

Directorate	Policy & Public Affairs	Date Last Reviewed	14 March 2016	3 November 15	Aug 15
Director	Dick Sorabji	Reviewed By	PAPA MT	Corporate Governance Group	CMB

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	Risk Rating without control (1-4)			Controls in place	Responsible Officer	Risk rating with control (1-4)		
				L	I	O			L	I	O
P&PA1	Loss of member authority support	Strategic, reputation,	Ineffective work results in member authorities withdrawing from London Councils	2	3	6	Regular reporting to member groups, various communication tools to engage borough members and officers and other stakeholders	Corporate Director for Policy and Public Affairs	1	3	3
P&PA 2	Inability to meet all stakeholder expectations with resource base	Operational, Project	Inability to cover the depth and breadth of issues that members or stakeholders would wish given normal resourcing constraints	2	3	6	Regular reviews of work programme by PAPA management team. Flexible deployment of resources. Regular engagement with member Portfolio holders	Corporate Director for Policy and Public Affairs	1	3	3
P&PA 3	Weak or defective analysis/ technical mistakes	Project, reputation	Errors in analysis could lead to inappropriate lines being taken, lobbying being ineffective or significant loss of reputation	2	3	6	Work and reports are completed by appropriate staff and cross-checked by more senior officers prior to publication. Involve boroughs directly in specifications for research.	Chief Officers of PAPA	1	3	3

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	Risk Rating without control (1-4)			Controls in place	Responsible Officer	Risk rating with control (1-4)		
				L	I	O			L	I	O
P&PA 4	Ineffective relationships with key stakeholders and with key decision makers	Strategic, reputation	Failure to develop effective partnerships is likely to reduce the quality of policy and service developments, which may result in key decision makers not understanding or taking account of the role and needs of boroughs and could result in duplication, for example between London Councils and the LGA.	2	2	4	Key partners identified during business planning process and stakeholder database developed.	PAPA Management Team	1	2	2
P&PA 5	Work undertaken not complying with equalities legislation	Compliance, reputation	The needs of London's diverse population should be reflected in policy work Publications, websites and events that are not accessible will have an adverse effect on London Councils reputation.	2	2	4	Equalities training is available for staff as required. Equalities impact looked at for all events; accessibility audits being implemented for publications, web and events.	Director of Communications, Team Heads	1	2	2
P&PA 6	Lobbying outputs do not deliver outcome changes	External and reputational	Voice and concerns of boroughs would not be considered when decision affecting public services and governance in London were being made	3	2	6	Public affairs team and priorities in place; introducing public affairs training and better use of stakeholder databases. In addition, cross cutting performance arrangements within Policy formalise the relationship between policy teams and	Dick Sorabji. Corporate Director for Policy and Public Affairs	1	2	2

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	Risk Rating without control (1-4)			Controls in place	Responsible Officer	Risk rating with control (1-4)		
				L	I	O			L	I	O
							Communications to ensure maximum benefit is gained from all work related to lobbying.				
P&PA 7	IT failure with web-site/intranet	Operational, Project	IT problems prevent work being completed or communicated effectively.	3	2	6	Liaison with IT support to ensure suitable backups. Training programmes in place.	Director of Communications	2	2	4
P&PA 8	London Councils websites not maintained or updated	Reputation	Loss of credibility among key audiences, inability to meet statutory requirements to publish information, for example Committee Papers	2	2	4	Professional web staff, and trained content managers across the organisation	Director of Communications	1	2	2
P&PA 9	Insufficient coverage of London councils' concerns in the national, regional, local and specialist press and TV & radio	External and reputational	No media coverage would significantly reduce the leverage of London local government in advancing its arguments on behalf of boroughs and those they represent	2	2	4	A team of press officers with clear objectives to deliver coverage. Also cross cutting performance arrangements within Policy formalise the relationship between policy teams and Communications to ensure maximum benefit is gained from all work related to lobbying.	Dick Sorabji. Corporate Director for Policy and Public Affairs	1	2	2

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	Risk Rating without control (1-4)			Controls in place	Responsible Officer	Risk rating with control (1-4)		
				L	I	O			L	I	O
P&PA 10	Work rendered abortive due to external policy changes or other external events	External	Policy changes (Government or GLA) means that abortive work has been undertaken	3	2	6	Regular communication with government departments and GLA (to gather intelligence) and with member authorities (to ensure work focuses on current priorities and to manage expectations).	PAPA Management Team	2	2	4
P&PA 11	Libel action taken against London Councils	Financial, reputation	Potentially expensive legal and compensation costs	2	2	4	Strict editorial control, insurance	Director of Communications	1	2	2