

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

1	The aims and objectives of the Corporate Plan may not be fully delivered because of the reduction in government funding; the rising costs of services; and the cause and effect of demographics and demand management.	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 4x3=12	(1xL) 2x4=8	Ongoing

Risk Owner: Chief Finance Officer (JW)

Risk Description

The council is facing a dual challenge of having to meet an increased demand for its services against a backdrop of reducing financial support from Central Government. Alongside this the uncertainty in general economic climate is placing further pressure on the council. The Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) showed a further significant reduction in funding to local authorities. Significant cost pressures within Adult Social Care and Children services continues arising from both inflationary pressures as a result of the government increasing the minimum wage and the continued demographic increases.

To meet this challenge the council must have a well defined medium term (1-5 year) plan to match its expected limited resources against the anticipated demand levels and we need to make sure that we have a flexible workforce that is capable with the necessary skills to deliver these services in these challenging times.

We need to be creative in terms of service delivery considering new ways of delivery including the involvement of the third sector.

Key mitigation activities

We have a well established financial strategy which is closely monitored. This is discussed and agreed with cabinet and council. Actual spend against budget is monitored on a regular basis and reported to officers and Members regularly with variations against expectations investigated and corrective action identified at an early stage.	Head of Finance (VB)
Medium term financial outlook is updated regularly with the impact of incoming changes and the levels of provisions reserves and contingencies are also reviewed on a regular basis. The medium term financial plan	Head of Finance (VB)

1

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

forms the basis of budget setting decisions.	
We have produced a Walsall Plan and a Corporate Plan that lays out the priorities for the council in the short to medium term. These plans are produced in consultation with key stakeholders in the local community.	Chief Finance Officer (JW) / Head of information, Communication & Technologies (CW)
Operational plans are in place for the key service areas of the council which lay out the plans for those areas and map their resources to their available resources including financial staffing and other resources.	Individual Heads of Service
Detailed delivery plans for key budget savings have been produced and risk assessed.	Chief Finance Officer (JW) / Head of Finance (VB)

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
Regular reports will be submitted to Corporate management team on progress against Corporate Plan.	Head of Information, Communication & Technologies (CW)	Ongoing
Rising costs within Children and Adults must be targeted with dedicated resources allocated to achieving this. Following CSR publication detailed budget options need to be produced for years 2017/18 – 2019/20.	} Executive } Directors } (KS/DH/SN) } and Chief } Executive (PS)	Mar 2016

Progress to Date

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
 3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Budget proposals have been submitted to cabinet and have been agreed. Council will meet to approve the budget on 25 February 2016. Detailed delivery plans have been submitted and reviewed by the Head of Finance. Pressures in Children and Adult services have been supported in the current financial year 2015/16 and into 2016/17 in the order of £13m for Adult Social Care and £7.5m for Children. Preparation on detailed budget options for future years are in progress.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

9	Failure to manage institutional and individual change	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
			3x5 =15	3x5=15	

Risk Owner: Chief Executive (PS)

Risk Description

The need of the State to deliver a reduced range of services with significantly fewer resources is presenting significant challenges. Over the medium term (6-7 years) there will be a need to seek to reconcile public expectations about the range and scale of council services and the reality of what can be afforded. Citizens will need to continue to develop their personal responsibility for key issues as the reach of the State reduces. There are challenges for individual citizens, for political groupings, for employees and for the council as a whole.

Key mitigation activities

Within the Council, there is widespread acknowledgement about the scale of the financial challenge facing the organization. The medium term financial outlook (MTFO) is regularly updated and reports on financial performance are presented to Cabinet and available to all Members of the Council. Briefings on the financial outlook and budget performance are available to opposition Group Leaders and these are taken up. The Chief Executive has been holding open staff briefing sessions for several years. The nature and scale of the financial challenge is well understood by staff as is the need for all employees to embrace new approaches to the way the organization is designed and provides services to the public.

The Council is now (2015/2016) in the fourth year of the Government's 'austerity programme'. Approximately £100million savings have been made since 2010/2011.

In 2010 the Council employed 3726 people; today the figure is 2921.

By Who:

Job title
[initials]

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<p>The numbers of senior and middle managers continue to fall and there is an ongoing process of restructuring within and across directorates. The scale of these changes is leading to new approaches to service provision often being managed by people who have been asked to take responsibility for services not previously managed. It is acknowledged that the pace of change and different ways of working are unfamiliar and will take time for Members and officers to become familiar with.</p> <p>The Council has maintained its practice of preparing a detailed budget for the following financial year with indicative budgets for the subsequent year. The Council has not yet implemented a four year budget approach and this will need to be addressed.</p> <p>There appears to be an apparent dissonance between the acknowledgement that service design, delivery and scale have and will continue to change and the expectation that somehow the Council will maintain long standing approaches and service levels. This will need ongoing attention both within the Council and in order to ensure that the scale of the change is understood by the people of Walsall.</p> <p>Rightly, the scrutiny process is used to challenge and, when considered necessary, to reflect or refer back to Cabinet its decisions. The opportunity also exists for the scrutiny process to be used to seek to develop cross party consensus about how the financial challenge can be effectively met. It is often claimed that scrutiny has limited ability to influence Council policy but it is not the case. It would be possible for scrutiny, for example, seek to identify processes for agreeing an overall approach to preparing a four year budget. Given that there is broad, although not universal acknowledgement of the need for the Council to continue to downsize, scrutiny could look at ways in which this broad acknowledgement may be explained to local people so that they are better able to respond. This issue of addressing public expectation is perhaps the least well developed area of Council activity and the public might well be less than clear about the overall direction of travel towards a smaller state. Inevitably, there will be differences of approach between Party Groups. This is welcome because it reflects vibrant democracies. However, there are common understandings about the scale of change required and the scrutiny process may offer an opportunity to help to explain agreed matters.</p>	
---	--

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<p>A particularly complex area of change relates to the expectation of greater integration between the NHS and Social Care. In addition, to its complexity, the work requires agreement across a number of commissioning and provider bodies. Whilst there is room for optimism in the inter agency arrangements at a local level, the NHS is greatly influenced by national and regional policy which do not always operate in a sympathetic way to Walsall systems and relationships.</p> <p>Over the past two years, the Council has committed considerable resources to the establishment of the West Midlands Combined Authority and the 'devolution deal' associated with it. A successful Combined Authority, in which Walsall is able to secure greater investment in the Borough, will require an ongoing commitment of management and political resources. A failure to secure a fair outcomes would adversely impact upon the Borough.</p>	
---	--

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
Chief Executive open staff briefings to continue in order to seek to ensure that employees are as aware as possible of the scale of change and the reasons for it.	CEx	
Maintain written challenges of communication with staff	CEx and EDs	
Seek to develop appropriate cross party understanding around broad parameters of change	CEx and CFO	
Provide challenge and support for scrutiny system to consider Council plans for communication with the public about the nature and scale of change and the potential impact upon individuals	Scrutiny Lead and EDs	
Continue to work with colleagues in the NHS to identify and implement the most effective integration	CEx and	

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

arrangements	ED - Adult Social Care	
Continue to work with the Walsall voluntary and community sector to move from grant aid to commissioning. Also to seek to develop the scope and role for volunteering	Head of Business Change	
Continue to ensure that the appropriate political, managerial and professional resources are available in order to secure the best possible outcomes from the Combined Authority.	CEx and ED (E&E)	

<u>Progress to Date</u>

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

8	Data control - Information - ICT - Cyber Risk	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x6=18	(1xL) 3x6=18	July 2016

Risk Owner: Chief Finance Officer (JW)

Risk Description

The council is increasingly managing personal data and information in the delivery of its services. With data held in a vast array of places, and transferring between supply chain partners, it becomes susceptible to loss, protection and privacy risks. This leaves the council vulnerable to significant fines and bad publicity should events of this nature occur.

An agreed action identified that there was a need to quantify the risk of a breach of security of information assets and thus take steps to mitigate such a risk.

Key mitigation activities

The Corporate Management Team recognises that data, information and records are organisational assets which must be managed and secured appropriately according to their level of sensitivity.

Information (data) Management Update February 2016

The Information Governance Team along with the Forum for Information Governance and Assurance (FIGA) continues to raise awareness and put in places measures to identify and mitigate risk relating to the management of information assets and to responding to the requirements of the Information Commissioners Office. The Forum meets focusing on key risks around the way we manage our information and providing assurance to the Chief Executive and CMT that there is a programme in place to mitigate risks. Aspects considered range from mandatory training, use of removable media, analysis of causes of data breaches, Bring Your Own Devices (BYOD) and password security. Outside of the forum matters of risk are brought to the attention of the Senior Information Risk Owner (SIRO) and / or the Information Risk and Governance Manager and, where appropriate,

Head of Information, Communication and Technology (CW) / Information Risk &

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<p>the Caldicott Guardian.</p> <p>The Information Rights team is currently working with Childrens Services and Money Home Job to support the handling of low level Freedom of Information requests. The team works with colleagues to minimise any risk of inappropriate release of information and will seek to extend this approach across the council over the next 6 months.</p> <p>The council has agreed with the Information Commissioner to undertake a consensual audit of the council's response to data protection practice within the next 6 months, due to the length of time to respond to Data Protection Subject Access requests.</p>	<p>Governance Manager (NU)</p>
<p><u>Activity and Progress</u></p> <p>The council is now fully compliant with the Health and Social Care Information Centre requirement for data breaches involving health or social care data to be categorised, used a nationally approved risk assessment tool and reported via the NHS toolkit. Thus far 3 incidents have been reported in this manner. This requirement means that data breaches reported may be published and reported to the Information Commissioner directly.</p> <p>New guidance relating to the use of cloud storage facilities and the risks presented by the increased use of web based systems has been developed and shared across the council along with reminders about the requirements to comply with the council retention and destruction schedule. Cloud storage is also a feature of the mandatory training.</p> <p>Maintenance of the Information Asset register, including identification of business critical assets and services, is ongoing and it continues to be populated based on updates from Information Asset Owners with support from the Information Governance Team towards ensuring that assets are properly identified, risk assessed and protected.</p> <p>Information Sharing Agreements continue to be developed to ensure that we share information, where appropriate, lawfully and safely. Recent guidance has also been developed and published to reinforce and clarify information sharing responsibilities alongside our duties in regard to child protection. Information Sharing Agreements are routinely approved by the Information Governance team prior to information sharing taking place.</p> <p><u>Privacy Impact Assessments</u></p>	<p>Head of Information, Communication and Technologies (CW) / Information Risk & Governance Manager (NU)</p>

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<p>Privacy impact assessments (PIAs) are now used as a tool to assist services with identifying the most effective way to comply with our data protection obligations. They are used to help identify and fix problems at an early stage, reducing the associated costs and damage to reputation which might otherwise occur. All PIAs are reviewed by the Information Governance Team.</p> <p><u>Single Contract for Off Site Storage</u> The Information Governance Team has reviewed the contract and the information /management/governance/security provisions of the framework and are happy that they meet all council requirements. In preparation for the use of this the existing use of external filing services is being reviewed to ensure records are stored correctly and that staff are fully trained on how to use relevant systems. Changes to service delivery relating to budget proposals are also being considered to ensure information is protected.</p> <p><u>Awareness Raising</u> A revised version of the Protecting information Training was launched in January 2016. Most training is completed on line and updates are currently being done to the number of solutions in place to allow us to provide training to those staff that do not have access to ICT depending on specific requirements.</p> <p>The revised training will also be offered to school based staff.</p> <p>FIGA will also run a Protecting Information Day which will highlight key risk areas across the council and remind staff of their responsibilities when handling information.</p>	<p>Information Risk & Governance Manager (NU)</p> <p>Information Risk & Governance Manager (NU)</p>
<p><u>ICT Update February 2016</u></p> <p><u>Workstation Security</u> The deployment of 'thin client' hardware to appropriate desks and staff in the organisation is complete. This system ensures information is stored centrally in the secure data centre. Where 'thin client' hardware does not meet customer needs a desktop or laptop is provided. These workstations use the Windows 7 operating system ensuring the continued deployment of security patches. The removal of all Windows XP workstations is complete eliminating any security vulnerability arising from unsupported software.</p>	<p>Head of Information, Communication and Technologies</p>

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<p>All newly issued council laptops are encrypted. The majority of legacy laptops are also encrypted. The remainder will be dealt with on an exception basis (e.g. occasional use laptops stored in cupboards).</p> <p>Where access to IT systems is required from a ‘non council’ location using a council laptop then secure access is provided with 2 factor authentication. This means that users need a physical key fob as well as a password.</p> <p>As there are no material matters of concern, workstation security will be removed from future updates unless areas of concern arise.</p> <p><u>Mobile Device Security</u></p> <p>There are no outstanding matters of concern for this topic.</p> <p><u>Compliance</u></p> <p>The council’s IT network and supporting systems have passed the necessary security requirements to comply with the Government Public Services Network (PSN) Code of Connection. The council’s PSN submission for 2015 was successful. There are a few areas of concern (weak passwords, security patch delays, upgrading unsupported server operating system for legacy systems), there are action plans in place to deal with this and suitable interim protection of systems.</p> <p>The council’s ability to continue to make payments using computer systems is governed by the Payment Card Industry (PCI) standard. A new version of the standard has highlighted some areas for improving security. Work is being planned to deal with these matters.</p> <p><u>Removable Media</u></p> <p>There are no particular matters of concern. The usage procedure that staff adhere to is being reviewed for update as a matter of course.</p> <p><u>Disaster Recovery / Business Continuity</u></p> <p>The council continue to a contractual agreement with Tamworth District Council to share space in their data centre to host some of our systems thus giving us a secondary site in order to improve our resilience with loss of</p>	<p>(CW)) / ICT Technical Services Manager (MP)</p> <p>Head of Information, Communication and Technologies</p>
---	--

Head of
Information,
Communication
and
Technologies

<p>access to data. Council data in Tamworth will still be within the protection it has on Walsall Council's network and protected from malicious attacks and probes. This arrangement provides the foundation for disaster recovery. Some hardware resides at Tamworth to start the process of recovering systems following a major incident.</p> <p>ICT will be working with the Resilience Unit to review the recently completed Corporate Business Continuity Plan and resulting disaster recovery requirements. Solutions and costs to meet requirements will be designed and reviewed against priorities. Requests for funding will arise from this work for implementation in future years</p> <p><u>Cloud Based Computing</u> Any new IT system upgrade or implementation that considers hosting council data in the Internet 'cloud' is assessed for good practice security controls. An internal audit of cloud computing good practice is underway.</p>	<p>(CW) / ICT Technical Services Manager (MP)</p>
<p><u>Cyber Risk</u> Major organisations continue to be targeted by criminal elements through the internet. There continues to be attacks on high profile organisations causing reputational, data protection and financial risk. Strategies around information security and infrastructure protection have been introduced however, the council's firewall, virus protection and penetration testing form part of the council's response to the risk. All three elements are updated appropriately and the latest trends in terms of cyber attack are being monitored.</p> <p>The council is expected to comply with the security requirements from the Cabinet Office which stipulate the network security standards that must be met by all organisations connecting to Revenue and Benefit systems and other systems containing sensitive and protected data held by central government. The council's IT department meet these standards.</p>	<p>Head of Information, Communication and Technologies (CW)</p>

<p><u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u> As described above in the main text.</p>	<p><u>By Who:</u></p>	
---	-----------------------	--

Progress to Date

<p>Information (data) management - detailed above in 'Key Mitigating Activities'.</p>

12

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

ICT matters	- detailed above in 'Key Mitigating Activities'.
-------------	--

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

21	Failure to implement the new case management system (Mosaic) for Children and Social Care and Inclusion (SCI) within the identified timescales.	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 2x3 =6	April 2016

Risk Owner: Executive Director, Children's Services (DH)

Risk Description

A number of previous Ofsted inspections have identified that the council's social care case management system (PARIS) is 'not fit for purpose and unable to help the council to manage the lives of some of our most vulnerable citizens'.

This risk relates to the council failing to safeguard and care for vulnerable citizens (Childrens and Adults) as a result of identified shortfalls in the current case management system and its related processes, together with its non compliance with imminent legislative changes – Childrens and Families Act and the Care Act. The risk will remain high whilst the council continues to use the incumbent system and processes.

Delayed implementation will carry a financial risk as the council would be unable to accurately monitor the financial impact of the new legislation (particularly relating to charging and the Care Act). This could also lead to future Ofsted inspection being unsatisfactory with the progress which the council is making in addressing the required improvements to social care case management.

It is likely that Ofsted will undertake a further inspection of the *Safeguarding* and *Looked After Children* service at some point during the Mosaic programme's implementation. The next Ofsted inspection window is January to April 2016.

To support the inspection activity, which is predominantly field work/practice based, will lead to the diversion of key social care staff away from the programme's implementation and the timescale for Children's Services implementation will be affected. There will be a key decision point when details of the inspection are known to consider whether to continue with implementation during inspection or to delay implementation to a later date.

In April 2014, Children's Services advised Ofsted that it would replace its existing case management system to a compliant system by the

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

end of 2014. The programme delivery timeline has been reviewed given the scope and resource requirements and is based upon a three phased implementation approach commencing with Phase 1 in May 2015.

CoreLogic's Mosaic system was procured as one system jointly implemented in Children's Services and Social Care and Inclusion, along with professional services from the supplier together with an in-house implementation team to install, configure, migrate data from Paris, train and support users of the system.

Key mitigation activities

There has been early engagement from key stakeholders across the council, to support the release of skilled resources to implement and embed the new system as effectively as possible.	Executive Directors – Children's (DH) and Social Care and Inclusion (KS)
Effective programme governance arrangements in place to ensure that the outcomes and benefits of the Mosaic Implementation Programme are achieved. Programme management arrangements changed during December 2014, with a recruitment process in place to appoint a technical programme lead with effect from February 2015. This has been revised in May 2015 with a full time Programme Implementation Manager joining the team from 15 June. Effective management arrangements remain in place and will continue until Phase 2 is complete (May 2016).	Mosaic Programme Board and Business Change – Head of Programme Delivery & Governance (CW)
Ensuring close working with all contributors to the Programme, including CoreLogic (supplier), SCI and Children's, and dedicated support and expert capacity, through the nominated business change managers and subject matter experts, ICT and the Programme Delivery Team.	Mosaic Implementation Board and Steering Group
Maintaining regular communications between Walsall Council and Ofsted to clarify any expectations on potential inspection dates and impact on the implementation of the new system	Executive Director – Children's Services (DH)
The impact from Ofsted should an inspection be called will require additional resource and expertise to support the process. DCS to formulate contingency measures to ensure an effective balance between Ofsted requirements and the programme delivery schedule can be achieved. The impact of inspection being called at various stages of the programme lifecycle has been assessed by the programme board and is included in the Board's Risk Register.	Executive Director – Children's Services (DH)
Effort from both Childrens and Adults is being focused through the Programme delivery team to align go live of Phase 2 Childrens and Phase 1 Adults as a concurrent roll out. Phase 3 rollout is currently being scoped (Feb 2016).	Programme Board and Programme Implementation Manager.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

<p><u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and revise dedicated expert and support capacity against risks as identified by the Programme Board 	<p><u>By Who:</u> ED Children's (DH) and SCI (KS)</p>	<p><u>When:</u> Monthly</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the programme delivery plan and key milestones ensuring that the programme remains desirable, achievable and affordable. 	<p>Mosaic Steering Group and Programme Board.</p>	<p>Bi-Monthly</p>

Progress to Date

This risk has been accepted and is part of the Corporate Risk Register. Reviewed and revised monthly at Programme Board.

In November 2015 CMT recommended that the score be reduced down to 3 (Impact Critical) x 3 (Likelihood Low) = 9. However, on further review of implementation progress, the risk owner recommends that 3 (Impact Critical) x 4 (Likelihood Significant) = 12 remains for the following reasons:

- In some parts of Children's and Adults Services full implementation of the system is slower than expected.*
- There have been some time delays in people being trained.*
- Technical errors and issues have had to be rectified causing some delay.*
- Reports are not yet fully operational across services.*
- Challenges in social worker usage of the system.*
- Ofsted inspection compromised.*

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

3a	Partnership working - local	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 3x3=9	June 2016

Risk Owner: Head of Business Change (PG)

Risk Description

Partnership Working - Local

In order to address the priorities within the Walsall Plan 2013 - 2016; it is important that the council and its partners deliver services and interventions that meet the needs, aspirations and priorities of local communities. Budget savings have significantly impacted on public and community sector organisations. In order to mitigate any risk to resources and reputation it is crucial that partnership working is joined up at a borough wide and locality level, that the involvement of private sector partners is encouraged and that we ensure a collaborative approach is taken.

Key mitigation activities

Partnership Working - Local

At a borough-wide level, the council's approach to partnership working is supported by the Borough Management Team (BMT) which consists of key agencies including Walsall Council, the Police, Walsall College, the Fire and Rescue Service, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Walsall Healthcare NHS Trust, Walsall Housing Group, Dudley and Walsall Mental Health Trust, etc. The BMT is supported by a Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination Group which includes representation from four strategic groups: Safer Walsall Partnership, Walsall's Health & Well Being Board, Walsall's Children & Young Persons' Board and the borough's Economic Board. At a locality level there are six Area Partnerships comprising of the key agencies, including the voluntary and community sector working within localities to improve the quality of life experienced in those areas. Each Area Partnership supports local accountability through the established Area Panels comprising the local councillors for those areas.

Six Area Partnerships have been operational since 2010 aiming to improve the relationship and involvement of the community through the implementation of Area Plans. Area Partnerships have been re-appraised within a

Head of Communities and Public Protection / Partnership Manager (KB)

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

framework for devolution.	
There is a comprehensive risk assessment in place for Area Partnerships which comprises of strategic, planning and operational risks.	
Regular reports on Area Partnerships were made to the council's Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel and to the Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination Group.	

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of the Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination Group (PTCG) is currently under review and performance monitoring measures will be agreed following completion. 	Head of Communities and Public Protection / Partnership Mngr (KB)	Sept 2016

Progress to Date

<p>Delivery against the Walsall Plan is monitored through the Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination Group and the Borough Management Team. Local delivery plans are being updated to take account of profile data which will inform the relevant themes in each area. A strategic partnership event took place in March 2015. A voluntary and community sector and local delivery partners event took place in May 2015 to begin to map local delivery against the strategic priorities of the Walsall Plan.</p> <p>Area Partnerships are currently under review as part of the budget process. This may mean that Area Panels are no longer formal committees of the council and there may not be any grant funding available to local organisations – this will mean a change in the way that local groups / organisations are supported and the need for closer networking and links with Walsall Voluntary Action.</p>
--

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

3b	Partnership working (Regional)	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Jan 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 3x3 =9	March 2016

Risk Owner: Executive Director – Economy and Environment (SN)

Risk Description

Partnership Working – Sub Regional (Black Country): The Black Country Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) is now established. With Government funding now increasingly channelled / influenced by / awarded to LEP's, there is a risk that without effective co-ordination and a formal basis through which this can be achieved, it will put at risk existing programmes like: City Deal, the Local Growth Fund and the European round for 2014 – 2020, and new programmes under development including the Devo Deal and the Combined Authority development etc. undermining our ability to secure a fair share of resources moving forward.

The Black Country Consortium (BCC) relies for its existence on the four councils providing core funding, with an evolving role moving towards providing secretariat support for the BC LEP. With austerity pressure placed on all councils to reduce their funding contributions, this will put at risk the BCC's capacity to meet its role, unless alternative funding can be secured.

Partnership Working – Regional (West Midlands): Joint working at the West Midlands level is developing quickly through the Combined Authority work, the Devo Deal and the emerging CA Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). Without effective joint working arrangements and structures we risk losing both funding and positioning opportunities and the West Midlands will be seen by Government as a un co-ordinated and non-effectual region.

West Midlands LEP's are tasked with the delivery of their individual EU Investment Strategies (ESIF's), these then attract significant EU funding to support agreed priority areas and outcomes. There are risks associated with the delivery of sufficient outcomes to meet targets set by Government departments on behalf of the EU commission, together with risks associated with claw back and eligibility. LEP's also need to develop cross working in the delivery of joint EU programmes to maximise efficiencies and outcomes.

Key mitigation activities

21

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

<p>Partnership Working - Sub Regional (Black Country): To mitigate this risk a Joint Committee (JC) structure, which complements and works with the LEP board, is now in place. The delegation of powers to the JC members has been agreed and a detailed Terms of Reference and signed (May 2014) Collaboration Agreement set into place. The JC is responsible for approving the appointment of Accountable Bodies for the variety of public funds allocated to the LEP, playing the appropriate role in steering and monitoring performance, assisted by the Advisory Board & Heads of Regeneration. Walsall Council has been appointed as the Accountable Body for the Growth Deal and Managing / Co-ordinating Authority for the City Deal programme.</p> <p>The Black Country Consortium (BCC) supports the LEP and the four councils in the execution of agreed duties, against agreed annual allocations from the four councils and is developing new funding streams to support its LEP secretariat role. The delivery of key initiatives like City Deal and the Local Growth Fund, together with Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and the EU Investment Strategy will continue to be delivered through identified resources. A dedicated programme office has now been established and sits within the BC Consortium. This provides support in the delivery and development of the Combined Authority / Devo Deal work together with the existing Growth Deal, City Deal programmes, by taking responsibility for all elements delegated as agreed by the LEP board and the JC.</p> <p>Partnership Working – Regional (West Midlands): Black Country Councils have developed proposals, now accepted by Government for the formation of the West Midlands Combined Authority, including its membership, size and scope which is now agreed, together with the associated deals with Government. [See corporate risk number 22]. This process is now continuing towards formal implementation.</p> <p>Cross LEP joint working on the successful delivery of their EU Investment Strategies is progressing with a number of joint initiatives developed and out to the market place to secure delivery partners etc. This will continue through the Technical Assistance teams established within each LEP area. These teams are essential if we are to ensure, through the appropriate design of systems and procedures that the activities delivered are eligible and the possibility for claw back against the Black Country is minimised.</p>	<p>Executive Director – Economy and Environment (SN) / Head of Strategic Regeneration (ML)</p>
--	--

<u>Are further actions required [if so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The delivery of an effective Joint Committee service for the Black Country to be continued and reported on / monitored. 	} Executive } Director -	31.03.16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the joint working arrangements for the West Midland Region, including the Combined Authority to be continued and monitored. 	} Economy and } Environment (SN)/ } Head of Programme	31.03.16
		31.03.16

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
 3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development joint working across the West Midlands and the Black Country to be continued, including the continuation of the Technical Assistance Team. 	} Management (ML)	
--	-------------------	--

Progress to Date

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC agreements and Governance Structures now set into place. Combined Authority work towards implementation well under way and continuing. A successful Technical Assistance Team is in place for the Black Country.

22	Proposals for a West Midlands Combined Authority	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		March 2016	(1xL) 3x3=9	(1xL) 3x2 =6	Dec 2016

Risk Owner: Chief Executive (PS)

Risk Description

Project Update

Combined authorities represent a new way of local authorities working together across geographical boundaries and collaborating on key strategic issues that are more effectively delivered at a regional level. During August and September of 2015 an engagement exercise was undertaken on a draft Governance Review with an options analysis having been undertaken across the three Local Enterprise Partnerships areas, as part of the process to formally establish a Combined Authority.

On the 19 October 2015 Cabinet and Council resolved to support for the formation of a combined authority for the West Midlands. At this same meeting Members were asked to approve the draft Scheme for the Combined Authority. The Scheme detailed the Constitutional and Non-Constitutional members of the Combined Authority and the functions, powers and voting rights of each member. The Scheme was approved and the partners listed in the Scheme all took unilateral decisions to join and the Scheme was submitted to Government 26 October 2015 for the Secretary of State to consider the drafting of an Order to legally establish the WMCA. During February 2016, the WMCA Shadow Board consulted stakeholders on the WMCA Scheme to ensure there was sufficient support for the legal process to proceed.

23

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

On 7 March 2016 Cabinet and Council were asked to note the consultation outcomes and resolved to approve the draft wording of the Order ahead of a parliamentary process to establish the WMCA. At that same meeting the Cabinet and Council were able to note the draft Constitution for the WMCA which will be adopted by the Board at its inaugural meeting planned for June 2016, and following the parliamentary approval process.

On 17 November 2015 the initial and first devolution deal was agreed with Government which would provide for £8bn worth of investment in the region, supported by a £1bn investment from Government over the next 30 years. The deal also paved the way for a review into Adult Skills and Further Education provision, support to Troubled Families and the Youth Justice System, and committed Government to greater collaboration on activities including tackling worklessness, improved business support and inward investment, and support to the Combined Authorities proposed Commissions for Mental Health and Land. Since this time the WMCA Shadow Board has been engaged in a process of super clarification with Government on the devolution deal to ensure all parties understand the mechanisms and processes required to deliver the deal and its intended outcomes within the next 5 years as part of the Deal's 5-year gateway review process- a performance monitoring tool.

Next steps

- WMCA Board to adopt the Constitution at its inaugural meeting and soon thereafter establish the process for a form Scrutiny.
- Cabinet and Council will be asked to agree the devolution deal following the super clarification period highlighted above. This decision is most likely to be taken in the new municipal year.
- Cabinet and Council will be invited to approve the Mayoral Scheme which will set out the powers afforded to an elected Mayor which were established in principle by the Devolution Deal.
- Work will continuing to develop the WMCA work plan formed around the Devolution Deal and day-to-day operations of the WMCA, these include the WMCA Investment Strategy, Programme and Risk Management, consideration of future delivery mechanisms and considerations including the SEP, DIEM and Infrastructure Plan.
- The WMCA Commissions for land, productivity and mental health have been established and preparatory work has commenced on the Adult Skills Area Review.

Key risks

These risks need to be balanced against the risk that Walsall fails to close the gap in its economic performance relative to England. The wellbeing of Walsall's economy directly affects the wellbeing of the people who live here; a weak local economy has a massive

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

impact on all the services provided by the local authority and its partners. The Combined Authority proposals seek to mitigate this by drawing together strategic work across economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills and to potentially access additional funding from Government - tackling longstanding challenges of the West Midlands in a new way.

- *Pace of proposals*

Update: There continues to be momentum behind the WMCA Work Programme, with the expectations of both the Shadow Board and Government determining the pace of delivery and progression towards the creation of the WMCA. There is therefore both programme delivery risk and reputational risk associated with missing milestone dates.

- *Uncertainty over geographical scope*

Update: The uncertainty over membership has been reduced due to the agreed membership of the WMCA - the constituent and non constituent members. Given the potential revisions to the WMCA governance arrangements that could be brought about through the election of a mayor to the Combined Authority, a window of opportunity has been presented to those Council's within the 3 LEP geography who have not yet agreed to become constituent/ non constituent members to take a decision to join before a mayoral scheme is consulted upon and decisions taken on this in the new municipal year. If Council's chose not to participate at this stage then they will be unable to join the WMCA in the short term as constituent/ non constituent members but could chose to participate as 'associate members' contributing to debate but unable to legally take part in decision making.

- *Political support*

Update: As stated elsewhere formal decision making on the WMCA Scheme was taken in October 2015, and subsequently on the Order in March 2016. Further amendments to the WMCA combined authority scheme will be required if the devolution deal including provisions for powers and functions awarded to a mayor is agreed upon by the Constituent Councils

- *Failure to deliver benefits*

Update: There is a risk that the WMCA will fail to deliver economic benefits at a number of levels:

- There will be disproportionate benefits to the members of the WMCA, and Walsall will fail to derive any economic benefit from its participation in the combined authority (i.e. there will be a lack of balance in the benefits experienced by constituent members of the WMCA). Locally there is an ambition that the combined authority must seek to protect Walsall's priorities and seek the best advantage for our communities.

- The combined authority will not deliver additional economic benefits above and beyond those that could be achieved by the 3 constituent Local Enterprise Partnerships individually (i.e. the CA benefits will not be greater than the sum of its parts).

- *Devolution of powers*

Update: See assessment details on the devolution deal status. Government has informed all combined authorities that subject to a demonstration of success, further opportunities for devolution will be provided. Also, through the launch of the Midlands Engine-a collaboration between combined authorities across the West and East Midlands as a means of driving improved productivity- the Government has sought the Midlands regions' asks towards a package of strategic interventions formed around the following themes;

- Promotion
- Transport
- Research & Innovation
- Access to Finance
- Skills

If these asks are approved by Government this could see further investment and powers delegated to a regional way of working. This is an early initiative and a greater understanding of the 'Midlands Engine', its governance, and its programmes of activity will be achieved over the coming months.

- *Capacity*

Update: There continues to be a significant call upon senior Members, Senior Managements and officers across the organisation to take forward the WMCA work programme and devolution implementation plan. This is, therefore, still placing a risk that there is a reduced capacity for other duties and day-to-day management, which in turn puts pressure on officers who are not directly involved in the work.

- *Financial implications*

Update: There continues to be our costs associated with bringing about the creation of the WMCA in addition to costs associated with officer time, including consultancy and programme management costs. A further £500,000 was approved by Cabinet/ Council in March 2016 forming a contribution to the WMCA 2016/17, these monies are intended to be the transitional fund until such time that the WMCA can secure its own revenue income afforded through the Devolution Deal. In line with the

26

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

Devolution Deal funding commitments, an Investment Strategy is being prepared by the Finance Workstream which will articulate and propose the revenue and capital implications and funding options of the WMCA programmes/interventions.

- *Engagement and Local support*

Update: Continued engagement and consultation will be necessary and specifically there will be a need to consult upon any mayoral Scheme and Order in the new municipal year.

Key mitigation activities

<i>Pace of proposals</i> - The risk is being mitigated through robust programme management and the WMCA governance arrangements that oversees delivery of the work activity.	Chief Executive (PS)
<i>Uncertainty over geographical scope</i> - To ensure there is still collaboration with the local councils, who at this time have chosen not to become members, arrangements are being made to hold regular update meetings with these partners to enable them to continually keep under review their decision to join.	Chief Executive (PS)
<i>Political support</i> - There will be further decisions needed of the Cabinet and Council in due course; any mayoral Scheme created by the devolution deal and changes to legislation will require further engagement with elected members and stakeholders and the outcomes will be reported to the Cabinet/Council in order to approve any amendments.	Chief Executive (PS) / Head of Law (SP)
<i>Failure to deliver benefits</i> - The continued preparation of the WMCA Strategic Economic Plan, Performance Management Framework and Urban Economic Impact Model, and the associated workstreams to develop the Investment Strategy and Prioritisation Framework Assessment, all contribute to reducing the risk that Walsall and other areas do not derive any benefit from the WMCA and the devolution deal.	Executive Director Economy & Environment (SN)
<i>Devolution of powers</i> - See elsewhere for mitigation commentary which includes the super clarification process with Government.	Chief Executive (PS)
<i>Capacity</i> - The review of officer capacity is continually reviewed through regular internal WMCA meetings chaired by the Chief Executive. In turn the Economy and Environment senior management team review individual work plans to ensure competing priorities are managed and mitigation steps are taken accordingly.	Chief Executive (PS) / Executive Director Economy & Environment (SN)

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<i>Financial implications</i> - Work is underway to develop an investment strategy for the WMCA which will better inform the financial implications for the WMCA itself and the local councils.	Chief Executive (PS)
<i>Engagement and Local support</i> - Further engagement and consultation is therefore proposed to support Members in making informed decisions. This work is overseen by the WMCA Communications Group.	Team Leader Borough Wide Development (JN)

Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below]: None at this time of assessment.	<u>By Who</u>	<u>When:</u>
--	---------------	--------------

Progress to Date

<p>In addition to the ongoing mitigation activities outlined above the WMCA Work Programme in concentrating upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of the WMCA through the WMCA Order and preparations for a Mayoral Scheme. • Development of the WMCA Investment Strategy in accordance with the Devolution Deal proposals. • Interim appointments to the roles of WMCA Chief Executive and Chief Operating Officer. • Developing the WMCA Strategic Economic Plan and Performance Management Framework. • Delivering an Urban Economic Impact Model to inform future investment decision making and test outcomes/outputs. • Work to develop an investment prioritisation assessment framework is also underway and will feature an assessment of balance linked to the emerging performance management framework for the WMCA. Balance metrics developed, taking into account their alignment with the economic needs of Walsall. • Continued momentum through the Mental Health Commission on the formation of policy recommendations. • Chair nominated to the Land Commission and commissioners being approach to participate in the Commission's work. A review of inward investment models has commenced. • Active participate by WMCA Board representatives in the Midlands Engine and launch of the Midlands Engine Investment Prospectus. • Preparations being made to undertake Adult Skills Area Review. • New WMCA website and other communication tools being developed.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

5	Loss of community cohesion	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 2x4=8	March 2017

Risk Owner: Head of Business Change (PG)

Risk Description

Risk – the impact of migrant communities

The population of Walsall continues to increase and diversify. Numbers of eastern european migrants have grown, with concentrations in areas such as Caldmere and Darlaston. A spike in the number of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO's) has caused significant issues in some areas, where local residents feel the dynamics of their existing community are being threatened by these properties, which, it is perceived, are specifically aimed at housing migrants to Walsall, ex-offenders etc. Darlaston residents have been active in protests and social media campaigns against one particular social landlord and the impact such properties are having on their town. An ongoing issue in areas, such as Caldmere, is the impact of differing lifestyles. Groups gathering on the street to drink alcohol and other anti-social behaviours are having an ongoing impact on some sectors of the local community. Female residents have reported that such gatherings compromise their feelings of safety and others that the behaviour of the incoming migrant communities is at odds with that of the existing residents. In Caldmere, and in some town centre locations, there has been an increase in the reporting of anti social behaviour (ASB) and crime related issues which affect open spaces and some residential areas, again related to street drinking, urination, sexual activity etc. in public view. The actions of these small groups unfairly influences opinions of existing residents about migrant communities and, in turn, affects cohesion.

Risk – Counter Terrorism arrests and the impact upon the muslim community and broader community tensions

Recent arrests in Walsall under Counter Terrorism (CT) legislation have necessitated the need for partners to deliver targeted work to monitor community tensions and support the local muslim community. Similarly, events across the world, related to ISIS activity and the war in Syria have required partners to monitor local impact. New legislation relating to the Prevent agenda has put a specific duty upon the authority and its partners.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

Risk – arrests and media attention around so called ‘hidden crimes’ such as Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and human trafficking and the impact upon certain communities and professions

So called ‘hidden crimes’ such as CSE, human trafficking and female genital mutilation (FGM) continue to place a focus, sometimes unwarranted, on certain communities and professions, which can impact upon cohesion and prevalence of hate crimes.

Extreme Right Wing (XRW) - arrests, local, national and international events which place media attention upon our muslim communities. Historic and ongoing local links to XRW organisations.

Local CT and CSE related arrests have attracted the attention of extreme and perceived to be right wing organisations. An English Defence League (EDL) gathering took place in the town centre in 2015 and partners are preparing for an event by the United Patriots in February 2016. With court appearances by those arrested under CT legislation due to take place soon, Walsall continues to be on the radar of XRW groups. In addition, there is evidence of right wing support/activity of eastern european XRW organisations. There is potential for these supporters to swell the ranks of existing organisations known to us which may target Walsall

Muslim Burials – inability to meet the faith requirements of the muslim community

Bereavement and Registration Services continue to work with our muslim communities in order to accommodate the requirements of their faith and ensure burial takes place as soon as possible after death (within 24 hours where practicable.) Burials may take place every day, except Christmas Day and evening burials are available at Streetly Cemetery up to 8.30pm from April –September. Should a reduction in resources compromise the ability of the relevant service to provide this facility, there would undoubtedly be a far reaching impact on community tensions and the relationship between the muslim community and this authority. Similarly, should exceptions be made for some faiths that are not afforded to others, this too could lead to challenge.

Emerging Issues

A challenge for cohesion is that, given the resources available and the ‘higher profile’ and more immediate issues that are presenting in the borough, other groups and communities with protected characteristics may be disadvantaged in terms of focus, support and services.

There are early concerns about a possible increase in secularisation within the muslim faith which is beginning to manifest in some areas.

Key mitigation activities

30

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

<p>The annual refresh of the Safer Walsall Partnerships Community Safety Plan will continue to show counter terrorism, community cohesion and hate crime as strategic priorities</p> <p>The Corporate and Public Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee have established a working group on the theme of community cohesion which has been meeting since Nov. 2015 and concludes at the end of Feb 2016. The group was established in order to consider the rapidly changing face of Walsall's diverse communities and how best the authority might respond to the need to develop and maintain cohesion and integration through positive engagement.</p> <p>The rationale of the working group is to explore how a wide range of key individual, agencies and groups view social integration; their attitudes and experience of life in Walsall and, from the findings, make a number of recommendations to Full Council which will also feed into a new and intelligence led integration strategy for 2016-18.</p> <p>From April 2015, Walsall became a Prevent priority area, under the Office for Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT), which has brought funding for a dedicated Prevent Co-ordinator and delivery of prescribed projects.</p> <p>Bereavement and Registration Services are working with key agencies on a public consultation exercise in order to ensure full consideration is given to any additional requirements of our communities.</p>	<p>Community Safety Manager (LDH)</p> <p>Bereavement & Registration Srvcs Mngr (SB)</p>
---	---

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved hate crime analysis needs to be delivered. 	} Community } Safety } Manager } (LDH)	Mar 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclude consultation and develop a strategic response and delivery plan in readiness for the new financial year, if possible, so that spend is aligned to identified strategic priorities. 		Mar/Apr 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve links with Strategic Housing and other providers in order to monitor incoming migrant/refugee communities and ensure early and appropriate engagement takes place. 		Mar 2016

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
 3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

Progress to Date

- In response to the Counter Terrorism and Security Act (July 2015) the governance structure around this agenda has changed and now consists of a high level CONTEST group and a PREVENT group which supports partners in ensuring the council and its partners meet the statutory 'PREVENT DUTY.' A revised strategic plan reflects this.
- Delivery of projects, funded through OSCT continues. Confirmation of year 2 funding for the Co-ordinator post and delivery is expected, but not yet received.
- Improved hate crime analysis has been initiated.
- Cohesion projects continue to be targeted to those communities most at risk, though abstraction remains a concern, given the need to respond to ongoing presenting risks.
- Post to work with eastern european migrant communities is in place.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

20a	Failure to safeguard children	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 3x3 =9	Ongoing

Risk Owner: Executive Director - Children's Services (DH)

Risk Description

Failure to ensure effective partnership practice in safeguarding children will result in significant harm, abuse or death for vulnerable residents of all ages. This has serious regulatory and reputational implications and risks, including intervention, for the council and the wider partnership, with serious consequences for service users and loss of confidence by local residents.

Key mitigation activities

Effective Children Safeguarding Boards, with good working arrangements and protocols between the Boards that support the protection of vulnerable children.	Executive Director – Children's Srvcs (DH)
Quality and effective front line practice.	Respective safeguarding Boards; Executive Director- Children's Srvcs (DH) and teams
Good multi-agency partnership working.	As above
Effective and comprehensive quality assurance.	Executive Director – Childrens

33

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

	(DH) and teams
--	----------------

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who</u>	<u>When:</u>
Timely replacement of ICS system, comprehensive migration of data and effective training for users.	Integrated Childrens System (ICS) programme board	Start April 2015 and phased to Oct 2015
Review of partnership arrangements to identify and respond to the scale of child sexual exploitation (CSE) is a fast emerging high risk for both children and adults safeguarding.	Safeguarding Boards working with regional PVVP group to ensure effective oversight	Ongoing

Progress to Date

The key mitigating activities listed above are in place but it is critical to ensure that that they continue in a sustainable and improved way. For Children we have reported actions and their impact to the Improvement Board since September 2012. There was a final meeting with DfE officials in March 2015 which concluded the DfE's monitoring and intervention in Walsall Children's Services. As an outcome of our self-evaluation there are a number of areas of practice that require continued focused improvement and monitoring. Following the half yearly performance review identifying significant priorities, a monthly Performance Board to challenge practice and monitor impact and progress will be in place from November 2015, chaired by DCS and with external challenge and scrutiny. Significant improvement work is taking place against a set of priorities to ensure that the services work is not inadequate.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

We regularly self assess and share that with partners, play a full part in our safeguarding board, conduct assurance meetings in line with guidance and are regulated regularly. A six weekly assurance meeting of the impact, outcomes, and progress of the Children's Safeguarding Board is chaired by the Chief Executive and attended by the Cabinet Member Children's Services, DCS, Police and Health representatives, independent adviser and chair of the Education Challenge Board.

The newly appointed Safeguarding Board Chair across Adult and Children's Services took appointment in September 2015. Organisational changes to bring forward strategic and operational alignment between the Boards is in consideration and will result in changes from next financial year.

Child sexual exploitation (CSE) is currently a high profile risk element in keeping adults and children safe. Work is current and ongoing to ensure that Walsall's response is proportionate, evidenced and effective. This work has been monitored externally with very positive outcomes. It has been reported to Children's Scrutiny Panel, Health and Wellbeing Board and Children and Young People's Partnership Board. There is very good collaborative working between the Police and the local authority. The multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH) is now operational and will further strengthen partnership work across agencies. Walsall has a strong strategic and operational group that works to prevent and manage risks to young people. A programme of multi-agency audits managed by the Safeguarding Children's Board helps to identify themes, areas of improved action and next step priorities to safeguard children across the Partnership, for example CSE.

There is much focus in Children's Services on the quality and effectiveness of frontline social work practice. A detailed and robust performance management policy and information is in place to enable effective management of performance improvement. Most indicators are improving; where they are not improvement plans are in place. Monthly audits of practice are undertaken and analysed to identify any weaknesses; the outcomes of the audits are improving. The new Information Management system implementation is progressing to meet an early November deadline. Improvement plans are put in place to address weaknesses and senior management oversight is in place with team and practice managers to focus on improving quality of frontline practice. A service restructure in April 2015 introduced the role of a practice manager within each team to focus on practice quality and with manageable case loads in all teams there should be good impact. Observations of practice will be re-introduced from April 2015 alongside supervision, to add to the quality assurance evidence. The caseloads are increasing (up to 25) and for the first time in 2 years there are unallocated cases. 3 more agency social workers have been recruited to ensure caseloads are manageable and that there are no unallocated cases.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)
Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

20b	Failure to safeguard all vulnerable adults	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 3x3 =9	Ongoing

Risk Owner: Interim Executive Director - Adult Services (KS)

Risk Description

Failure to ensure effective partnership practice in safeguarding vulnerable adults will result in significant harm, abuse or death for vulnerable residents of all ages. This has serious regulatory and reputational implications and risks, including intervention, for the council and the wider partnership, with serious consequences for service users and loss of confidence by local residents.

Key mitigation activities

Effective Adult Safeguarding Boards, with good working arrangements and protocols between the Boards that support the protection of vulnerable adults.	Executive Director – Adult & Social Svcs (KS)
Quality and effective front line practice.	Respective safeguarding Boards; Executive Director – Adult & Social Svcs (KS) and teams
Good multi-agency partnership working.	As above
Effective and comprehensive quality assurance.	Executive Director –

38

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

CMT Risk Register – January 2016

Appendix 1(iii)

	Adult & Social Srvcs (KS) and teams
--	---

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure Mental Capacity Act [especially Deprivation of Liberty (DOLS) requirements in the light of legal judgements] is applied across all partners and assured through the Safeguarding Adults Board. The specific risk is the significant rise since April 2014 (in line with national trends) in the volume of DOLS referrals and the capacity to meet those. Awareness / training across elected Members and council staff. 	<u>By Who</u> Head of Community Care (AC)	<u>When:</u> Ongoing
	Workforce Development Mngr (LK)	Ongoing

Progress to Date

The key mitigating activities listed above are in place but it is critical to ensure that that they continue in a sustainable and improved way. For Children we have reported actions and their impact to the Improvement Board since September 2012.

Safeguarding of Adults has been place on a statutory basis since April 2015 with extensive cross agency training and a revised Safeguarding Adults Board governance. The progress by the board is reported annually to Scrutiny and in a published report (ie: November 2015).

Further work on awareness and training across elected Members and council staff generally is still necessary. Cross agency training and practice development is necessary to fully implement the Making Safeguarding Personal requirements under the Care Act.

There have been two Serious Case Reviews carried out in the last 12 months. These are due to be finalised by the Board by February 2016.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

11	Demographic Change	Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Achieved by
		Feb 2016	(1xL) 3x4=12	(1xL) 3x4=12	Nov 2016

Risk Owner: Interim Executive Director – Social Care & Inclusion (KS)

Risk Description

The tension between short-term cuts and long-term goals is illustrated by demographic changes. Demographic change could in future have a significant impact on the delivery of the council's objectives. The Corporate Plan 2015/16 has the priority for improving health and well being includes the following desired outcomes:

- Gaps in life expectancy between the least and most deprived wards in the borough are reduced
- More people living healthier and more active lifestyles
- Reduced childhood obesity leading to healthier adult lifestyles
- Fewer vulnerable adults and older people needing intensive support and for shorter periods
- More vulnerable adults living meaningful lives in their own homes with fewer people living in long term residential or nursing care

But Walsall has a changing and ageing population and there will be challenges as this demographic transition occurs.

There are rising numbers of very elderly and disabled people liable to need support, because of:

- High birth rate in 1920s (between end of WW1 and 1930s depression) and in the 1960's
- Larger numbers of disabled children and adults with life long conditions
- Lifespan rising faster than years of healthy life (the anticipated rise in people over 65 years is nearly twice the national average i.e. 45% in the next 10 years)
- Increasing numbers of people with dementia
- Larger numbers of people caring for family or friends
- Lower levels of male adult life spans than the national average

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

- Higher levels of infant mortality than the national average.

Key mitigation activities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good intelligence on the structure and dynamics of the borough's population, e.g. rising birth rate coinciding with increasing numbers of very elderly, stretching the working age population dependency ratio. Public health and a joint Council/CCG commissioned study into demand and demographic factors is under way. • Maximising prevention, independence and self-reliance through individual, family and community capacity building, to reduce dependence on expensive statutory services. • Adult health and social care plans which maximises preventative interventions, thereby reducing the need for long term intensive and expensive care, and targeting help to those most at risk of admissions to hospital or care homes. The integration of health and social care is underway in identifying and working those people over 75 years most at risk of hospital and care home admissions. • Understanding and acting on the role of all council – and partner – services in the prevention agenda. This is not exclusively a children's and adult social care issue. Reducing demand on public support is explicit within the new cross directorate service and budget plans for 2016-20. • Working towards minimising better outcomes, at lower costs through a new delivery plan from January 2016 following a peer challenge in November 2015. • Maximising service user contributions towards meeting the costs of services, while ensuring ability to pay through the Community Based Charging Policy. • Work continues between Bereavement and Registration Services and the muslim communities in order to accommodate the requirements of their faith and ensure burial takes place as soon as possible after death [corporate risk number 5 refers]. 	Public Health (BW) / Head of Finance (VB)/ Economic Intelligence Mngr (EC) / ED – Social Care & Inclusion (KS)/ Bereavement and Registration Services Manager (SB)
--	--

<u>Are Further Actions required? [If so, list below:]</u>	<u>By Who:</u>	<u>When:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure fed into the annual budget round, medium term financial plan and long term financial plan – explicit reference to mitigations outlined in the draft budget plan 2016-2020. 	Head of Finance (VB)	Quarterly

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of Better Care Fund Plan for 2015/16 and plans for continued joint health and social care commissioning in 2016/17. • Regular review of the demographics; monitor, change and adapt accordingly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2011 census detail; - Annual mid year estimates 	Executive Director – Social Care & Inclusion (KS)	Ongoing (5 year plan through to 2019/2020)
	Economic Intelligence Mngr (EC)	Annual (September)

Progress to Date

The revenue budget for 2015/16 and in draft plans for 2016-2020 reflects the mitigation activities detailed above, in particular the maximisation of prevention and alignment of our operating model. The development of the Better Care Fund Plan, the new Charging Policy, and the implementation of the Care Act are all on track. A revised analysis of demand from older people has been commissioned for Joint Commissioning Committee by April 2016.

There are indications in the acute hospital of greater demand from older people which is placing pressure upon the whole system. Reablement and social work services, working closely with NHS partners, are the key to the mitigation and constitute the main focus for the next two years on containing demand.

The Children and Families Act 2014 is providing requirements and opportunities this year to develop joint working with Children's services for those in transition and thereby ensure better outcomes at lower costs in meeting that demand. A more detailed and targeted action plan for special education needs and disabilities is underway for 2016/17.

Impact: 1=Negligible (Little effect to organisational objectives) 2=Marginal (Affects some of the organisational objectives)
3=Critical (Affects most of the organisational objectives) 4=Catastrophic (Affects all of the organisational objectives)

Likelihood: 1=Almost Impossible; 2=Very Low; 3=Low; 4=Significant; 5=High; 6=Very High.