

**Follow Up Report on the Mid-Year Review of the
Strategic/Corporate Risk & Opportunity Register
- Risks With High (Red) Target Ratings**
Risks in Reference Number (Numeric) Order

UNMANAGED / INHERENT RISK

Risk Description		Risk Owner						
<p>Balancing the cost of care and maintaining minimum quality standards – the risk is that a combination of the following on-going pressures – financial pressures on local authorities (e.g. reduced teams for critical processes such as contract management and monitoring, inability to uplift prices to counter competition for workers and inflationary increases etc.), a significant failing of a current provider, significant and continued pressures on hospital A&E and periods of ‘black alert’, market-wide decrease in the number of care workers due to ongoing poor employment conditions, ongoing issues in providing temporary care staff through local framework agreement and continued economic pressure on care providers leads to a drop in care quality/standards and failure of providers to maintain basis or minimum standards for service users. Ultimately results in risk to service users’ health, reputational damage to the Council and increased costs in managing escalated care and health needs and council intervention as a result. Neighbouring boroughs where contract monitoring was reduced have experienced care home failures, and in one home alone it was estimated that over 4,500 hours have been spent addressing this. Estimates indicate that the cost of this professional involvement were approximately £140k. Reductions in the number of contract officers from 4 to 2 and the senior contract officers from 2 to 1 means that monitoring cannot take place as frequently as it used to. Also the introduction of new team responsibilities means that the senior and team manager are covering both areas. The implementation of the National Living Wage from April 2016 has added a further pressure to already stretched resources.</p>		Les Billingham						
Link to Corporate Priority								
Improve health and wellbeing								
Inherent Risk Rating	Date:	01/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very likely (4)	Rating:	16

DASHBOARD

Inherent Risk Rating & Date: 01/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 21/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 14/09/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Target Risk Rating & Target Date: 31/03/2017
<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>

Comments
<p>The risk evaluates the impact of a combination of issues on the maintenance of care quality standards and the ability to meet the needs of service users who meet Adult Social Care eligibility criteria. The risk is rated at the higher level due to the financial pressures on local authorities and the impact this has in turn on providers – e.g. reduced teams for critical processes such as contract management, inability to uplift prices to counter competition for workers, inflationary pressures etc.). In 2015-16, the Council agreed to provide residential providers for older people with an uplift of 1% and the possibility of a further 1% linked to performance. Whilst contingencies are and continue to be considered, the current Council financial situation makes finding a workable solution increasingly difficult – particularly with the added pressure of the National Living Wage. 2015/16 also saw two domiciliary care providers unable remain viable, and the Council having to take a considerable number of hours back in-house. The service and the market place is extremely stretched, and this risk remains a significant threat to the Council's ability to provide continuity and high quality care packages.</p> <p>Update as of September 2016 - The market continues to show signs of being extremely stretched. This includes a waiting list for people requiring care packages which is the first time this situation has occurred. This in turn is placing strain on the wider system, with a greater reliance on informal carers (friends and relatives) and a delay to people ready to leave hospital. For the first time the delay in providing social care packages has led to more than 25 delayed discharges. The impact of the Council having to take care packages back in-house due to external provider failure has led to a squeeze on our own capacity and the need for improvement. A plan is in place and being implemented which responds to a recent CQC report and also an independent review of our in-house domiciliary care provider – Thurrock Care at Home. Regardless of improvements made and on-going work to control demand, the risk of continued system failure remains extremely high.</p>

EXISTING ACTION / RESIDUAL RISK

Management Action or Mitigation Already in Place	Date Implemented								
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive compliance monitoring and audit process in place. 2. Quarterly information sharing meetings with Care Quality commission (CQC) to identify and share concerns/risks. Quarterly Quality Surveillance Group (QSG) meetings with health colleagues and CQC to identify and manage risks across the whole system. 3. Develop a comprehensive accommodation-based programme to deliver choice and quality in the local market. 4. Compliance with the Care Act regarding market failure and service interruption 5. Provision of increase (1% plus 1% for performance) for OP residential providers 6. Bring back in-house domiciliary care packages of failed providers 	<p>2013/14 2013/14</p> <p>From 2013 From Apr 2015 From Apr 2015 From 2015</p>								
Residual Risk Rating	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Date:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">21/04/2016</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Impact:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Critical (4)</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Likelihood:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Likely (3)</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Rating:</td> <td style="width: 10%;">12</td> </tr> </table>	Date:	21/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Date:	21/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12		

FURTHER ACTION / TARGET RISK / REVISED RESIDUAL RISK

Further Management or Mitigating Action	Implementation Date	Progress
7. Development of specification and tender for domiciliary care contract – 'Living Well at Home'	Throughout 2016/17	The pilot for Living Well at Home is due to start within the next month. A report detailing arrangements for procuring domiciliary care from April 2017 will go to HOSC in November 16 and Cabinet in December 16 after which the tender process will commence.
8. Implementation of 2% increase on fees paid to care home providers for older people with a 1% performance enhancement for any of these providers obtaining an excellent rating following their contract compliance visit	April 2016	Commenced
9. Development and implementation of Enhanced Care Homes pilot	July 2016	A report detailing proposals for the Enhanced Care Homes pilot is to go to the Integrated Commissioning Executive before the end of October. The pilot will commence once the ICE has agreed the proposals. Funding to support the pilot has already been allocated via the Better Care Fund.

10.Continued work to manage demand via the ASC Transformation Programme and Better Care Fund Plan		Throughout 2016/17		Work is continuing on the development and implementation of the ASC Transformation Programme (Living Well in Thurrock) and Better Care Fund Plan. Both are aimed at utilising resources across the system in a way that better manages demand. Both the Living Well in Thurrock Programme and Better Care Fund Plan are overseen by the Integrated Commissioning Executive and also via the Health and Wellbeing Board. Recent progress includes the development of the Living Well at Home pilot, Social Prescribing, Single Point of Access (due to launch in February), and the establishment of Micro Enterprises. A number of projects and initiatives sit as part of the LWiT programme and BCF Plan.				
11. Deliver improvement action plan which responds to CQC inspection of Thurrock Care at Home (in-house domiciliary care service) and independent review.		On-going – actions prioritised						
Target Risk Rating	Target Date:	Refresh 31/03/2017	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Revised Residual Risk Rating	Date:	14/09/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very Likely (4)	Rating:	16

Rationale for applying High (Red) Target Ratings to the Risk

The health and social care market across the country is under extreme pressure and this shows little sign of abating. We have had to take back one dom care provider in the past 12 months and another has given us back the work because of financial pressures. High demand, increasing costs and tightening finances all contribute to this. Nationally a number of big providers have either issued profit warning or decided to pull out of the care market all together. It has become increasingly difficult to recruit quality care staff and all local authorities rely very heavily on agency staff.

The pressures remain and will not be alleviated in the short term. A target date of 31/03/2017 has been applied to the risks, which is the time when the risk and management response arrangements will be fully refreshed and updated to reflect any changes to the situation

UNMANAGED / INHERENT RISK

Risk Description		Risk Owner						
<p>Adult Social Care and the NHS are finding it increasingly difficult to meet demand for services, particularly when resource continues to decrease. With the expected ageing and growth of the population, we can expect age-related disease to continue to rise. Dementia for example is predicted to rise steeply in Thurrock, and by 2033 the population aged 85+ is projected to double. Two thirds of the resource spent on social care nationally is already spent on individuals with at least one-term condition. Lifestyle factors too will continue to compound the problem with Thurrock levels for smoking and obesity being significantly higher than the national average. Alongside a system that was designed in the 1940s and is no longer fit for purpose and a change in the way that local government is funded in the future, major transformation is required.</p> <p>The Council, working in partnership with NHS Thurrock Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has developed a joint transformation programme which is overseen via an Integrated Commissioning Executive (Better Care Fund Plan). Integration though continues to be a significant challenge. As such, the Directorate has also established its own Adults Transformation Programme (Living Well in Thurrock). Failure of the programmes to achieve their objectives will lead to the inability of social care and health to be able to meet demand within existing resources. For adult social care, this would mean either not providing services to those people who were eligible to receive them – which would leave the Council open to challenge and also result in a failure to meet statutory duties – or continue to provide services to those who qualify but exceeding the available budget.</p>		Roger Harris						
Link to Corporate Priority								
Improve Health and Wellbeing								
Inherent Risk Rating	Date:	01/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very Likely (4)	Rating:	16

DASHBOARD

Inherent Risk Rating & Date: 01/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 22/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 14/09/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Target Risk Rating & Target Date: 31/03/2017
<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>

Comments

Significant programme management capacity and expertise is required to deliver both the Adult Social Care Transformation Programme and the Health and Social Care Integration Programme. There are also challenges to overcome to progress integration with health. This includes current pressures on the Essex-wide health economy, a 'local' health agenda which is geographically broader than Thurrock, and how decisions made by non-Thurrock parts of the Essex-wide system will impact upon what Thurrock wants and needs to achieve. Thurrock is a very low spending authority per capita on adult social care and also faces significant on-going reductions to funding. Risks of non-delivery of any, or all, of these important programmes are exacerbated by these factors. Migration in the form of securing resources in the short-term to provide adequate programme management, delivery and specialist expertise where required is necessary.

Update September 2016

Whilst initiatives designed to manage, reduce, and meet demand are on-going, the results are in most cases not immediate. As a result, the risk rating as at March 2017 is still likely to be high. The management of demand in social care has links across the whole system, and therefore the speed at which the NHS can also transform will have a bearing on the success of our own programme. As detailed in our other Corporate Risk, we are currently seeing the impact of domiciliary provider failure on our own in-house provision and on our ability to provide care to people in their own home.

EXISTING ACTION / RESIDUAL RISK

Management Action or Mitigation Already in Place								Date Implemented
1. Programme Management arrangements in place								2014/15
2. Programme Initiation Document established and agreed								"
3. Close partnership working with Thurrock CCG established								"
4. Separate risk register developed as part of the Programme Management arrangements								"
5. Integrated Commissioning Executive established to oversee the development of work between health and social care								"
Residual Risk Rating	Date:	22/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

FURTHER ACTION / TARGET RISK / REVISED RESIDUAL RISK

Further Management or Mitigating Action	Implementation Date	Progress
6. Continue programme arrangements	April 2016	Programme arrangements established
7. Complete refresh of Better Care Fund 2016-17	May 2016	Better Care Fund 2016/17 has been approved
8. Delivery of 2016-17 work programme for ASC Transformation Programme	June 2016	The work programme for LWiT continues to be developed and is being overseen by the Integrated Commissioning Executive
9. Development of action plans to support the implementation of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy	July 2016	Action plans have been developed, but further work is taking place to ensure that the action plans reflect local engagement and also include any interdependencies

Target Risk Rating	Target Date:	Refresh 31/03/2017	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Revised Residual Risk Rating	Date:	14/09/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

Rationale for applying High (Red) Target Ratings to the Risk

We are part of the Essex Success regime. This is a national initiative launched in June 2015 and reflects the difficult position the NHS and Adult Social care find themselves in. In effect as a system we have been put in special measures. The NHS across Essex is facing a deficit approaching £ 300m. We are working closely with our local CCG and NHS providers to develop a local model that is based on building stronger communities, integrated health and social care, developing a stronger primary care offer and improving the housing offer.

The pressures remain and will not be alleviated in the short term. A target date of 31/03/2017 has been applied to the risks, which is the time when the risk and management response arrangements will be fully refreshed and updated to reflect any changes to the situation.

INHERENT RISK

Risk Description							Risk Owner	
Failure to manage the increases in demand and budget/ resource pressures for Children's Social Care could lead to a breakdown in the quality or performance of the service provided to vulnerable children and results in less favourable outcomes from inspection and damage to reputation of the service does meet the required standards							Andrew Carter	
Link to Corporate Priority								
- Create a great place for learning and opportunity - Improve health and wellbeing								
Inherent Risk Rating	Date:	01/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very Likely (4)	Rating:	16

DASHBOARD

Inherent Risk Rating & Date: 01/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 29/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 27/09/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Target Risk Rating & Target Date: 31/03/2017

Comments
<p>This risk evaluates the impact of increased demand and resource pressures on children's social care quality of service and provision. The pressures outlined throughout previous years remain acute. They include increased volumes, increased complexity and ongoing activity to review high cost placements. The implementation of the early help service model and the Thurrock multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH) has been successful although as anticipated it has led to an increase in the volume of work to children's social care, this is ongoing. The service continues to maximize the external investment and opportunities presented through the Troubled Families Programme and continuously measures impact of the MASH. Ongoing savings to be made across Children's Services including from the Children's Social care budget will be risk assessed to mitigate the impact on front line services.</p> <p>The service has to be demand and needs lead and cannot fail to respond to the needs of a child due to budget or resource constraints. Changes on a local, regional and national level can have a significant impact on the demand for services. War and international factors can result in an unplanned increase in the number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children or families with no recourse to public funds. Geographical movement of families across the Eastern Region and London can see a rise in families needing services, including large sibling groups. An incident of civil disorder could result in more young people being placed in custody and a resulting increase in remand costs to the local authority.</p> <p>Caseloads are too high in some teams and this represents a pressing safeguarding concern. Areas for improvement have been identified within the recent Ofsted (SIF). The level and complexity of some children and young people's needs and the lack of available national resources (specialist placements) to meet those needs is driving up cost pressures. As the Council continues to improve practice regarding the identification and tackling of Child Sexual Exploitation there is an increase in demand for service provision</p>

in terms of intervention; prevention and victim support. Current and new duties in terms of radicalization also place pressures on the service in terms of workforce capacity. Trends can be predicted based on previous levels of demand but these are subject to variance. The pressures outlined above will not be alleviated in the short term and the risk rating will remain at the higher (red) level for the period covered. A target date of 31/03/17 has been applied to the risk, which is the time when the documentation will be fully reviewed, refreshed and updated.

EXISTING ACTION / RESIDUAL RISK

Management Action or Mitigation Already in Place								Date Implemented
1. Quality Assurance and Safeguarding functions are in place and robustly applied. Functions extended to include the establishment of an Improvements Board.								Ongoing
2. Trix Policies and Procedures have been introduced across Children's Social care. All procedures to be subject to review and updating.								Completed / ongoing
4. Joint delivery of the 'Early Offer of Help Strategy' and associated services are now embedded to meet the new the duty placed on Council's to coordinate an early offer of help to families who do not meet the criteria for social care services and ensure that the 'step down and step up' processes are robustly managed. Further improvements in these services have been identified within the Ofsted SIF. A service redesign is planned based on the SIF findings and work by iMPower.								Ongoing
5. Internal quality assurance audits to evidence appropriate application of thresholds.								Ongoing
6. Ongoing data analysis to enable us to benchmark and target areas for improvement; complete redesign of PKI and trends analysis.								From Apr 2016
7. Placement Review – an external reviews of high cost placements.								Ongoing
Residual Risk Rating	Date:	29/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

FURTHER ACTION / TARGET RISK / REVISED RESIDUAL RISK

Further Management or Mitigating Action			Implementation Date	Progress				
8. Ongoing implementation and/or application of actions 1 - 7 above.			From Apr 2016	Ongoing				
Target Risk Rating	Target Date:	Refresh 31/03/2017	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Revised Residual Risk Rating	Date:	27/09/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

Rationale for applying High (Red) Target Ratings to the Risk

This risk evaluates the impact of increased demand and resource pressures on children's social care quality of service and provision. Pressures include increased volumes, increased complexity and ongoing activity to review high cost placements. The service is demand and needs lead and cannot fail to respond to the needs of a child due to budget or resource constraints. Changes on a local, regional and national level can have an impact on the demand for services (e.g. war and migration factors can result in an unplanned increase in the number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children and geographical movement of families across the Eastern Region and London can see a rise in families needing services, including large sibling groups).

The implementation of the early help service model and the Thurrock Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) has been successful although as anticipated it has led to an increase in the volume of work to children's social care, this is ongoing. The service continues to maximize the external investment and opportunities presented through the Troubled Families Programme and continuously measures impact of the MASH. However caseloads remain high in some teams and this represents a pressing safeguarding concern. As the Council continues to improve practice regarding the identification and tackling of Child Sexual Exploitation there is an increase in demand for service provision in terms of intervention; prevention and victim support. New duties in terms of radicalization also place pressures on the service in terms of workforce capacity.

The pressures outlined above will not be alleviated in the short term and the risk rating will remain at the higher (red) level for the period to the 31st March 2017, which is the time when the risk documentation will be fully reviewed, refreshed and updated.

INHERENT RISK

Risk Description							Risk Owner	
Failure to ensure that all children and young people in need of help or protection are safeguarded and supported could result in them not achieving their full potential and increasing the risk of a child death or serious injury.							Andrew Carter	
Link to Corporate Priority								
- Build pride, responsibility and respect , - Create a great place for learning and opportunity, - Improve health and wellbeing								
Inherent Risk Rating	Date:	01/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very Likely (4)	Rating:	16

DASHBOARD

Inherent Risk Rating & Date: 01/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 29/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 27/09/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Target Risk Rating & Target Date: 31/03/2017
<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>	<p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>

Comments

The nature of the work in terms of safeguarding and supporting children at risk of harm means that this will always be a high risk area although through the application of the S.E.T (Southend, Essex & Thurrock) Child Protection procedures the department actively works to mitigate this risk and reduce the likelihood. The risk of children and young people coming to harm cannot be completely eliminated and the risk level needs to remain high and ensure clear vigilance across the council and partner agencies. New and emerging risk factors will arise and there is always a potential for agencies 'not knowing, what they don't know' that needs to be guarded against. Embedding the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and Early Offer of Help has supported earlier identification of risk through a multi-agency approach enabling the department to work to intervene at an earlier stage and reduce the risk of harm in some cases. The impact for individual children and families, particularly in cases of child death is significant and whilst actions to reduce the likelihood are implemented the impact will remain as critical. There is also a critical impact score in terms of reputational damage should a child death or serious injury occur.

The ongoing nature of risk in child protection and safeguarding is such that despite effective mitigation the acknowledgement of the risk needs to remain high and will not reduce. This is not to say that the risks are unmanageable but for effective management the gravity and complexity of the risk needs to be acknowledged. Within the context of this work we have a high level and critical risk that is being proactively managed. The management of the risk across partner agencies is reducing the likelihood of such risk, where the potential for such risks are known but cannot reduce the potential magnitude for the child in incidents such as child death or permanent disability. The unknown element of risk for families not known to the service means that overall the likelihood remains high. Families are also not static and risk is a constant changing variable within known families. Managing this risk places inherent pressures on the Children's Social Care budget as a demand led budget. The current trend has seen increasing numbers of children requiring child protection plans, children in need plans and children who the council is required to look after (children in care). Effective demand and resource management remain a priority for the service within an overriding context of keeping children safe.

The risk rating will remain as a constant throughout the period covered.

EXISTING ACTION / RESIDUAL RISK

Management Action or Mitigation Already in Place							Date Implemented	
1. Application of the Southend, Essex & Thurrock Child Protection procedures 2. Local Safeguarding Children's Board established, progress reported annually and guidance reviewed 3. Quality assurance and safeguarding function of Children's Social Care. 4. Legal framework and court action 5. Continue to strengthen the Thurrock Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub introduced Sept 2014 and services commissioned as part of the Early Offer of Help Strategy 6. Case Audits 7. Quality assurance framework							Ongoing. Ongoing. Ongoing. Ongoing. Ongoing. Ongoing.	
Residual Risk Rating	Date:	29/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

FURTHER ACTION / TARGET RISK / REVISED RESIDUAL RISK

Further Management or Mitigating Action		Implementation Date	Progress					
8. Ongoing implementation and/or application of actions 4 - 7 above. 9. Improvement plan in-line with Ofsted SIF inspection and iMPower consultation.		From Apr 2016	Ongoing					
Target Risk Rating	Target Date:	Refresh 31/03/2017	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Revised Residual Risk Rating	Date:	27/09/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

Rationale for applying High (Red) Target Ratings to the Risk

The nature of the work in terms of safeguarding and supporting children at risk of harm means that this will always be a high risk area although through the application of the S.E.T (Southend, Essex & Thurrock) Child Protection procedures the department actively works to mitigate this risk. The risk of children and young people coming to harm cannot be completely eliminated and the risk level needs to remain high and ensure clear vigilance across the council and partner agencies. New and emerging risk factors will arise and there is always a potential for agencies 'not knowing, what they don't know' that needs to be guarded against. The Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and Early Offer of Help arrangements have supported earlier identification of risk through a multi-agency approach enabling the department to work to intervene at an earlier stage and reduce the risk of harm in some cases.

The gravity, complexity and ongoing nature of risk in child protection and safeguarding is such that despite appropriate management arrangements the acknowledgement of the risk needs to remain high. The management of risk across partner agencies is helping to mitigate the position, where the potential for such risks are known or identified. However families are not static and risk is a constant changing variable within known families. The unknown element of risk for families not familiar to the service means that overall the likelihood remains high. Managing this risk places significant pressure on the Children's Social Care resource as demand led budget. The current trend has seen increasing numbers of children requiring child protection plans, children in need plans and children who the council is required to look after (children in care). Effective demand and resource management remain a priority for the service within an overriding context of keeping children safe.

The risk rating will remain as a constant (at the higher level) throughout the period covered. The risk documentation will be fully reviewed, refreshed and updated 31st March 2017.

UNMANAGED / INHERENT RISK

Risk Description							Risk Owner	
From the 1 st April 2015 the responsibility for Business Continuity Planning transferred from the Public Protection Team to Service Managers. Failure of the Council and/or service managers to coordinate and maintain Business Continuity Planning would lead to the business continuity management arrangements across the Council becoming inconsistent, outdated and ineffective in times of a disruption affecting Thurrock.							Directors Board Performance Board	
Link to Corporate Priority								
A well-run organisation.								
Inherent Risk Rating	Date:	01/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Very Likely (4)	Rating:	16

DASHBOARD

Inherent Risk Rating & Date: 01/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 18/04/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at: 25/08/2016	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Residual Risk Rating as at:	Target Risk Rating & Target Date: 31/03/2017																																																																																																																																																						
<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact				<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact				<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact				<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact				<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact				<table border="1"> <tr><td>Likelihood</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="4">Impact</td></tr> </table>	Likelihood	4	8	12	16		3	6	9	12		2	4	6	8		1	2	3	4		Impact			
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										
Likelihood	4	8	12	16																																																																																																																																																							
	3	6	9	12																																																																																																																																																							
	2	4	6	8																																																																																																																																																							
	1	2	3	4																																																																																																																																																							
	Impact																																																																																																																																																										

Comments
<p>The risk evaluates the position if business continuity plans are not coordinated and maintained, which would lead to business continuity planning arrangements across the Council becoming inconsistent, outdated and ineffective in times of a disruption affecting the authority.</p> <p>Review to identify priority functions/ICT systems and to update service business continuity plans undertaken by Service Managers during 2015/16. Analysis of information undertaken and an interim solution for ICT Disaster Recover arrangements identified and agreed March 2016. The interim solution for ICT DR when implemented along with the updated service BCPs put the Council in a fair position to deal with a significant disruption, if an event was to occur.</p> <p>The risk is expected to remain at the higher level until assurance is obtained that the business continuity plans for the Council and the critical functions are adequate and effective. Oversight of Business Continuity Management provided by Performance Board from July 2016 and a quality assurance programme of the Business Continuity Plans for the critical functions commenced August 2016.</p>

EXISTING ACTION / RESIDUAL RISK

Management Action or Mitigation Already in Place								Date Implemented
1. Review of Business Continuity Plans – Exercise undertaken between April and October 2014. 75% of BCPs reviewed and returned to Public Protection								Apr - Oct 2014
2. Programme for the development and implementation of critical incident plans for schools commenced March 2014. BC team working with Education Department the development and implementation of critical incident plans for schools to ensure that Thurrock Schools are resilient in their operation.								Ongoing from March
3. Programme of BC Exercises commenced of critical functions and services. Five reviews of service BCPs undertaken between April to October 2014, with consideration given to Third Party suppliers and their BC arrangements. Further BC exercise of Highways & Transportation function undertaken in December 2014.								Apr - Dec 2014
4. Further review of Business Continuity Plans commissioned Feb 2015 to update plans to take into account office moves, restructures, closure of the Culver Centre, etc. As at 20/03/2015 only four updated plans submitted to the Emergency Planning Team.								From Feb 2015
5. BC Review of Team function – Review of BC team undertaken. Decision taken to transfer the BC function from the Emergency Planning Team to Service Managers with effect from 1 st April, 2015.								Dec 2014 - March 2015
6. Approach for the 2015/16 review of Business Continuity Plans (and ICT Disaster Recovery arrangements) developed and agreed by the Director of Planning and Transportation.								June 2015
7. BCP & DR Group established to oversee the 2015/16 review of BCP and ICT Disaster Recovery arrangements. Group made up of Directorate representatives and supported by Corporate Risk Officer and ICT Commercial Manager. Ongoing monthly review meetings from Sept 2015.								From Sept 2015
8. Report on the approach for the 2015/16 review of BCP and ICT Disaster Recovery arrangements presented to Standards & Audit committee via Directors Board and Digital Board								Sept 2015
9. Business Impact Analysis undertaken by Service Areas to identify (i) Priority functions and the time frames for reinstatement (ii) Priority IT applications and order/speed of restoration and Service Business Continuity Plans updated.								Oct 2015 - Feb 2016
10. Analysis of priority functions/IT applications undertaken by ICT Service and report on the interim solution for ICT DR arrangements presented to Directors Board, via Digital Board								Feb – March 2016
Residual Risk Rating	Date:	18/04/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

FURTHER ACTION / TARGET RISK / REVISED RESIDUAL RISK

Further Management or Mitigating Action	Implementation Date	Progress
11. Outcome of review to update BCPs (and ICT DR arrangements) to be reported to Directors Board along with the potential way forward for the ongoing management of business continuity across the Council.	April 2016	Outcome of review along with proposals to strengthen BCM arrangements across the Council submitted to Directors Board in April 2016. Performance Board to provide oversight role for Business Continuity Planning from July 2016
12. Develop and implement plan for the ongoing management of business continuity following agreement of the preferred approach by Directors Board	Post Apr 2016 From July 2016	Responsibility for Business Continuity Planning to remain with Service Managers and oversight role to be provided by Performance Board. Quality assurance programme of Business Continuity Plans for critical functions

13. Council to implement interim solution for ICT Disaster Recovery arrangements		Post Apr 2016.	commenced by Performance Board Aug 2016.					
14. Services to review and update BCPs to reflect the ICT DR arrangements (interim solution).		Post Apr 2016	Proposal to implement an interim DR solution based at Southend Council's data centre in progress. Approach will allow access to key Council systems (within 24 hours of an incident) for a minimum of 100 concurrent users.					
Target Risk Rating	Target Date:	Refresh 31/03/2017	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12
Revised Residual Risk Rating	Date:	25/08/2016	Impact:	Critical (4)	Likelihood:	Likely (3)	Rating:	12

Rationale for applying High (Red) Target Ratings to the Risk

With effect from the 1st April 2015 the responsibility for Business Continuity transferred from the Emergency Planning Team to service managers and the risk evaluates the position if business continuity plans are not coordinated and maintained, which would lead to business continuity planning arrangements across the Council becoming inconsistent, outdated and ineffective in times of a disruption affecting the authority.

A review to identify priority functions/ICT systems and to update service business continuity plans was undertaken by Service Managers during 2015/16. Following analysis of the review information an interim solution for ICT Disaster Recovery arrangements was identified and agreed March 2016 and when fully implemented will put the Council in a fair position to deal with a significant disruption, if an event was to occur. From July 2016 Performance Board are providing an oversight role for Business Continuity Management. A quality assurance programme of Business Continuity Plans has been developed and Performance Board are to undertake some work with Directorates to check that the critical functions have been identified and the plans in place are adequate to respond to a significant disruption.

The risk is expected to remain at the higher level until assurance is obtained that the business continuity plans for the critical functions identified are adequate and effective. A target date of 31/03/2017 has been applied to the risk which is when the risk and the management action plan will be refreshed and updated to reflect any changes to the situation.