

SWP Strategic Risk Register

| SWP Strategic Risk Register | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------------|--------|-------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------|--------|---------------|
| Last Updated: | | 7th February 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ref | Business Plan Link | Cause | Description of risk | Consequence | Assess current risk | | Risk rating | Change from last review | Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned | Target risk score | | Target rating |
| | | | | | Likelihood | Impact | | | | Likelihood | Impact | |
| Opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Op 1 | Building Capability | We are a multi partner organisation working in a political environment | Opportunity to tackle new and emerging issues from an holistic and mutually supportive perspective | Economies of scale in analysis, planning and managing responses to new legislation or Govt policy or other changes in the operating environment. | 4 | 4 | 16 | ↔ | The Board is well established and well regarded with a good track record of financial management, value for money, innovation and a reputation for delivery. Maintain culture of innovation with support from Board. Seek / bid for external funding where possible. | 5 | 4 | 20 |
| Op 2 | | | Opportunity to influence commercial waste and waste producers in Somerset | SWP, as a partnership, has a good reputation in the industry and could bring that to bear by creating links with local businesses and business groups. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | SWP will be considering opportunities as part of a recently initiated review of the Waste Prevention Strategy. Opportunity will be developed through implementation of the new strategy. | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Op 3 | | Financial Pressure on Partners | Opportunity to market experience internally & externally | Obtain income from marketing experience and advice | 4 | 3 | 12 | ↔ | SWP is open to secondment and consultancy opportunities, though focus on Somerset initiatives reduces capacity for this. | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Op 4 | Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery | Householder behaviour | Opportunity: Encourage householders to save money individually by waste reduction and wider community to recycle. | Waste reduction and improved participation and capture rates. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Directed Communications campaign. Promotion using variety of media | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| Op 5 | | | Opportunity to capitalise on the 'blue planet' effect and increased awareness of the impact of plastic consumption | Opportunity to encourage households to change their consumption behaviours and encourage local producers to change their choice of packaging materials | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Briefing sent to all partner authority members and to Parish and Town Councils in Somerset; increased emphasis on waste reduction in SWP social media messages and communication. SWP to encourage partner authorities to consider initiatives and policies that will minimise reliance on single use plastic, including pledge schemes | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Op 6 | | Recycle More Implementation | Opportunity to align Core Service review (see Business Plan) with refreshment of kerbside services. | Opportunity to ensure all public facing services are aligned so the complement each other and are more easily understood and used by residents. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Early consideration of review underway. Detailed consideration of opportunities presented as part of integrated approach to the review. | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| Risks | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Building Capability | Financial Pressure on Partners | Membership of the Partnership changes. | Governance and cost sharing arrangements are out of date. Services must be maintained. | 4 | 3 | 12 | ↔ | Governance impacts have been identified in readiness for review. Brief Board on implications and develop clear plan for governance and finance review | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 2 | | | One or more partners requires savings that impacts on existing services | Reduced performance and /or transfer of costs to others. Increased whole system costs | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↔ | Well established budget management processes are effectively maintained. Dialogue between Board members & Cabinet/Executive Colleagues on future service/savings requirements (SWB) | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 3 | | | SWP Team does not have sufficient capacity and capability to be sufficiently effective, or is too reactive | Impacts on recycling performance, contractor performance and customer call centres | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | To date team reduced by natural wastage and one redundancy plus one officer on secondment. Review of SWP staffing structure reflected in 2018-23 business plan (and review of Kier contract performance management) | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 4 | Building Capability | We are a multi partner organisation working in a political environment | Loss of shared vision and trust between partners | Difficulty agreeing on priorities, impact on reputation of partners. Focus becomes on managing negative relationships, not the business | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↔ | Involve all partners in the business plan process and continue to promote early dialogue about issues via SMG group and with individual partners as appropriate. Maintain awareness of partner pressures and aspirations via the Somerset Waste Board, SMG and formal/informal contact with all partners | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | | | Lack of member engagement and/ or frequent member turnover. | Potential failure within partners to understand basis and benefits of SWP. Diversion of attention to managing relationships not the business | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↔ | Induction Training for new members, involve all partners in the business plan process, monthly member briefings, continue to attend and inform scrutiny committees and other local bodies including TCs/PCs | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | | | **NEW** Lack of resources within SWP mean issues arise during implementation of new SWP Customer Service system | Use of legacy system (Wisper) is extended, increasing risk of failure and creating demand on support resource. | 2 | 3 | 6 | NEW | Temporary system hosting has been agreed with SCC and TDBC IT teams; System procured is underpinned by robust support service. Continue to work closely with supplier to optimise quality of development; provide regular progress updates throughout design and build phases to allow early updates on progress. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 7 | | | Inefficiencies due to customer relations IT not being joined up | More staff required to do same job, slower response to customers | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | New customer service systems being introduced adding flexibility and efficiency. Review IT strategy. Plan and schedule next generation IT, including collection service "in-cab" and tracking systems in tandem with Recycle More procurement process | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 8 | | | External agencies fail to understand us and penalise effective joint working (eg loss of partial VAT exemption). | Unexpected costs and/or time consuming and otherwise pointless changes to our contractual & governance arrangements | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Joint approach to briefing and lobbying at appropriate level. Act quickly and in a concerted way to any new threats (SMG) | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 9 | | | Planning authorities agree new developments without consideration of waste requirements | Poor developments may not fit standard collections model and require different arrangements leading to increased costs and frustration for householders. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | SWP working with partners to incorporate developer's guidance into planning. | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 10 | Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery | Householder behaviour | Increase in material in refuse bins | Heavy material goes in kerbside bins not to Recycling Centres. Impacts on district recycling rate (not to Somerset overall). | 4 | 3 | 12 | ↔ | Directed Communications campaign, review messages to the public about how to use services sustainably. Promote cost effective disposal routes for business waste. Promotion using variety of media, encourage members to take ambassadorial role in promoting benefits of services (Comms Team, SWB Members) | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 11 | | | Reduction in recycling materials | Loss of income while some costs remain fixed. Increase in disposal costs if put in refuse instead. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Positive promotion of services. Promotion using variety of media as described in the Communication Plan (Comms Team) | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 12 | | | Poor separation of materials by householder | Loss of income if material quality deteriorates. Reduced efficiencies due to increased sorting time. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Positive promotion of services. Promotion using variety of media as described in the Communication Plan (Comms Team) | 3 | 3 | 9 |

SWP Strategic Risk Register

| SWP Strategic Risk Register | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|--------|-------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------|--------|---------------|
| Last Updated: | | 7th February 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ref | Business Plan Link | Cause | Description of risk | Consequence | Assess current risk | | Risk rating | Change from last review | Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned | Target risk score | | Target rating |
| | | | | | Likelihood | Impact | | | | Likelihood | Impact | |
| 13 | Action c | | Reduction in existing or new garden waste customers | Loss of income while some costs remain fixed | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↔ | Positive promotion of services. Note that customer base has increased year on year in recent years. Promotion using variety of media | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 14 | Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery | Procurement of new collection contract | Lack of interest from bidders, uncertainty about RM service model or similar procurements going to market during the same period. | Bidders drop out and we fail to have a competitive process and deliver best value. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↑ | Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Liaise with other authorities procuring at the same time. Assessment of pre-procurement phase to gauge appetite of market for Somerset procurement. Go/No Go decision. Contingency plan is to establish a LAC | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 15 | | | Bidders take a risk averse approach due to lack of experience with RM service | Bidders price high to mitigate risks. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↑ | Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Risk sharing on materials values and yields is likely to reassure bidders. Amend procurement approach following pre-procurement | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 16 | | | Failure to achieve economic and efficiency objectives through the procurement. | Failure to achieve economic and efficiency objectives would impact on partners MTFPs. Reputational damage to SWP. Cuts to services may be necessary. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↑ | Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. Assessment of pre-procurement phase to gauge likely outcomes of the procurement process. Go/No Go decision? Contingency plan is to establish a LAC | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 17 | | | Failure to achieve environmental and social objectives through the procurement. | Failure to achieve environmental and social objectives would impact on partners plans and strategies | 2 | 2 | 4 | ↓ | Management of an effective pre-procurement phase and dialogue process. | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 18 | | | Procurement process takes too long. | Failure to have a contract in place | 2 | 5 | 10 | ↑ | Close involvement in the process by T& F group and "managed dialogue" approach to procurement, with specialist support, ensures all parties are engaged and process is understood. Plan for contingency LAC solution to ensure service maintained regardless of outcome. | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 19 | | | Cost of procurement and external support exceeds budget | Fail to achieve best value for partners | 2 | 2 | 4 | ↓ | Budget monitoring | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 20 | | | Legal challenge to the procurement process. | Could delay contract award if challenge is received. This could put commencement at risk. High costs if damages are awarded against SWP | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↑ | Procurement assurance role is built into project structure. Also, experienced external advisors will be used and internal legal oversight. | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | | | Depot network does not allow for efficient delivery of RM | Costs of inefficiency adds to bid prices | 4 | 4 | 16 | ↑ | Secure option on new depot site. Establish bidders preferences and optimum network during pre-procurement. | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 22 | | | Changing demographics of Somerset population - increasing aging population. | Increasing emphasis on care in the home and care in the community leads to additional demand for clinical and assisted services. | 2 | 2 | 4 | ↔ | Regular review of assisted collection service requirements (every three years). Diversion of sanitary and hygiene waste to additional refuse capacity. Predicting demand through ongoing monitoring of key demographic changes to ensure effective service planning. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 23 | | | New vehicles are not available in time due to supply chain problems. Vehicles do not achieve design levels of productivity | Unable to deliver service as planned. | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↑ | Bidders to produce contingency plans utilising alternative vehicles | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 24 | Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery | Recycle More Implementation | Bidders are unable to find cost effective solution for pots tubs and trays (PTT inc black plastic) and cartons. | Reduction in quality of offering to customers. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Current advice from WRAP is that black plastic should not be collected for recycling. There are possible technical solutions being developed. SWP to make clear ambitions in pre-procurement and learn from market response | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 25 | | | Transition between current service and RM takes longer than anticipated | Savings and diversion for residual waste/environmental benefits are delayed. Impact on partner MTFPs. | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↔ | Key area for dialogue and evaluation of bids. Effective pre-planning prior to service implementation | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 26 | | | SWP capacity is insufficient to deliver transition to Recycle More | Transfer of resource to procurement may deplete support of current service. Increase in complaints. Sub-standard planning and implementation of new service. | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↔ | Ensure business case includes analysis of SWP resource requirements of new contract and transition. On-going review of SWP client team structure and priorities. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 27 | | | New vehicles for RM are inefficient for delivering current service prior to transition. | Low utilisation of vehicles, increase in 2nd tips and OT | 1 | 2 | 2 | ↔ | Pre-procurement and dialogue process will include fleet configuration and vehicle specification. Reduced fleet of RCVs to be maintained until after transition. | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | | | Waste profile changes (particularly as a result of Deposit/Return Scheme or similar). | Vehicles/plant become inefficient. Materials value reduces | 1 | 2 | 2 | ↔ | Tracking of consultation process and possible implementation to ensure vehicles specs are aligned with any changes | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | Action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery | New Waste Treatment Facility | Delays in development of Energy from waste infrastructure | An alternative route would be required for disposal of residual waste. | 3 | 2 | 6 | ↔ | Contractual risk is with the contractor, who are wholly responsible for finding alternative disposal routes at no additional cost to SWP. The residual risk would be reputational and environmental only. Ensure progress is monitored and communications plans in place in event of anticipated delay. | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 30 | | | Risk of fire at Waste Transfer Station of Disposal site. | Waste Transfer Stations temporarily out of action. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Landfill is monitored and transfer to Waste Transfer Station will improve capacity to monitor potential fires. Removal of small electrical items and possibly household batteries will reduce key cause of fires. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 31 | | | Financial case for alternative to landfill is damaged and cost increases (e.g. due to legislative changes) | Tied into contract that is not best value in future due to changes in market costs. | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Break clauses in the contract provide opportunities to review options. Monitor market costs and technical developments to ensure effective planning through life of the contract. | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 32 | | | Driver/loader shortages | Impact on service delivery if not all rounds deployed. Quality of delivery suffers when inexperienced drivers are employed. This is a developing risk due to impacts of Brexit (weak pound and uncertainty of future residency rights) and increasing competition from Hinckley C build. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↔ | Work with contractors to ensure they have policies in place for driver training and retention. Establish pay rates and identify areas of concern. Create joint SWP/Kier working party to develop recruitment strategies. Seek opportunities to improve role of drivers. Work with local colleges to promote driving as a career option. Continue to monitor pay rates. | 3 | 3 | 9 |

SWP Strategic Risk Register

| Last Updated: | | 7th February 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--------|-------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------|--------|---------------|
| Ref | Business Plan Link | Cause | Description of risk | Consequence | Assess current risk | | Risk rating | Change from last review | Control measures currently in place and additional mitigating actions/control measures planned | Target risk score | | Target rating |
| | | | | | Likelihood | Impact | | | | Likelihood | Impact | |
| 33 | Maintaining services and operational effectiveness | Contract management | Risk of under investment and deterioration of depot facilities if contractor loses interest as contract approached end of term | Poor working conditions for staff, H&S risks, increased D/T on fixed plant. Backlog of R&M at contract end. | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↔ | Regular audits by ops staff, Development of action plans for essential works at each depot. Review contract management. Introduce quarterly strategic review meeting between senior SWP officers and senior contractor staff. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 34 | | | Aging sorting and baling plant becomes unreliable as contract approaches expiry. | Increased downtime on fixed plant, increased O/T, lack of storage space in yards possible impact on collections/unloading. | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↔ | Regular updates on down time and remedial work at ops meetings. Deed of variation requires plant to be "safe and servicable" in accordance with the contract. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 35 | | | Service degradation due to loss of interest as contract approaches expiry | Missed collections, container deliveries, complaints not dealt with. | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↔ | Regular monitoring (IT), KPI reviews at Ops meetings. Strategic partnering board established. Review contract management. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 36 | | | Aging fleet becomes unreliable as contract approaches expiry | Increased down time disrupts collection services - performance deteriorates | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Regular updates on down time and R & M at ops meetings. Deed of variation requires vehicles to be "safe and roadworthy" in accordance with the contract but also allows use of substitute vehicles from other contracts to improve resilience. Review contract management. Ensure service performance is considered with newly introduced Strategic Partnership Board | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 37 | Maintaining services and operational effectiveness | Service impacts due to things outside of our direct control | Lack of preparedness or poor response to service disruption events eg weather | Lose control of situation resulting in high call loads; Loss of customer confidence and reputation; Loss of partner confidence in SWP. | 2 | 4 | 8 | ↔ | Business Continuity Plans (BCPs) in place for SWP and contractors. Draw on experience of cold weather events in 2008-11. Clear communications strategy approved by the Board's Severe Weather Sub Group. Further work intended to ensure that contractor and client side BCPs are joined up (MG & BC) | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 38 | | | Drop in value of recyclate (e.g. due to changes in Chinese policies) | Impact on contractor bottom line and viability of contract; Loss of public confidence in recycling | 4 | 3 | 12 | ↑ | Monitor pricing index for mixed plastics. Maintain our emphasis on quality which provides the best buffer for this risk. Provide reassuring messages to the public in the event of further price drops | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 39 | | | **NEW** Legislation changes requiring different ways of handling materials (e.g. Hazardous wood) | Difficulties storing material separately, finding suitable processors/implementing charges/refuse to accept | 3 | 4 | 12 | NEW | Industry is lobbying the EA to clarify, work with contractor to ensure solutions found. Continue to monitor the situation | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| 40 | | | DCLG continues to challenge innovation in funding Recycling Centres (e.g. entry fees/material charges) | Potential to reduce services provided or lead to increased costs. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↔ | Continue to base policy on performance, popularity, effectiveness and affordability. Work with members from all tiers of local government to seek flexibility to ensure continuity of services. Keep members, and particularly Board Members, informed especially following changes to administration or portfolio holders. | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 41 | | | Increase in value of material or energy | Potential for income share with both contractors | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Continue to lobby govt for challenging packaging recovery targets and lobby industry for quality to be reflected in higher prices. Evaluate potential for risk/reward share in all future ventures including infrastructure development and addition of new materials | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| 42 | | | National HGV driver shortage, exacerbated locally by competition from Hinckley C build. | Unable to adequately crew vehicles, resulting in incompletions. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↔ | Contractor is ensuring pay rates remain competitive. Recruitment exercises across Somerset, supported by SWP comms team. Initiatives planned to improve promotion of waste services as an attractive career and to develop better pathways in to the jobs. | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 43 | | | Landfill site fires, primarily caused by hot ashes in waste, unwrapped broken glass acting as a magnifier, or lithium ion batteries in waste | Hazard for site staff, closure of landfill sites, operational delays for vehicles resulting in late kerbside collections | 3 | 3 | 9 | ↔ | Increase publicity relating to fire prevention, encouraging people to dispose of waste responsibly. Cease use of landfill sites for disposal of Somerset's residual waste, transferring to disposal via Waste Transfer Stations. | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 44 | Maintaining services and operational effectiveness | Issues inherent in working at roadside and/or with heavy vehicles manoeuvring in confined working areas. | Risk of serious injury or death to staff | Personal impacts; Potential fines, legal claims; intervention by HSE etc. Loss of reputation | 3 | 5 | 15 | ↔ | Health & Safety has a high profile within service and with contractors. Bi-annual reports to SMG and SWB on internal and contractor performance. H&S advisory Group meets quarterly. Collection activities were the subject of a routine HSE inspection in Nov 2011 and no major concerns were identified. On sites public separated from heavy plant movements. As a result of HSE recommendations, SWP are increasing frequency of crew monitoring by officers and resources to enable this to be done efficiently are being prepared. Level of accidents to public on sites are very low and generally self-inflicted. | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 45 | | | Risk of serious injury or death to member of the public | Personal impacts; Potential fines, legal claims; intervention by HSE etc. Loss of reputation | 2 | 5 | 10 | ↔ | | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 46 | Maintaining services and operational effectiveness | Financial pressure on Contractors | Qualitative and/or quantitative reduction in contractor's management team or front line staff | Deterioration in service, higher complaints, reduced satisfaction with service, more pressure on client, lack of capacity to innovate. | 3 | 4 | 12 | ↔ | Frequent programmed engagement with Senior Management Teams of both contractors. Direct engagement with front-line staff by SWP. Continued secondment of experienced SWP staff to Kier. Sign-off to significant changes. Develop improved regular liaison with new Kier Senior Mgmt Team and attend staff meetings at depots. Maintain current arrangements with Viridor (MD and Chairman). Close monitoring of performance and implement contractual penalties if appropriate. | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 47 | | | Contractor defaults or fails | Potential short term delivery implications, requirement for service review / procurement with associated costs of process and potential higher cost of delivering the service. | 2 | 3 | 6 | ↔ | Awareness of financial state of cos. through checks & regular contact with Senior Managers, networking within industry to get early warning of trends & pressures. Respond quickly to any relevant intelligence obtained, assess risks that ensue and act accordingly (MD and Team). | 2 | 3 | 6 |