## STRATEGIC RISKS

RISK							
No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
1.1	A partner is not represented at a meeting as no member from that authority has attended, or the attendee does not have executive powers.	There is an imbalance in the decision making power of the committee. A decision is taken on a local matter without local representation. Decision making delayed.	Each authority will nominate a substitute member who has executive powers. Publish dates in good time combine meetings with other commitments where possible.	Each member authority	Mar 2013	9	3x3
1.2	Due to financial constraints, one of the partners challenges their funding arrangements for the partnership	Decrease in service provision / failure of the partnership. Stranded costs to be covered by the remainder of the partners.	Ensure that member authority representatives fully understand the partnership agreement and are involved in the budget setting of each authority	Chief Finance Officer	Mar 2013	12	3x4
1.3	There's a change in political will of a partner that leads to the partner withdrawing from the arrangement	Decrease in service provision. The partnership fails and external funding is lost or needs to be repaid.	Ensure that performance of the partnership is appropriately reported back to each authority and the effects of withdrawing are understood	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	12	3x4
1.4	Preferences of members dictates the direction of the meeting.	The items for decision on the agenda do not receive equitable debate and more important items may not receive proper consideration.	Strong chairmanship of the meetings. Members should ensure that they are aware of the committee protocols.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	6	3x2

RW/HJM

AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 04 Oct 2012

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
1.5	Relationship between senior management of the partnership and the committee deteriorates.	Low morale, poor decision making reduced capacity Lack of innovation.	Strong leadership of the partnership Open and honest communication between management and committee	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	4	2x2
1.6	Lack of partnership support for shared targets.	Failure to deliver key targets, missed opportunities, Tarnished reputation.	Ensure that partners are fully briefed on and committed to shared targets.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	3	1x3
1.7	Essex County Council review decriminalised parking services across the county and make fundamental changes to the service.	Direct effect on the partnership as any County changes will effect the services that the partnership are required to deliver possibly resulting in resourcing and delivery issues.	Members of the committee should maintain close liaison with County and ensure that all opportunities to participate in discussions are taken.	Chair of the joint committee	Mar 2013	6	2x3
1.8	Decisions are taken on a political basis as opposed to being considered on their own merits.	Decisions are not in the best interests of the partnership. Imbalance in services provided to each partner.	Reports should be clear regarding outcomes and benefits to the wider partnership.  Members should ensure that they are aware of their role and accountability when representing the partnership	Chair of the joint committee	Mar 2013	4	2x2
1.9	Potential future financial challenges, of reduced income and increased costs, are greater than expected.	Inability to invest in the future of the service.  Missed opportunities Failure of the service.	Financial performance is stringently monitored and deviancies reported to the partnership for action.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	16	4x4

RW/HJM

AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 04 Oct 2012

## **OPERATIONAL RISKS**

RISK							
No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
2.1	High staff turnover	Staff unable to provide services due to excessive or conflicting workloads Unable to provide more than a minimal service leading to a reputation loss and loss of income	Effective recruitment and training processes Flexible approach to recruiting casual and agency staff Pay/Conditions comparable to similar jobs.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	2	1x2
2.2	Inability to access buildings/systems required files and computers to provide service.	Interruption to the supply of the service, Loss of income and reputation. Inability to deliver urgent work. Failure to meet legal or regulatory deadlines.	Development of a Business Continuity Plan. Each partner should consider insuring for loss of income for off street parking.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	8	2x4
2.3	Fraud is committed within or to the service.	Lack of resources to fund essential items of expenditure. Financial and reputational loss to the service. Reduction in service to cover losses.	Recruit managers with financial management skills and experience. Regular monitoring and control of expenditure and income.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	3	1x3
2.4	Poor control of budgets and financial planning	Overspending or under- recovery of funds leading to pressure to cut other activities.	Regular monitoring with the lead authority's accountant. Financial performance is stringently monitored and deviancies reported to the partnership. Sufficient information is given about variances to enable future forecasting.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	5	1x5

RW/HJM AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 04 Oct 2012

NEXT REVIEW: March 2013

Page 3 of 7

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
2.5	Service delivery is misaligned to the county's overarching parking policies.	Failure to deliver key county targets, missed funding opportunities tarnished standing and reputation	Effective joint-working and communication. Ensure that strategic policy of the partnership supports county's objectives.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	3	1x3
2.6	Inadequacy of Repairs and Renewals provision.	Reduction or closure of services due to failure of plant, equipment or infrastructure.	Funding programmes presented during budget setting process.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	3	1x3
2.7	Sundry fees and charges associated with the enforcement process do not reflect the true cost of enforcement.	Service does not run according to business plan and cannot break even in the given timescale.	Monitoring future changes in legislation. Ensuring that management are actively involved in influencing national debate regarding parking policy and strategy.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	6	3x2
2.8	Ineffective communication of solutions across partnership	Failure to share information leading to 'silo' effect and poor use of resources and / or learning.	Regular meetings with county and partnership committee. Group and team meetings, 1-1's, performance management processes, task groups, Team Leaders Meetings & Customer Excellence.  Effective training.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	4	2x2

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
2.9	Serious accidents to staff / customers / public	Injury / death to staff / customers, financial and reputation loss to the service. Injury to staff.	Risk assessments. Monitoring and Review of accidents. Training / management input to ensure Health and Safety Responsibilities owned by Managers and staff. Safe working practices. documented and followed. Building Safety Audits Abuse logs	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	10	2x5
2.10	Failure to address Health & Safety issues.	Financial and reputational loss to the service. Risks to staff and public, low morale.	Ensure that there is adequate training for staff, at all levels, to understand their responsibilities. Ensure there is better clearer guidance for staff.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	3	1x3
2 .11	Vulnerability of staff whilst on duty – assault or accident.	Financial and reputational loss to the service. Risks to staff and public, low morale.	Lone Worker Policy Cautionary Contact Scheme Orbis monitoring including GPS System Monitoring & Follow up of incidents & review of procedures.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	8	2x4
2.12	Theft / vandalism of property.	Additional cost, negative impact on service and reputation.	Regular Safety Audits and Inspections Measures to rectify problems quickly including out of hours Security measures.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	4	1x4

RW/HJM

AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 04 Oct 2012

RISK No.	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	CONTROLS	BY WHOM	REVIEW	SCORE	WORKINGS
2.13	Poor working relationship between managers and their teams.	Low morale, poor decision making reduced capacity lack of innovation.	Team building, training & investment - Customer Excellence	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	2	1x2
2.14	The professionalism and conduct of an officer or member fails to meet the expected standards.	The work of the partnership is bought into disrepute. Public opinion of the civil enforcement officers is poor. Potential increase in disputes impacts on the reputation and standing of the partnership. Greater risk of confrontation with the public.	Ensure that all civil enforcement officers receive professional training. Develop the handbook for enforcement to reflect changes of new partnership Ensure that all officers understand protocols of operation and expected standards of conduct. Regular monitoring of complaints to identify trends. Ensure that all members are aware that they still need to comply with their own organisation's code of conduct.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	12	3x4
2.15	The changes to the cash collection processes of the lead authority impact on the service - financially or procedurally.	Increased costs in terms of collection and counting of cash. Cash collection frequency may reduce.	Ensure that the requirements of the service are fully defined and included in future cash collection decisions.	Parking Partnership Manager	Mar 2013	9	3x3

RW/HJM

AGREED BY COMMITTEE: 04 Oct 2012

## **IMPACT TABLE**

	Very Low	1	Low	2	Medium	3	High	4	Very High	5
PROBABILITY	<10%		10 – 25%		25 – 50%		50 – 75%		<75%	
Impact	Minimal - no interruption to service delivery < £10k		Minor - temporary disruption to service delivery £11k - £25k		Significant - interruption to part of the service £26k - £75k		Severe – full interruption to service delivery £76k - £100k		Catastrophic – complete service failure £100k<	

Minimum Score = 1 Maximum Score = 25

Low risk = 1-4 Medium Risk = 5-12 High Risk = 13-25