VfM PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME RISK REGISTER **-** PROGRESS REPORT as at 2nd September 2008

Notes:

1. Impact (I) scored on scale of 1 – 5, with low = 1, limited = 2, medium = 3, high = 4, critical = 5

2. Likelihood (L) scored on scale of 1 – 5 with remote = 1, unlikely = 2, possible = 3, likely = 4, high = 5

3. Risk rating calculated by multiplying impact score by likelihood score

No	**Risk Register Ref.**	Risk (Threat to achievement of business objective**)**	Assessment of risk (prior to treatment)			Planned treatment	Assessment of residual risk (once treatment measures implemented)			Progress to date	Risk Owner; Risk Manager
1.		Failure to build in adequate resources to enable and support the review programme, leading to bottlenecks and slippage of deliverables.	5	3	15	The governance arrangements provide for both a Programme Board and a Programme Support Office to manage and co-ordinate the activities within the Programme. In addition each project has a Project Team involved in delivery and a Project Board overseeing the strategic delivery of the project, change control. any risks and issues etc. The composition and availability of the Project governance is agreed at the same time as commissioning the work. By these means workload is being managed on an ongoing basis.	5	2	10	A Resource Plan has been considered by the Programme Board which set out the current resource needs of commissioned projects and available resources. This will be reviewed, and updated for further meetings.	Programme Board D Parfitt

2.		Failure to communicate adequately with all "stakeholder" groups.	3	2	6	A communications strategy and stakeholder engagement plan has been developed to guide the process of stakeholder engagement, which will be ongoing for the life of the Partnership.	3	1	3	The Programme Board has approved the Communications Strategy, and communication plans are being prepared for each individual review.	Programme Board D Parfitt
3.		Risk of emphasising projects which deliver quick savings, at the expense of the overall Programme.	4	3	12	The issue of the balance of the programme – between qualitative service improvement and quantitative cost reductions, and between quick wins and longer term improvements is recognised, and will be addressed by the Programme Board as it approves the candidate projects and the timing/flow of specific reviews.	4	1	4	The Programme Board considered a Resource Plan report at its meeting on 4th March, which will be reviewed on a regular basis.	Programme Board D Parfitt
4.		Failure of the organisation, or parts of the organisation, to engage with the Programme and support the achievement of its objectives.	5	4	20	The Cabinet and the Management Board are committed to delivering service improvement and cost reduction, and have recognised that the VfM Partnership will provide the resources to enable this to happen. They are providing the leadership which will drive the Council forward to achieve the objectives of the partnership.	5	3	15	The Programme Board's leadership, PwC's engagement with senior officers in order to develop potential new projects, regular discussion at Management Board, and the VfM communications strategy are combining to maintain a focus on the importance of the VfM agenda, and encourage participation.	Management Board Programme Board

No.		Risk				Mitigation				Further Action	Owner
5.		Failure to engage with staff and understand the pressures on them during the Programme may lead to staff absence, poor staff morale, non-compliance.	3	3	9	There will be full consultation/engagement with staff on any planned changes affecting them as a consequence of outcomes form the Programme. This will be underpinned by the communications strategy. The 'joint team approach' will ensure that staff are fully engaged with project delivery and inputting to the outcomes. Stakeholders will be fully engaged during the process.	3	2	6	The Communications Strategy recognises the importance of staff communication and is addressing this issue. The 'Joint Team' approach is key to ensuring that staff 'buy in' to the purpose of the review and its outcomes.	Management Board D Parfitt
6.		Failure to identify and plan for skill requirements to deliver Programme leading to insufficient resources allocated to training/ recruitment, resulting in undeliverable Programme.	4	3	12	PwC are experienced in supporting Councils in delivering Programmes of this kind, and will support the Council in the identification and planning for the delivery of the Programme. In addition they have access to additional resources if necessary, and will engage with the Council immediately to provide skills training to the in-house team	4	2	8	As reports are presented to the Programme Board, the need for specific skills to support each review is identified – already additional internal resources have been identified and allocated to the end to end review work of the Operational/Support Services review.	B Messinger D Parfitt
7.		Failure to empower officers with appropriate level of authority – which could lead to an inability to make decisions quickly and effectively, resulting in delays, additional bureaucracy and an inability to achieve Programme targets.	3	3	9	A Project Initiation Document (PID) will be prepared for each project, which will contain a statement of resources needed and responsibilities of Council staff, and PwC.	3	2	6	As individual projects are commissioned, project leads and project teams are being established and some project management decisions are devolved to leads, in accordance with governance arrangements approved by Programme Board	Programme Board D Parfitt

8.		Failure to plan to get the right balance between Programme ambition and achievability within the resources available. This in turn, leads to an inability to cope with peak workloads and poor decision making, resulting in ineffective use of resources and significant service failure.	5	3	15	The Programme Board, with support from the Programme Management Office, will manage the composition and timing of the projects in order to ensure that projects are achievable and deliverable with available resources – PwC has the flexibility to support the Council with additional resources to meet "peaks" of activity, as long as the additional cost can be justified	5	1	5	The Partnership Board has considered a Resource Plan which considered the twin objectives of achievability and affordability, and will be reviewing regularly.	Programme Board\n\nD Parfitt
9.		Failure to accurately identify and realise the benefits across the organisation	5	3	15	The Programme Management Office is tasked with the responsibility to track the realisation of savings from the business case to actual delivery – a benefits realisation process is being established, and each project will be regularly monitored and progress reported to the Programme Board	5	1	5	A benefits realisation methodology has been established by the Programme Management Office to define and measure financial and non-financial benefits. It is being applied to all projects.	Programme Board\n\nM Coult
10.		Failure to manage and communicate risks	4	3	12	This risk register for the overall Programme will be monitored regularly and reported to the Programme Board quarterly – in addition, individual projects within the programme will have their own risk registers which will be managed by project leaders and monitored by the Programme Management Office	4	1	4	This report is the second quarterly review of the Programme Risk Register to be presented to the Programme Board for consideration.	Programme Board\n\nD Parfitt

No.		Risk				Mitigation				Current Position	Owner
11.		Poor quality information, or the non-availability of information which inhibits the undertaking of reviews in a timely manner (or at all), and could lead to poor planning and decision making.	4	4	16	Each project will be subject to a clear Business Case Approval Process – with gateways at the Project Brief, Outline Business Case, and detailed Business Case stages. Projects will only proceed to next gateway if Programme Board approval is given. Each Project will be supported by HR and Finance officers to contribute to the business case development. This approach will strengthen the decision making process, and help to limit the impact of poor quality information	4	3	12	Base-lining and data gathering are important components of business case development, and the Partnership has experienced some problems with the availability of data for initial projects, which are being tackled on a case by case basis.	Programme Board D Parfitt
12.		Failure to manage dependencies between projects and across the organisation	3	4	12	One of the key governance roles for the Programme is the Design Authority (the VfM Steering Group), whose responsibility it is to consider the whole Programme and recognise and report on dependencies across the Council.	3	2	6	The VfM Steering Group, which meets every 6 weeks, has taken on the role of Design Authority.	Programme Board D Parfitt
13.		Failure of internal controls to be properly understood and/or adhered to as services are reviewed, or be built into new service delivery arrangements	4	3	12	The Council's internal audit team will play an important role in supporting the Programme, and will provide advice on matters of internal control as part of the business planning arrangements	4	1	4	The Internal Audit team will provide advice and guidance on specific projects at the stage prior to implementation in order that internal controls are properly understood, and are built into new service delivery proposals in a way which is commensurate with the risks being managed.	Management Board D Parfitt

14.		Ineffective Partnership arrangements may lead to a conflict of agendas	4	3	12	The Council and PwC are entering into this VfM approach as partners – and both the City Council and PwC representatives will be members of the Programme Board.	4	1	4	The Programme Board meets every 6 weeks, and has agreed Partnership Success Criteria, the achievement of which will be reviewed at every Board meeting.	Programme Board B Messinger/J McGuigan

DRAFT