Appendix F: Risk Register Extract

RISK ID	RISK DESCRIPTION (Cause & Impact)	CONTROLS (Response Plan)	POST RESPONSE: LIKELIHOOD / IMPACT
1	**One of the <u>Partners withdraws</u> from the Project, due to a <u>lack of mutual agreement</u> around the Business Case and/or Inter Authority Agreement or wider political/financial pressures/tensions, resulting in the Shared Service not being implemented and existing TS ties (e.g. TSMT) being severed.**	- Ensuring that plans and key project documentation are developed in consultation with the SROs and with the Project Board (at a high level), to ensure operational and political interests are reflected - Engaging in early discussion about any potential "deal breakers" and ensuring that both parties have clarity on key issues (including checking that appropriate advice has been sought, e.g. legal/finance/HR) - Undertaking environmental analysis (PESTLE/SWOT) in order to identify and assess potential points of tension / areas that could cause this to happen and have in place risk responses and a robust communications plan. - Regualrly reviewing escalated Risks & Issues with the Project Board. - Involving a third-party to lead on managing the Project with both parties, to introduce impartiality, at the start of the project. - Receive external advice on TUPE (and other sensitive areas) to ensure that proposals are reasonable, robust and consistent with other practices in the market. - Engaging early with both Legal Teams and encourage them to co-design the MoU / IAA.	**Remote / Severe**

2	**A <u>failure to effectively engage with TS staff</u>, particularly around TUPE and Terms and Conditions, results in <u>resistance to change</u>, tensions between BCC and SCC staff and/or potential industrial dispute.**	- Good communications / Keeping staff informed through creation of Stakeholder Engagement and Communications (SEC) WG and robust Communications Plan, built on the foundation of analysis including SWOT/PESTLE at an individual level - Involving staff in design through WGs - Understanding points of tension / areas that could cause resistence - Inform Unions, understand what involvement they seek - Focusing effort on areas where resistance will most undermine the project	**Likely / Moderate**
3	**<u>Incompatibilities of IT systems</u> (or other technical aspects of the two services) results in project slippage, inefficient work-arounds and/or additional systems investment or technical support being required.**	- An IT Working Group (ITWG) has been created to scope and risk assess the IT alignment aspects of this Project and to plan the transitional steps from the present to future state	**Possible / Moderate**
4	**A <u>lack of required investment in essential IT</u> (e.g. databases, equipment, connectivity), infrastructure and other technical aspects compromises the delivery of the service standard and integration being sought.**	- A Systems Working Group has been created to scope and risk assess the IT alignment aspects of this Project and to plan the transitional steps from the present to future state. - Piloting and testing will be factored in to Phases 3/4 of this project, to try to identify any issues. - Any additional investment decisions will be assessed by the Project Board, who will be provided will full brieifngs on the problem, impact and a range of costed solutions.	**Remote / Significant**

5	**A lack of investment in Project Management (resource, planning, delivery) and insufficient internal BCC/SCC commitment/resource to deliver the project, leads to project delays or failure to meet objectives and realise benefits.The end of iese involvement and handover of PM to SCC / BCC leads to less robust PM approach when planning Phase 3 and Phase 4, with some necessary actions not being completed, possible risks not being managed.**	- Engagement of IESE to manage Phase 1+2 of the Project and to provide expertise/experience in relation to organisational transformation, design & culture and HR-specifc issues (e.g. TUPE). - Having an influential Project Board, which understands the time required by BCC and SCC resources and the Board itself. This is also to be supported by clear project governance arrangements. - The development of a robust project structure and key documentation, which clearly lays out the main activities of the project and resource requirements. Also to be supported by regular project reporting. - The creation of aligned WG Terms of Reference documents, which set out the activities and scope of the WG and the way in which the WG engages with the wider project. - SROs to carefully plan for usage of Iese's remaining service hours - Iese to create handover documentation for SCC/BCC to pick up - Internal PM resource to work more closely with each other to determine new roles and responsibilities	**Certain / Moderate**
6	**Budget/resource reductions and/or unfavourable political decisions relating to TS in either or both authorities result in adverse impacts or additional or changed demands, which will need to be factored in to the new TS JS Target Operating Model (TOM) design. Dependencies outside of the project (e.g. the 'BCC Future Shape' Programme, authority savings targets and/or any potential authority move towards outsourcing), lead to 'trade-offs' that affect project delivery and/or the quality of the resulting joint service, or may lead to the project being closed altogether.**	- Retaining awareness of financial situation in each authority (to predict and act quickly if adverse budget decisions are being considered) - Being clear to financial decision makers of the impact of reduced budgets (good use of intel and data) - Recommending that the TS are out of scope for the BCC "Future Shape" Programme, via the BCCTS JS Project Board representatives - Interdependent Programmes/Projects are being identified as part of the Business Case process, which will include review of plans and impact. - BCC/SCC Cabinet Members will be briefed about TS JS throughout the project, so they are aware of what this project is aiming to do and when, so that they can consider this when planning other projects. - Continued relationship between HoS and their finance teams as part of the budget setting process - Awareness of outside projects and programmes to be continued throughout planning phase 3 and 4	**Possible / Significant**

7	**Concerns about the potential for return on investment and the overall mutual benefits of introducing the joint service, mean that the project does not gain approval from BCC and SCC Cabinets, resulting in either severe slippage while the business case re-enters the approval process, or in project closure.**	- A template has been provided to Working Group Leads which requires them to quantify benefits in either financial or time savings or increased income. - In the initial conversations between BCC and SCC, it was noted that the benefits would be mainly be around increased resilience and other factors which are difficult to translate into tangible ourcomes. - The present over-arching benefits have been shared informally in the past during inter-authortiy meetings and have been considered valid. - A full project budget forecasting exercise has been undertaken as part of this exercise, which provides several costed options.	**Remote / Severe**
8	**The development of the detail of the Target Operating Model (TOM) highlights logistical (e.g. linked to geography) or technical obstacles and/or conflicting opinions regarding the acceptable levels of local variation, standardized practice and resourcing, creating slippage or failure to secure approval for the Business Case.**	- The Working Groups were created early on in the project and there is already understanding from both sides about how each service works presently and the parts that both would like to take forward in the future and some of the potential geographical barriers have been discussed up front. - The Business Case will be taken through each Authorities appropriate political decision processes and pre-briefings will be provided to key members. Cabinet Members will also identify potential opposition as soon as possible and flag it to the Board.	**Remote / Moderate**
10	**A lack of agreement around financial aspects (including sources of funding for the project, transparency around overheads/on-costs, projected income/expenditure for the new service and calculating the relative budget contributions and revenue share) leads to project slippage and/or political tensions.**		**Possible / Moderate**
11	**Some of the more complex aspects outlined within the Target Operating Model (TOM) prove more difficult to agree and implement than originally anticipated - potentially including legal, contractual and relations with other partners - which leads to unplanned iterations of original plans or changes in direction, and creates project slippage.**	Ensure clear comms with all staff and WG leads on what is to be achieved and how service is going to get there Monitor and control progress on Implementation plan	**Remote / Moderate**

12	**Slippage** (particularly linked to the processes described in risk 7) leads to the 'heavily preferred' full service <u>launch date ((April 15) being missed</u> and results in dis-juncture between financial and business planning/reporting arrangements.	Robust control of critical path of WG implementation, and overall project duration (review at PM meetings) Up-date PB and escalate issues to PB to resolve (more funding for project support / external consultancy to bring project in on time)	**Remote / Significant**
13	**Staff may be affected by changes to the way <u>they work</u> and in particular BCC staff re TUPE,** which might lead to resistance, decreased work output	People WG considered likely obstacles and produced action plan to overcome / mitigate them; Full consultation throughout TUPE process with staff and unions to raise issues and address them	**Possible / Moderate**
14	**<u>Individual authority independence</u> and autonomy around decision making processes for local issues might be affected by joint service set up, which might lead to dispute**	Governance, decision-making authority and dispute process are being described and agreed on in the Inter Authority Agreement; Representatives of both parties on Joint Committee and Management Board to raise and disolve possible issues around autonomy	**Remote / Significant**
	INSERT NEW LINES ABOVE		