Audit and Governance Committee – July 2025

Corporate Risk Register – Risk Table

Risk Ref	Risk Title	Net Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner	Risk Status
CR27	We may fail to adequately address concerns around environmental impacts - cliff management/instability	16	16	Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer	Corporate Risk
CR23	Potential implications of the Dedicated Schools Grant financial deficit	16	8	Graham Farrant, Chief Executive (Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services and Adam Richens, Director of Finance)	Corporate Risk
CR15	We may fail to have in place suitable talent attraction, retention and succession planning, staff wellbeing and support	12	12	Sarah Deane, Director of People and Culture	Corporate Risk
CR04	We may suffer a loss or disruption to IT Systems and Networks from cyber attack	12	9	Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes	Corporate Risk
CR02	We may fail to achieve appropriate outcomes and quality of service for children and young people including potential inadequate safeguarding	12	8	Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services	Corporate Risk
CR09	We may fail to maintain a safe and balanced budget for the delivery of services, and managing the MTFP	12	8	Adam Richens, Director of Finance	Corporate Risk
CR20	Potential of climate change to outstrip our capability to adapt	12	8	Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms & Policy	Corporate Risk
CR19	We may fail to determine planning applications within statutory timescales, or within agreed extensions of time (EOT)	9	6	Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer	Corporate Risk
CR26	Risks associated with the availability of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)	9	6	Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes	Corporate Risk
CR18	We may fail to provide adequate customer interfaces	9	2	Matti Raudsepp, Director of Customer and Property Operations	Corporate Risk

Risk Ref	Risk Title	Net Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner	Risk Status
CR21	**Impact of global events causing pressure on BCP Council & increase in service requirements**	**6**	**6**	Kelly Deane, Director of Housing and Public Protection	**Corporate Risk**
CR25	**We may be unable to effectively transform services to achieve efficiencies and improve service standards**	**4**	**4**	Corporate Management Board Collective	**Corporate Risk**
CR16	**We may fail to secure or manage partnerships, miss out on associated funding and be unable to deliver services for communities**	**4**	**2**	Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms & Policy	**Corporate Risk**
CR24	**We may fail to adequately address concerns around community safety**	**2**	**2**	Kelly Deane, Director of Housing and Public Protection	**Corporate Risk**
CR01	Failure to respond to the needs arising from a changing demography.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q4 2022
CR03	Failure to ensure adequate Information Governance – now Key Assurance – Information governance Board Risk	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q2 2020
CR05	Failure to plan effectively for EU Transition	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk Removed Q2 2020
CR06	Failure to adequately respond to an incident involving the activation of the emergency plan– now Key Assurance – Resilience Governance Board Risk	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk Removed Q2 2020
CR07	Failure to provide adequate services as a result of an incident requiring a business continuity response– now Key Assurance – Resilience Governance Board	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk Removed Q2 2020
CR10	Failure to deliver effective health and safety to protect staff, councillors including the public	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q3 2020
CR11	Ability of the council to function and operate efficiently in the delivery of single services across the area of BCP	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q1 2023

Risk Ref	Risk Title	Net Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner	Risk Status
CR12	Failure to achieve appropriate outcomes and quality of service for young people	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q4 2023
CR13	Failure to deliver the transformation programme	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q4 2023
CR14	Continuity of Public Health arrangements for health protection	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q3 2023
CR17	Risk to Reputation of Place & Council if summer arrangements are not managed	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk Removed Q3 2022
CR22	Failure of local care market to meet increasing demand	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q4 2023

AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

July 2025

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE Q1 – 2025/26

1.1 Mitigation actions and significant changes this quarter are detailed below.

1.2 The table below is a key to arrow directions in relation to individual risk scoring.

	RISK DIRECTION OF TRAVEL STATUS
↑	Risk impact or likelihood has **increased** since last review.
↓	Risk impact or likelihood has **decreased** since last review.
↔	There is **no change** to the risk impact or likelihood

Risk CR27 – We may fail to adequately address concerns around environmental impacts – cliff management/instability

Risk Owner – Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Richard Herrett, Cabinet Member for Destination, Leisure and Commercial Operations, Councillor Andy Hadley, Cabinet Member for Climate Response, Environment and Energy

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
- Our communities have pride in our streets, neighbourhoods and public spaces
- Climate change is tackled through sustainable policies and practice
- Using data, insights and feedback to shape services and solutions

Risk Information

This risk has been created to capture emerging risks in relation to environmental impacts. The first risk to be included under this group is that of cliff instability and the risk will primarily reflect this initially. The risk will continue to develop to include further areas over the next several months.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

In respect of cliff stability, the cause is linked to natural elements of cliff movement as well as groundwater penetrating the cliff face, increased risk is through lack of maintenance of existing specialist drainage infrastructure over the last couple of decades.

No budgeted funding to look after existing cliff drainage infrastructure and undertake remedial works required.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

Failure of Seafront assets such as retaining walls and access pathways.
Risk of damage to property and inability to operate services – both have an asset and financial risk. Potential for larger failures such as the East Cliff Lift slip in 2016, also posing risk to life.

Financial impact linked to cost of work associated with works to stabilise the cliffs and respond to slips as well as lost income from the inability to operate commercial services when impacted directly by slips or within a compound exclusion area.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Environmental, Physical, Economic, Political, Social, Technological, Legislative, Customer, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		⟷

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

Cliff Management Strategy (CMS) being developed by Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Team (FCERM) to inform Seafront as to engineering investment needs. Specialist Geotechnical Engineer employed to lead on strategy delivery and future technical advice. Cliff Management Working Group set up to table and discuss ongoing risks and actions.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	4	16		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		April 2025
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	CMS risk register to be developed	TBC
Action 2:	CMS to demonstrate funding needs for immediate priority issues and future likely needs	TBC
Action 3:	Maintenance regime to be developed, funded and actioned	TBC
Action 4:	Monitoring of cliffs via visual inspection as well as GPS and drone technology, in line with CMS recommendations	TBC
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	4	16		⬌

Quarter Update

Procurement process underway to take forward initial remedial works to part of the west cliff slip area, and ongoing work is underway to both monitor current levels of risk to support decisions around the scale of current cliff slip cordons required, as well as to confirm works required going forward and associated costs. Initial costings have been identified for anticipated works required on the current slips as well as ongoing maintenance but these need to be finalised following more detailed inspections and quotes.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	As above
Net Score	⬌	As above
Target Score	⬌	As above

Risk CR23 – Potential implications of the Dedicated Schools Grant financial deficit

Risk Owner – Graham Farrant, Chief Executive (Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services and Adam Richens, Director of Finance)

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Mike Cox, Deputy Leader of the Council, Vice-Chair of Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Finance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Using our resources sustainably to support our ambitions

Risk Information

The council is forecasting revenue spending of £122m on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) services in 2025/26. This is **£55.7m** more than the £64.5m revenue grant provided by the Department for Education (DfE) as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), High Needs Block allocation.

In 2024/25 the draft Financial Outturn indicates the council spent £111.9m on SEND revenue expenditure, which was £49.9m more than the £62m DSG grant allocation and £5.3m more than the quarter 3 forecast.

This annual discrepancy creates an accumulating deficit which was **£113.3m** on the 31 March 2025 and is now forecast to be **£170.9m** on the 31 March 2026.

Government have put in place a Statutory Instrument (SI) which states the council **cannot** contribute to the deficit, **cannot** hold a reserve to act as a counterweight and has been required to move the deficit to an **unusable reserve** where it will **sit as though it did not exist** within the council's accounts or balance sheet. This statutory instrument expires on the 31 March 2026.

2025/26 is a watershed moment, it is the first time the council will start a financial year with an accumulated deficit on its DSG in excess of the total amount of its reserves and balances. In other words, it is the first time the council will start the year in a technically insolvent position. The total reserves and balances of the council are forecast to be **£83m** as of 31 March 2025.

In setting the budget for 2025/26 the council also had to address the fact that it had run out of headroom to be able to cashflow the accumulating DSG Deficit. Options explored included the possibility of the council entering the government Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) programme and seeking a capitalisation direction which would be a formal permission to borrow to fund the £57.5m deficit for 2025/26. This approach could have led to government intervention, for example a further Best Value Notice. Eventually, the government recommended that we temporarily borrow the £57.5m as part of our Treasury Management activity. This is on the basis that councils can exceed their agreed borrowing limits provided it is seen as just being temporary and is associated with the ebb and flow of Treasury Management activity. The government advocated this approach on the basis that they have committed to putting forward in 2025 a plan to return the national SEND system to financial sustainability.

The risks posed by this annual imbalance between revenue expenditure and government funding for the SEND service presents an existential threat to the financial viability and sustainability of the council and one which government must address in 2025.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

Insufficient grant funding is provided to the council by the government with insufficient recognition of growing demand and high costs of provision.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

Financial sustainability of the council, including insufficient cash flow to meet normal service expenditure with further risk of illegality from the need to borrow to meet revenue expenditure to maintain appropriate levels of statutory services.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please [see pages 2-5 of this guidance](#) – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

- **Economic –** inability to meet financial commitments
- **Legal -** breach of regulations that prohibit borrowing for revenue expenditure
- **Resources** – impact on other areas of the council (capital and revenue) as expenditure is limited to preserve cashflow.
- **Reputation** – lack of confidence in the ability of the council to manage its financial affairs as indicated by the issue of a S114 notice (effective bankruptcy).

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

Cabinet Report: December 2024: Assessing the serious cashflow issue caused by ever-increasing demand and cost outstripping High Needs Dedicated Schools Grant government funding. Set out not just the background and context to the issue but all the activity including that of the Chief Executive, Director of Finance, Leader and Local MPs in trying to draw attention to and resolve the issue.

Council Report: February 2025: Set out the conclusion and approach to be taken in drawing the 2025/26 Budget. This included the acknowledgement of both the External Auditor and CIPFA that temporary borrowing via Treasury Management powers was a pragmatic but not sustainable outcome.

14 February 2025: CIPFA published paper: Reforming SEND finance: meeting need in a sustainable system.

Cabinet Report: May 2025: Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) Update report. Reminded members of the risk and included a brief update on messaging from government.

Cabinet Report: July 2025: MTFP Update. Included letters from the Leader to the Secretary of State and Director of Finance to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government setting out the ongoing concerns in regard to the SEND deficit.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking, but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	Not possible to eliminate the funding gap through reduced expenditure as there are statutory requirements. Strategy is to secure additional DSG grant.
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	Not possible - the solution must be additional funding or a completely redesigned system.
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	The service are implementing a management plan to build and address sufficiency as appropriate.

Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases, the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	No – it cannot be tolerated, and government have to deliver a solution.

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	4	16		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Monitor activity and statements delivered by the government as part of the three-year spending review	Spring 2025
Action 2:		
Action 3:		
Action 4:		
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Quarter Update

Further update included in the July MTFP Update report to Cabinet

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	
Net Score	⬌	
Target Score	⬌	

Risk Owner – Sarah Deane, Director of People and Culture

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) – Councillor Jeff Hanna, Cabinet Member for Transformation, Resources and Governance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Developing a passionate, proud, valued and diverse workforce

Risk Information

A new People Strategy was launched in December 2023 which covers the period from 2024 to 2027. The People Strategy is closely aligned to the corporate vision and ambitions, and the transformation agenda. There are twelve key workstreams in the People Strategy together with a three-year detailed implementation plan. BCP Council needs to have the right staff, at the right time, in the right roles to deliver front line and corporate services effectively and efficiently.

Key outcomes:

- single pay structure and terms and conditions to ensure fair and equal pay
- high performance culture
- improved workforce planning
- improved talent attraction and retention
- improved wellbeing and absence rates
- improved leadership development
- full automation of HR systems to support efficiencies and new ways of working.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

Pay and Reward has created significant risks to the delivery of the overall objectives within our People Strategy.

On 30 June 2025 however, both recognised trade unions confirmed that their members had voted to accept the latest offer. This offer and its implementation, is subject to Council approval on 22 July. Given the significant milestone that a successful ballot brings, this risk has been updated based on an assumed approval by Council which will be confirmed after 22 July 2025. If the Council does not approve the offer, officers will have to revise this risk assessment as quickly as possible.

The threat of industrial action has been removed as a result of members voting to accept the Pay and Reward offer and the potential for significant numbers of equal pay claims, similar to that experienced in other local authorities have experienced, has now greatly reduced. There do remain some risks to the organisation, however, as follows:

Potential for claims to arise

It is still the case, and has been the experience of others, that the introduction of a new job evaluation scheme and pay structure, could bring the potential for a range of employment claims and challenges to grading and role assessment. We have built appropriate appeals mechanisms, involving trades union colleagues, into the agreement.

Risk of increased levels of turnover

The updated certainty that the ballot outcome now gives us provides clarity for our colleagues on the way forward together with the associated timescales for this. It is acknowledged, however, that there are colleagues that still remain unsatisfied with the outcome and these changes will present challenges and anxiety. Support will be provided to those who wish to access it but others may choose to seek alternative employment and it is possible that our turnover levels may be slightly higher than normal as we move forward into implementation and beyond into the period of pay protection for those colleagues seeing a reduction in pay.

Financial risk - Incremental drift

The Medium Term Financial Plan and corporate resources provided for the cost of Pay and Reward, do not include additional exposure by the authority to annual incremental drift. Services have been required to manage this cost historically within their base budget allocation and will continue to do so. However, it should be highlighted that this cost is estimated to have increased significantly due to the additional head room in this enhanced offer. For 1 April 2026, this cost is estimated to now amount to circa £4.0m for 2026/27 and can be compared to an annual cost of around £1.5m under the current arrangements. This cost will be mitigated by various issues including turnover, take-up of colleague benefits (eg salary sacrifice schemes) and performance. There will then be further similar exposure in future years which this enhanced offer has increased due to the additional headroom on grades.

Risk to viability of services

The increases in base salary costs including the additional incremental drift and changes to terms and conditions may challenge the viability of numerous services including those that are expected to achieve full cost recovery and those covered by fees and charges where the fee is based on the level acceptable to the market. It will also reduce the amount of grant funding available for non-salary cost expenditure.

Appeals

The numbers of colleagues wishing to appeal their role profile mapping is unknown at this time with the window for appeals to be lodged opening in December 2025. Previous experience of implementing job evaluation in the preceding councils has highlighted the likelihood of significant numbers of requests. The appeals process will therefore run into and throughout December 2026 as needed. Successful appeal outcomes will mean greater financial impacts to services and could ultimately impact further on the viability of services and balancing the budget.

Attracting new talent

Recruitment literature and job information will provide certainty to prospective colleagues and it is hoped that our improved offer and new colleague benefits will significantly support our employer value proposition, encouraging a wider range of applications for our vacancies and reducing our need to appoint agency cover for vacant posts. However leading up to implementation, we will need to advertise both the current and future salaries, which has the potential to create some confusion and/or concern where salary levels are falling.

National skills shortage

As well as the Pay and Reward impact, there remains a national shortage of skills which means that there are still significant recruitment difficulties in some areas of the council. The council

relies heavily on agency workers to fill hard to recruit business critical roles, particularly in frontline services, which affects our ability to serve residents effectively. Agreement of the new Pay and Reward offer will help this situation but will probably not solve it completely.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

The developments in Pay and Reward have created more certainty for our colleagues and for the majority will be seen as a positive step forward but it is acknowledged that the situation will also bring concern and anxiety for some who will see a reduction in their pay. It is anticipated that the ongoing process of implementation leading on to appeals will continue to destabilise the workforce for a period of time. During this time there will be an increased risk of grievances, and higher turnover with resultant increase in recruitment costs, low morale and employee engagement in specific areas, together with a negative impact on employees' wellbeing and financial situations. This could mean that some service delivery may be affected.

The People and Culture 2024/25 growth bid was not approved and this therefore means that full delivery of the people strategy will not be possible within the original planned timescale and that further development of our Talent Acquisition efforts will be delayed due to limited capacity for proactively searching for passive candidates with niche skills, which is crucial for increasing direct hires and reducing agency costs.

The People and Culture team are continuing to work on key priorities however and have made good progress with our new careers site and development of our Employee Value Proposition amongst other key achievements within the People strategy.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please [see pages 2-5 of this guidance](#) – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Resource, Legal, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		⟷

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- The threat of immediate industrial action has been removed since achieving a vote to accept the offer from both recognised trade unions
- Support for colleagues impacted negatively by Pay and Reward is in place
- Services are beginning to work through the financial impact that Pay and Reward will have on their budgets and to services to better understand mitigation strategies
- Potential sources of mitigation for budgetary pressures include national insurance savings delivered from new benefits such as the salary sacrifice additional pension fund voluntary contributions and other salary sacrifice schemes and reduced costs from any current market supplements not required or required at a lower level.
- Whilst the growth bid submitted for consideration to resource the full Talent Acquisition operating model has been rejected due to the financial landscape of the

council, the Talent Acquisition Team continue to deliver some of our Talent Acquisition ambitions.
- Services continue to work with People and Culture to undertake risk assessment of retention issues in relation to Pay and Reward and look to put mitigation options in place.
- Change and wellbeing training sessions have been delivered together with signposting to relevant toolkits and means of support.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	✓
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	✓

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	3	12		⬇

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Implementation of Pay and Reward	1 Dec 25
Action 2:	People Strategy Implementation Plan	2027
Action 3:		
Action 4:		
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	3	12		

Quarter Update

Following a fourth ballot, both recognised trade unions have confirmed that their members have voted to accept the latest Pay and Reward proposal and that they are happy to proceed to sign a collective agreement. This proposal, including the financial impact of it, is subject to Council agreement on 22 July 2025. This risk update has assumed approval is given but will be updated shortly after that date to provide confirmation.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score		As above
Net Score		As above
Target Score		As above

Risk CR04 – We may suffer a loss or disruption to IT Systems and Networks from cyber attack

Risk Owner – Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) – Councillor Jeff Hanna, Cabinet Member for Transformation, Resources and Governance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Working together everyone feels safe and secure

Risk Information

BCP Council relies heavily on digital technology and online capability, including in the delivery of essential and public-facing services.

Disruption can come in many forms (some described below), both deliberate through acts of cyber-crime, or accidental through loss of hardware or infrastructure. Both can cause immense disruption to the council by denying staff and public access to key services. Even traditional face-to-face services can be impacted by a loss of IT systems as many back-office functions rely entirely on the availability of computers and data.

Nationally, the threat of cyber-attack remains high on the UK.GOV National Risk Register, featuring prominently across the register with the potential for disruption to national infrastructure, finance, telecommunications, transport and social care systems. Cyber is ranked the number one surveyed risk by the Business Continuity Institute in 2024 and again moving into 2025.

While there are huge opportunities and benefits for the council by continuing to actively leverage technology in support of the transformation agenda, our vulnerabilities become greater as we increasingly rely on cyberspace.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

Some of the highest risk causes include:

Phishing attacks: These attacks use social engineering tactics to trick individuals into revealing sensitive information, clicking on malicious links or trying to defraud the council of money. These often lead to further breaches by allowing the attacker to gain access to the council's systems and data.

Ransomware attacks: These attacks involve encrypting the council's data and demanding payment in exchange for the decryption key.

Insider threats: These threats can come from employees, contractors, or other individuals with access to the council's systems and data.

Supply chain attacks: These attack target third-party vendors or suppliers to gain access to the council's systems and data.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

A loss or disruption to IT systems, specifically those caused by cyber-attacks, can incapacitate essential networks, for example, by encrypting or destroying data on which vital services depend. Such attacks could cause a variety of real-world harm if services such as Social Care, Housing or Place (Highways etc.) are impacted.

Financial loss is the most common impact through direct loss of funds, recovery costs and Information Commissioner's Office fines. There are also reputational impacts.

Public confidence may be affected if the council is not able to adequately protect its IT systems and networks against loss or disruption, whether caused accidentally or intentionally.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please [see pages 2-5 of this guidance](#) – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Technological, Customer/Citizen, Economic, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

IT and Programmes have in place robust mitigations to assist in the management of this risk, however this is still considered a "when, not if" event and the risk will never be totally mitigated. Continued focus on end-user training as it is ALL staff and councillors who provide the best and last line of defence against cyber attacks. IT Security Course Completion Rates continue to show an upward trend in most areas of the council.

IT Security Course completion is now actively tracked by managers as part of annual performance reviews, under our new framework, and as such we are expecting to see this upward trend to continue.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	No
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	Partial
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	Yes
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	Yes

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	3	12		⬄

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		Ongoing
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Training and increase user awareness of risks: ITSEC teams continue to deploy monthly cyber awareness training to all staff digitally.	Ongoing
Action 2:	Increased cyber detection and response tooling: Annually, IT and Programmes undertake an exercise to bid for capital or additional revenue funding to improve or maintain its IT infrastructure and cyber security posture.	Ongoing

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	3	9		⬄

Quarter Update

Over the past few months, we have encountered several cyber threats that have tested our IT systems and networks. The council will continue to work with partners to limit our vulnerability to such threats.

Funding has been approved to appoint an additional IT Security Officer and recruitment is underway.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	The general trend in ongoing attacks means the risk requires ongoing close monitoring.
Net Score	⬌	The general trend in ongoing attacks means the risk requires ongoing close monitoring.
Target Score	⬌	The general trend in ongoing attacks means the risk requires ongoing close monitoring.

Risk CR02 - We may fail to achieve appropriate outcomes and quality of service for children and young people including potential inadequate safeguarding

Risk Owner – Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Richard Burton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People, Education and Skills

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
- High quality of life for all, where people can be active, healthy and independent
- Working together, everyone feels safe and secure
- Those who need support receive it when and where they need it
- Skills are continually developed, and people can access lifelong learning
- Intervening as early as possible to improve outcomes
- Working closely with partners, removing barriers and empowering others
- Providing accessible and inclusive services, showing care in our approach

Risk Information

Corporate Context

Safeguarding is the responsibility of all councillors and corporate officers, and this is reflected in the Corporate Safeguarding Strategy which was agreed by Cabinet in September 2019.

BCP Council had a Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) inspection in June 2021 which identified significant gaps in services which are being addressed through a SEND Improvement Plan and a Department for Education (DfE) Statutory Notice. A review by the DfE and NHS England (NHSE) in July 2023 concluded that not enough progress was being made and a Statutory Direction from the Secretary of State has been issued to BCP Council.

BCP Council had an Ofsted ILACS (inspecting local authority children's services) inspection in December 2021 and was rated inadequate. Detailed improvement plans have been put in place since that judgement, and there have been 6 monitoring visits and a DfE review which have confirmed that there is progress being made. BCP Council has now had its full ILAC inspection and achieved a Good rating from Ofsted.

Partnerships

BCP Council must ensure that it is working with all partners in the most effective way to identify, assess and respond to safeguarding issues, and those which cut across children's, adults' and community safety. BCP Council does this through various boards: the Pan Dorset Safeguarding Partnership, BCP Children's Safeguarding Board and Community Safety Partnership being examples.

Communities

Key consideration for the Communities directorate in discharging the range of duties provided across a range of services, community safety and domestic abuse.

Children's Services

There is an increase in demand for services and in the complexity of need in children and young people presenting to Children's Services across Children's Social Care and Education and Skills. This is placing demand on resources and budgets. For example, there is an increase in the number of children with complex needs placed in residential care which creates additional pressure on the Children's Service's budget; providers also increase their costs and there is an increase in Education, Health and Care Assessments.

There is a shortage of Children's Services social workers nationally, which means that there is a reliance on agency staff which puts pressure on budgets and can affect the continuity and consistency of service to our children and young people. Whilst there has been significant progress in stabilising the workforce the Pay and Reward programme may have an impact on this going forward.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- Lack of collaboration with partners
- Shortage of staff and staff capacity
- Insufficient specialist local and national placements from both in-house and external provision which also drives up the cost of placements
- Failure to deliver safe service to children and families as per the findings of the Ofsted ILAC inspection December 2021 and the Care Quality Commission/Ofsted SEND Inspection July 2021
- Poor identification and management of risk across the service and partnership.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- Victims, death or serious injury
- Children and Young People being placed further away from networks
- Delays in finding suitable homes
- Poor performance assessment
- Poor staff morale and further retention issues
- Litigation costs and failure to meet legislative requirements
- Council-wide economic impact with more children being placed out of borough and additional budget pressure
- Adverse media coverage - damaged reputation/public image.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Customer, physical, legislative, resource, social, contractual, political, reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

Children's Directorate

- Focus on the SEND improvement journey to ensure core services are safe for vulnerable children and young people
- The strongest mitigation is to have the capacity and resources to meet the rising demand of need across the services and to have the assurance of the quality of practice through quality assurance frameworks and governance processes
- Robust governance is in place to ensure that improvement continues at pace in SEND
- Children's Services have developed a Children and Young People's Partnership plan now the services are rated Good by Ofsted
- There is a SEND Improvement Board which is chaired by a DfE Advisor and the Board holds service, council and partners accountable for the delivery of improvements identified in the improvement plan
- DfE Advisor and Improvement Officers have been assigned by the DfE to oversee and support the improvement of services as identified in the Statutory Notices to Improve from the Secretary of State for SEND
- Education Services are subject to termly Ofsted Monitoring meetings which oversee improvement and hold the service accountable for meeting statutory standards

- A Quality Assurance Framework has been embedded into Children's Social Care practice giving the assurance that improvements are being made. Practice Learning Reviews (audits) now evidence practice consistently at 'requires improvement' with an increasing number of 'good' demonstrated. Governance processes introduced in 2022 continue to review practice and give increasing assurance that children are safeguarded. Ofsted in their Monitoring visit 6 and in the full ILAC, stated that they considered children to now be safe in the BCP Council area
- Scheme of Delegation reviewed and updated for Children's Services
- Monthly budget management meetings between finance and budget holders
- Financial accountability is held at Senior Leadership Team and Building Stronger Foundations (BSF) Board through reporting by the Finance Manager.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which a2x1=2re being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking, but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	3	12		⬅➡

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Deliver on the Children's Services Improvement Plan - Raise the quality of practice to improve the experiences and progress of children who need help and protection - Raise the quality of practice to improve the experiences and progress of children in care and care leavers.	**Complete**
Action 2:	Deliver on the SEND Improvement Plan (8 areas for improvement)	June 2025
Action 3:	Deliver on the Education Improvement plan	June 2025
Action 4:	Create an environment where BCP children and young people are understood to be everyone's responsibility in BCP and all BCP and partner services own this and take accountability	**Complete**
Action 5:	Ensure the BCP model of Corporate Support services and systems is fully conducive to the children's improvement journey	**Complete**
Action 6:	Sufficient suitable accommodation available for our Care Experienced young people and placement choice of good quality locally for children in care	June 2025

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		↔

Quarter Update

Children's Services were inspected by Ofsted against the full ILAC inspection schedule and given an overall rating of Good. This is a significant achievement from a position of Inadequate in 2021. Care leavers received an individual rating of Requires Improvement and the areas of development highlighted by Ofsted will be incorporated into the service plan and monitored through business as usual quality assurance activities.

SEND improvement against the Written Statement of Action, continues to be managed through the Improvement Board chaired by the DfE Advisor. There is optimism from the DfE Advisor in the direction of travel and BCP is waiting for the full SEND Care Quality Commission and Ofsted Inspection before the summer of 2025. There are risks and challenges particularly around recent national changes for the NHSE. We will continue to work with our health partners to mitigate any risks to our progress.

The financial implication of not managing the risks in SEND will be the costs of failure to manage service delivery.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	↔	For children's social care this is now business as usual with directorate risk management. For SEND this continues to be work in progress however going in the right direction.
Net Score	↔	
Target Score	↔	

Risk CR09 – We may fail to maintain a safe and balanced budget for the delivery of services, and managing the MTFP

Risk Owner – Adam Richens, Director of Finance

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Mike Cox, Deputy Leader of the Council, Vice-Chair of Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Finance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Using our resources sustainably to support our ambitions

Risk Information

The council has a legal responsibility to ensure it can balance its budget. As part of this framework, it is not permitted to have negative reserves.

Council approved its **2024/25** Budget at Council on 20 February 2024, based on the following main aspects:

- 4.99% Council Tax increase (2.99% basic and 2% Social Care Precept) in line with the maximum threshold for upper tier authorities
- £38m of savings, efficiencies, increases to fees and charges, and service reductions of which £13.5m is in relation to transformation
- Provision of £7.5m in extra resources to cover demand and inflationary pressures, including any pay changes, in the council's highest priority area, Children's Services
- Provision of £15.2m in extra resources to cover demand and inflationary pressures, including any pay changes, to the most vulnerable members of our community via investment in Wellbeing Services be that adult social care or housing services
- Elimination of the £30m structural deficit/funding gap created by using £30m of reserves to balance the 2023/24 budget.

The Financial Outturn position as set out in a July 2025 Cabinet report provides the evidence that the council delivered services in 2024/25 within the parameters of the approved General Fund Budget.

Council approved its **2025/26** Budget at Council on 11 February 2025, based on the following main aspects.

- 4.99% Council Tax increase (2.99% basic and 2% Social Care Precept) in line with the maximum threshold for upper tier authorities
- £7.8m of savings, efficiencies, increases to fees and charges, and service reductions of which £1.7m is in relation to transformation
- Provision of £6.5m in extra resources to cover demand and inflationary pressures in the council's highest priority area, Children's Services
- Provision of £14.4m in extra resources to cover demand and inflationary pressures in the most vulnerable members of our community via investment in Wellbeing Services be that adult social care or housing services
- Temporary borrowing of £57.5m to finance the difference in 2025/26 between the £122m revenue expenditure on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) services and the £64.5m Department for Education (DfE) grant allocation as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) High Needs Block allocation.

Council on the 11 February 2025 were presented with a balanced Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) covering the period 2026/27 and 2027/28. Notably there is a £4.9m funding gap in **2026/27** which is then recovered in 2027/28.

Cabinet on the 13 May 2025 were provided with an update on the MTFP which tends to ebb and flow through to formal Budget Council in February each year. This report also provided details of a scenario planning exercise designed to help shape activity now needed to ensure a balanced 2026/27 budget is delivered.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- Expenditure of the authority is higher than all available sources of income.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- S151 Officer would be required to issue a formal s114 report.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:
- Customer/Citizen, Economic, Political, Reputational

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		↔

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Microsoft Dynamics Enterprise Resources System implemented in April 2023 to improve the provision of financial management information underpinned by the principle of self-service. Therefore, real time budget monitoring information made available to budget holders.
- Regular meetings between portfolio holders and senior officers in respect of the financial strategy and the budget position.
- Quarterly budget monitoring reports to Cabinet including progress against budget savings.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	3	12		↔

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	**Cabinet report:** Financial Outturn report 2024/25	July 2025
Action 2:	**Cabinet report:** MTFP Update report	July 2025
Action 3	**Cabinet report:** Quarter 1 Budget Monitoring 2025/26	Sept 2025
Action 4	**Cabinet report:** MTFP Update report	Oct 2025

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Quarter update

The financial outturn report for 2024/25 demonstrates that as per the assumption underpinning the 2025/26 budget, the council delivered its financial outturn for 2024/25 within the parameters of the approved budget for the year.

As set out in risk CR23, Council agreed to borrow £57.5m in 2025/26 to cashflow the difference between the £122m it is forecasting to spend on SEND services and the £64.5m revenue grant provided by the DfE as part of the DSG, High Needs Block allocation. This is a short-term arrangement on the basis that the government have committed to putting forward in 2025 a plan to return the national SEND system to financial sustainability. The council awaits a further announcement as part of the 11 June 2025 Comprehensive Spending Review.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	
Net Score	⬌	
Target Score	⬌	

Risk CR20 – Potential of climate change to outstrip our capability to adapt

Risk Owner – Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms & Policy

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Andy Hadley, Cabinet Member for Climate Response, Environment and Energy

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
- Climate change is tackled through sustainable policies and practice
- Using data, insights and feedback to shape services and solutions

Risk Information

The International Panel on Climate Change's 5th report has robustly concluded that climate change is unequivocally real and caused by human activity such as the burning of fossil fuels and destruction of habitats releasing greenhouse gases in unprecedented levels and limiting the earth's ability to reabsorb them.

The UK Government has committed to achieving 'net zero' greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, and a challenge of this scale will require transformative change to the UK economy. BCP Council has declared a climate and ecological emergency committing the council and region to decarbonising the economy and society by 2030 and 2045 respectively (the latter having been agreed by Cabinet on 6 March 2024).

There are a number of departments across BCP Council that are central to the response to climate change. However, the all-encompassing nature of achieving net zero means that all council departments and arms-length bodies, have a role to play. To be more resilient to the threat posed by climate change, in addition to meeting the challenges of achieving net zero, it is vital that all of BCP Council and its organisations effectively manage climate change risks.

Climate change risks should not be considered in isolation and should be clearly integrated into the strategy of an organisation. It is vital for organisations to recognise that the potential impacts of climate change are not only to do with the physical effects on people and the environment, but also to do with the effects of the transition to a changing climate and the adaptation and mitigation work involved. Similarly, the impacts of climate change should not only be considered as long-term risks.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
Floods, sea level rise and coastal change, changes in temperature and rainfall.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
Floods will have a significant impact on infrastructure causing damage to buildings and wide-scale disruption to service delivery; sea level rise and coastal change will pose risks to certain communities and organisations; and changes in temperature and rainfall will place additional pressures on infrastructure. Physical risks can also lead to indirect economic and social impacts through supply chain disruptions, subsequent impacts from infrastructure damage (for example, lack of transport, communication, manufacturing) or market shifts (such as increases in insurance premiums, changes in the need for government support, consumer attitudinal and expectation changes).

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Citizen, Social, Environmental, Economic, Physical, Resource, Political, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		⬌

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

Physical risks mitigations in place:

The most immediate risk to the BCP area comes from Flooding and Coastal Erosion. As a result, most of the council's adaptation resources have been dedicated to addressing these.
The Flooding and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) team have been involved in joint authoring of draft policies relating to flood risk, coastal change risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage to support Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole's development agenda for the next 15 years. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is also in preparation, which includes a new assessment for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole's open coast to establish the risk from wave action. A new Christchurch Bay and Harbour FCERM Strategy is in preparation for managing flood and coastal erosion risks for the next 100 years in a sustainable way from Hengistbury Head to Hurst Spit, as is a new integrated cliff management strategy for all the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area sea cliffs and chines. The team is also preparing a new beach management plan that will draw together historic information on how beaches between Sandbanks and Hengistbury Head have been managed, to create a single reference for how the beach is managed to ensure it provides its vital coast protection function.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place and flooding and coastal erosion management measures in place as described above.

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	3	12		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1: **Achieved**	Appointment to new post to begin work on an Adaptation Strategy (will be resolved when Directorate restructuring is completed and included in the 3 new posts created – see below)	Jan 2025
Action 2: **Achieved**	Increasing capacity within the Climate team, 3 x new sustainability officers to be recruited – advertised and applications received	Jan 2025
Action 3: **Achieved**	2 x Sustainability Officers appointed	Feb 2025
Action 4:	Sustainability Officer to prepare climate change vulnerability data to aid adaptation planning/awareness.	October 2025
Action 5:	Poole Bridge to Hunger Hill is the last remaining undefended waterfront in the town centre, with a high risk of tidal flooding, increasing significantly over the next century due to climate change and sea level rise. Community Infrastructure Levy funding to contribute to a permanent flood defence along 1.5 km of the eastern side of Holes Bay is to be considered by Cabinet in June 2025.	June 2025

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Commitment.

Quarter Update

The Flooding and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) team have completed major works to protect Hamworthy Park against future coastal erosion for the next 20 years. A 200 metre stretch of sea wall has been reinforced on the eastern promenade with low carbon concrete, and new steps have been built to the shoreline. The work also included repairs to the two jetties and the addition of buttresses to support the wall. The project cost £550,000 in total and was made possible thanks to an investment of £318,000 from central government's Levelling Up Fund and £233,000 Community Infrastructure Levy support funding. The project is the first of multiple schemes due to

be delivered across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole seafront thanks to the £19.9million government grant.

Also completed is the upgrade of the Hengistbury Head Long Groyne. Contractors worked with the tides around the clock, placing a total of 33,500 tonnes of rock and a host of environmental enhancements have been incorporated into the design to provide important new marine habitat. The Long Groyne plays a critical role in reducing coastal erosion in Poole Bay and is a stabilising feature for Christchurch Bay. However, during storm events the original structure was regularly submerged meaning it was unable to continue to perform effectively, particularly with the additional threat of sea level rise. These significant works will help protect the coastline from sea level rise over the next 100 years.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	A certain level of climate change is ensured due to emissions already in the atmosphere
Net Score	⬌	Actions taken to protect and adapt will be effective against predicted climate change
Target Score	⬌	Further adaptation and mitigation actions will further reduce the risk, but not remove it altogether

Risk CR19 – We may fail to determine planning applications within statutory timescales, or within agreed extensions of time (EOT)

Risk Owner – Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) – Councillor Millie Earl, Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Good quality homes are accessible, sustainable and affordable for all
Providing accessible and inclusive services, showing care in our approach

Risk Information

The risks associated with CR19 relate both to the reputation of the council and being put into special measures by the government if performance falls below 60% for major planning applications and 70% for non-major planning applications. The Planning Service is presently performing as follows:

Category	Government Intervention level	2021/2022	2023/2024	2024/2025
Majors	60%	83%	80%	84%
Minors	70%	79%	70%	74%
Others	70%	85%	86%	84%

As can be shown from the above statistics, there is no risk of the council being put into 'special measures' as a result of planning applications performance. The performance since 2021/22 has consistently been at a reasonable level, well above intervention by government when minors and others are combined. It is recognised that the above statistics include use of Extensions of Times (EOT) as per government guidelines. Whilst this is accepted at government level and can be a pragmatic way of engaging with customers to resolve issues, the council wants to ensure the Planning Service performance moves to making decisions within the statutory timeframes, especially for non-majors.

The Head of Planning Operations together with the Development Management mangers and team leaders monitor performance on a weekly basis, identifying any trends in downward performance and put interventions in place.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- Workloads
- Staff (both number and experience levels)
- Implementation of the MasterGov system and downtime

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- Reduced speed of decisions
- Increase backlog
- Reduced quality of service

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:
Customer/Citizen, Environmental, Political, Reputational

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	4	12		↔

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- A Planning Improvement Board continues to monitor performance and to ensure mitigations are on track
- A senior officer was appointed to assume responsibility for managing this backlog of older cases and there are now no cases more than 2 years old
- Recruitment process is ongoing to replace contractors with permanent members of staff.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	3	3	9		↔

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Recruitment process (on going)	01/07/2024
Action 2:	Reduce backlog (Completed)	01/10/2024
Action 3:		
Action 4:		
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		↔

Quarter Update

Performance remains strong and well above government targets. This quarter has seen the implementation of the new MasterGov system which resulted in some down time and additional time for officers to learn a new system. Performance has been maintained throughout this period and the single IT system will have benefits moving forward.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	↔	
Net Score	↔	Performance remains strong in this area
Target Score	↔	

Risk CR26 – Risks associated with the availability of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)

Risk Owner – Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes

Cabinet Member – Councillor Jeff Hanna, Cabinet Member for Transformation, Resources and Governance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
- Using data, insights and feedback to shape services and solutions
- Intervening as early as possible to improve outcomes
- Working closely with partners, removing barriers and empowering others
- Creating an environment for innovation, learning and leadership

Risk Information

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a way of using computers to replicate human intelligence - Generative AI (GenAI) is one of many forms of AI.

GenAI produces texts, images and other content from people telling the model what to do (sometimes referred to as 'prompting'). GenAI models have learnt from a huge amount of information, often taken from the internet, to produce this content.

GenAI can already be accessed by staff and councillors through:
- Websites (e.g. ChatGPT, Bing or Dal-E)
- Individual apps for personal computers or phones (e.g. Google Assistant lets you ask when your first meeting is)
- Plug-ins for websites (e.g. Expedia allows people to use GenAI to ask for travel plans and flight details)
- New features within computer software (e.g. Microsoft CoPilot and CoPilot365)

Currently, GenAI is most used to support individual tasks and act as a personal assistant, for example:

GenAI can help you be more creative:
- Create images and videos from scratch by simply telling a tool what you want to see
- Come up with lots of new ideas in seconds - for example, coming up with icebreakers for meetings

It can help you be more productive:
- Create first drafts of an email or document for you to finish writing, and then find ways to improve the quality of your writing once you have done so
- Quickly find sources of information and break down complex topics into easy-to-understand information
- Summarise meeting notes and documents

However, improvements and the widespread availability of GenAI tools means it can also be used for many other tasks, changing how we work, how residents engage with us and how the council runs and makes decisions.

The Local Government Association has identified several key risks the use of GenAI places on councils ([external link to LGA website](#)).

The risks identified include insufficient data foundations, a lack of capacity or knowledge within information governance and data protection teams, the perpetuation of digital exclusion and wider forms of exclusion, insufficient knowledge across different business areas in the council, a lack of transparency, job losses, and the impact on resident trust if not implemented transparently and appropriately.

To achieve a balance between innovation and regulation, this high-level risk will attempt to lay out some of the early identified risks, and potential mitigation, that BCP Council will consider as it embraces the use of GenAI within the organisation.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

Trust and Transparency: There are risks about the potential for GenAI to generate misleading or false information, also known as "hallucinations". This could lead to the spread of misinformation or disinformation or even lead to incorrect advice being provided to residents if unchecked which could lead to undesirable outcomes.

Ethics and Bias: GenAI models can inadvertently perpetuate or amplify existing biases present in the data they were trained on. This could lead to unfair or discriminatory outcomes.

Data Privacy: GenAI often requires access to large amounts of data for training and operation. Ensuring the privacy and security of this data is a significant concern. Without sufficient technical controls or user-training in place it is likely that potentially sensitive data may be exposed.

Data Retention and Compliance: GenAI models often retain training data, which may conflict with Subject Access Request requirements to delete or anonymise personal data upon request and affect the ability to comply fully with Freedom of Information Act requests.

Misuse of Technology: GenAI could be used for political propaganda, compromising local/national security, leaking confidential data, vexatiously increasing council officer workloads, and disseminating inaccurate information.

Cybersecurity Risks: As with any digital technology, GenAI systems can be vulnerable to cyber-attacks or can be leveraged to initiate more complex or sophisticated attacks (such as spear-phishing).

Erosion of Public Trust: If not properly managed, the issues above could lead to a loss of public trust in the council's use of GenAI and data in general.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

As described above, the impacts are largely financial or reputational:

- Financial impacts through fines if data breaches occur without appropriate technical, procedural or policy controls being in place
- Reputational impacts with residents and erosion of trust in council use of data
- Increasing cyber security risks (CR04)
- Progressing with our Data and Innovation Programme with corporate buy-in is imperative to ensure we optimise the output of our Transformation Programme. We need to continue to innovate and drive continual improvement, to meet our vision to deliver seamless, accessible, and personalised digital experiences that empower our customers, simplify interactions and ensure every service is intuitive, efficient and designed around customers' needs.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Technological, Customer/Citizen, Economic, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Microsoft CoPilot365 GenAI tool is currently only in a Project Managed proof of concept stage amongst 300 colleagues from all areas of the council. Review of pilot and next steps linked to Data and Innovation Programme being shared and scoped.
- BCP Council's existing Information Security Policy already describes expected staff and councillor behaviours in respect of responsible use of IT in general.
- IT Security Training published to all staff and councillors is available through the MetaCompliance Training portal.
- Rules regarding ethical and responsible use of AI published to Our Intranet.
- Our Digital Strategy reflective of our Digital vision for BCP has been shared with our Directors Strategy Group, Corporate Strategy Board and with our portfolio holder. Our Data and Innovation Programme will drive the delivery of this and the initial 'discovery phase' of this programme has been signed off by our Corporate Strategy Board and is underway.
- AI briefing and overview to be scheduled with Cabinet.
- Data Loss Prevention (DLP) initiative progressing and led by Information Governance to put in place an information classification scheme to be applied to all council documents.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	No
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	No
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	Yes
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	Yes

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	3	3	9		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Develop and implement GenAI Strategy document. This should describe: • How use of GenAI will be governed within BCP Council • How BCP will be training staff and councillors and providing regularly updated guidance on the responsible use of GenAI to support their work • To our residents, how BCP Council will use GenAI, especially if we start to use it to support public facing or critical service areas • How BCP Council's professional areas (IT, Information Governance, Legal, Risk, Audit etc) will continue to account for potential future uses of Generative AI, ensuring all necessary technical infrastructure, safeguards and policies are in place for responsible uses and are compliant with required legislation (UK GDPR etc) **UPDATE:** Our Digital Strategy reflective of our Digital vision for BCP has been shared with our Directors Strategy Group, Corporate Strategy Board and with our portfolio holder. Our Data and Innovation Programme will drive the delivery of this and the initial 'discovery phase' of this programme has been signed off by our Corporate Strategy Board and is underway.	In progress, October 2025
Action 2:	Implement Microsoft Data Loss Prevention (DLP). CoPilot and CoPilot365 has access to whatever data the user has access to. It is therefore imperative that additional technology is implemented to help mitigate the risks of staff or councillors "sharing" content that could make it visible to a wider set of users than intended. DLP is a security solution, already available under existing licencing (but not enabled), that identifies and helps prevent the unsafe or inappropriate sharing, transfer or use of sensitive data contained in the M365 eco-system (Teams, OneDrive, SharePoint).	In progress, to be implemented Autumn 2025

	A project has been agreed and is currently being scoped to deliver DLP and timelines for deployment will be published in due course. **UPDATE:** The first phase has been completed with Corporate Management Board (CMB) accepting the proposal to adopt the recommended Data Classification Scheme on all council document artefacts and emails. Phase 2 is now underway. It has extended the userbase and will ensure the technical controls applied to these labels will not "break" existing working practices prior to a full deployment later in the 2025/26 financial year.		
Action 3:	Establish an Information Classification Policy (ICP) that can be applied to DLP tooling. BCP Council has an established Information Governance Policy however this does not currently specify a standardised set of information classification labels (e.g. Restricted, Controlled, Public) that can be applied to ALL unstructured data held within the M365 ecosystem. This will help mitigate risks around data loss as it will enable GenAI tools such as CoPilot and CoPilot365 to make use of applied labels when determining access rights. **UPDATE: COMPLETED** - The first phase has been completed with CMB accepting the proposal to adopt the recommended Data Classification Scheme on all council document artefacts and emails.	**COMPLETE**	
Action 4:	Develop and publish GenAI Responsible Use Guidance & Training for all staff and councillors. **UPDATE:** A document describing the "Seven Rules to Responsible Use of AI" has been written and published to Our Intranet, using experience/advice from local authorities who are ahead of BCP Council in this space. IT are currently working with Corporate Communications to make this guidance known to all staff and councillors. High level "AI Awareness" training has already been delivered to all staff and councillors in 2023 and 2024 as part of mandatory training. Further training is expected but not yet planned. **UPDATE: COMPLETED:** Rules regarding ethical and responsible use of AI published to Our Intranet.	**COMPLETE**	
Action 5:	Formation of AI Governance Board for long term policy setting and decision making around appropriate use of specific GenAI tools for agreed use-cases. Linked to Data and Innovation Programme. **UPDATE:** We maintain conversations with other local authorities and business to understand approaches in other organisations. An 'AI council' or governance board is recommended and will be approached as a deliverable within the Data and Innovation Programme. In the Interim, and in lieu of any formal expertise in AI internally, the Head of Information Governance has agreed to ensure AI ethics and governance is a standing agenda item at the council's	October 2025	

	Information Governance Board, including ensuring any use of GenAI does not contravene or complicate existing Subject Access Request and Freedom of Information Act responsibilities.	
Action 6:	Update BCP Council's Information Security Policy referring to any agreed GenAI Responsible Use Guidance & Training (as described in Action 4). **UPDATE: COMPLETED.** The IT Security Team, working alongside Information Governance colleagues, ensuring the policy is updated.	**COMPLETE**
Action 7:	Consider any upskilling/resourcing of the council's Information Governance Teams to be able to provide effective professional advice to support any established AI Governance bodies and wider colleagues. Our Data and Innovation Programme will have a key workstream focusing on how our organisation is set up operationally to support our Digital Strategy and requirement for strong governance in support of this. **UPDATE:** Still recommended but not started, this has been scoped as an output for Phase 1 of the Data and Innovation Programme.	October 2025
Action 8:	Develop IT and Programmes expertise on the topic of GenAI through formal training. Several staff in IT and Programmes are just starting a 13-month programme called "AI for Business Value". Topics covered include AI ethics, Identifying Opportunities for AI, Managing AI change in your organisation and Measuring AI ROI (return on investment) and Business Impact. **UPDATE:** AI business analysis training underway as described above for 5 staff within IT and Programmes. Additionally, we have extended our training offering across the organisation and are seeing some very positive uptake. Technical training on developing secure and effective AI tools, as well as more detailed and formalised end-user training on how to effectively adopt and leverage these tools, will fall within scope of the deliverables for Phase 1 of the Data and Innovation programme.	In progress

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		↔

Quarter Update

Updates to the actions listed have been included within the table above.

Phase 1 of the Data and Innovation Programme is now underway.

This discovery phase is designed to lay the groundwork for the entire initiative. The focus is on establishing robust governance structures, completing fundamental IT and data projects, and enabling the control of AI usage across the council.

By leveraging digital technologies and data-driven insights, the programme aims to enhance service delivery, improve customer experience, and drive operational efficiency for BCP Council.

These initial activities will involve engaging with strategic partners and staff, mobilising governance structures, and setting the foundations for future phases of AI innovation.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⬌	
Net Score	⬌	Actions progressing
Target Score	⬌	

Risk CR18 – We may fail to provide adequate customer interfaces

Risk Owner – Matti Raudsepp, Director of Customer and Property Operations

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) – Councillor Andy Martin, Cabinet Member for Customer, Communications and Culture

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Providing accessible and inclusive services, showing care in our approach

Risk Information

While full-scale transformation of the council is underway, there is a risk that our current customer service capabilities, capacity, systems and processes fail to provide the level of responsiveness that our communities and residents expect. This risk is specifically focused on the short-term capabilities of the council.

Full baselining and data monitoring of the corporate Customer Contact Centre is now possible with the significant upgrade to the council's legacy telephony arrangements having been undertaken during the Covid pandemic. Data is now available across all telephone contact lines within the corporate Customer Contact Centre, but there remains much less robust data in respect of the lines that continue to be managed within services. This reflects the current fragmented customer contact picture, which the transformation process is designed to simplify through the introduction of new customer contact technology and the consolidation of customer contact staff (as far as practicably possible) into a single council front door.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- The end-to-end customer journey is affected by a range of factors, both within the Contact Centre and also within services. Delays in redesigning any aspect of the journey can impact the customer experience
- The availability of new digital functionality may arise incrementally which means that in the short term the management of customer contact can become more, not less, complicated, potentially impacting the customer experience.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- Call answering performance that does not meet customer expectations. Customer contact subject to ongoing handoffs to services, which may complicate and extend the process and increases the risk of failure and customer dissatisfaction
- Customers in need of important support fail to receive a timely response to address their needs.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:
- Customer/Citizen
- Technological
- Political

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	3	12		↔

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Temporary funding for 2022/23 ended in March 2023 which resulted in a reduction of approximately 20 staff who had been used to improve call response performance. Call response times have fallen back as a consequence
- Call handling performance data is available to monitor performance on a line-by-line basis, which can support the allocation of available staff resources. The implementation of the council's Target Operating Model along with streamlined technology and processes is anticipated to mitigate the loss of temporary funding, but it is anticipated that there will be pressure on capacity in the interim
- New BCP Council website successfully launched, replacing legacy sites, allowing for further development based on a single platform
- Web pages under review and being rewritten to ensure clarity, and as a basis to support development of further online digital functions
- New Contact Centre telephony system successfully implemented in December 2023
- New Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system now in place with legacy digital functionality being updated within new system. This creates additional opportunities for improving existing and new online services.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	3	3	9		⬌

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Implementation of improved corporate telephony solution	Dec 2023 **Completed**
Action 2:	Launch of new website - improved platform for digital solutions	Dec 2023 **Completed**
Action 3:	Implementation of selected, high volume, high impact customer journey improvements	April 2024 Ongoing
Action 4:	Service redesign to improve and simplify customer journeys	Ongoing
Action 5:	Complete next phase of the new Dynamics CRM system, which provides a platform for new digital service development	June 2025
Action 6:	Complete rewrite of website pages	June 2025

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		

Quarter Update

The focus during the last quarter has been on delivery of the second stage of the Dynamics CRM system. This is due to be completed in June 2025 and will deliver the following benefits:

- **Enhancements to the platform** adding reusable, consistent features for calculating age, preventing underage access, restricting past and future dates and checking for duplicate records.
- **Google Maps** enhancements.
- **Payment processing** ability to issue full or partial payment refunds
- **Save for Later Functionality** allows users to pause and resume incomplete service requests.
- **My Account Improvements** improving accessibility, fixing errors, and integrating features like bookings, payments, and file uploads.
- **Causeway Alloy Bin Day Lookup** a tool that helps people check their bin collection dates easily.
- **Causeway Alloy Integration** ensuring cleansing and road/pavement reports update in real-time across all systems, automating case updates.
- **Garden Waste Integration** Automates annual garden waste payments, handling renewals and cancellations.
- **Telephony Integration with Customer Relationship Management system** to provide full visibility of customer interactions to Customer Advisors.

- **Knowledge Transfer** documenting workflows, integrations, and error-handling for smooth knowledge handover between staff and services.
- **Decommissioning of former CRM**

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⟷	
Net Score	⟷	New CRM functionality will deliver some benefits immediately with others emerging over the next 12 month period. There is still work to do on redesigning customer journeys to ensure they are optimised and can take advantage of, and be supported by, the new technology now in place
Target Score	⟷	

Risk CR21 – Impact of global events causing pressure on BCP Council & increase in service requirements

Risk Owner – Kelly Deane, Director of Housing and Public Protection

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Kieron Wilson, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regulatory Services

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Working together everyone feels safe and secure

Risk Information

Several global conflicts have required a humanitarian response/offer of refuge to those fleeing and in each case the UK government has set out its policy for accommodating and resettling refugees in every local authority area. The schemes in operation are:

- UK Refugee Resettlement (UKRS - previously known as the Gateway Scheme/Syrian Resettlement scheme)
- Afghan Resettlement (ACRS/ARAP)
- Homes for Ukraine/ Ukraine Family scheme
- Communities for Afghans Scheme

In addition to these schemes the Home Office also accommodates all who arrive and apply for asylum in the UK and, if granted refugee status, these households require access to accommodation and support with community integration. Due to the exponential increase in the volume of asylum seekers arriving in the UK, the government has become reliant on contingency accommodation (nightly let hotels). Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole currently have hotels who are contracted by the Home Office to provide this accommodation while those housed await their asylum decision.

Risks related to asylum and refugee resettlement include:

- Potential homeless presentations from Ukrainian refugees should the H4U scheme support from government (financial incentives to sponsors) be discontinued
- Lack of required support for those seeking asylum and those who are already refugees
- Safeguarding risks to asylum seekers/refugees as well as to staff or the public not being mitigated
- Pressure on the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole housing market which is already inhospitable and unable to meet demand of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole families
- Pressure on Primary, Secondary and Community NHS services from these cohorts of new patients
- Pressure on social care services (notably Children's Services as a result of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children)
- Pressure on Homelessness services as asylum seekers receive positive decisions on their applications and are given notice to vacate their Home Office funded hotel accommodation
- Repeat homelessness where single people subsequently apply for family reunion visas
- Pressure on schools to provide education and related support to refugee children
- A detrimental impact on the tourism economy in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole as hotels in use are a significant portion of the available rooms (impact anticipated more in summer months)
- Concerns around community cohesion and tensions in relation to asylum and refugee resettlement
- Increase in activity of extremist groups

Gaza and Israeli conflict

In addition to the information provided above we are also monitoring any localized tensions relating to the conflict in Israel and Gaza and receive regular updates regionally and nationally regarding the complex situation.

Protests

The Public Protection team is working closely with Dorset Police around an increase in planned and unplanned protests both in relation to the Gaza and Israel conflict and around immigration. In the last quarter there have been an increase in protests requiring a multi-agency approach and an increase in protests at the Civic Centre site and around asylum accommodation. The protests have remained peaceful, with minimal arrests or dispersals. There has been a national rise in protests, with some areas of the country experiencing violence and rioting, however, this has not transpired locally. Going forward we are now seeing an increase in regular planned protests by key protest groups. Dorset Police hold the lead, however a separate command structure has been set up within BCP Council to support. Teams such as Facilities Management, CSAS (Community Safety Patrol Officers) and highways have been engaged to provide security to the Civic site, manage traffic flow on the network and engage with protest groups. Risks from protests include:

- Damage to the Civic Centre or cenotaph
- Disruption at council meetings affecting the civic process
- Disruption to communities
- Disruption to businesses
- Disruption to the transport network

Extensive planning between BCP Council and Dorset Police is undertaken for each protest to mitigate these risks.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- Conflict in Israel and Gaza and increasingly in the surrounding territories
- Home Office SAP (Streamlined Asylum Process) policy and related notices to vacate hotels
- Transport of ARAP/ACRS refugees from other 3rd countries to UK (in MoD accommodation and into private rented sector)
- National tensions around the asylum and immigration process and trend of increased protests
- Lack of clarity regarding Ukraine visa scheme and continued government support of sponsorship


Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- Heightened community tensions and inter-faith relationships
- Number of homeless applications increased
- Number of former asylum seekers found to be street homeless increased
- Disruption to the transport network, business operations and community

---

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:
Economic, Social, Environmental, Citizen, Resource, Physical, Political, Reputation

---

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	3	9		↔

**Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions**

- Multi-agency partnership working and governance framework in place, communication channels in place e.g. briefings, webpages, dedicated staff team established, links with government agencies
- Strategic leadership from BCP Council in relation to asylum accommodation and refugee resettlement, identifying need for collaboration with all stakeholders and progressing with impact assessment for the council and its partners of asylum and refugee resettlement
- Additional grant funded resource recruited to manage this new programme and case manage households now resident in the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area and enable proactive preventative support
- Engagement with the Home Office and their contracted providers to discuss and deliver dispersed asylum accommodation in the community
- Work with the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to address gaps in support required across all schemes
- Appropriate use of tariff incomes to incentivize hosting sustainment and access to move-on accommodation for Ukrainian refugees
- Intensive prevention/welfare case support to Ukrainian scheme guests and hosts to discuss options and planned exit from the scheme if funding does end
- Lobbying of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Home Office re pressures and required resources to address family reunion homelessness
- Participation in Local Authority Housing Fund programme (government grant funded) to mitigate the risk of homelessness for Ukrainian and Afghan refugees while adding to housing portfolio of BCP Council longer term
- Lobbying on the pressures being experienced by local authorities, to Ministers and the Home Office
- Regular updates from the Home Office on the situation in Gaza and Israel, both abroad and in the UK
- BCP Council command structure working with Dorset Police to manage protest intelligence and responses.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	3	2	6		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Continue to monitor community tensions relating to the conflict in Gaza and Israel and work with partners to address as needed	ongoing
Action 2:	Continue to work with Dorset Police regarding regular planned protests	ongoing
Action 3:	Continue to monitor community tensions relating to protests and work with partners to address as needed	ongoing
Action 4:		
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		

Quarter Update

There are no significant updates for the quarter. Protest activity continues to be well managed with multi agency working between the council and police. Pressures continue to be managed regarding asylum seeker placement, with active engagement at a national and regional level. The Home Office is seeking to identify pathways and frameworks for improving accommodation provision and move-on for asylum seekers. However, the council has been clear there are resource requirements which go beyond the financial support on offer and until these are resolved, we are unable to support.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⟷	
Net Score	⟷	Sufficient management and mitigation in place at this stage
Target Score	⬆	See quarter update above

Risk CR25 – We may be unable to effectively transform services to achieve efficiencies and improve service standards

Risk Owner – Corporate Management Board Collective

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) – Councillor Jeff Hanna – Cabinet Member for Transformation, Resources and Governance

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
- Creating an environment for innovation, learning and leadership
- Using our resources sustainably to support our ambitions
- Using data, insights and feedback to shape services and solutions

Risk Information

With the closure of the BCP Transformation Programme in March 2025, it is essential we maintain our focus on achieving the efficiencies targeted as outputs of the programme and that we have a sustained focus on improving service standards.

Efficiencies and improved service standards are predicated on having the resource (financial and people) to identify and implement the changes necessary to achieve the council's operating model. An environment of increasing financial challenges or other demands on council resource could slow the rate of tangible benefits associated with transformation or require the council to reassess its initial ambitions based on what is achievable.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):
- Reduction in financial and human resources available to deliver, support and drive a culture of change, innovation and focus on efficient approach to service delivery and practice
- Increase in demand on services to deliver business as usual and lack of workforce engagement with innovation
- Conflicting corporate and service led priorities
- Further requests for service transformation funding
- Lack of funds to build growth, capacity and capability in established Centres of Expertise i.e. Data and Analytics, Procurement, Projects and Programmes (PPM)
- Transformation Programme closing without a sustained plan of approach for continuous improvement and strategic intent, to build on the outputs of transformation, to drive efficiencies and realise ongoing associated benefits.

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):
- Slower pace of change
- Unable to achieve Target Operational Model and foundations to enable ongoing efficiencies across our organisation
- Negative view of the Transformation Programme and what it promised, both internally within our organisation and outwardly by our residents. Detrimental to our reputation and great success with the Transformation Programme and its outputs
- Poor return on the investment we have made on our technology stack and the opportunities we have to link this with strategic systems and innovation/efficiencies
- Inability to meet our vision to deliver seamless, accessible, and personalised digital experiences that empower our customers, simplify interactions and ensure every service is intuitive, efficient and designed around their needs
- Longer term associations to our ability to recruit if we are unable to offer modernised, efficient approaches to our work, service delivery and processes through technology.

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

The following risk categories apply:
Corporate Risk Categories: Technological, Customer/ Citizen, Economic, Political
Service Risk Categories: Resource, Technological

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	3	9		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

Following the closure of the Transformation Programme we maintain the following mitigations:

- The Transformation Programme, formally agreed by Cabinet and Council, was closed in March 2025. The Data and Innovation Programme has been initiated and is in first stage discover phase; signed off by the BCP Council Corporate Strategy Delivery Board to ensure robust governance, reporting is maintained and that we continue to drive outputs and deliverables.
- Our Digital Strategy has been written and will soon be published, with the Data and Innovation focused on delivering this vision.
- Corporate Strategy Delivery Board established to ensure maintained focus on continuous improvement and strategic delivery to meet Corporate Strategy objectives.
- Resourcing/capacity (both within core programme team and service areas) is on the programme risk register and we are actively reviewing our corporate priorities with our Corporate Management Board (CMB) and councillors to ensure we are focused on delivering agreed priorities. Corporate Transformation Programme closed in March 2025. However, our exposure to this risk remains as we maintain our focus on continued improvement and optimisation of the foundations we have established, through the delivery of the Data and Innovation Programme, our Customer Strategy and our efforts to build the capacity and capability to deliver this.
- Transformation Working Group has been maintained and provides monthly updates to our members on outputs of the initial programme. We have recently renamed this to our 'Digital Working Group'; our aim to continue to share insight and progress of our digital strategy to meet the associated aims of BCP Corporate Strategy.

We must remain focused on achieving our digital vision and realising associated benefits:

Data and Innovation Programme:
- First phase 'discovery' is underway, aligned to corporate Digital Strategy. The programme and strategy have been agreed with our Corporate Strategy Board and in ongoing conversations with our Portfolio Holder. Continued focus on Artificial Intelligence and innovation; development of our corporate approach to Co-Pilot and response to first phase rollout.
- Identification of use cases: working with our Microsoft partner to identify funded opportunities to help us demonstrate tangible opportunities for efficiencies using technology to drive and support workforce engagement and build our business case for growth.
- Ongoing focus on evolving and establishing the service offering of the Data and Analytics Centre of Expertise
- Focus on data quality, integrity and accuracy across the organisation
- Data migration and ownerships
- Information governance, data protection and compliance
- Strategic focus on how we drive, govern and agree innovation as an operational model within IT and Programmes and across the organisation.
- Drive organisational change through data led decision making

Digital Strategy:
- Digital Strategy will soon be published and has been shared with Corporate Strategy Board and our Director's Strategy Group. It will also feed into the delivery of the Customer Strategy.

Systems Ownership, Consolidation & Integration:
- Sustained focus on successful implementation and support of systems
- Deliver systems ownership model

- Maintain strategic supplier relationships
- Consolidate and rationalise

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

Net risk Score – this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	2	2	4		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Effective management of the current Transformation Board and its close-down and support the effective transition of the strategic focus of the Corporate Strategy Delivery Board on continuous improvement and ongoing strategic outputs from foundations laid by the Transformation Programme **COMPLETED**	January 2025
Action 2:	Continue Children's Transformation Programme UNDERWAY	April 2025
Action 3:	Continue Adults' Transformation Programme UNDERWAY	April 2025
Action 4:	Develop and establish a new Data and Innovation Programme UNDERWAY	April 2025
Action 5:	Continue Strategic Corporate Management Board and Cabinet Members Working Group (ensuring robust knowledge exchange)	April 2025

Action 6:	Commit resource and support to upcoming Children's inspections **COMPLETED**	Late 2024 (TBC)
Action 7:	Agree formal BCP Digital Strategy **COMPLETED**	April 2025
Action 8:	Data and Innovation Programme business case to be proposed and put through governance procedures for sign off and agreed commencement UNDERWAY	June 2025

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	2	4		

Quarter Update

Our Data and Innovation programme has commenced, with a focus on four key workstreams:
- Employee Empowerment and Digital Adoption
- Our Data
- Technology and Innovation
- Governance, Collaboration and Continuous Improvement

Our BCP Council Digital Strategy has been drawn up and will shortly be published.
Digital Working Group continues to focus monthly to share outputs of our Transformation programme and our ongoing delivery against our Digital Strategy with our members.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score		
Net Score		
Target Score		

Risk CR16 – We may fail to secure or manage partnerships, miss out on associated funding and be unable to deliver services for communities

Risk Owner – Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms & Policy

Cabinet Member ([BCP Council – Democracy](#)) – Councillor Millie Earl, Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet

Links to Corporate Objective(s):
Working closely with partners, removing barriers and empowering others

Risk Information

The new Corporate Strategy focuses on working with partners and enabling communities. As the council moves to this model of delivery that relies more on working with others and securing funding through partnerships, there is a risk of a negative impact on communities if partnership working fails or is not optimal.

This risk could occur due to:

- poor working relationships with or between partners
- inability to secure funding available via partnership working

Partnerships can include other agencies such as the police, other councils or organisations such as BIDs (Business Improvement Districts) and specialist boards (eg Destination Marketing Board). A helpful definition is in the council's Partnership Guidance: "a partnership is any arrangement involving the Council and one or more other organisations (from any sector) who share the responsibility for agreeing and subsequently delivering a set of actions and outcomes that support or contribute to achievement of the Council's corporate priorities."

Partnership arrangements have also been highlighted as a risk in the Annual Governance Statement and external audit reports.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

- Lack of resources to identify partnerships, maintain a council partnership register, develop and gain approval for a partnership governance framework
- Lack of resources to ensure guidance is shared, promoted and championed
- Lack of resources to manage partnership relationships effectively
- Lack of resources or ability to identify and engage in partnership working and funding opportunities
- Changes to partner objectives, funding or behaviour
- Policy changes and funding opportunities following the recent change of government

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

- Poor relationships impede delivery of services to communities
- Lack of funding impacts delivery across various services (depending on partnership)
- Council is not compliant with its own policy and/or recommended guidance from Government/other organsiations

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please [see pages 2-5 of this guidance](#) – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:
Economic, Social, Environmental, Citizen, Resource, Physical, Political, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	3	9		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Partnership governance guidance in place – being reviewed
- Partnership register in place – being updated

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	2	2	4		

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

		Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:		
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Internal audit met with the new Head of Service for Policy, Strategy & Partnerships to outline the recommendations from the 23/24 internal audit report	March 2025
Action 2:	Review and update the Partnership Register	April 2025
Action 3:	Templates to be circulated to Directors for review and update the partnership register	Sept 2025
Action 4:	Corporate Management Board (CMB) to determine what level of corporate oversight is required for partnerships. Head of Service to bring a report to CMB outlining actions taken and to enable CMB to: • consider whether all existing partnerships are still required and fit for purpose to deliver corporate priorities efficiently and effectively, and thereafter to: • provide assurance (such as via a best practice checklist*) over the governance arrangements in place for key partnerships • agree and co-ordinate production of relevant performance information to facilitate corporate oversight	December 2025
Action 5:	Ensure framework is operational/provide relevant performance information facilitating corporate oversight	
Action 6:		

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		

Quarter Update

When the new Head of Policy, Partnerships and Strategy started in March 2025, internal audit held a meeting to discuss the outstanding recommendations from a previous audit, and the need to be compliant.

A team meeting was held to discuss the work and identify some key early tasks which are now completed.

Building on work previously done to define a partnership, what good governance means and why it is needed, and the creation of partnership registers for some areas of the council, these tasks were to re-organise the registers into the current service structure, to add in template registers where these were missing, and to re-allocate partnerships to their appropriate services.

Next steps will be to spend time explaining the need and the ask of Directors to work with their management teams to identify the key partnerships in their areas and add them to their lists, before the autumn 2025.

A report will be written for CMB as outlined above, scheduled for around the end of the year (2025).

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	↔	
Net Score	⬇	Work has started on the actions related to this risk.
Target Score	⬇	Work has started on the actions related to this risk.

Risk CR24 – We may fail to adequately address concerns around community safety

Risk Owner – Kelly Deane, Director of Housing and Public Protection

Cabinet Member (BCP Council – Democracy) **–** Councillor Kieron Wilson, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regulatory Services, Councillor Andy Hadley, Cabinet Member for Climate Response, Environment and Energy

Links to Corporate Objective(s):

Working together everyone feels safe and secure

Risk Information

Due to budget constraints, services in Public Protection are working at a statutory baseline. Emerging public concerns around areas such as Bournemouth Town Centre show public concern for residents and visitor safety.

A number of initiatives are in place to mitigate the risks including:

- Police Operation Clear, Hold, Build that tackles organised crime which is significantly linked to serious violence
- A new Serious Violence Strategy that works with partners to address the root cause of serious violence
- Policing operations increasing visibility such as Operation Nightjar and Operation Track
- Town Centre Action Partnership Group and tactical groups that have a multi-agency response to tackle issues in Bournemouth Town Centre
- Evidence-led approaches to the deployment of resource in Public Protection
- Six-weekly multi-agency walk arounds in Bournemouth Town Centre to identify issues relating to environmental concerns and safety concerns
- Community Safety Partnership (CSP) in place to tackle most prevalent issues in relation to community safety
- Initiatives delivered based on CSP priorities around serious violence, violence against women and girls, exploitation and anti-social behaviour.

In the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area, violence against women and girls (VAWG) is one of the four key priorities for the Safer BCP Community Safety Partnership. Tackling issues relating to VAWG and all gender based violence is also a key priority for the Safer BCP Serious Violence Strategy, following the detailed analysis undertaken through our Serious Violence Needs Assessment. To this effect we have a BCP Adults Safeguarding Board, and Pan-Dorset Children's Safeguarding Board alongside other groups including a Domestic Abuse Strategic Group, Serious Violence Delivery Group (Sexual Offences), Sex Workers Risk Assessment Conference, MARAC (multi-agency risk assessment conference - high risk domestic abuse) and other task and finish groups as identified through the monthly data analysis.

Risk Causes (definite situational facts affecting our objective) (please list):

- Reduction in resources, leading to a statutory minimum delivery due to savings
- Public perception of issues in high priority areas
- Changes to partner objectives, funding or behaviour
- Policy changes and funding opportunities following the recent change in government

Risk Impacts (contingent effect on objective) (please list):

- Reduction in public perception and public confidence
- Failure to deliver on statutory duties
- Fear of crime increases

Risk Categories (for impacts) – please see pages 2-5 of this guidance – choose all that apply in either Service or Corporate Categories whichever fits best:

Citizen, Social, Physical, Resource, Economic, Environmental, Political, Reputation

Gross Risk Score – this is the rating of a risk as if there were no mitigations in place:

| Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	2	6		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Six-weekly multi-agency street audits to identify defects and issues in Bournemouth Town Centre
- Supporting Dorset Police in Clear, Hold, Build initiative, hotspot policing and key operations to enhance visible presence across the conurbation
- Partnership Action Group for Bournemouth Town Centre
- Serious Violence Strategy and Serious Violence Delivery groups to identify and tackle serious violence issues in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole, monitored through the statutory BCP Community Safety Partnership
- Safer Streets 5 funding
- Successful grant funding from Department for Transport (DfT) for an anti-social behaviour (ASB) Community Safety Accreditation Scheme pilot managing anti-social behaviour on the public transport network
- Successful grant funding under the Bus Service Improvement Programme to install 250 CCTV cameras at the most used bus stops.

Risk Response Strategies

Please indicate all strategies which are being utilized in the management of this risk:

	Chosen strategy/ies:
Termination: It is impossible to remove or eliminate all risk from an undertaking but it is possible to avoid a particular identified cause.	
Transfer: Transfer does not change the risk directly but involves others in its management. The risk transfer strategy aims to pass ownership and/or liability for a particular threat to another party nearly always for payment of a risk premium. This strategy rarely transfers the 'whole' risk. Risk transfer falls into two groups: financial instruments and contractual arrangements.	
Treat: By far the greatest number of threat risks will be treated in this way. The purpose of risk treatment or mitigation is to contain the risk at an acceptable level.	✓
Tolerate/accept: There may be limited ability to do anything about some risks, or for a limited number of minor threats the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In these cases the most appropriate response may be to tolerate or accept the risk.	

**Net risk Score –** this is the rating of a risk with current mitigations in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	2	1	2		⬌

All Significant Actions to Achieve Proposed Target Risk Score:

Please confirm the overall target score **expected completion date** and list all the significant actions required to achieve this score and **when they are each individually due to be completed**.

	Due Date/s:
Overall Target Score Expected Completion Date:	April 2025
List All Significant Actions Below:	
Action 1: Deliver Serious Violence Strategy and delivery groups through the Community Safety Partnership	**Complete**
Action 2: Continue Partnership Action Group and associated tactical delivery	April 2025
Action 3: Deliver Department for Transport Grant funded ASB project	April 2025
Action 4: Deliver chewing gum removal	**Complete**

Target Risk Score – this is projecting forward to what the scoring of a risk will be when further actions or mitigations have been completed and are in place

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likeli-hood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		⬌

Quarter Update

Strong partnership working continues to take place to address issues relation to Community Safety and perceptions of community safety using an evidence-based approach. The launch of the Community Safety Partnership's #Justdont campaign seeking to address inappropriate male behaviour towards women: Just Dont campaign. We have finalised the activities under our grant funded Safer Streets 5 programme and launched a programme of work to address Harmful Sexual Behaviours using education, information and early prevention techniques.

Direction of Travel

Please provide a commentary on the direction of travel of the risk. It is appreciated risks may not change enough in a quarter to warrant a change to the scoring but please provide a direction of travel for the risk and provide an explanation against each assessment level.

Assessment Level	Direction of Travel during Quarter (please indicate: the same, increased, decreased)	Explanation
Gross Score	⟷	No significant changes experienced.
Net Score	⟷	
Target Score	⟷	