

Workstream/Project Name : YPSS Project

Baseline Date (Date Compiled) 5th September 2011

Workstream Lead / Project Manager : Mark Brotherton

Revised Date 31st October 2011

Ref.	Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner	Controls fully in place to manage the risk	Current Risk Rating				Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Target Risk Rating				Date reviewed
					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	
	Examples: Ability to ... Management of ... Failure to ... Lack of ... Inappropriate ... Opportunity to ...	What is the cause of the risk? What will the impact be?	Who is responsible for the risk?	What controls are fully in place now?	See impact scoring matrix	See likelihood scoring matrix			Do you accept this level of risk? If yes, no further action is required. If no, decide what further actions need to be taken to manage the risk and list them here.	Identify officers responsible for each action	Agree deadline	Comment on what progress has been made and any problems or delays	See impact scoring matrix	See likelihood scoring matrix			Date of last review and update
R001	Secretary of State does not approve closure of existing YPSS	SoS feels that closure will not lead to the necessary improvements in the service; should not result in any major change of direction for the project and the new service.	Mark Brotherton	Setting up the project demonstrates clear commitment to transforming the service; Business Case contains explanation and justification; all will be captured in the application to SoS.	1	1	1	Low	Continued engagement with SoS required; acquire support from schools for the new service model and communicate to SoS	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Ongoing - application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low	
R002	Failure to implement new service due to Secretary of State decision on awarding the Power To Innovate	Failure to secure approval to become part of the pilot scheme and be granted the Power To Innovate will result in a major change of direction or possible cancellation of the project in its current form.	Mark Brotherton	Original application was submitted in early 2011; SoS invited us to re-apply, inferring good prospects of success; clear direction of travel and commitment to the pilot already demonstrated through project set-up; all to be captured in the application to SoS.	4	1	4	Low	Low risk so existing controls are expected to be sufficient; could communicate schools' support for the new delivery model if necessary; could emphasise the improved outcomes for young people	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low	
R003	Failure to effect sufficient immediate improvements to the service through 11/12 prior to implementing new service	Failure to implement the current Ofsted Action Plan to improve the service and/or a poor Ofsted inspection could result in the DfE requesting the take-over of the service, and will disadvantage the young people currently in the service; would prove a major distraction to the Project Team and reduce capacity to work towards new service.	Martin Cooper	Manage and monitor the implementation of the Ofsted Action Plan; ensure YPSS is suitably prepared and supported for the scheduled Ofsted inspections; regular communications with and feedback from staff; YPSS Executive Board to oversee implementation of Action Plan and performance.	2	4	8	Medium	Improve communications with staff to ensure motivation and commitment towards improving the service; secure and deploy additional temporary resources to support centre staff.	Martin Cooper, DCE Finance?	First inspection in Oct/Nov date tbc		2	2	4	Low	
R004	Lack of support from all or some of the schools for the new service model due to funding concerns, capacity/ability to deliver, or on general principle.	Some schools may oppose the transfer of responsibility for YPSS; schools may fail to agree on the best way of delivering the service collectively or singularly; could result in the council remaining responsible for all or part of the service.	Mark Brotherton	Schools being provided with initial info pack including financial info; presentations to be given at WASSH and Federation meetings; specific meeting arranged with Headteachers; surgeries arranged; all measures to encourage schools to be enthused to take advantage of the opportunity.	4	2	8	Medium	Targeted engagement with specific schools if necessary; additional work to illustrate potential options and highlight benefits of new service; contingency to use the money that would have been devolved to schools to buy provision for the students involved.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Proposal to be considered by schools from 5th Sept. Additional actions if necessary following feedback		2	2	4	Low	
R005	Lack of support from all or some of the schools for the specific reason that capital investment is required for them to provide the necessary facilities.	Schools may not have adequate facilities from which to deliver the service and would require capital investment from us to do so; if capital is not available schools may resist taking responsibility for the service which may result in the failure of the pilot and new service.	Mark Brotherton	Audit of existing facilities that could be used by schools as off-site provision is being undertaken, details will be given to schools as part of initial information.	4	2	8	Medium	Assist schools with a plan to develop accommodation with appropriate funding needs; further explore the facilities that could be made available through the council's own property portfolio; full analysis of existing/new specialist providers and the facilities they may have to support the service.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Ongoing from 5th Sept.		3	2	6	Medium	

Ref.	Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner	Controls fully in place to manage the risk	Current Risk Rating				Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Target Risk Rating				Date reviewed
					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	
R006	Loss of existing YPSS staff before the implementation of the new service due to uncertainty over future and impending 'closure' of existing YPSS	Service may suffer from haemorrhaging of staff due to uncertainty about their future employment and roles; could result in failure to provide adequate service, problems with Ofsted, and failing young people currently in the service.	Martin Cooper	Regular communication and engagement with staff throughout the project including regular newsletter, centre meetings, staff 1-to-1's; illustrate as possible the role staff may perform in the new service; encourage staff to retain focus on young people in the service	4	3	12	High	Consider contingency plans for additional temporary staff; provide opportunity for YPSS to make proposals to operate as a traded service; develop proposals to create employment opportunities for staff via schools or specialist providers.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper, DCE Finance?			3	2	6	Medium	
R007	Failure of new delivery model to provide improved service and outcomes for young people.	Individual or collections of schools may fail to deliver the service at a suitable quality standard; young people would continue to be disadvantaged as a result, potential risk of further Ofsted intervention (see R003)	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Service Specification and Framework Agreement provide clear understanding of the standards expected and the outcomes required for young people;	4	1	4	Low	Process of monitoring and reporting and over-arching governance arrangements to be developed to support the new service once implemented.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	October onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R008	Failure of alternative providers to meet required safeguarding standards.	If alternative providers are not considered to have adequate and satisfactory safeguarding measures, schools will have difficulty in buying in provision.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Assessment criteria developed and in place to ensure that providers know what is expected of them; register of potential providers being developed;	4	2	8	Medium	Need to establish, in partnership with the schools, a regime for ongoing monitoring and assessment of providers in the new service model.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	December onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R009	Insufficient number of suitable providers able to meet the demand for the new service.	As this is a new opportunity, sufficient numbers of suitable providers may not yet exist which could result in capacity problems and a failure to deliver/improve the service	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Audit of existing providers has been undertaken	3	2	6	Medium	Review results of audit and analyse provider capacity; develop proposal to enable YPSS to operate as a traded service and therefore fill any provider capacity gap	Martin Cooper, Tom Smith	September onwards		2	2	4	Low	
R011	Failure to identify & correctly apply TUPE requirements for YPSS staff through the process of YPSS closure & development of new provision.	Existing provision will be completely redesigned with different approaches being adopted by federations & schools. Understanding & identifying whether staff in the current YPSS will be individually or collectively in scope of TUPE will remain a challenge as future delivery models are proposed & agreed. Incorrect assessment of TUPE position could lead to staff claims, legal challenge, reputational & financial damage.	Mark Brotherton, Lorraine Nolan	YPSS Steering Group membership includes HR Business Partner & Solicitor. Assessment of proposals for future provision will include HR/Legal comment on the potential TUPE implications of each proposal. Ongoing comms with feds & schools to provide early perspective on the TUPE implications of their proposals.	3	2	6	Medium	?? Develop an HR TUPE 'gateway' step in the process for assessing each of the proposals - develop standard format for the HR response & subsequent feedback to feds & schools. ??	Lorraine Nolan (?)	November		3	1	3	Low	
							0								0		
							0								0		

**Wiltshire Council Impact Scoring Criteria**

Score	Effect on service	Embarrassment/ reputation	Personal safety	Personal privacy infringement	Failure to provide statutory duties/meet legal obligations	Financial	Effect on project objectives/ schedule deadlines	ICT	Environment
<b>4 Significant</b>	Major loss of service, including several important areas of service and/ or for a protracted period  Service disruption 5+ days	Adverse and persistent national media coverage  Adverse central government response, involving (threat of) removal of delegated powers  Officer(s) and/ or Members forced to resign	Death of an individual or several people	All personal details compromised/ revealed	Litigation/ claims/ fines from Departmental £250k+  Corporate £500k+	Costing over £1m  Major increase on up to 75% of budget	Complete failure of project/ extreme delay - 3 months or more  All benefits fail to be realised	Total replacement of existing system  Major redevelopment required  Substantial impact on service	Significant/ excessive emissions to land, air or water; or disruption to plant and/ or animal life with long term effects (over 5yrs)
<b>3 Moderate</b>	Complete loss of an important service area for a short period  Moderate effect to services in one or more areas for a period of weeks  Service disruption 3-5 days	Adverse publicity in professional/ municipal press, affecting perception/ standing in professional/ local government community  Adverse local publicity of a major and persistent nature	Severe injury to an individual or several people	Many individual personal details compromised/ revealed	Litigation/ claims/ fines from Departmental £100k to £250K  Corporate £250k to £500k	Costing between £250k and £1m  Up to 50% of budget	Significant impact on project or most of expected benefits fail/ major delay of 2-3 months  Majority of benefits fail to be realised	Major configuration of existing system  Disruption to service	Severe emissions to land, air or water; or disruption to plant and/ or animal life with medium term effects (3-5yrs)
<b>2 Minor</b>	Minor effect to an important service area for a short period  Adverse effect to services in one or more areas for a period of weeks  Service disruption 2-3 days	Adverse local publicity/ local public opinion aware  Statutory prosecution of a non-serious nature	Minor injury to an individual or several people	Some individual personal details compromised/ revealed	Litigation/ claims/ fines from Departmental £25k to £100k  Corporate £50k to £250k	Costing between £50k and £250k  Up to 25% of budget	Adverse effect on project/ significant slippage of 3 weeks - 2 months  Some benefits fail to be realised	Basic IT requirements. Some minor configuration  Minimal disruption to service	Limited emissions to land, air or water; or disruption to plant and/ or animal life with short term effects (up to 2yrs)
<b>1 Insignificant</b>	Brief disruption of important service area  Significant effect to non-crucial services area  Service disruption 1 day	Contained within section/ Unit or Directorate  Complaint from individual/ small group, of arguable merit	Slight injury or discomfort to an individual or several people	Isolated individual personal details compromised/ revealed	Litigation/ claims/ fines from Departmental below £25k  Corporate below £50k	Costing less than £50k  Up to 10% of budget	Minimal impact to project  Slight delay less than 3 weeks  Minimal benefits fail to be realised	Basic IT requirements met  No disruption to service	Negligible emissions to land, air or water; or disruption to plant and/ or animal life with no lasting effects (Current)

**NB: Not all categories may apply to each risk. You need to come to a management consensus among your group.**

**Scoring criteria for likelihood**

SCORE	DESCRIPTION	INDICATORS
4 Almost Certain	More than 75% chance of occurrence	Regular occurrence Circumstances frequently encountered -daily/weekly/monthly
3 Possible	40% - 75% chance of occurrence	Likely to happen at some point within the next 1-2 years Circumstances occasionally encountered (few times a year)
2 Unlikely	10% - 40% chance of occurrence	Only likely to happen 3 or more years
1 Rare	Less than 10% chance of occurrence	Has happened rarely/never before