Workstream/Project Name :	YPSS Project		Baseline Date (Date Compiled)	5th September 2011
		•		
Workstream Lead / Project Manager :	Mark Brotherton		Revised Date	

						Current Risk Ra			Current Risk Rating			ing					Target Risk Rating				
	Ref.	Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner		Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	Date reviewed			
		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			
F	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.		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	SoS required; acquire support from schools for the new	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Ongoing - application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low				
F			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 emonstrated 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	Brotherton,	Application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low				
F	₹003	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	Medi um			First inspection in Oct/Nov date tbc		2	2	4	Low				
		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.	Brotherton	Schools being provided with initial info pack including financial info, presentations to be given at WASSH and Federation meetings; specific meeting arranged with Headtleachers; surgeries arranged; all measures to encourage schools to be enthused to take advantage of the opportunity.	4	3	12	High	specific schools if necessary; additional work to illustrate	Martin Cooper	Proposal to be considered by schools from 5th Sept. Additional actions if necessary following feedback		2	2	4	Low				
F	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 giver to schools as part of initial information.	4	2	8	Medi um	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.	Martin	Ongoing from 5th Sept.		3	2	6	Medi um				

					Current Risk Rating					Targ	jet Risk	ng					
Ref	. Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner	Controls fully in place to manage the risk	Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	Date reviewed
	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 haemorraging of staff due to	Martin Cooper	Regular communication and engagament 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	Mark Brotherton,			3	2	6	Medi um	
R00	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)	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	reporting and over-arching governance arrangements to	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	October onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R00	B 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.	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	Med	Need to establish, in partnership with the schools, a regime for ongoing monitoring and assessment of providers in the new service model.		December onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R009	9 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	Med		Martin Cooper, Tom Smith	September onwards		2	2	4	Low	
R01	Ability/capacity of council to fund possible redundancies from closure of YPSS and implementation of new service	If setting up YPSS as a traded service is not successful and schools do not recruit existing YPSS staff, redundancies will be required. Funding of the redundancies would be a currently un-budgeted cost to the council.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	None in place	4	4	16	High	YPSS to operate as a traded service and therefore retain the services of numbers of existing		September to ensure Corporate Finance can consider alongside 2012/13 budget planning		2	3	6	Medi um	
							0								0		