

Corporate Risk Register: Liverpool City Region Combined Authority
Date of Review: September 2019



Ref.	Corporate /Service Objective Jeopardised	Risk Details			Inherent Risk Scoring			Control Measures in Operation	Residual Risk Scoring		
		Risk Description	Consequences of Risk Materialising	Risk Owner (post title)	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Total Score		Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Total Score
1	All	Failure to achieve the required outputs associated with prioritising and managing the resources and responsibilities associated with the City Region's devolution deal.	Inability to deliver Devolution Deal Loss of devolved powers Opportunities for growth compromised Withdrawal of Constituent member	Director of Investment and Commercial Development	5	5	25	Corporate Plan Performance Management PMO Capacity Commercial and Investment expertise Budget recognises delivery as a priority	5	4	20
2	All	Lack of sustainable funding mechanism to support the achievement of Mayoral priorities, maintain capacity and resilience and manage the external funding portfolio associated with the City Region's devolution deal.	Inability to deliver Devolution Deal Loss of devolved powers Opportunities for growth compromised	Director of Corporate Services	5	5	25	Transitional funding package 2018/19 Mayoral Capacity grant CIPFA study on sustainable funding Budget process 2019/20 and beyond Role of Scrutiny	5	3	15
3	All	Inability to collaborate effectively with constituent Local Authorities, and with other key partners – including residents and businesses – to identify City Region priorities and determine the most effective mechanisms for delivering these priorities.	Inability to deliver targets, outputs and outcomes Reputational damage Inability to deliver Devolution Deal Loss of devolved powers Withdrawal of Constituent member	Director of Corporate Development and Delivery	5	4	20	Strategic involvement of constituent Local Authorities Role of portfolio holders and deputy portfolio holders Collaboration on key strategies FASJAB Formal consultation mechanism for TUs	5	3	15
4	All	Failure to maintain a strong and effective governance framework that promotes a delivery-focused culture that puts the requirements of the City Region first.	Failure to engage effectively with member organisations Ineffective allocation of resources Inability to deliver Devolution Deal Loss of devolved powers Corruption and illegality Ill informed decision making Reputational damage Increased complaints Inability to work with partners and stakeholders if lack of confidence in governance arrangements Inability to demonstrate effective governance Failure to deliver targets, outputs and outcomes Implications for employee wellbeing, morale, turnover and absence levels Legal action and associated costs, penalties and fines Insurance claims	Director of Corporate Services	5	4	20	Revised Constitution Code of Corporate Governance Assurance Framework Financial Regulations Internal Audit Plan Increased capacity in Internal Audit Risk Management arrangements Performance management arrangements Corporate Plan	5	3	15

Ref.	Corporate /Service Objective Jeopardised	Risk Description	Risk Details			Inherent Risk Scoring			Control Measures in Operation	Residual Risk Scoring		
			Consequences of Risk Materialising	Risk Owner (post title)	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Total Score	Impact Score		Likelihood Score	Total Score	
5	All	Failure to effectively identify and address the impact of political, social and economic uncertainties, in particular those associated with future arrangements for exiting the EU.	Loss of structural funds Skills shortages Relocation of key businesses and employers Disruption and damage to LCRCA initiatives Failure to achieve outcomes in business growth	Director of Investment and Commercial Development	5	4	20	Investment Strategy Assurance Framework Strategic Investment Fund LCR Working Group Increased financial support for small/medium sized enterprises (SMEs)	5	4	20	
6	Economy Housing Environment Culture & Tourism	Failure to establish an appropriate Spatial Framework to support and enable LCRCA's growth ambitions	Misalignment of Local Plans Inability to deliver housing targets and growth in homelessness Inability to promote economic growth Reputational damage	Director of Policy and Strategic Commissioning	5	5	25	Dedicated capacity for Spatial Plan in place Paper to be presented to CA on the engagement proposals for the Spatial Development Strategy	5	3	15	
7	Environment	Failure to maximise LCRCA's opportunities to have a positive impact on air quality and to improve air quality across the City Region.	Impacts on health, wellbeing and environmental outcomes Loss of future funding streams	Director of Policy and Strategic Commissioning	5	5	25	Consideration as part of policy and strategy Monitoring of air quality on transport network	5	3	15	
8	All	Failure to prevent, plan and respond to major incidents impacting on transport networks, and in particular failure to maintain robust systems and procedures in respect of our own transport assets.	Deaths and serious injuries Loss of connectivity Implications for reputation and confidence Legal issues – e.g. corporate manslaughter Disruptions to network Unavailability of key systems and operational disruption Lost revenue Injury and claims arising. Temporary (and maybe permanent) removal of service to address risk HSE investigation and fines Staff absence Increased complaints. Criticism/negative media coverage Recovery costs Increased insurance premiums	Director of Integrated Transport	5	5	25	Asset Management Plan Mersey Tunnels capital programme Resilience arrangements in place and tested Control Centre co-ordination Renewal of Rolling Stock Fleet Investment in Mersey Ferries vessels	5	3	15	
9	All	Information Governance breach or cyber attack	Data loss Remediation costs Regulator fines Implications for reputation and confidence Unavailability of key systems and operational disruption Ill informed decision making. Systems compromised, resulting in internal and external threats: Viral, Denial Of Service attack, Data Integrity (different levels of data: Financial, personal, commercial, operational) [Theft of data, Deletion of data and Data corruption], Disruptive attack and Privilege escalation. Litigation and cost of claims. Increased complaints. Inability to work with partners and stakeholders if lack of confidence in integrity of systems.	Director of Corporate Development and Delivery	5	5	25	Information Management Group Senior Information Management Officer Information Sharing Protocol Information Management Policy Framework Information System Security Arrangements Staff Identified and Trained Senior Information Risk Owner ICT Strategy Policy - Data Protection Policy Resilience and Recovery Arrangements ICT Security Protocol Monitoring of Performance External Assessment Internal Policies and Procedures Code of Conduct for Employees PCI Compliance Arrangements Acceptable Use Policy Business Continuity Arrangements	5	3	15	

Ref.	Corporate /Service Objective Jeopardised	Risk Description	Risk Details			Inherent Risk Scoring			Control Measures in Operation	Residual Risk Scoring		
			Consequences of Risk Materialising	Risk Owner (post title)	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Total Score	Impact Score		Likelihood Score	Total Score	
10	Good quality and affordable housing	<p>Due to the nature of the direct client facing delivery taking place on the Housing First programme, and its pilot status, there are a number of risks related to the project that combined make it an organisational risk. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No/reduced Housing Supply 2. Serious incident within the service 3. Current lack of clarity on re-profile of spend/Unable to spend out of year 4. Unknowns of delivery 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unable to deliver Housing First, or significantly reduced capacity to deliver. 2. Harm to person including death. Adverse public reaction/reputational damage. 3. Unable to commission further delivery and meet target projections. 4. Inability to sufficiently plan and mitigate risks as the CA, and organisations in the LCR have never delivered Housing First. 	Director of Policy and Strategic Commissioning	5	4	20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commitment from 16 Housing Associations to provide Housing. 2. On call system, lone working protection, robust safeguarding training and procedures, links to police, mental health and NHS. 3. Commitment is over the spending review period, and good working relationships with MHCLG. Commitment to HF from Secretary of State. 4. Comprehensive project risk register held by Project Board and HF Steering Group and regularly reviewed. Expertise in the team include staff who have delivered homelessness services, including HF so experience of potential risks are highlighted as much as possible. 	5	3	15	