London Councils Corporate Risk Register

Responsibility - CMB

Reviewed by; Corporate Governance Group Reviewed by; CMB

Date last reviewed : July 2016

Date last reviewed : August 2016

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	(Risk Rating without control (1-4)		Controls in place	Responsible Officer		rat w or	isk ing ith ntrol
Corp 1	Loss of borough support	Financial, Reputational and Strategic	Inability to demonstrate value to London local government resulting in boroughs withdrawing support for London Councils.	4	4	16	London Councils has a range of controls in place and regularly reports to Leaders' Committee, the Executive and other forums; Members through the party group leaders and the Executive to influence and shape the priorities of the organisation. A member communication programme is in place that offers online and tailored services to all members in the form of exclusive, policy-based member briefings, a free events programme and a bespoke members' website. In addition, London Councils officers engage and work with relevant officer groups across London, including but not limited to CELC, ADASS, ALDECS and SLT. A Challenge process was commissioned during 2016 to help inform the organisation's consideration of what it needs to be capable of delivering on behalf of London local government over the next five years.	John O'Brien, Chief Executive	3	2	0

Business Continuity/ Disaster Recovery Plans not in place or inadequate Disaster Recovery Plans not in place or inadequate Disaster Recovery Plans Reputational, Financial Disaster Recovery Plans Reputational, Financial Disaster Recovery Plans Not in place or inadequate Reputational, Reputational, Plan (BCP) was updated and approved by CMB in April 2016. An internal audit review of the BCP has recently been completed and the recommendations were incorporated into the final version. The BCP includes adequate arrangements to ensure that all areas of service could continue the event of a disaster. Nominated Gold, Silver and Bronze team members are the main points of contact for help or advice on emergency procedures and continuity arrangements. Each Directorate has considered its business continuity arrangements. Each Directorate has considered its business and identified appropriate contingency plans. The BCP includes details of scenario testing, and internal audit review of the BCP includes details and approved by Continue arrangements are the main points of contact for help or advice on em	No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	V	Ris Rati vith cont (1-	ing out trol	Controls in place	Responsible Officer		Ris ratii wit ont (1-	ng h rol
and examples of the types of	-	Continuity/ Disaster Recovery Plans not in place or	Reputational,	access unable to be restored in the event of a disaster scenario resulting in an inability to continue	4		0	Plan (BCP) was updated and approved by CMB in April 2016. An internal audit review of the BCP has recently been completed and the recommendations were incorporated into the final version. The BCP includes adequate arrangements to ensure that all areas of service could continue in the event of a disaster. Nominated Gold, Silver and Bronze team members are the main points of contact for help or advice on emergency procedures and continuity arrangements. Each Directorate has considered its business continuity risks which are reflected in the business risk impact analysis and identified appropriate contingency plans. The BCP includes details of scenario testing, communication plans	Director of Corporate	1	ı	0

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	v	Risk Rating without control (1-4)		Controls in place	Responsible Officer	ľ		ng th trol
Corp 3	Inadequate	Compliance, Financial,	London Councils policies including HR policies, not compliant - Risk of prosecution and damage to London Councils reputation for failure to comply with current legislation, including compliance with information legislation, Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998,		3	1) O	The organisation has a number of controls in place to address its statutory responsibilities. The financial controls have been approved by the external auditors and there is robust budget monitoring and reporting of monthly salaries forecasts to Corporate Management Board and detailed quarterly budget monitoring reports to the Executive and funding stream committees (performance management framework in place to rectify poor performance of grant funded organisations, supplemented by robust monitoring). There is also a rolling internal audit programme. An annual governance statement is in place and is approved by the Audit Committee and outlines corporate	Frank Smith, Programme Director, Corporate Resources Christiane	2	2	4)
	governance	Reputational	Inability to meet statutory and best practice requirements; non compliance with external auditor recommendations, lack of a corporate governance framework, information management issues; lack of robust financial systems, including grant funded organisations.				governance arrangements, policies and procedures. In addition, an annual Corporate Governance report goes to CMB outlining the work completed and development areas for the following year. Guidance on data protection and for responding to requests for information is available for all staff on the intranet. Information Management Policies were approved in October 2014. Corporate support will be offered to assist implementation of the policies, including development of a comprehensive information asset register and a review of all contracts involving personal information. All	Jenkins, Programme Director, Corporate Governance			ntrol -4) O

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	R W C	Risk Rating without control (1-4)		Controls in place	Responsible Officer		sk ing ith itrol -4)	
				L	Ì	O			L	Ì	O
							staff are required to attend an appropriate information security/data protection training session. Further support is available from Corporate Governance and, where necessary, legal advice can be obtained from the City of London.				

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	F W	Ris Ration with cont ont (1-4	ng out rol	Controls in place	Responsible Officer		Ris ration wite ont (1-	ng h rol
				L	I	0			L	I	0
Corp 4	Non-delivery of pan London mobility services	Operational, Reputational	Failure to manage/retain the funding and delivery of the Freedom Pass, Taxicard and concessionary fares would impact directly on London's older and disabled residents and possibly borough budgets.	2	4	8	Contracts, negotiations, governance and management processes are in place monitoring cost and performance. Members receive regular committee reports. Back office data management systems underpin both schemes.	Spencer Palmer, Director Transport and Mobility	1	2	2
Corp 5	Non delivery of London Tribunals (formerly the Parking and Traffic Appeals service known as PATAS)	Strategic, Operational, Reputational, Financial	London Council's main statutory responsibility is to run ETA, formerly PATAS, part of London Tribunals (which also comprises RUCA). A failure to run these services effectively has financial consequences on the boroughs directly and also may affect their own enforcement operations; it also affects London Councils' reputation.	3	4	12	Closely specified and managed contract for administrative support; with strong KPIs and management arrangements internally.	Spencer Palmer, Director Transport and Mobility	2	2	4

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	W	Risk Rating without control (1-4)		Controls in place Responsible Officer			Ris ration wite ont (1-	ng :h :rol
Corp 6	Ineffective relationships with key stakeholders, key decision makers and the media	External Project Reputation Strategic	Failure to develop effective relationships is likely to reduce our ability to influence key audiences and the quality of policy and service developments which could lessen the impact of the work, in particular, inability to stabilise productive relationships with the new Mayor and Mayoral Advisers and new Government.	2	2	4	Key partners identified during business planning process; continuing dialogue during commissioning of services, monitoring of delivery, sharing of knowledge and intelligence.	Chief Executive, John O'Brien and Corporate Directors; Nick Lester, Dick Sorabji	1	1	1
Corp 7	Inability to be flexible with resources to ensure appropriate responses to changing circumstances	Strategic, Operational, Reputational, Financial	Insufficient response to economic, social, legal, political changes in society rendering existing work less relevant and/or missing opportunities to have a greater impact	4	2	8	Regular engagement with Members to ensure that any changes to organisational priorities are supported; effective work programmes and robust corporate business planning to enable flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.	Chief Executive, John O'Brien and Corporate Directors; Nick Lester, Dick Sorabji	2	2	4
Corp 8	Failure to deliver a robust Grants Scheme that delivers members requirements	Strategic, Operational, Reputational, Financial	Loss of confidence in the grants programme by London boroughs, the voluntary sector and other private and voluntary sector funders; effective	3	3	9	Close liaison with Members, lawyers, services, other funding bodies and the voluntary sector.	Nick Lester, Corporate Director for Services	2	2	4

No	Risk	Risk Type	Risk description	V	Ris Rati vithe cont (1-4	ng out rol	Controls in place	Responsible Officer		Ris ratii wit ont (1-	ng h rol
				L	ı	0			L	ı	0
			consultation and delivery of equalities objectives								
Corp 9	Failure to deliver ongoing efficiency savings	Reputational, Financial and Operational	Efforts to secure ongoing efficiency savings.	4	3	12	Managing proposals to ensure proper consideration is given to options for savings and enough information is given to Members to enable informed decisions on the impact of any proposed savings.	Chief Executive, John O'Brien and Corporate Directors; Nick Lester, Dick Sorabji	3	2	6