

Services Risk Register - 2014/15

Division		Services					Date Last Reviewed	13 June 2014			
Director		Nick Lester					Reviewed By	NL / SP / MVM / RR / SB / SC			
Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1- 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1- 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall

GENERAL

A1	Staff management	Compliance, Financial, Operational, Project	Loss of key staff would reduce capacity to undertake work plan; Services would cease or reduce, good will of contractors and customers lost; Sickness, transport chaos. Low morale in times of difficulties.	4	3	12	Maintain good staff relations and communication. To review business processes to improve efficiencies and reliability and to enhance the disaster recovery plan.	Nick Lester, Corporate Director of Services	3	2	6
A2	Poor quality work in representing boroughs	Reputation and Financial	Inappropriate or inaccurate work by officers in representing borough interests. Lobbying ineffective. Lack of invitations to attend events and meetings	2	3	6	Recruitment of appropriate staff and effective staff management	Nick Lester, Corporate Director of Services	1	3	3
A3	Achievability and impact of targets on service delivery	Financial	Failure to achieve targets being set and/or affects delivery of services that we are responsible for delivering.	3	4	12	To look at savings and to monitor the process	Nick Lester, Corporate Director of Services	2	3	6
A4	Failing to provide input into key policy areas affecting London Councils members/ ineffective lobbying	External Project Reputation London	May result in key decision makers not understanding or taking account of the role and needs of boroughs and their residents. Would lose confidence of boroughs in London Councils ability to represent their interests.	2	3	6	Key GLA and govt. policy and legislative developments potentially affecting boroughs, Londoners and London's VCS regularly monitored. Formal London Councils responses developed for key London issues. Developing alliances with partners, including VCS in London to enhance lobbying. Relationships developed with key decision makers. Schedule for briefings in place to support members in effective lobbying.	Nick Lester (Corporate Director), Richard Reeve (Tribunal Manager), Spencer Palmer (Director - T+M), Simon Courage (Head of Grants and Community Services), Mary Vine-Morris, Director (Young People's Education & Skills)	1	2	2

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
A5	Mishandling or misplacing of sensitive personal data	Compliance, Financial, Reputation	Sensitive personal data released to unauthorised people	2	4	8	Security. Strict controls on receipt and management of data. Use of secure systems such as Notify and promotion of best practice on secure information sharing between organisations through Data Share London, including model agreements and protocol documents	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M), Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	4	4
A6	ICT failure causes loss of processing capability and inability to deliver public facing and other key services. ICT contractor going into liquidation.	Compliance, Operational & Financial, Project, Reputation, London, Strategic	The main servers for CF, PATAS, Taxicard and LLCS are remote and their loss would severely limit the availability of critical data and could lead to the suspension of public facing services. These and other services (including Grants and notify procurement) are also dependent on the Southwark Street IT network leading to additional complexity in managing continuity. Other services such as LCP are dependent on external IT providers.	4	4	16	The ICT contractor and the in-house IT team have jointly agreed and regularly reviewed disaster recovery programmes are in place, including fault reporting protocols.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M), Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager, and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	2	2	4
A7	General failure or delay in delivery of projects involving external partners	Reputation Financial and Operational	Failure to deliver on time and to budget project involving 3rd parties (evidence application for TfL/IBM)	3	3	9	Monitoring and liaison with all relevant parties.	Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer	1	3	3
A8	Failure to comply with equalities legislation and good practice	Compliance, External, Operational, Reputation	To be effective, as well as to comply with legislation, the needs of London's diverse population must be reflected in commissioning priorities, the delivery of commissioned services and in any review into the size and scope of the grants scheme.	3	3	9	All specifications for commissioned services have been subject to assessment for equalities impact. Services are targetted at whosoever has the need for that service. More generally, equalities awareness introduced to every divisional meeting; equalities implications are part of all reports to Committee(s). Staff trained on London Councils equalities approach and legislative requirements.	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services, Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M), and Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager, Mary Vine-Morris, Director (Young People's Education & Skills)	2	2	4
A9	Political / legislative change	Reputation Operational Compliance External	Local authority powers / responsibilities could diminish: legislation could transfer local authority powers/responsibilities to other organisations (e.g. VCS, local groups, providers).	3	4	12	Contributing to policy development. Prepare for options following period of local elections.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director, Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M) and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	2	2	4

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
A10	Supplier failure	Financial, Operational, Reputation	Supplier failure puts operational services in jeopardy.	2	4	8	<p>Business continuity plan and intelligence about spotting any potential failures at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Regular liaison with all suppliers and working together to resolve issues as they arise.</p>	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M), Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
TRANSPORT AND MOBILITY											
B1	Failure to negotiate Freedom Pass settlement with transport operators by 31 December 2014	Reputation	Statutory default scheme kicks in (which would be more expensive for boroughs and would impact on London Councils' reputation).	3	3	9	Ongoing discussions with TfL over the deal and on production of data.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	2	3	6
B2	2015 Freedom Pass Reissue	Operational, Reputation, Financial	Failure to reissue all or a significant proportion of 900K passes by end of March 2015. Significant cost escalation of reissue project. Failure to deal adequately with increase in customer enquiries.	2	4	8	Early start to planning and preparation. Outsourcing of reissue processing and customer support to existing contractor. Regular project board meetings with key stakeholders. Regular budget monitoring, reporting and control.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M) and Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer	1	3	3
B3	Taxicard applications not assessed.	Operational	Applicants will not receive their cards. Complaints re London Councils performance	1	3	3	Systems in place and managed	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	1	1
B4	Taxicard fraud	Operational, Reputation	Users or drivers misuse cards	2	2	4	Detailed audit checks in place	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	2	2
B5	Taxicard financial management problems	Reputation, operational and financial	To run out of money for Taxicard part way through the year or underspend	3	3	9	Contract management arrangements.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	2	2
B6	Parking services (TRACE, DVLA link, Northampton County Court link) fail	Operational, Reputation	Borough enforcement compromised and public confidence effected	1	3	3	Capita disaster recovery	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	2	2
B7	Parking / Traffic enforcement advice, guidance not provided	Compliance, Operational, Reputation	Boroughs left to own devices and no standardisation	1	4	4	Regular meetings scheduled and advice provided and updated	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	1	1

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
B8	LEPT currency variation	Financial	Rate fluctuation will impact on the LEPT budgets. Lack of income to cover budget.	3	2	6	Constant monitoring	Spencer Palmer, Director (T&M)	3	1	3
B9	HEB permits not issued; HEB permit applications not checked	Financial, Operational, Reputation	Medical practitioners issued with PCNs while on emergency calls; Permits issued to non-emergency attendees	1	3	3	Issuing processing system in place, limited scale of scheme means easy to relocate; Checks in place	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	1	1
B10	Lorry Control permits not processed	Operational	Hauliers without permits forced to travel illegally	1	3	3	Permit issue system in place	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	2	2
B11	Lorry Control routing advice not provided	Operational	Hauliers not given opportunity to confirm legality of route	2	3	6	Routing advice available	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	1	2	2
B12	Significant Lorry Control enforcement does not take place	Operational	Hauliers allowed to make illegal journeys. Generates complaints from boroughs and public	3	3	9	Contract management of the NSL contract.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	2	2	4
B13	Lorry Control PCNs not processed	Financial, Operational	Enforcement not demonstrated, no revenue	4	3	12	PCN processing system in place	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	3	2	6
B14	Mid-Term Freedom Pass review issues (Risk removed on 12 May 2014)										

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
PATAS											
C1	New regulations require changes to systems	Compliance, External	New regulations require substantial changes to London Councils systems	2	3	6	Managed Services contractual change mechanism in place , involvement in Government working parties	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M) and Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager	2	2	4
C2	London Councils Offices/PATAS hearing centre unavailable	Financial, Operational, Reputation, Strategic	Office and hearing centre facilities become unavailable due to building defect, incident in building or other emergency; causing service interruption which might also affect remote services.	1	3	3	SGPS disaster recovery and plans to move essential processes to remote site. Remote working from home/other available office space (SGPS/London Councils). If necessary PATAS could suspend work for one week and personal hearings for one month. Remote access is available for home/external working on Grants activities.	Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M), Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2
C3	Court Judgement requiring significant changes to systems and processes	Operational	Judgement in High Court or Court of Appeal requires major changes in practice / procedures	2	4	8	Contingency budget for IT /info /publicity development - manual workarounds while developments being installed	Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager	1	3	3
C4	Adjudicator unavailability	Operational	Lack of sufficient adjudicators.	2	4	8	Amending personal hearings if unable to cover them	Caroline Hamilton, Ingrid Persadsingh, Chief Adjudicators, and Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager	1	4	4
C5	New areas of activity	Operational, Financial, Reputation, Strategic	Taking on new areas of activity that we cannot properly deliver.	3	3	9	Proper analysis and all relevant approvals in advance.	Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager and Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	2	2	4
C6	POPLA	Operational, Financial, Reputation, Strategic	Failure to deliver POPLA effectively on time or within budget.	3	4	12	Effective management and liaison with BPA.	Richard Reeve, Tribunal Manager and Spencer Palmer, Director (T+M)	2	2	4
C7	Capita contract	Operational, Financial and Reputation	Capita fail to deliver on the contract on operating PATAS.	3	4	12	Contract monitoring arrangements	Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer	2	2	4
C8	Capita contract transfer	Operational, Financial and Reputation	In the event of a change of contractor following retender, the service is severely disrupted by the transfer of personel and systems.	3	4	12	Agree service tranfer plan with existing contractor. Regular demobilisation and mobilisation liaison meetings. Contract preparation and planning. Contingency arrangements with Capita.	Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer	2	2	4

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall

GRANTS

D1	Failure to deliver current grants programme 2013/15: not monitoring/ demonstrating the impact of funding according to outcomes in the service specifications for Grants funded services including ESF schemes	Financial, Project, Reputation, London, Strategic	Grant Programme fails to deliver outputs, and outcomes as outlined for each service specification. Risk ability to deliver business plan, the future allocation of funding for the Grants Scheme, London Councils' reputation.	3	4	12	Quarterly RAG rating of providers. Performance management framework to rectify poor performance, supplemented by robust monitoring of funded organisations.	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2
D2	Not releasing payments when due	Financial Operational Project Reputation	Grant payments are made to organisations on a quarterly basis following the receipt and acceptance of quarterly reporting. Failure to pay organisations on time could damage their cashflow position and undermine their ability to deliver the objectives of the programme.	2	4	8	Grants officers are set targets of paying providers within four weeks of approving the quarterly report. They are monitored to ensure this happens. Where either officers or providers do not meet requirements performance management measures will be put in place.	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2
D3	Non-receipt of match funding for the programme (borough and/or ESF).	Financial Operational Project Reputation	Payments are made to London Councils from two sources: - ESF (payments in arrears) - Boroughs (payments in advance) Receipt of both sources of income are required in order to pay providers and ensure that London Councils does not run deficits on the ESF programmes. Either could have an negative impact on programme delivery and the financial health of London Councils and providers.	3	2	6	Controls to be developed as part of the handover from MB to SB. SB has developed a financial management template that tracks this information. The following inputs are required to make this operational: - Complete list of borough purchase order numbers to ensure invoices can be raised: - Invoice request forms completed and sent to finance on quarterly basis - Finance to provide regular report of invoices sent and amounts paid - Quarterly calculation of programme expenditure - Quarterly claims made to ESF - Record kept of ESF payments received	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	3	1	3

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1- 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1- 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
D4	Audit and controls on programmes insufficient and lead to failures putting at risk borough and ESF investment.	Financial Operational Project Reputation	In general, the London Councils Grants Programme is under increasing scrutiny. It is vital that funding is spent on the activities for which it is intended. In particular, ESF is subject to a strict audit regime and receives a minimum of four audit visits per year. At audit, financial claims made by London Councils for S48 and ESF monies must be able to be verified against programme and project records. Where the records do not match claims made, irregularities are reported. If this occurs, London Councils would not be fulfilling its statutory duties and would also be required to repay associated ESF funding.	4	3	12	Controls include: -Strict guidance to providers on ESF regulations -Detailed checking of provider claims prior to payment -Quarterly monitoring visits to providers -Thorough preparation for audit These controls are not currently being applied as well as they should be to the Community Grants element of the programme due to unmet staffing requirement. - NB arrangements with GLE important for M&A costs	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	2	1	2
D5	London Councils fails to match its allocation of ESF - currently ca £4.1m short.	Project Reputation	London Councils has a total ESF allocation of £25.5m and has match funded £21.4m. This leaves a total of £4.1m ESF to be matched. This situation is due to a combination of factors; underspends from previous rounds of funding and a reduction in S48 funding to the ESF programme. The way to mitigate this risk is to offer boroughs the opportunity to match fund the ESF, as has been done previously. Should London Councils not be able to match fund the ESF, this could undermine London Councils continued position as an ESF Co-financing Organisation (CFO)	2	2	4	Letter sent to borough Chief Execs and borough contacts emailed.	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	2	1	2

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall

COMMUNITY SERVICES

E1	London Care Services fails to deliver savings and service improvements for children supported by London boroughs	Reputation and financial	Poor response by providers of children's services and boroughs; recommendations on fees and charges not sustainable	3	3	9	Effective arrangements for engaging providers and boroughs through web, interviews and alignment with borough priorities	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2
E2	notify 2 fails to maintain support of London boroughs	Reputation and operational	Failure to effect notifications of data between boroughs; loss of data	3	3	9	Engagement of borough officers; security of data	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	3	2	6
E3	Service delivery failures as a result of providers withdrawing services to boroughs and not achieving efficiencies	reputational and operational	Failure to support boroughs, user interests and providers in delivery of excellent services	2	2	4	Engagement of borough officers and effective consultation with providers and users in key areas such as data sharing, briefing boroughs, transition of children to adult independence	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	1	2	2
E4	London Care Services fails to engage effectively with key stakeholders - the board, boroughs, sub-regions, DfE and PaPA - thereby making its work less relevant	Financial and operational.	Work becomes less relevant. Members question the value of the service and cease paying. Revenue decreases. Ability to deliver undermined.	3	3	9	Regular board meetings at which timely, accurate and relevant information about the service is provided.	Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services	2	2	4

YPES

F1	Lack of understanding of the needs of London's young learners	Reputation Operational	There is a risk that if policy and strategy are developed independent of the needs of young people, they will not achieve the necessary transformation of the sector in London	2	4	8	Improving the engagement of young people and key stakeholders in "Learner Voice London", participating in critical projects (such as the LEP) with strategic partners and maintaining a robust evidence base with our Data and Academic Partners	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2
F2	Partnership of stakeholder working loses coherence	Reputation Operational	Partner disengagement imperils funding and will reflect badly on London Councils' ability to coordinate, lead and influence boroughs effectively	2	3	6	Board and working group structure maximises partner engagement	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
F3	Implementing the strategic vision for young people's education and skills does not contribute to the achievement of full participation for 16-18 year-olds by 2015	Reputation Operational	YPES' work plan does not address the major priorities of Local Authorities, or influence their operations	3	3	9	Quarterly meetings of all London LAs (Forum / conference) together with workshops / seminars on specialist themes ensures a constant focus on Local Authorities' priorities	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2
F4	YPES does not link effectively with nor influence key decision makers such as the DfE, LGA, GLA and ALDCS	Compliance Financial Reputation Operational	Failure to identify critical factors to inform and influence local and regional environment	2	3	6	Maintain effective working relationship with other strategic partners and suppliers	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2
F5	London is not adequately prepared for the reform of provision for young people with Special Education Needs and Disabilities, including funding	Compliance Financial Reputation Operational	YPES does not influence the development of national policy or the effective implementation of the reforms in London	3	3	9	Scanning the policy horizon and keeping abreast of legislation enables YPES to provide a creative input to key decisions appropriately, while uprating the structures that provide support to SEN / LLDD ensures systematic and consistent Pan London implementation	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	3	3
F6	The ESF Youth Programme for 2014-2020 lacks integrated commissioning	Operational	There is a risk that, without integrated commissioning, different funding streams may duplicate their effort, compete inefficiently for recruits and dilute their collective impact on youth unemployment	3	3	9	Delivery of the work programme of the External Funding Group and maintaining strategic influence with key partners	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	2	3	4

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
G1	London Councils does not manage its Capital Ambitions programme and projects effectively	Compliance Financial Reputation Operational	Lack of programme and project management will expose London Councils to financial and / or reputational loss (including failure under audit or legal challenge)	3	3	9	Robust programme management in place; a programme review is underway, instigating active and immediate remedial actions if and when necessary; ongoing scrutiny by Capital Ambition Board and sub-groups Note the Capital Ambition Board has closed the fund to new applications, limiting the scope for new issues.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2
G2	Capital Ambition projects run in partnership (e.g. those co-funded or sponsored by private sector organisations) are distorted and become inconsistent with the values and / or behaviours expected of London Councils	Compliance Financial Reputation Operational	Some private sector practices may be unacceptable to London Councils and some organisations may not be attracted by the degree of transparency associated with dealing with London Councils and their partners - this could impact on the initiation, the means and the outcomes of delivery	3	4	12	Work on a future organisational model is led by the Capital Ambition Board and managed by senior officers with consistent reference to London Councils requirements; upfront, clear, open and honest communication with partners; and reference to specialist advisers as and when necessary (e.g. governance, legal, finance and procurement).	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	1	2	2
G3	Capital Ambition projects do not deliver and / or realise benefits for participating local authorities / boroughs	Compliance Financial Reputation Operational Project	Boroughs will not realise benefits from the work and will have to absorb the costs and opportunity costs where investment in projects does not demonstrate benefits. Government and local authorities will be less likely to involve or support London Councils in future improvement and efficiency work, potentially missing the advantages of regional leadership and scale fostered by London Councils and the Capital Ambition brand.	3	3	9	Note that this risk has largely been shared out by commissioning project lead local authorities and partners to control day-to-day project management. Programme management activities are expected to identify issues with delivery and assure remedial actions are instigated; staged delivery and monitoring will manage these risks and financial controls are in place to regulate spending.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	2	2	4

Risk Management				Risk Rating (without controls)					Risk Rating (with controls)		
Risk No.	Risk	Type of Risk	Risk Description (including Implications)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall	Controls in Place	Risk Owner (Name & Position)	Likelihood (1 - 4)	Impact (1 - 4)	Overall
G4	Capital Ambition London Ventures does not deliver projects with demonstrable benefits for participating local authorities and boroughs	External Project Reputation London Strategic	This risk centres on London Ventures failing to generate projects that deliver LC and borough priorities and demonstrable results; or by extension, generating projects with negative impacts on LC and boroughs. LV is currently embryonic, building relationships and has to define viable projects and meaningful measures of success. The project constraints remain tight. Implications include: potential damage to key relationships with local authorities and other stakeholders and a reduced willingness towards future partnership working, with impacts on the reputation of LC and on public service delivery.	4	2	8	Controls include: defining and delimiting the project scope as a "brokerage" role; buying in expertise from and sharing risks (notably reputational) with Ernst & Young and to an extent with voluntary private and local authority stakeholders. Directing delivery through LC governance arrangements; managing contract specifications and clear gateways e.g. controlled investment and payment schedule; clearly staged project cycle, with deliverables and key performance indicators; and ensuring dialogue with key stakeholders and managing communications at all project stages.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	2	1	2
G5	Capital Ambition does not use unallocated resources to best strategic effect	Compliance Financial Project Reputation London Strategic	This risk centres on LC failing to use unallocated resources to optimise improvement, innovation or efficiency. The effects could include: delayed decisions; efforts are duplicated; delivery is untimely; strategic opportunities are missed or resources are wasted, delivering no demonstrable benefits.	3	2	6	Controls include: defining and delimiting clear strategic options for decision-makers; ensuring decision-making is aligned with and informed by policy 'horizon-scanning' through active relationships with members, LV, PAPA, LGA, LCEN and project leading boroughs; work to ensure commissioning is robust', including clear business cases, delivery mechanisms and anticipated benefits, explicit grant award agreements; and an ongoing programme management capacity for work during the coming period.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	2	2	4
G6	Capital Ambition does not effect adequate project closures, securing information about benefits and legacies for wider communication and dissemination	External Operational Project Reputation London	This risk centres on LC failing to close down the CA projects and programme effectively. The implications are that there is no coordinated dissemination and access to knowledge and learning about benefits and legacies for London authorities and potentially dissatisfaction amongst key stakeholders concerning LC delivery of intended CA outcomes.	4	1	4	Controls include: ongoing member-led governance to ensure clear communications priorities; ongoing programme management capacity, with an emphasis on working with project leaders, collating and communicating information about programme benefits realisation and legacies; work through London Ventures to build on legacy relationships and arrangements where appropriate and ensure due credit; and increased support from LC Communications to identify and exploit appropriate communications opportunities; including refocussing the CA brand within the LC portfolio and programming future communications.	Mary Vine-Morris, Director	2	1	2