# LGR Programme Level Risks - update

Lead Officer: Alyn Jones, LGR Programme Director

Author: Angela Farmer, Risk Manage for LGR Programme

Contact Details: angela.farmer@sedgemoor.gov.uk

Cabinet Member: Cllr Val Keitch Division and Local Member: All

### 1. Summary

**1.1.** There are many definitions of risk. In most cases it is the threat to the delivery of objectives that form the definition.

Therefore, to have risk management in place is about good governance and by having good governance in place, the Council will look to achieve the objectives it has set itself.

The programme level risks identified are those that the programme need to be aware and actively mitigate in order to ensure that all products are delivered.

Without effective risk management, the LGR programme will fail to deliver the desired outcomes either in terms of time, cost, quality, or a blend of all three.

#### 2. Issues for consideration / recommendations

- **2.1.** Members of the Joint Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the current 17 LGR programme risks
- **2.2.** Members of the Joint Scrutiny Committee are asked to review and scrutinise the programme level risks to:
  - 1. Identify any of the risks that the committee believe further consideration to mitigate the risk are needed
  - Identify any risks or subject areas which the committee would like the programme risk manager to investigate as a consideration of a potential programme level risk

## 3. Background

- **3.1.** As part of the development of the LGR programme, a risk management framework for the programme was developed. This has allowed consistency in approach to risk assessment, scoring and mitigation. It also develops the process by which risks are escalated to Programme Steering Group and Programme Board.
- **3.2.** As of August 2022 there were 18 programme level risks and these are set out below:

Workstream	Programme Level risks
People	Loss of staff from County and District Councils

	deemed essential to programme delivery
	2. The risk that there are insufficient people
	resources to implement LGR programme and
	deliver the approved business case
	3. There is a risk that there are stretched resources
	to deliver BAU activity, programme and projects
	outside of LGR
	<ol> <li>The risk that there is insufficient capacity to</li> </ol>
	manage the people side of change
CCP	<ol> <li>Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE</li> </ol>
	services to new operating model and outcomes
	as defined in the Business Case
	2. Design/products to create new unitary council will
	not have the community as the central focus in
	the design of the new operating model
Service	<ol> <li>Lack of decision around contracts that are</li> </ol>
Alignment	reaching the end of their life between now and
	2024
	<ol><li>Unforeseen or increase in the level of civil</li></ol>
	contingencies incidents requiring mobilisation of
	Business Continuity/Civil Contingencies activity
	3. The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not
	effectively joined-up with LGR implementation
Finance	1. There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new
	Somerset Council in 2023/24 when districts and
	County budgets combined, significantly impacting
	financial sustainability of the new authority
	<ol><li>There is a risk that legacy councils make spend</li></ol>
	commitments that adversely affect
	implementation and benefits delivery
	<ol><li>The risk that the back office ERP (Enterprise</li></ol>
	Resource Planning) system is not sufficiently
	implemented to support the new authority
	<ol><li>Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their</li></ol>
	expected financial benefits as described in
	business case (£18.5m p.a. after 2 years)
PSG/PMO	<ol> <li>Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR</li> </ol>
	programme
	2. Inter-dependencies between the workstreams not
	managed effectively
	3. The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key
	LGR products that other workstreams are
	dependent on
	<ol> <li>The risk that the LGR programme negatively</li> </ol>
	impacts service provision and improvement
	activities of Children's Services and Adult Social
	Care.
	<ol><li>The risk of overspend of the £16.5m costs</li></ol>

A full breakdown of the risks can be found at Appendix One, which will show is more detail the risk scores and mitigation.

## 3.3 Monitoring and review

Programme Level risks are reviewed and developed in a number of ways:

- 1. Weekly review by the Programme Director
- 2. Monthly through Programme Steering Group and the Programme Board on the current programme level risks which includes agreement to add additional risks to the programme level register
- 3. Through reports to Programme Steering Group where risks can be identified and thus developed.
- 4. Through direct work with the workstreams and their respective project and change managers to ensure that the delivery of mitigation is being undertaken
- 5. Reviewing workstream risks for risks that are being recommended for escalation to the programme risk register
- 6. New risks as the workstream develop their products for delivery, and the risks that are associated with the delivery

### 4. Implications

**4.1.** A risk is the potential for something to occur that can have an impact on what you are trying to deliver. The programme level risks identified represent risks that the programme need to be aware and actively mitigate in order to ensure that all products are delivered.

### 5. Background papers

**5.1.** The LGR Risk Management Framework

**Note:** For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author