact. The current impact assessment of moderate is considered to accurately reflect the position with the existing controls in place, including training, development and upskilling to ensure that staff have the tools and support to carry out their roles and deliver services to residents	Retain existing score
00121	Service	3 x 3 =9	4 x 4 = 16	Housing	Housing IT and Systems	Nerys Parry	The current probability rating of possible (3) and impact of moderate (3) are considered to accurately reflect current circumstances with the controls in place around getting the best out of the housing system, while undertaking a re-procurement exercise of the existing contract and parts of the housing system relating to homelessness and allocations to improve functionality for staff and customers.	Retain existing score
00122	Service	3 x 4 =12	3 x 5 = 15	Housing	Data and performance	Nerys Parry	The current impact score is considered to accurately reflect that there would only be a major impact if this risk occurred with the existing controls in place including: a) A significant programme of work being undertaken to ensure the integrity and effective management of asset data, alongside sufficient resourcing to capture outstanding tenant information and b) Improvement in performance management systems and mechanisms across housing are currently being reviewed to ensure that resources are targeted to address service issues.	Retain existing score
00124	Service	2 x 4 = 8	3 x 4 = 12	Housing	Inadequate controls to manage HRA financial spend	Nerys Parry	The current probability score and impact are considered to accurately reflect existing circumstances with controls around new client management arrangements and performance management measures to deliver works within budgets.	Retain existing score
00125	Service	4 x 4 = 16	4 x 5 = 20	Communities and Citizens	Leisure contract financial performance	Hagan Lewisman	In line with the scoring criteria, the service feels that the impact score should be reduced to a 3 (moderate: £250-£500k risk per annum). Based on this, the risk would equate to a 3 and we're proposing to revise this accordingly.	Reduce risk impact score from 4 to 3
00127	Service	3 x 3 = 9	3 x 4 = 12	Property & Assets	Property Non Compliance - Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards	Malcolm Peek	The new financial year will see surveys and better clarity of the responsibilities that OCC will have in this area (tenant responsibility vs Freeholder) and the extent of works required and enable a programme of works to be drawn up over the MTFP to achieve the target. This will also inform the key issues on funding requirements to achieve the targets. The recommendation for the change in score is accepted.	Accept recommended change