

**PERFORMANCE AND RISK REPORT FOR THE 1<sup>st</sup> QUARTER OF 2013/14**

**Cabinet Member** Cllr Neal Davey  
**Responsible Officer** Head of Communities & Governance

**Reason for Report:** To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2013/14 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

**RECOMMENDATION(S):** That the Committee reviews the Performance Indicators and Risks that are outlined in this report and feedback any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

**Relationship to Corporate Plan:** Corporate Plan priorities and targets are effectively maintained through the use of appropriate performance indicators and regular monitoring

**Financial Implications:** None identified

**Legal Implications:** None

**Risk Assessment:** If performance is not monitored we may fail to meet our corporate plan and local service plan targets or take appropriate corrective action where necessary. If key business risks are not identified and monitored they cannot be mitigated effectively.

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report provides Members with details of performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for the first quarter of 2013/14. (Appendices 1- 6)
- 1.2 Appendices 7-12 show the higher impact risks from the Corporate Risk Register. This now includes operational and Health and Safety risks where their score meets the criteria for inclusion.
- 1.3 All the appendices are now produced from SPAR, the corporate Service Performance and Risk Management system.

## **2.0 Management comment – corporate plan and local service performance targets**

### Managing the Environment Portfolio - Appendix 1

- 2.1 The targets for refuse and recycling are rightly tough but have not all been met for the first quarter of 2013/14. The actual tonnage of waste, both recycled and in total, has increased against the same quarter last year however the % recycled remains fairly constant at 48.5% (2012/13 48.6%).

- 2.2 The proportion of dry recycled waste has fallen slightly against the same quarter last year 1,153 compared to 1,169 tonnes.

Decent and affordable Homes Portfolio - Appendix 2

- 2.3 Performance was on or above target for bringing empty homes back into use, gas safety and repairs completed on time across all the categories which is excellent.

- 2.4 Rent arrears are above target at present but in the current economic climate and with the effects of Welfare Reform, Local Council Tax Support and “Bedroom tax” beginning to kick in; this is really not that surprising.

Community Well Being Portfolio - Appendix 3

- 2.5 All the performance indicators are on or above target which is encouraging.

Planning and Regeneration Portfolio - Appendix 4

- 2.6 Staff resources were low, fully staffed again as at September.

Working Environment Portfolio - Appendix 5

- 2.7 There has been mixed performance against targets in this area however CRM is being upgraded so these results may not be accurate. It has also not been possible to report customer satisfaction as the kiosk in Phoenix House is faulty.

Finance Portfolio - Appendix 6

- 2.8 Most indicators are on or above target. The % of system audits completed is slightly below target at 19% compared to the target of 20%.

Risk register – Appendix 7

- 2.9 The Corporate risk register has been reviewed by Management Team and updated. Risk reports to all committees will continue to include all strategic risks with a score of 15 or more and/or all those with an Impact score of 5.

- 2.10 This report does not at present show target levels for risks set by MT, which is the tolerance level for each risk, however these are shown in the individual risk entries on SPAR where applicable.

- 2.11 Please note that where a risk has been identified by more than 1 leisure centre it has not been included twice on Appendix 9 with the exception of “car parks” where it is felt there are different issues at the 2 centres.

- 2.12 We are still going through a risk review exercise with service managers; any risks from service business plans which meet the above criteria for inclusion will be added to the corporate risk register.

2.13 The profile of these risks for this quarter is:

<b>Impact</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	
	<b>4</b>				<b>1</b>	
	<b>3</b>					
	<b>2</b>					
	<b>1</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
		<b>Likelihood</b>				

### 3.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

3.1 That the Committee reviews the performance indicators and risks that are outlined in this report and feedback any areas of concern to the Cabinet. .

**Contact for more Information:** Amy Tregellas, Head of Communities & Governance ext 4246

**Circulation of the Report:** Management Team and Cabinet Members

## **Glossary of Terms**

Prev Year End: This is the actual final value for the year 2011/12

Annual Target: This is the year end target for 2012/13

Current Target: This is the profiled target for the 2012/13 year to date

Q1-Q4 Act: These are the actuals for the 2012/13 year to date quarter by quarter. Some indicators do not have results for every quarter.

Improvement: This is against the corresponding quarter last year

## MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Environment - Cllr Clive Eginton Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

*Key to Performance Status:*

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

*Key to change on same period in previous year:*

↑	Improved Performance	↓	Worse Performance	↔	Unchanged
---	----------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------

### MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Above target	<u>Reduce the amount of waste going to landfill by 9% by 2015</u>	487.71	470.00	117.50 (1/4)	106.50				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well below target	<u>Increase Dry Recycling Rate to 20% by 2015</u>	14.70%	20.00%	20.00% (1/4)	13.89%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Below target	<u>% of Household Waste Reuse, Recycled and Composted</u>	46.2%	50.0%	50.0% (1/4)	48.5%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well above target	<u>% of missed collections per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u>	0.03%	0.30%	0.30% (1/4)	0.02%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well above target	<u>% of Missed Collections per Quarter (recycling)</u>	0.06%	0.30%	0.30% (1/4)	0.03%				↔
<b>Management Notes:</b>									

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Friday, September 06, 2013  
15:27

## DAH Performance Report - Appendix 2

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Decent and Affordable Homes Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

## Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

## Key to change on same period in previous year:

↑	Improved Performance	↓	Worse Performance	↔	Unchanged
---	----------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------

## DAH Performance Report - Appendix 2

## Performance Indicators

Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
On target	<u>Deliver 15 homes per year by bringing Empty Houses into use</u>	33	15	4 (1/4)	4				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 1)  The reduction of long term empties is a critical factor in maximising opportunities to gain New Homes Bonus. Mid 2nd Quarter, owners of empty homes that are registered as empty beyond 6 months have received a mailshot. This is aimed at establishing a greater understanding of the reasons behind properties remaining empty and identifying any advice or assistance on options to get them back into use. The impact of changes to the CT charges from April, particularly the introduction of a 150% liability for empties over 2 years old is still being assessed.  (HS)									
Well below target	<u>Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)</u>	77	100	25 (1/4)	11				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 1)  22 houses at Wells Park in next quarter  (NS)									
Above target	<u>% Emergency Repairs Completed on Time</u>	99.74%	99.50%	99.50% (3/12)	100.00%				↔
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>% Urgent Repairs Completed on Time</u>	99.69%	98.50%	98.50% (3/12)	100.00%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>% Routine Repairs Completed on Time</u>	99.76%	98.50%	98.50% (3/12)	100.00%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>% Repairs Completed at First Visit</u>	99.33%	98.50%	98.50% (3/12)	100.00%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well below target	<u>Ratio of expenditure between planned and responsive repairs</u>	82.18	70.30	70.30 (1/4)	60.40				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									

## DAH Performance Report - Appendix 2

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Below target	<u>Rent Collected as a Proportion of Rent Owed</u>	99.74%	100.50%	100.50% (4/12)	98.00%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well below target	<u>Rent Arrears as a Proportion of Annual Rent Debit</u>	0.86%	1.00%	1.00% (4/12)	1.44%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well below target	<u>% Decent Council Homes</u>	80.20%	95.00%	95.00% (3/12)	80.75%				↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
On target	<u>% Properties With a Valid Gas Safety Certificate</u>	99.90%	100.00%	100.00% (3/12)	100.00%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well below target	<u>Average Days to Re-Let Local Authority Housing</u>	17.01days	17.00days	17.00days (3/12)	22.90days				↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
<hr/>									
<hr/>									
Printed by: Catherine Yandle				SPAR.net		Print Date: Friday, September 06, 2013 15:28			

### CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 3

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Community Well-Being - Cllr Bob Deed Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

Key to change on same period in previous year:

↑	Improved Performance	↓	Worse Performance	↔	Unchanged
---	----------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------

### CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 3

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Above target	<u>Issue of Licences</u>	96%	95%	95% (1/4)	99%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Above target	<u>Ensure 80% of people who contact the Council about anti-social behaviour see improvements</u>	79%	80%	80% (1/4)	83%				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 1)  Figures provided by service areas. Housing 86%, EH 83% & Operations 81%  (JR)									
On target	<u>Conduct a number of community action days</u>	3	2	1 (1/4)	0				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well above target	<u>Response to service requests</u>	99%	95%	24% (1/4)	99%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well above target	<u>Response to water sampling requests</u>	100%	95%	24% (1/4)	100%				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well above target	<u>Response to Planning consultations</u>	87%	75%	75% (1/4)	92%				↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
On target	<u>Investigate 100% of accidents Incident</u>	100%	100%	100% (1/4)	100%				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
On target	<u>Investigate 100% of accidents Complaint</u>	100%	100%	100% (1/4)	100%				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Above	<u>Operational Recovery</u>	86.49%	87.50%	87.50% (1/4)	88.56%				↑





## Planning and Economic Development Performance Report - Appendix 4

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Planning and Economic Regeneration - Cllr Richard Chesterton Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

*Key to Performance Status:*

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

*Key to change on same period in previous year:*

↑	Improved Performance	↓	Worse Performance	↔	Unchanged
---	----------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------

### Planning and Economic Development Performance Report - Appendix 4

Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Above target	<b><u>Reduce the number of empty shop units (TIVERTON)</u></b>	8.80%	8.00%	8.00% (1/4)	7.56%				↑
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Well above target	<b><u>Reduce the number of empty shop units (CREDITON)</u></b>	5.20%	8.00%	8.00% (1/4)	5.88%				↑
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Well below target	<b><u>Reduce the number of empty shop units (CULLOMPTON)</u></b>	14.70%	15.00%	15.00% (1/4)	16.84%				↑
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Above target	<b><u>Planning Applications: Householder Applications</u></b>	81%	80%	80% (1/4)	83%				↑
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Above target	<b><u>Enforcement site visits</u></b>	100%	90%	90% (1/4)	92%				↓
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Above target	<b><u>Delegated decisions</u></b>	93%	90%	90% (1/4)	93%				↔
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
Well below target	<b><u>Planning Applications: over 13 weeks old</u></b>	45	45	45 (1/4)	50				↓
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
(Quarter 1)									
Staff resources were low now fully staffed again as at September									
(SB)									
Well above target	<b><u>Customers rating the service good</u></b>	92%	75%	75% (1/4)	92%				↑
<b><u>Management Notes:</u></b>									
↔									

**Planning and Economic Development Performance Report - Appendix 4**

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
On target	<u>Searches carried out w/in 5 working days</u>	99.95%	100.00%	100.00% (1/4)	100.00%				
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Below target	<u>Building Regulation Applications</u>	92%	95%	95% (1/4)	93%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Above target	<u>Building Regulation Full Plan Applications</u>	100%	95%	95% (1/4)	100%				↔
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well below target	<u>Planning Applications: Major Applications</u>	70%	60%	60% (1/4)	0%				↓
<u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 1)  Volume of work, S106 agreements not finalised and Committee call-ins  (CY)									
Well below target	<u>Planning Applications: Minor Applications</u>	56%	65%	65% (1/4)	41%				↓
<u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 1)  Volume of work and shortage of staff  (CY)									
Below target	<u>Planning Applications: 'Other' Applications</u>	78%	80%	80% (1/4)	76%				↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									

## Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Working Environment and Support Services - Cllr Brenda Hull Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Data not entered, Not calculable

*Key to Performance Status:*

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

*Key to change on same period in previous year:*

↑	Improved Performance	↓	Worse Performance	↔	Unchanged
---	----------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------

### Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Above target	<u>% of incoming calls answered</u>	91.89%	90.00%	90.00% (1/4)	91.42%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Below target	<u>% calls to Customer First answered within 2 minutes</u>	91.55%	95.00%	95.00% (1/4)	90.50%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
No Target	<u>Number of phone calls to CF per month</u>	11,084	For Information Only	For Information Only	11,597				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>% of visitors to reception seen to within 15 minutes of arrival</u>	96.00%	95.00%	95.00% (1/4)	96.00%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well below target	<u>% complaints acknowledged w/in 3 days</u>	72%	80%	80% (1/4)	69%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
(Quarter 1)									
details taken from the CRM, the report is being upgraded to check the accuracy of the data and these figures may be amended later in the year.									
(LR)									
Below target	<u>% of complaints resolved w/in timescales (10 days - 12 weeks)</u>	88%	90%	90% (1/4)	82%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
(Quarter 1)									
details taken from the CRM, the report includes non working days and further work will be completed later in the year to check the accuracy of all the data. These figures may be amended.									
(LR)									
Above target	<u>% Emails received by Customer Services responded to within 5 days</u>	99.3%	95.0%	95.0% (1/4)	99.7%				↓

**Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5**

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
On target	<u>% of Minutes published</u>	100%	100%	100% (1/4)	100%				↔
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
On target	<u>% of Committee Agendas</u>	100%	100%	100% (1/4)	100%				↔
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Below target	<u>Response to FOI Requests (within 20 working days)</u>	86%	100%	100% (1/4)	97%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well below target	<u>Working Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence</u>	7.83days	7.00days	1.75days (1/4)	2.30days				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
On target	<u>Customer Satisfaction IT Survey</u>	9.7	9.7	9.7 (1/4)	9.7				↔
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>System Availability</u>	100.0%	99.9%	99.9% (1/4)	100.0%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Above target	<u>% SLA Achieved</u>	86%	84.00%	84.00% (1/4)	84.67%				↑
<b>Management Notes:</b>									

## Finance Portfolio Performance - Appendix 6

Quarterly report for 2013-2014  
 No headings  
 For Finance - Cllr Neal Davey Portfolio  
 For MDDC - Services

**Key to Performance Status:**

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

**Key to change on same period in previous year:**

Improved Performance	Worse Performance	Unchanged
----------------------	-------------------	-----------

### Finance Portfolio Performance - Appendix 6

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Data not due	<u>% of core audits completed in financial year</u>	117%	100%	100%					
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Below target	<u>% of system audits completed in financial year</u>	67%	80%	20% (1/4)	19%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
On target	<u>Percentage of customer satisfaction</u>	n/a	100%	100% (1/4)	100%				n/a
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well above target	<u>% total Council tax collected - monthly</u>	98.12%	98.00%	32.67% (4/12)	28.61%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Well above target	<u>% total NNDR collected - monthly</u>	97.56%	99.00%	33.00% (4/12)	25.36%				↓
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Data not due	<u>Percentage of Invoices Paid on Time</u>	96.20%	100.00%	100.00%	n/a		n/a		n/a
<b>Management Notes:</b>									
Data not entered	<u>Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events</u>	7days	14days	14days					
<b>Management Notes:</b>									

## MTE PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 7

Report for 2013-2014

For Environment - Cllr Clive Eginton Portfolio

Filtered by Flag: Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+

For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

*Key to Performance Status:*

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

### MTE PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 7

**Risk: Security of tenure at Silverton Mill** Security of tenure at Silverton Mill

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Waste Management**

**Current Status: High (15)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium**

**Head of Service: Paul N Williams**

**Review Note:**

**Risk: Waste Collection - Health and Safety** Inadequate training with regards to Manual Handling and workplace hazards (eg contact with broken glass) could result in Health and Safety risks

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):** - Increasing demand and service costs due to increasing population, consumer society and an increasing amount of waste

**Service: Waste Management**

**Current Status: High (15)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium**

**Head of Service: Paul N Williams**

**Review Note:** There are undeniable risks; work is continuing to reduce the likelihood of an accident occurring.

Health and Safety training is ongoing - including annual driver competence checks and manual handling training programme for all waste operatives.

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Monday, September 09, 2013 08:51

## DAH PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 8

Report for 2013-2014  
 For Housing - Cllr Ray Stanley Portfolio  
 Filtered by Flag:Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+  
 For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

### Key to Performance Status:

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

## DAH PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 8

**Risk: Asbestos** Health risks associated with Asbestos products such as lagging, ceiling/wall tiles, fire control.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Housing Services**

**Current Status:**  
**Medium (5)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
**Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -**  
**Very Low**

**Head of Service: Nick Sanderson**

**Review Note:** Only non-licensed asbestos work shall be carried out. By removing the high risk licensed works the risk is immediately reduced

Printed by: Catherine  
 Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Monday,  
 September 09, 2013 08:52



## CWB PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 9

Report for 2013-2014

For Community Well-Being - Cllr Bob Deed Portfolio

Filtered by Flag: Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+

For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

*Key to Performance Status:*

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

### CWB PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 9

**Risk: Chemicals** Staff using chemicals incorrectly.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Leisure Services**

**Current Status:**

**Medium (10)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -  
Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -  
Low**

**Head of Service: Jill Stimpson**

**Review Note:** Updated

**Risk: Health and Safety** Inadequate Health and Safety Policies or Risk Assessments and decision-making could lead to Mid Devon failing to mitigate serious health and safety issues

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

- An incident could result in death and/or serious injury to persons
- Claims against and prosecution of individual Members, Officers or the Council as a whole

**Causes (Likelihood):**

- No formal risk assessments have been drawn up specifically for the standby function although risks have been identified

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status:**

**Medium (10)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -  
Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -  
Low**

**Head of Service: Kevin Finan**

**Review Note:** The Corporate Health & Safety Committee meet on a quarterly basis to ensure that all serious risks are mitigated and raised as issues to Management Team

SPAR risk reporting going live September 2013

## CWB PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 9

### **Risk: Legionella No.9** Legionella

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Leisure Services**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -**  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Jill Stimpson**

**Review Note:**

### **Risk: Lifeguard Training** Poor quality training. Improper use of rescue equipment

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Leisure Services**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -**  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Jill Stimpson**

**Review Note:** Lifeguard training is only to be carried out by Trainer Assessors qualified and registered with the RLSS.

**Printed by: Catherine  
Yandle**

**SPAR.net**

**Print Date: Thursday,  
September 12, 2013 10:45**

## Planning Risk Management Report - Appendix 10

Report for 2013-2014

For Planning and Economic Regeneration - Cllr Richard Chesterton  
Portfolio

Filtered by Flag: Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+  
For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

*Key to Performance Status:*

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

### Planning Risk Management Report - Appendix 10

**Risk: Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** Failure to manage the transition, introduction and adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would affect capacity to take on collection work

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** - Capacity to take on collection work for CIL  
- Delay in introduction of CIL

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Development Control**

**Current Status: High (15)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium**

**Head of Service: Jonathan Guscott**

**Review Note:**

Printed by: Catherine  
Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Thursday,  
September 12, 2013 12:05

## Working Environment Risk Management Report - Appendix 11

Report for 2013-2014

For Working Environment and Support Services - Cllr Brenda Hull  
Portfolio

Filtered by Flag: Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+  
For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

*Key to Performance Status:*

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

## Working Environment Risk Management Report - Appendix 11

**Risk: Document Retention** If documents fail to be retained for the statutory period then we may face financial penalties

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

- The Council may be disadvantaged in taking or defending legal action if prime documents are not retained;
- Performance statistics cannot be verified;
- The external auditor may not be able to verify the Council's final accounts and subsidy may be lost.
- Ability to meet Freedom of Information requests may be limited if data is not available.
- Mismanagement of burial records

**Causes (Likelihood):** • "Data debris" cluttering system and storage space

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity:** 5 -  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood:** 1 -  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Christina Cross**

**Review Note:**

- ICT are currently undertaking a review of ICT storage files
- The Council has a guide to document retention on SharePoint.
- Archive systems are in place for manual files, on the basis that as new files enter archive each year, files that have reached their date to be destroyed are removed
- The Council's electronic file management system (DMS) is organised into years

## Working Environment Risk Management Report - Appendix 11

**Risk: Fire and Explosion** Risks associated with storage of combustible materials, fuels and flammable substances and sources of ignition, as well as emergency procedures (existence, display and knowledge of), accessibility (or obstruction) of emergency exits and walkways to. Also, risks associated with use of fire extinguishers, having correct type in location, in date and trained operatives on site.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** Very High (5) – Although the risk is low, a fire in the server or storage room could potentially cause loss of life, have serious financial implications and severely impact the councils ability to provide services due to loss of IT infrastructure.

**Causes (Likelihood):** Very Low (1) – The likelihood of a fire within ICT is extremely low. No quantities of combustible materials are stored within the work area. There is easy access to the emergency exit and all staff have received fire awareness training.

**Service: I C T**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -**  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Christina Cross**

**Review Note:**

**Risk: Safeguarding Young Persons and Vulnerable Adults** Safeguarding/Child Protection associated risks, including accusations of, in situations where a person may come into contact with children or vulnerable adults. Also, psychological and emotional impact on officer in contact with such situation as well as having robust policies and knowledge of by officers and Members when faced with a safeguarding/child protection situation.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Customer First**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (10)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -**  
Low

**Head of Service: Liz Reeves**

**Review Note:** Customer First team have regular updates on safeguarding and how to report any incidents. The volume of contacts and the level of contact may not be sufficient for CF staff to identify issues.

## Working Environment Risk Management Report - Appendix 11

**Risk: Security** The Council and its employees could suffer financially and physically through lack of security of valuables (such as cash, keys, safe), buildings (including offices and car parks), plant and equipment and personal belongings.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • The Council could be exposed to charges of corporate manslaughter and fines

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Management Team**

<b>Current Status:</b> Medium (5)	<b>Current Risk Severity: 5 -</b> Very High	<b>Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -</b> Very Low
--------------------------------------	--	---

**Head of Service: Nick Sanderson**

**Review Note:** - Cash is regularly banked and cash floats and controlled stationery are secured in safes

**Risk: Vehicles, Transport, Driving** Risk of collisions with other moving or stationary vehicles, cycles and/or pedestrians.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Customer First**

<b>Current Status:</b> Medium (10)	<b>Current Risk Severity: 5 -</b> Very High	<b>Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -</b> Low
---------------------------------------	--	--

**Head of Service: Liz Reeves**

**Review Note:** follow corporate policy and procedure when using pool cars

**Risk: Workplace Welfare** The provision of adequate welfare arrangements is important both in terms of complying with the law and keeping the workforce happy. People tend to perform better and be happier at their work if they are working in a safe and healthy environment.

Workplace welfare includes the working environment (such as ventilation, noise, temperature, lighting, humidity, space, workstations and seating), welfare facilities (provision of drinking water, rest room and sanitary facilities including toilets, wash basins and showers), workplace safety and housekeeping (cleanliness and waste disposal).

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Customer First**

<b>Current Status:</b> Medium (10)	<b>Current Risk Severity: 5 -</b> Very High	<b>Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -</b> Low
---------------------------------------	--	--

**Head of Service: Liz Reeves**

**Review Note:** All corporate policies are followed for sickness, dignity at work, health & safety, coaching and counselling if needed.

Printed by: Catherine  
Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Friday,  
September 13, 2013 12:35

## Finance Risk Management Report - Appendix 12

Report for 2013-2014

For Finance - Cllr Neal Davey Portfolio

Filtered by Flag: Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+

For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

Key to Performance Status:

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

### Finance Risk Management Report - Appendix 12

**Risk: Contracts** Failure to adequately manage contracts could result in poor service delivery, contractors not meeting agreed conditions and customers receiving poor quality service

An insufficient behavioural culture of 'data protection' with supplier/contractor could result in a Data Protection breach

Failure to apply due diligence in contracting new suppliers could lead to service delivery problems

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • Service issues are not communicated and effectively addressed

- Major supplier fails, leading to significant disruption and reputational damage to the Council
- Failure to deliver to contractual terms

**Causes (Likelihood):** • Ineffective contract records are kept, poorly maintained and out of date

**Service: Procurement**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (10)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 2 -**  
Low

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:** • Contract placed on pay on valuation when works complete. No payment on account.

- Effective contract management processes

## Finance Risk Management Report - Appendix 12

**Risk: Council Finances - Banking Arrangements** Problems with banks and online services may affect ability to access funds when we need to or receive / process payments on a timely basis

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** Unable to promptly pay suppliers or treasury commitments

**Causes (Likelihood):** ICT systems down at Council or Bank so impossible to review cash position or make urgent payments

**Service: Financial Services**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity:** 5 -  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood:** 1 -  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:** Cash balances are reviewed daily in accordance with approved policies.

A short term outage could occur, but previous experience suggests this is infrequent and the downtime is likely to be resolved within one or two days. In the event of an inability to access online services we could move monies by physically attending the high street branch of our bank to effect transactions. A reconciliations register is maintained in Finance, risk of loss in the event of a delay in reconciling the bank account is low.

**Risk: Council Finances - Investments** Failure to invest in the Council's funds in an efficient and effective manner may cause potential of a loss of monies invested

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • Could result in cash flow loss of up to £3M

**Causes (Likelihood):** • Future banking collapses

**Service: Financial Services**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity:** 5 -  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood:** 1 -  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:** Only invest in Government Accounts and main UK Banks and Building Societies that meet strict credit rating criteria

The Chief Executive, Leader and Finance Cabinet Member are kept up-to-date on any investments that are made and any developments within the banking sector

**Risk: Council Finances - Treasury Management** Failure to comply with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management /local authority accounting would be a breach in statutory duty

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Financial Services**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity:** 5 -  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood:** 1 -  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:**

Treasury Management Policy continues to be reviewed on a half yearly basis



## Finance Risk Management Report - Appendix 12

**Risk: Failure to comply with card security standards** As an organisation we need to comply with the requirements of TrustWave to be authorised as card payment processors.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):**

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status: High (20)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High**

**Head of Service: Christina Cross**

**Review Note:** At present MDDC has failed to comply with the most recent self assessment due to there being no policy in place. Plans are being made to have a policy in place by September 2013.

**Risk: HRA Borrowing** Failure to repay the debt would invoke default provisions associated with the loan agreement

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • Inability to maintain existing stock levels to a decent standard

**Causes (Likelihood):** • Increased rent arrears and reduced cash-flow leading to an inability to pay the debt

**Service: Financial Services**

**Current Status: Medium (10)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low**

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:**

## Finance Risk Management Report - Appendix 12

**Risk: Reduced Funding - Budget Cuts** The Council fails to review performance standards and objectives, as well as the equality impact arising from budget cuts leading to service failure and a loss in reputation.

If we concentrate on short term cost savings, it may increase long term impact of decisions

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • Increased workforce stress and declining morale can add to the dangers of a major incident if staff come under pressure as budget cuts force changes in operational models

- Budget cuts may limit the financial resources that we can dedicate to network security potentially making us more vulnerable to cyber-attacks

- Use of reserves to supplement reduced funding for budgets could put a strain on reserves in future, with inability to maintain them

- The Council could significantly over or underspend against budget on the provision of Council services

- There may be inefficient use of public money and a failure to comply with the Council's objectives

- The relative scale of impact in an incident will be higher due to decreased organisational resilience as a result of diminishing financial reserves and workforce response capacity

**Causes (Likelihood):** • Severe financial pressure caused by a significant reduction to the Council's Revenue Support Grant

- Ceasing of other grants

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status: High (15)**

**Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High**

**Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium**

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:**

**Printed by: Catherine Yandle**

**SPAR.net**

**Print Date: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 17:01**

## MT Risk Management Report - Appendix 13

Report for 2013-2014

For Leader of the Council - Cllr Peter Hare-Scott Portfolio

Filtered by Flag:Include: \* CRR 5+ / 15+

For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

*Key to Performance Status:*

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

### MT Risk Management Report - Appendix 13

**Risk: Breaches in Legislation** Failure to keep Council policies up to date, that complement the appropriate legislation

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** - The Council could face poor reports from assurance bodies  
 - Failure to meet statutory duties could result in paying penalties, stretching already thin financial resources  
 - Failure to comply with legislation could lead to legal challenge against individuals or the Council as a whole  
 - Future legislation changes, their impact on services and the cost of implementing changes to policies, procedures and service delivery  
 - Use of unlicensed software could result in financial penalties

**Causes (Likelihood):**

**Service: Management Team**

<b>Current Status: Medium (5)</b>	<b>Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High</b>	<b>Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low</b>
---------------------------------------	---	--

**Head of Service: Jill Stimpson**

**Review Note:** - Policy framework  
 - All Heads of Service keep up to date with changes to legislation in their area and brief Management Team and Members as and when appropriate

## MT Risk Management Report - Appendix 13

**Risk: Contingency - Emergency Plan** The Council fails to have an effective Emergency Plan / Pandemic Plan in place that is up-to-date and complements the Business Continuity Plan, Disaster Recovery Plan and Risk Management Plan leading to service failure and loss in reputation.

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** • Inadequate space made available for mass morgues / burials

**Causes (Likelihood):** • Instances of environmental health pollution such as Legionella or a Norovirus outbreak

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status:**  
Medium (5)

**Current Risk Severity: 5 -**  
Very High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -**  
Very Low

**Head of Service: Paul N Williams**

**Review Note:** - MDDC has an Emergency Plan in place and works with other agencies in the event of an emergency - recent example is the flooding

**Risk: Welfare Reform Act - Benefits** Failure to implement and communicate the new benefits framework effectively could result in applications not being completed in time

**Effects (Impact/Severity):** Impact on number of officers required in service

**Causes (Likelihood):** If the changes from current benefits system to Universal Credit go ahead, the system will require greater staff resource

**Service: Management Team**

**Current Status: High**  
(16)

**Current Risk Severity: 4 -**  
High

**Current Risk Likelihood: 4 -**  
High

**Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett**

**Review Note:**

Printed by: Catherine  
Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Friday,  
September 13, 2013 12:49