

# THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2014

## **Introduction**

Each year, Three Rivers District Council updates its Strategic Plan. This document identifies the Council's priorities, and the measures it will use to assess their delivery. It focuses on those areas where the Council has a lead role, or can play a key part in delivering or influencing the outcomes.

## **The Vision and our Priorities**

Three Rivers District Council's long-held vision is that *the district should remain a prosperous, safe and healthy place where people want and are able to live and work*. We recognise that Three Rivers District is a mixture of beautiful countryside, villages and small towns, and the majority of its inhabitants are relatively healthy, well educated, affluent, articulate and able to access our public services. Not surprisingly, people want this state of affairs to improve further, or at least to stay the same, and the Council's plans must pay careful heed to this point of view, without slipping into complacency.

However, deprived communities do exist in the District, often side by side with more affluent areas, where disadvantaged individuals and groups find difficulty in accessing the full range of services and facilities many of us take for granted. The Council has therefore made a conscious decision to concentrate on improving services and access to services for all people, particularly the people in deprived communities.

We recognise our increasing duty to promote "greener" ways of delivering services, reducing the carbon footprint of the district, and creating cohesive communities that enable people to live in harmony with each other and with their environment. We also recognise that the people of Three Rivers need and expect from an excellent Council a high standard of customer service. Finally, we know that our residents have had a fear of crime and anti-social behaviour disproportionate to the crime statistics that show the district is exceptionally safe.

Our objectives have emerged from what you, the public, tell us. We have undertaken surveys and focus groups with local residents and partner agencies. We receive regular feedback through your elected councillors. We are not isolated, however and our plans influence and are influenced by national, regional and county considerations. Where the delivery of local priorities falls to Three Rivers District Council in partnership with other agencies, these are reflected in our Community Strategy which is developed by the Local Strategic Partnership. This is made up of members from the NHS, Police Constabulary, Police Authority, County Council, Parish Councils, Thrive Homes, the Voluntary Sector and Business Sector. The Community Strategy 2006-12 identifies 5 shared priority objectives for to accomplish over that period:

- 1. Reducing anti-social behaviour, crime, and fear of crime**
- 2. Reducing inequalities, (including health, poverty, access to services and employment)**
- 3. Improving the environment**
- 4. Improving children's and young people's access to education, skills and training**
- 5. Improving the supply and standard of affordable housing**

Whilst we play a major role in the LSP's work programme, Three Rivers District Council's Strategic Plan focuses (as stated above) on those areas where the Council has a lead role, or can play a key part in delivering or influencing the outcomes. Thus, out of the above five objectives, we have decided to concentrate our energies on three major thematic areas of activity: **community safety**, **sustainability** and **customer service**, and our aims for these are set out below.

**1) Community Safety** - We shall work with partners to make the district a safer place and we shall provide a safe and healthy environment.

**2) Sustainability** - We want to provide equal access to services and facilities for the public within the district and surrounding area and in particular address the needs of vulnerable residents such as elderly, disabled and young people. In addition, we want to maintain a high quality local environment and reduce the eco-footprint of the district.

**3) Customer Service** - We shall deliver services to a standard that meets the needs and expectations of all of our customers and provides exemplary value for money.

**Cllr. Ann Shaw OBE**  
**Leader of the Council**

**Dr Steven Halls**  
**Chief Executive**

Key to the Grid set out overleaf: Themes, Aims and Objectives

As explained above, the Three Rivers **vision** is that *the district should remain a prosperous, safe and healthy place where people want and are able to live and work*. This is our aspirational statement describing the future and the grids reflect the thematic areas of **community safety**, **sustainability** and **customer service**, subdivided into the relevant aims. These describe what we want to have achieved by 2014.

For each aim the tables set out our **objectives**, which are all the things we need to achieve in order to realise our aims, with how these will be measured, their targets and the lead Council service and/or Partnership that will support or monitor delivery.

1. Safer Communities				
1.1 We will work with partners to make the district a safer place.				
Objectives	Measures	Target setting	Lead	Service / Partnership
1.1.1 Reduce anti-social behaviour and crime.	Community Safety Partnership measures.	Reduction/increase on 2010/11 totals.		
	No of ASB incidents (reported to the Police)	4,328 (3% reduction)		
	No of Violent crimes	562 (2% reduction)		
	No of domestic violence crimes (reported to independent DV advisor)	140 (4% increase)		Community Safety Partnership supported and monitored by Leisure & Community Services.
	No of household burglaries	250 (1% reduction)		
	No of 'other' burglaries	325 (6% reduction)		
	No of vehicle crimes	588 (2% reduction)		
	No of hate crimes (reported to the police, inc, graffiti)	100 (7% increase)		
1.2 We will provide a safe and healthy environment.				
1.2.1 Ensure the health and safety of people in the district.	Number of successful prosecutions / sanctions against food business operators and other employers who fail to comply with hygiene and occupation health law.	10 prosecutions / sanctions		
	Year on year reduction in number of serious accidents and incidents reported.	48 reports		Environmental Health
	Percentage annual increase in the number of food premises that are <b>broadly compliant</b> with food safety law	1% increase from 95% baseline.		
	All medium and high risk premises inspected within prescribed timescales	100%		
	Implement the District Safeguarding plan	No end date required –		Leisure and

		targets objectives	specific	to	Community Services
	Children's play activities will be termed as good by Ofsted	3 schemes			
<b>1.2.2 Maintain clean streets.</b>	Satisfaction with 'keeping public land clear of litter and refuse'	69%			Environmental Protection

## 2. Sustainable Communities

Objectives	Measures	Target	Lead Service / Partnership
<b>2.1 We want to provide equal access to services and facilities for the public within the district and surrounding area and in particular address the needs of vulnerable residents such as elderly, disabled and young people.</b>			
<b>2.1.1 Improve access to benefits.</b>	Increase in number of claimants.	4% increase	
	Increase in the number of people attending benefits surgeries.	5% increase	Revenues & Benefits
	Implement self-service, where customers can access their own accounts	October 2011	
<b>2.1.2 Provide a range of supervised leisure activities and facilities for young people.</b>	Attendances by young people at leisure venues and activities.	97,456	
	No of attendances by children from low income families at Easter and summer play schemes	630 attendances	Leisure & Community Services
	Vulnerable children's satisfaction with leisure projects	90% satisfaction	
<b>2.1.3 Improve or facilitate access to housing.</b>	Net additional homes provided.	180 per annum	Development Plans
	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross).	54 (30% of all homes provided)	
	Provide additional lettings through partnerships with social landlords, using 'chain moves' and local lettings plan	30 (minimum)	Housing Needs
	Enable lettings in private rental sector using the	60 lets (minimum)	

	Council's rent deposit guarantee scheme, to people in priority housing need.		
<b>2.1.4 Improve and facilitate access to leisure and recreational activities.</b>	Attendances by adults at leisure venues and activities.	364,209	Leisure & Community Services
<b>2.2 We want to maintain a high quality local environment and reduce the eco-footprint of the district</b>			
<b>2.2.1 Maintain the number of accredited open spaces, parks and woodland areas.</b>	Parks and open spaces with Green Flag accreditation.	Three parks.	
	UK Woodlands Assurance Scheme (UKWAS) accreditation.	Maintain accreditation.	Leisure & Community Services
	Satisfaction with quality/provision of parks and open spaces	77.2%.	
<b>2.2.2 Minimise waste and optimise recycling.</b>	Increase the percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting.	51%	
	Decrease the tonnage of Household waste collected and sent to landfill	475 kg per household	
	The percentage of respondents who are satisfied with refuse collection	91%	Environmental Protection
	The percentage of respondents who are satisfied with doorstep recycling	87%	
	The percentage of respondents who are satisfied with local tips/household waste recycling centres.	88%	
<b>2.2.3 Preserve the green belt.</b>	Percentage of new homes built on previously developed (brownfield) land.	90%	Development Plans
<b>2.2.4 Minimise energy and water consumption, reduce CO2 emissions and increase the use of renewable energy.</b>	CO2 reduction from local authority operations. (definition will be amended to show a sample of 10% of invoices to assess the CO2 reduction rather than all invoices)	-1.5% per annum	Sustainability
	Level achieved in standard "Planning to adapt to	Maintain Level 1	

Climate Change”.

Improve Air quality - % reduction in NOx and primary PM10 emissions through local authority’s estates and operations. NOx – 7.2 %  
PM10 – 0.13 %

Achievement of ISO 14001 Environmental Management standard. Accreditation Maintained for 2<sup>nd</sup> year.

3. Customer Service				
Objectives	Measures	Target	Lead	Service / Partnership
<b>3.1 Customers – We will deliver our services to a standard that meet the needs and expectations of all of our customers.</b>				
<b>3.1.1 We will strive to improve and maintain service standards for all services.</b>	A basket of performance indicators for customer-facing services will be monitored against targets:			
	Percentage of calls answered	97%	Customer Centre	Service
	Percentage of calls answered within 20 seconds	85%		
	Processing major planning applications within 13 weeks	60%	Development Management	
	Processing minor planning applications within 8 weeks	65%		
	Processing other planning applications within 8 weeks	80%		
	Respond to all requests for service within 24 hours (no.) – Pollution	98%	Environmental Health	
	Respond to all requests for service within 24 hours (animal control)	98%		
	Respond to all requests for service within 14 days (pest control)	98%		
	Number of household waste collections missed per 100,000 collections	90	Environmental Protection	
The percentage of housing applications registered within 10 working days	90%	Housing Needs & Strategy		
Speed of processing new claims	20 days	Revenues & Benefits		

	Speed of processing changes of circumstances.	10 days	
<b>3.1.2 We will strive to improve and monitor customer satisfaction.</b>	The average customer satisfaction with public-facing Council services	90%	All Services, monitored by Leisure & Community Services.
	The percentage of priority indicators showing 'Maintained or improved'.	90%	
<b>3.1.3 We will inform and update customers about the Council's work and services.</b>	The percentage of people who feel informed about local public services overall.	48%	Monitored by Corporate Services (Communications)
<b>3.2 Governance – We will manage our resources to deliver our strategic priorities and service needs.</b>			
<b>3.2.1 We will manage our financial resources to deliver value for money.</b>	The extent to which local people agree the council provides value for money	50%	Dept. for Corporate Resources and Governance
	The percentage of people who agree that local public services:		The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) supported by Leisure & Community Services.
	...are working to make the area safer	76%	
	...are working to make the area cleaner and greener	76%	
	...promote the interests of local residents	54%	
	...act on the concerns of local residents	55%	
...treat all types of people fairly	78%		
<b>3.2.2 We will ensure employees are properly trained, developed and motivated.</b>	Reduce sickness absence	7.6 days per year.	All Services, supported Human Resources and Customer Service Centre
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall quality of the service you received from the customer service centre staff?	95%	

## The Council's Commitment to Data Quality – A Policy Statement

Statutory and local performance indicators as well as a range of financial and non-financial information are used throughout the organisation to aid the decision making process as well as assess the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. The financial and performance information that we use must, therefore, be accurate, reliable and timely. To meet these requirements we adopted the Audit Commission's Standards for Better Data Quality which defined a framework of management arrangements that organisations can put in place to ensure the quality of the data they use to manage and report on their activities. These standards cover the five key areas of:-

- Governance and leadership
- Policies
- Systems and processes
- People and skills
- Data use and reporting

We will implement the Standards for Better Data Quality through our Data Quality Strategy.

### Risk Management Implications

The following table shows the risks that have been identified and gives an assessment of their impact and likelihood in accordance with the Council's Risk Management Strategy:-

	Description of Risk	Impact	Likelihood
1	Failure to secure improvements to services	III	E
2	Failure to tell residents about improvements	III	E
3	Failure to make progress on the Sustainability Action Plan	IV	E
4	Failure to engage the community in the Strategic Plan	III	E
5	Failure to achieve Community Safety targets	III	E
6	Failure to achieve the priorities of the Community Strategy through the LSP	III	D

(Note: the defined impacts are set out overleaf.)

Likelihood	A					
	B					
	C					
	D			6		
	E			1, 2, 4, 5	3	
	F					
		I	II	III	IV	V
Impact →						

Impact  
V = Catastrophic  
IV = Critical  
III = Significant  
II = Marginal  
I = Negligible

Likelihood  
A = ≥98%  
B = 75% - 97%  
C = 50% - 74%  
D = 25% - 49%  
E = 3% - 24%  
F = ≤2%

The above risks are plotted on the matrix below depending on the scored assessments of impact and likelihood, detailed definitions of which are included in the risk management strategy. The Council has determined its aversion to risk and is prepared to tolerate risks where the combination of impact and likelihood are plotted in the shaded area of the matrix. The remaining risks require a treatment plan.

All the risks that require management and monitoring are included in the appropriate service plans.

Impact Classification	Service Disruption	Financial Loss	Reputation	Failure to provide statutory service/meet legal obligations	People
V Catastrophic	Total failure of service	>£1m	National Publicity. Resignation of leading member or chief officer	Litigation, claim or fine >£500k	Fatality of one or more clients/staff
IV Critical	Serious disruption to service	£500k - £1m	Local media criticism	Litigation, claim or fine £250k - £500k	Serious injury, permanent disablement of one or more clients/staff
III Significant	Disruption to service	£100k - £500k	Local public interest and complaints	Litigation, claim or fine £100k - £250k	Major injury to individual
II Marginal	Some minor impact on service	£10k -£100k	Contained within service	Litigation, claim or fine £10k - £100k	Minor injuries to several people
I Negligible	Annoyance but does not disrupt service	<£10k	Contained within section	Litigation, claim or fine <£10k	Minor injury to an individual

## STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Risk Ref	Risk <i>Brief Description – Title of Risk</i>	Impact <i>See Impact Table</i>	Impact Classification <i>See Impact Table</i>	Likelihood Classification <i>See Likelihood Table</i>	Reason for Assessment <i>Use this box to describe how the score has been derived</i>		
1	Failure to secure improvements to services	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	II I III I I	E	Data fails to be captured due to decrease in resources and outcomes cannot be demonstrated to residents or members.	Requires Treatment Last Review Date Next Milestone Date Next Review Date Date Closed	Yes 02/11/10 01/04/11 31/10/11 --
2	Failure to tell residents about improvements	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	I I III I I	E	The Council's reputation might suffer if residents weren't informed of the Council's successes. The measure in place to inform residents of improvements (e.g. Three Rivers Times) reduces the likelihood of residents not being informed	Requires Treatment Last Review Date Next Milestone Date Next Review Date Date Closed	Yes 17/01/11 01/04/11 31/10/11 --
3	Failure to make progress on the sustainability action plan	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	I II IV II I	E	Having made sustainability one of the two 'outward' looking themes of the Strategic Plan, the Council's reputation might suffer if the outcomes were not achieved.	Requires Treatment Last Review Date Next Milestone Date Next Review Date Date Closed	Yes 17/01/11 01/04/11 31/10/11 --
4	Failure to engage the community in the Strategic Plan	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	I I III I I	E	Data fails to be captured due to decrease in resources and outcomes cannot be demonstrated to residents or members	Requires Treatment Last Review Date Next Milestone Date Next Review Date Date Closed	Yes 02/11/10 01/04/11 31/10/11 --
5	Failure to achieve Community Safety targets	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	II I III I I	E	Strategy continues to meet majority of targets. Individual targets not met are being addressed by local action plans.	Requires Treatment Last Review Date Next Milestone Date Next Review Date Date Closed	Yes 02/11/10 01/04/11 31/10/11 --

Risk Ref	Risk <i>Brief Description – Title of Risk</i>	Impact <i>See Impact Table</i>	Impact Classification <i>See Impact Table</i>	Likelihood Classification <i>See Likelihood Table</i>	Reason for Assessment <i>Use this box to describe how the score has been derived</i>		
6	Failure to achieve the priorities of the Community Strategy through the LSP	Service Disruption Financial Loss Reputation Legal Implications People	I I III I I	D	Loss of 50% of the Performance Reward Grant reduces capacity for local projects.	Requires Treatment	Yes
						Last Review Date	02/11/10
						Next Milestone Date	01/04/11
						Next Review Date	31/10/11
						Date Closed	--

Likelihood ↑	A				
	B				
	C				
	D			6	
	E			1, 2, 4, 5	3
	F				
		I	II	III	IV
<b>Impact</b> →					

**Impact**

- V = Catastrophic
- IV = Critical
- III = Significant
- II = Marginal
- I = Negligible

**Likelihood**

- A = ≥98%
- B = 75% - 97%
- C = 50% - 74%
- D = 25% - 49%
- E = 3% - 24%
- F = ≤2%

## RISK ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT PLANS

Risk Ref:	1	Risk Title:	Failure to secure improvements to services		
Responsibility	<i>Who is managing the risk?</i>		Community Partnerships Manager		
Consequence	<i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management fail to monitor performance and address under performance and targets not met.</li> <li>• Some service areas have failed.</li> </ul>		
Cause / Trigger	<i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data fails to be captured to assess achievement of the Strategic Plan.</li> <li>• Services fail to input data into performance management system.</li> <li>• No action taken to address poor performance.</li> <li>• Management and Members only monitoring performance.</li> </ul>		
Existing Control	<i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance monitoring system in place.</li> <li>• Quarterly reports to management board and 6 monthly reports to Policy and Scrutiny Committees.</li> <li>• Performance Improvement Officer.</li> </ul>		
Adequacy of Control	<i>What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?</i>		Majority of corporate targets are on track. Or being over achieved.	Impact III	Likelihood D
Further Action / Controls Required	<i>What gaps have been identified? What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace performance plus with more manageable system that is resistant to staffing changes.</li> <li>• Annual review of targets with Heads of Service.</li> <li>• Improve shared service performance management.</li> <li>• Procedure notes for indicator collection to be improved.</li> <li>• Improvements to shared services performance management systems in collaboration with Watford Borough Council.</li> </ul>		
Cost / Resources	<i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i>		Staff time.	£ 0	
Current Status	<i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New system being developed.</li> <li>• Strategic plan reviewed with Heads of Service and Management Board.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood E
Critical Factor	Success	<i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic plan targets achieved.</li> <li>• Customer satisfaction improves.</li> </ul>	Impact II	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	2	Risk Title:	Failure to tell residents about improvements		
Responsibility	<i>Who is managing the risk?</i>		Communications Manager		
Consequence	<i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor response rates from hard to reach groups</li> <li>• Stakeholders not understanding/valuing the services the Council provides</li> <li>• Low levels of public satisfaction with the Council</li> </ul>		
Cause / Trigger	<i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen's Panel not representative of community</li> <li>• Consultation methods fail to engage hard to reach groups</li> <li>• Insufficient resources to engage hard to reach groups</li> <li>• Messages unclear or garbled</li> <li>• Responsive rather than proactive</li> <li>• Distribution failures (Three Rivers Times)</li> </ul>		
Existing Control	<i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate consultation data analysed by race, gender and disability</li> <li>• Regularly updated strategy and action plan with increased emphasis on quality controls</li> <li>• Editorial Working Party reviews TRT and A-Z</li> <li>• TRT distributor provides street by street delivery report and delivery quality checked with staff who live in the district</li> <li>• TRT delivery reminder service implemented</li> <li>• Annual focus groups for TRT, A-Z and priority communications issues</li> <li>• Press release output and coverage targets in place</li> <li>• Feedback mechanisms include Pensioners' Forum, Youth Council, prize draw survey in democracy packs, welcome packs for new residents, surveys in TRT and at key points of contact.</li> <li>• Communications team action plan produced annually and reviewed twice a year</li> <li>• Cross-department communications group gives feedback three times a year</li> <li>• Staff marketing and press release workshops held three times a year</li> <li>• Web development workshops implemented and web editors now expected to attend cross-department communications group</li> <li>• Audio version of Three Rivers Times actively distributed for visually impaired or those with reading difficulties</li> <li>• Use of web analytics tools</li> <li>• Internal Communications survey completed</li> </ul>		
Adequacy of Control	<i>What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer Service Excellence accreditation</li> <li>• Council recognised as good communicator by LGA</li> </ul>	Impact	Likelihood
				III	C
Further Action / Controls Required	<i>What gaps have been identified? What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications and resident focus groups to be held</li> <li>• Overarching communications strategy for sustainability</li> <li>• Telephone surveys on delivery of TRT</li> </ul>		

Cost / Resources	<i>Impact if something does go wrong?</i> <i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i>	No additional resource requirements identified	£	
Current Status	<i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional controls to be completed during 2011/12.</li> <li>Impact and probability have not changed since last review</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood E
Critical Factor	Success <i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All key groups will be represented in consultation feedback.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood E

Risk Ref:	3	Risk Title:	Failure to make progress on the sustainability action plan		
Responsibility	<i>Who is managing the risk?</i>	Head of Sustainability			
Consequence	<i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The authority fails to lead by example on sustainable initiatives and does not provide the opportunities for residents to take advantage of, for example, energy saving measures</li> <li>Failure to resource the plan properly</li> <li>Lack of awareness of current initiatives</li> <li>National Indicators have been abolished. The Council is at a high level already and a high base line may prove difficult to improve on if new Indicators are introduced.</li> </ul>			
Cause / Trigger	<i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring reveals that the actions in plan are not taking place and targets are not being achieved</li> <li>Withdrawal of Government funding for sustainable initiative subsidies</li> </ul>			
Existing Control	<i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Plan for the development of Climate Change Strategy agreed</li> <li>Sustainability team has been set up</li> <li>Regular progress reports on strategy development reported to SEPSC</li> <li>Standing items for Cabinet/Management Board and Management Board meetings</li> <li>Partnership arrangements have been set up with the LSP and Energy Savings Trust</li> <li>Membership of the University of Herts Climate Change Group with bi-monthly meetings</li> <li>Information is provided via the "Our Climate Is Changing" website</li> <li>Local Climate Impacts Profile has been submitted to DEFRA</li> <li>ISO14001 accreditation achieved (excluding Batchworth Depot)</li> </ul>			
Adequacy of Control	<i>What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are kept up to date on progress via regular reports</li> <li>Internal audits</li> <li>Submissions to DEFRA</li> </ul>	Impact IV	Likelihood D	
Further Action / Controls Required	<i>What gaps have been identified? What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued local monitoring of ex NI186 via Climate Change Partnership</li> <li>Annual audit and re-accreditation of ISO14001</li> <li>Seeking accreditation for ISO14001 for Batchworth Depot by Summer 2011</li> <li>Continued promotion of Government (CERT) funding, whilst available</li> </ul>			

		<i>Impact if something does go wrong?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued development and promotion of the “Our Climate Is Changing” website</li> </ul>		
Cost / Resources		<i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i>	No additional resource requirements identified	£	
Current Status		<i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional controls to be completed during 2010/11.</li> <li>Impact and probability have not changed since last review</li> </ul>	Impact IV	Likelihood E
Critical Factor	Success	<i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Successful ISO14001 accreditation for Batchworth Depot</li> <li>Successful ISO14001 re-accreditation</li> </ul>	Impact IV	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	4	Risk Title:	Failure to engage the community in the Strategic Plan		
Responsibility		<i>Who is managing the risk?</i>	Community Partnerships Manager		
Consequence		<i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor engagement with hard to reach groups results in lack of evidence base to meet vulnerable group needs.</li> <li>Recent consultation has seen increase in engagement of key hard to reach groups.</li> <li>Loss of funding for engagement work.</li> <li>Citizen’s panel becomes unrepresentative.</li> <li>Consultation methods fail to engage hard to reach groups.</li> <li>Insufficient resources to engage groups.</li> <li>Hard to reach groups fail to remain engage due to lack of TRDC response to needs.</li> <li>Corporate consultation budget in place to support work.</li> <li>Panel membership updated each year.</li> <li>Response rates to surveys monitored.</li> <li>Joint work developed across county and locally with partners to reduce costs and increase overall engagement outcomes.</li> <li>Engagement in public engagement partnership.</li> <li>Diversity group with Thrive NHS HCC and Police in District.</li> <li>LGBT Partnership.</li> <li>County Omnibus survey.</li> <li>Improvement to joint working e.g. LGBT consultation.</li> <li>Follow up work with BME communities.</li> <li>New projects with people with mental health problems.</li> <li>Increased participation of people with learning disabilities.</li> </ul>		
Cause / Trigger		<i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i>			
Existing Control		<i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i>			
Adequacy of Control		<i>What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?</i>		Impact III	Likelihood D
Further Action /		<i>What gaps have been identified?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further joint work to engage low income groups and those with low literacy on area basis</li> </ul>		

Controls Required	<i>What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>with partners' agencies.</li> <li>Secure joint approach to corporate surveys to reduce costs.</li> </ul>		
Cost / Resources	<i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i>	Staff time	£	
Current Status	<i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft plans to increase joint working being developed to reduce costs.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood E
Critical Factor	<i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence base supports new legal requirements.</li> <li>Increase in residents' view that they can influence local decision making.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	5	Risk Title:	Failure to achieve Community Safety targets		
Responsibility	<i>Who is managing the risk?</i>	Community Safety Manager			
Consequence	<i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ineffective target setting</li> <li>Resources not allocated to address actions</li> <li>Changes in recording systems</li> <li>Initiatives fail to meet targets</li> <li>Public do not understand what work is being achieved</li> <li>Overall strategy has met strategic targets</li> <li>Strategy not translated into plans for each partners' agency</li> <li>Action Plan not monitored for impact and corrective action</li> <li>MIDAS / monitoring systems fail</li> <li>Poor practice and enforcement by partners</li> <li>Residents misinformed by national media</li> <li>Reduction in funding for partnership</li> <li>No joint risk management</li> <li>Lack of commitment of staffing resources from partners</li> <li>Lack of equality monitoring</li> <li>No business continuity or disaster recovery plans</li> <li>Quarterly reports to Community Safety Board and Co-ordination Group,</li> <li>Six monthly reports to Leisure and Community Safety Policy and Scrutiny Committee</li> <li>Engagement in Safer Stronger Executive Group</li> <li>Briefings with CEO and portfolio holder</li> <li>Participation in Family Intervention Project, Offender Management Group and ASB Action Group</li> <li>Equality impact monitored</li> <li>Strategy overall is on target. Where individual targets not met</li> </ul>			
Cause / Trigger	<i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i>				
Existing Control	<i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i>				
Adequacy of Control	<i>What evidence is there that the existing</i>		Impact	Likelihood	

Further Action / Controls Required	<p><i>Rating be without the existing controls?</i></p> <p><i>What gaps have been identified? What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?</i></p>	<p>new action plans have been put in place and targets revised annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review all bids for sustainability.</li> <li>Assess risks of all partnership projects.</li> <li>Request clarity of staffing commitments from all partners through annual action plan.</li> <li>Request CRB checks for partnership funded projects where relevant.</li> <li>Request equality impact on all funding proposals. Health and safety terms to be given to all grants.</li> <li>Review data protection arrangements for non-statutory partners.</li> <li>Assess business continuity needs for all partnership projects.</li> <li>Implement shared ASB management system.</li> <li>Seek county clarity on funding sources.</li> </ul>	III	D
Cost / Resources	<p><i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i></p>	<p>Staff time. ICT support to implement new ASB system.</p>	£ tbc	
Current Status	<p><i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grants reviewed, and sustainability proposals being reviewed.</li> <li>Dialogue started with LSP regarding funding sources.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood E
Critical Success Factor	<p><i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targets of strategy met for year.</li> <li>Review new risks at that point.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	6	Risk Title:	Failure to achieve the priorities of the Community Strategy through the LSP		
Responsibility	<p><i>Who is managing the risk?</i></p>	Community Partnerships Manager			
Consequence	<p><i>What can go wrong? How can it go wrong? Has it gone wrong before?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver on the strategy by some partners</li> <li>Loss of resources to support achievement of the priorities.</li> <li>Action Plans not effectively implemented</li> </ul>			
Cause / Trigger	<p><i>What happens to bring the risk into being?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of national targets and funding streams.</li> <li>Changes in priorities of individual partners.</li> <li>Budget limitations.</li> <li>Poor development of action plans.</li> <li>Limited buy in to strategy by partners.</li> </ul>			
Existing Control	<p><i>What controls exist now to minimise the risk?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Plan updates provided to board from all sub-partnerships.</li> <li>Key performance indicators being tracked.</li> <li>Regular briefings with Leader.</li> <li>Regular meeting of LSP Board.</li> </ul>			
Adequacy of Control	<p><i>What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress made on key projects in the District.</li> <li>Challenge provided to poor performance.</li> </ul>	Impact III	Likelihood C	

Further Action / Controls Required	<p><i>Rating be without the existing controls?</i></p> <p><i>What gaps have been identified?</i></p> <p><i>What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board reviewing impact of CSR and new changes.</li> <li>• Sustainability key decision element to project funding.</li> <li>• Complete review of LSP post CSR.</li> <li>• Assess new sources of potential shared funding for local priorities.</li> <li>• Maintain risk assessment of all proposals for funding and joint action.</li> </ul>		
Cost / Resources	<p><i>Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?</i></p>	Staff time. Partners funding and commitment.	£15,000	
Current Status	<p><i>What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating</i></p>	Review of partnership has started to risk assess future needs.	Impact III	Likelihood D
Critical Success Factor	<p><i>How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?</i></p>	Partnership achieves further progress on priorities in areas of deprivation in sustainable manor.	Impact III	Likelihood E

