

Audit and Governance Committee – March 2026

Corporate Risk Register – Risk Table

Risk Ref	Risk Title	Net Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner	Risk Status
<u>CR27</u>	<u>We may fail to adequately address concerns around environmental impacts - cliff management/instability</u>	16	12	Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer	Corporate Risk
<u>CR23</u>	<u>Potential implications of the Dedicated Schools Grant financial deficit</u>	16	8	Aidan Dunn, Chief Executive (Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services and Adam Richens, Director of Finance)	Corporate Risk
<u>CR09</u>	<u>We may fail to maintain a safe and balanced budget for the delivery of services, and managing the MTFP</u>	12	12	Adam Richens, Director of Finance	Corporate Risk
<u>CR15</u>	<u>We may fail to have in place suitable talent attraction, retention and succession planning, staff wellbeing and support</u>	12	12	Sarah Deane, Director of People and Culture	Corporate Risk
<u>CR04</u>	<u>We may suffer a loss or disruption to IT Systems and Networks from cyber attack</u>	12	9	Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes	Corporate Risk
<u>CR20</u>	<u>Potential of climate change to outstrip our capability to adapt</u>	12	8	Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms and Policy	Corporate Risk
<u>CR26</u>	<u>Risks associated with the availability of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)</u>	9	6	Sarah Chamberlain, Director of IT and Programmes	Corporate Risk
<u>CR18</u>	<u>We may fail to provide adequate customer interfaces</u>	9	2	Matti Raudsepp, Director of Customer and Property Operations	Corporate Risk
<u>CR02</u>	<u>We may fail to achieve appropriate outcomes and quality of service for children and young people including potential inadequate safeguarding</u>	8	8	Cathi Hadley, Corporate Director for Children's Services	Corporate Risk
<u>CR08</u>	<u>We may fail to run a fair and open election/referendum</u>	8	4	Aidan Dunn, Chief Executive	Corporate Risk
<u>CR21</u>	<u>Impact of global events causing pressure on BCP Council & increase in service requirements</u>	6	6	Kelly Deane, Director of Housing & Public Protection	Corporate Risk

Risk Ref	Risk Title	Net Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner	Risk Status
CR28	We may fail to adopt a Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Local Plan	6	6	Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer	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	Partnerships may not support delivery of the corporate strategy, objectives or priorities	4	2	Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms and Policy	Corporate Risk
CR24	We may fail to adequately address concerns around community safety	2	2	Kelly Deane, Director of Housing & Public Protection/Rob Carroll, Director of Public Health & Communities	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
CR19	We may fail to determine planning applications within statutory timescales, or within agreed extensions of time (EOT)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk Removed Q1 2025
CR22	Failure of local care market to meet increasing demand	N/A	N/A	N/A	Risk removed Q4 2023

AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

March 2026

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE Q4 – 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 <u>increased</u> since last review.
	Risk impact or likelihood has <u>decreased</u> since last review.
	There is <u>no change</u> 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 base budgeted funding to look after existing cliff drainage infrastructure and undertake the 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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

A Cliff Management Strategy (CMS) is being developed by the Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Team (FCERM) to inform engineering investment needs. A Specialist Geotechnical Engineer has been employed to lead on strategy delivery and provide future technical advice. The Cliff Management Working Group has been 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)	Likelihood (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 2026
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Cliff asset database developed indicating risk levels for each section of cliff. This is a dynamic document and to be updated regularly in line with inspections.	Completed
Action 2:	CMS to demonstrate funding needs for immediate priority issues and future likely needs.	Completed - Priority funding requirements identified for both maintenance and capital works over the next 20 years
Action 3:	Maintenance regime to be identified - Maintenance regime identified as part of the CMS. Maintenance requirements identified by ongoing inspections are discussed each quarter at the Cliff Management Working Group and are agreed in line with what funding is available.	Complete
Action 4:	Long term maintenance regime to be funded - Current funding is tackling the very top priorities of a long list. Further funding needs to be secured to address ongoing needs identified in Action 2.	Ongoing
Action 5:	Monitoring of cliffs via visual inspection as well as GPS and drone technology, in line with CMS recommendations.	Ongoing
Action 6:	Delivery of the CMS.	April 2026

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	3	12		

Quarter Update

Cabinet and Council approved the allocation of £1.446m towards cliff stability works, a review of the required areas of spend of this funding across the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial years has been agreed and work is moving forward to deliver this. Elements of the spend are to undertake assessments and develop future mitigations strategies to assist in cliff stabilization. This will require additional funding.

CMS is due for completion 31 March 2026. It will contain live documents including: a new cliff asset management database that incorporates a dynamic risk register, a new cliff management manual that sets out how every aspect of cliff management is delivered across all BCP Council services as an internal operational guide, and new public facing guide for residents, home-owners and other public stakeholders with an interest in how the cliffs are managed.

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	↓	Once works have been carried out to investigate and complete maintenance on sand drains, the likelihood of impacts should be slightly reduced although it should be noted that due to the nature of the cliffs and the natural environment a risk remains of slips

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

Risk Owner – Aidian Dunn, 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

In respect of 2024/25 the July 2025 Financial Outturn report to Cabinet set out that the council spent £111.8m on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) revenue expenditure, which was **£49.8m** more than the £62m Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) grant allocation and £5.2m more than the quarter three forecast.

In respect of 2025/26 the February 2025 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) Update report set out that the council was originally forecasting revenue spending of £123.2m on SEND services. This was **£57.5m** more than the £65.7m revenue grant provided by the Department for Education (DfE) as part of the DSG, High Needs Block allocation.

The 2025/26 quarter three budget monitoring report presented to Cabinet on 4 February 2026 set out that the deficit in 2025/26 is now **£70.3m** once funding adjustments and prior year adjustments are considered.

This means the accumulating DSG deficit which was **£113.3m** on the 31 March 2025 is now forecast to be **£183.6m** 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. In June 2025 the government set out plans, as part of a consultation of the Fair Funding Formula, to extend the period covered by this SI to 31 March 2028.

2025/26 was a watershed moment, it is the first time the council started 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 was the first time the council started a financial year in a technically insolvent position. The total reserves and balances of the council were **£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 capitalization direction which would be formal permission to borrow to fund the £57.5m original 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 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 promised to 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)	Likelihood (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: 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 (MHCLG) setting out the ongoing concerns about the SEND deficit.

Cabinet Report: October 2025: MTFP Update. Provided details of a conversation with representatives of MHCLG further to the letter included in the July report.

Cabinet Report: December 2025: DSG High Needs Expenditure Forecast 2025/26. Seeking Council approval for a £14.3m in-year increase in the originally approved overspend and

requests the Corporate Director of Children's Services implement deficit management measures.

Cabinet Report: December 2025: MTFP Update. Provided an update based on:

- a) 20 November 2025 Local Government Policy Statement. This included the statement that Government recognises local authorities are continuing to face significant pressure from the impact of DSG deficits on their accounts and that these authorities will need continued support during the transition to a reformed SEND system. This will include working with local authorities to manage their SEND system and deficits. The statement referenced that the government would set out further details on its plans to support local authorities with historic and accruing deficits in the provisional 2026/27 local government finance settlement.
- b) 26 November 2025: National Autumn Budget. This sets out that the government are proposing that they will take over the responsibility for day-to-day funding of SEND from 1 April 2028 onwards, which is when the current statutory override ends. The current accumulated deficit and any further increase in the deficit between now and the 31 March 2028 will be retained by BCP Council with any support for these elements announced as part of the December 2025 provisional local government finance settlement for 2026/27.

Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2026/27: Conditions for accessing any support with historic and accruing deficits would be provided later in the settlement process with any such support linked to the submission and quality of a Local SEND Reform Plan to be completed within the two months after the release of the school's white paper early in 2026 and based on five principles:

- **Early.** Children should receive the support they need as soon as possible. Intervening upstream, including earlier in children's lives when this can have most impact, will start to break the cycle of needs going unmet and getting worse.
- **Local.** Children and young people with SEND should be able to learn at a school or college close to their home, alongside their peers, rather than travelling long distances from their family and community. Special schools should continue to play a vital role supporting those with the most complex needs.
- **Fair.** Every school education setting should be resourced and able to meet common and predictable needs, including as they change over time, without parents having to fight to get support for their children. Where specialist provision is needed for children and young people in mainstream, special or alternative provision, we will ensure it is there, with clear legal requirements and safeguards for children and parents.
- **Effective.** Reforms should be grounded in evidence, ensuring all education settings know where to go to find effective practice that has excellent long-term outcomes for children and young people.
- **Shared.** Education, health and care services should work in partnership with local government, families, teachers, experts and representative bodies to deliver better experiences and outcomes for all our children and young people.

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)	Likelihood (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:	Continue to reflect on good practice examples of how any annual deficit can be kept to a minimum.	Ongoing
Action 2:	Monitor activity and statements delivered by the government	Ongoing
Action 3:	Local SEND Reform Plan	May 2026
Action 4:		

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Quarter Update

On the 9 February 2026 government announced the final Local Government Finance Settlement for 2026/27 which was the latest date the settlement has been received since 2017/18. This included the following:

Support for the council's historic and accruing DSG deficits in waves. The first phase of which has been designed to address historic deficits and will take the form of a new High Needs Stability Grant to cover 90% of the deficit as of the 31 March 2026. This grant is not guaranteed and will be subject to BCP Council submitting and securing the DfE approval of a Local SEND Reform Plan. If agreement is reached the grant will be paid during the autumn of 2026 and will need to be held as a grant received in advance within reserves and applied to the residual balance on the 31 March 2028.

Government also acknowledged that the SEND reform plans will take time to fully embed and local authorities will need further support. For deficits that arise in 2026/27 and 2027/28, it was highlighted that local authorities can expect that government will continue to take a similarly appropriate and proportionate approach to such support, although it was recognised that this support would not be **unlimited**.

In respect of the statutory override, which allows the council to ignore the DSG deficit, within its statutory accounts, it was confirmed that this will cease on the 31 March 2028. **The advice to local authorities from government is that they need to plan to be able to meet the cost of**

the residual deficit from their own resources in 2028/29 including setting aside appropriate reserves in the preceding years. If the council also receives 90% of its forecast accruing DSG deficits in 2026/27 and 2027/28 then the council will need reserve funding of £37.9m in 2028/29 to specifically cover the residual deficit.

The impact of the potential support for historic accumulated deficit as of 31 March 2026 is assumed to be a contribution of **£165.24m** (£183.6m * 90%) and impacts of the previously assumed deficits as follows:

	Previous Estimate	Latest Estimate
31 March 2025	£113.3m (Actual)	£113.3m (Actual)
31 March 2026	£183.6m	£183.6m
31 March 2027	£279.3m	£114.1m
31 March 2028	£379.3m	£214.1m

Although this contribution is welcome and positive the council will still be technically insolvent as these net deficits will still be greater than the council's forecast reserves. Based on the sentiment in the final 2026/27 local government finance settlement the council would anticipate receiving a further £176.13m contribution in 2028/29 towards the deficits of £95.7m in 2026/27 and £100m in 2027/28. It is assumed that ultimately the council will be required to manage from its own funds £37.93m which is 10% of the previously assumed 31 March 2028 deficit. Council is continuing with the strategy of delivering a pipeline of capital receipts from the disposals of surplus council assets as a means of mitigating, insofar as is possible, the likely minimum of £38m now needed from local funds by 2028/29.

An additional consequence of the payment is it reduces the amount of borrowing and subsequent interest that the council will need to incur to finance the DSG deficit. As a matter of prudence, it has been assumed that this payment will be made towards the end of the 2026/27 financial year and therefore the impact, estimated at £6.6m per annum, will not materially impact before the 2027/28 financial year. From a risk perspective it should be emphasised that the £165.24m High Needs Stability Grant is not guaranteed and is subject to the agreement of a Local SEND reform Plan with DfE.

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 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, 16 July 2025, 29 October 2025, and the 17 December 2025 were provided with updates on the MTFP which tends to ebb and flow through to formal Budget Council in February each year. This included updates on the impact of the government's new funding formula, the November 2025 provisional local government policy statement and the Chancellor's Autumn Budget. As per the December 2025 MTFP Update report, the funding gap for **2026/27** had increased to £8.9m.

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)	Likelihood (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.
- Regular MTFP update reports to Cabinet.
- Quarterly budget monitoring reports to Cabinet including progress against budget savings.
- Bi-weekly Corporate Management Board/Cabinet meetings.

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)	Likelihood (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: 2025/26 Financial Outturn		July 2026

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	3	12		

Quarter update

Council approved its legally balanced **2026/27** Budget at Council on 24 February 2026, based on the following main aspects.

6.74% Council Tax increase (4.74% basic and 2% Social Care Precept). This included an additional 1.75% flexibility given to BCP Council following a requested to be allowed, in support of the challenges caused by the historic and accruing DSG deficits, to increase the amount to cover the amount a previous Administration did not charge over the two-year period 2021/22 and 2022/23.

£14m of savings, efficiencies, service reductions, and additional fees and charges across services including £4.4m which has been established as transformation and invest-to-save related.

£22m planned increase in council spending across all service areas excluding pay-related costs, this includes:

- £11.5m (6.5% increase) to cover demand and inflationary cost pressures in wellbeing services including adult social care and homelessness services.
- £9.2m (8.2% increase) to cover demand and inflationary cost pressures in children's services.
- 2.8% assumed pay award for 2026/27.
- Continuation of the utilisation of the one-off business rates collection fund surplus as per the 2024/25 approved budget. In 2025/26 these resources are being used to continue to facilitate the delivery of council regeneration activity and the externalisation of the Russell Cotes Museum ambitions, as well as assisting with the one-off costs associated with Pay and Reward and to fund the in-year 2025/26 quarter three forecast £4.573m overspend. Additional £6.829m of resources are also being applied to support the 2026/27 budget.

- Temporary borrowing of £95.7m to finance the 2026/27 excess SEND High Needs DSG revenue expenditure above the government grant being made available. This is also based on previous assurance from government that the council can exceed its borrowing thresholds temporarily based on their commitment to return the SEND system to financial sustainability.

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 CR15 – We may fail to have in place suitable talent attraction, retention and succession planning, staff wellbeing and support

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

The People Strategy was launched in December 2023 covering the period from 2024 to 2027. The People Strategy is closely aligned to the corporate vision and ambitions, and the previous 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 but following Council approval on 22 July 2025 and the introduction of Pay and Reward on 1 December 2025, the threat of industrial action has been removed and the potential for significant numbers of equal pay claims 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 implementation of Pay and Reward now gives clarity to our colleagues on pay and terms and conditions. It is acknowledged, however, that there are colleagues who still remain dissatisfied 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 beyond implementation and 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, but 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 the final 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 the 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 now known. Successful appeal outcomes will mean greater financial impacts on 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.

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.

Other People Strategy delivery

The People and Culture team have prioritized the delivery and implementation of the Pay and Reward programme which is running concurrently with the implementation of a new payroll solution. This work has been huge and has meant other work in progressing deliverables aligned to our People and Culture Strategy have fallen behind schedule.

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.

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)	Likelihood (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 have been working through the financial impact that Pay and Reward will have on their budgets 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.
- 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)	Likelihood (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	Complete 1 Dec 2025
Action 2:	Completion of role profile appeals	30 Apr 2026
Action 3:	People Strategy Implementation Plan	2027
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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	3	12		

Quarter Update

Pay and Reward was implemented on 1 December 2025. Nearly 1000 questions were managed by the People and Culture team and the first payroll went smoothly. The appeals window has now closed. 188 appeals have been received and panels will commence from 17 February 2026 onwards. This is expected to take several months to conclude, and once final pay outcomes are settled and advised, the potential for claims could increase.

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		We have only recently implemented Pay and Reward and appeals have not yet been heard. It is expected that any claims coming forward might do so after the appeals process has completed
Net Score		We have only recently implemented Pay and Reward, and appeals have not yet been heard. It is expected that any claims coming forward might do so after the appeals process has completed
Target Score		We have only recently implemented Pay and Reward and appeals have not yet been heard. It is expected that any claims coming forward might do so after the appeals process has completed.

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 continues to remain 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 2025.

There continues to be huge opportunities and benefits for the council by continuing to actively leverage technology in support of continuous improvement and driving service efficiencies. However, our vulnerabilities have become greater as we increasingly rely on cyberspace to deliver council services.

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)	Likelihood (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 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 – via 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.	Yes – a significant number of controls are in place to mitigate the risk.
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.	Given the persistent and evolving nature of cyber threats and BCP Council’s increasing reliance on digital systems, it is both pragmatic and necessary to accept a level of residual risk.

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

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likelihood (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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	3	9		

Quarter Update

During this quarter the council delivered a planned corporate cyber preparation exercise, facilitated by the IT and Emergency Planning teams and supported by Southwest Regional Cyber Crime Unit.

The exercise brought together representatives from multiple services to practice the council's response to a simulated cyber incident and to strengthen organisational readiness.

The session focused on improving coordination, communication and decision-making during a major disruption and allowed teams to test existing continuity plans in a safe, controlled environment.

A follow-up debrief session has been scheduled by Emergency Planning colleagues, with feedback collated from participants to help refine incident response arrangements and ensure that learning from the exercise is captured and acted upon. This work will support the ongoing improvement of the council's resilience measures and reinforce our ability to respond effectively to cyber-related emergencies.

IT teams continue to monitor national threat intelligence closely and adjust our controls, training and resilience measures in line with emerging risks to ensure we remain protected against the evolving threat environment.

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	↔	Cyber threat levels have not diminished or increased substantially
Net Score	↔	Cyber threat levels have not diminished or increased substantially
Target Score	↔	Cyber threat levels have not diminished or increased substantially

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

Risk Owner – Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms and 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 at 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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions**Physical risk mitigations in place:**

The most immediate risk to the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole 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.

Meanwhile, work is continuing to tackle the causes of climate change, including decarbonising both the Council's estate (by 2030) and working with partners to reach net zero by 2045. This includes energy efficiency and sustainable generation as well as encouraging active travel and supporting our greenspaces. Full details of the targets and progress against them can be found on the Climate dashboard and in the Annual Climate Reports. The Local Area Energy Plan (LAEP) launched in October 2025 also sets out the activity needed to reach these targets. The challenge will be the resource needed to deliver these changes at the pace required.

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)	Likelihood (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:	Sustainability Officer to prepare climate change vulnerability data to aid adaptation planning/awareness. The vulnerability tool was created in October.	October 2025 Complete
Action 2:	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 (CIL) 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 Complete - £7.3m CIL allocated to the scheme

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Quarter Update

The Local Area Energy Plan (launched in October 2025) sets out the activity needed to reach these targets. The Annual Climate Report (draft published ahead of Environment and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 25 February 2026) charts the progress made against net zero targets in 2024/5.

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		This is a long-term risk with few short-term solutions or mitigations. Adaptations take time and efforts to reach net-zero are also long-term actions. Recent flooding in Christchurch and across Dorset, alongside the wildfires in Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset last year demonstrate that this is a real and active risk.
Net Score		Mitigations remain the same.
Target Score		The LAEP sets out what can be done to reduce the causes of climate change in our area. Our FCERM team continue to monitor and address flooding issues where possible.

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 mean 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)	Likelihood (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.
- Microsoft CoPilot Chat has been successfully launched and made available to all staff with access to a device and a computer account.
- BCP Council's existing [Information Security Policy](#) already describes expected staff and councillor behaviours in respect of responsible use of IT in general, but also AI specifically.
- 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 Council 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 has been delivered to Cabinet and Corporate Management Board
- The Data Loss Prevention (DLP) initiative is progressing. 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)	Likelihood (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:	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). A project has been agreed and is currently being scoped to deliver DLP and timelines for deployment will be published in due course. UPDATE: We are still working with our Information Governance team to achieve Corporate Management Board sign off of this project and drive delivery collaboratively and at pace.	In progress
Action 2:	Consider any upskilling/resourcing of the council’s Information Governance Teams to be able to provide effective professional advice to support established AI Governance bodies (CMB) and wider colleagues. Our Continuous Improvement and Innovation Programme (CIIP) aims to deliver 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: Ongoing as we work with our Information Governance colleagues to establish the most effective structure and approach for the organisation.	Ongoing
Action 3:	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: We continue to build internal capability to support the safe and effective use of Artificial Intelligence across the organisation. Three members of staff have now completed formal AI Governance training, strengthening our ability to assess, oversee	In progress

	and guide the responsible adoption of AI solutions across the council. These trained colleagues will continue to contribute to the organisation by helping to identify and deliver value from AI as part of our Continuous Improvement and Innovation Programme (CIIP). In addition to this, ongoing professional development is taking place across the wider IT and Programmes service, with several technical staff engaging in side-of-desk learning to expand their AI knowledge. As a result, a small but growing community of proactive, self-taught AI practitioners is emerging across different areas of the department. This community is already helping us build organisational understanding, share good practice and support early AI use-case exploration in a safe and well-governed manner.		
--	---	--	--

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		

Quarter Update

During this quarter, the council has continued to strengthen its approach to the safe, ethical and well-governed use of AI. Building on the success of the Data & Innovation Programme, we have expanded internal skills, broadened awareness and continued to embed structured governance processes to support responsible AI adoption across services.

Internal capability continues to grow, with three members of staff having now completed formal AI Governance training, equipping them to provide informed advice and oversight as the organisation explores new AI opportunities. Their expertise will support wider service areas to identify and safely progress AI use cases as part of our Continuous Improvement & Innovation Programme (CIIP).

Alongside this, ongoing side-of-desk learning is taking place across IT and Programmes, and a small community of proactive, self-taught technical practitioners is beginning to emerge across different teams. This community is playing an increasingly valuable role in sharing knowledge, supporting colleagues, and contributing to early-stage AI exploration.

The council's AI governance framework has also continued to develop, including the use of structured assessment processes that ensure that new AI ideas are reviewed consistently and transparently. This approach has recently been applied in meetings exploring potential AI use cases in operational services, helping colleagues understand the steps required to ensure ethical, transparent and accountable deployment of AI tools.

To encourage innovation in a controlled environment, staff in several areas have also taken part in AI-focused collaborative sessions, including internal workshops and "agentathon"-style activity exploring how AI-powered agents and automation could support service improvement. These sessions remain

early-stage and exploratory, but they are helping to build organisational understanding of how AI may support efficiency, self-service and improved customer experience in the future.

The council continues to participate in wider local government networks, supporting sector-wide collaboration and ensuring alignment with national best practice. Invitations to practitioner groups and AI knowledge-sharing networks further support our capability-building and ensure IT and Programmes remains connected to the latest thinking across the public sector.

Overall, the council continues to take a measured, responsible approach to AI adoption, balancing innovation with strong governance, supporting staff development and ensuring that all exploration of new AI tools remains safe, transparent and in line with public expectations.

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 meaningful change in risk levels.
Net Score	↔	No meaningful change in risk levels.
Target Score	↔	No meaningful change in risk levels.

Risk CR18 – We may fail to provide adequate customer interfaces

Risk Owner – Matti Raudsepp, Director of Customer & 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

The Transformation Programme for the council closed in March 2025 and as part of the ongoing commitment to service improvement it was agreed that remaining workstreams would move into business-as-usual activity or into dedicated programmes.

Whilst this programme of work is established, and then delivered, 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.

The Transformation Programme upgraded the council's legacy telephony system and introduced an updated version of the council's Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system onto which existing processes have been migrated. A single improved web platform was also introduced.

The remaining requirement is initially to improve the performance of the corporate customer contact centre, easing the journey for our residents and creating business efficiency for improved service delivery. A second stage will be required to fulfil the requirements of the Customer Strategy creating a single front door and consistency across the council. This means identifying customer activity sitting across service areas which need to be brought into management via the CRM with performance monitored and reported under a single customer umbrella.

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 within services. Delays in redesigning any aspect of the journeys can impact the customer experience.
- The availability of new digital functionality has not been introduced to the service environment which has restricted our ambitions.
- There are varying degrees of sign-up to the Customer Target Operating model which was formally agreed within the Transformation Programme.

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

- Call answering performance that does not meet customer expectations. Customer contact is subject to ongoing handoffs to services, which may complicate and extend the process and increases the risk of failure and customer dissatisfaction.
- Phone contact is heavily relied on in the absence of other effective options and staff numbers cannot cope.
- Frustrating customer journeys which are not efficient for either the business or customer.
- Problems arising from ineffective processes create issues for customers which impact their lives.
- Inefficiency in the cost of delivering effective customer response.

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	3	12		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Call handling performance data is used to monitor performance.
- Staff have been trained on a wider range of skills to support areas where staff numbers have been lost to support the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- New contact centre telephony system successfully implemented in December 2023 with pilots completed to understand potential additional functionality.
- New CRM system now in place with legacy processes moved across.
- New CRM has some improved functionality and has repeatable service patterns to support end to end process reviews.
- Customer Strategy is being refreshed for adoption in early 2026.
- Programme Board has been set up to progress a range of actions to bring efficiency to the service and improve the customer offer.
- Resourcing needs being considered to ensure delivery.

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 acting 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)	Likelihood (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:	Agree refreshed Customer Strategy	March 2026
Action 2:	Implement end to end process reviews across the functions currently delivered through the existing corporate customer contact centre to drive efficiency, deploy new functionality and improve service for Customer	April 2026 - March 2027
Action 3:	Develop and implement a programme to reduce reliance on the telephone as a contact method, increasing digital service uptake	March 2027
Action 4:	Create and continuously update the list of technical enhancements required to improve service delivery connected with the Dynamics 365 System	March 2027
Action 5:	Continue to innovate and learn new technologies to support efficiency to support the Customer Strategy	March 2027

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		

Quarter Update

- Refreshed Customer Strategy has been subjected to Directors Strategy Group consideration and input
- Agreement secured to recruit Business Analyst capacity, which is essential in order to fully map and evaluate current processes and to design how new customer journeys will operate
- Work on stabilising the blue badge processing backlog continues with response times now well within the Department for Transport guideline of 12 weeks and being maintained within that level. Meanwhile, the design of an improved approach to the management of the blue badge process is ongoing.

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 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 Children's Services had an ILACS inspection (an Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services) in December 2024 and achieved a Good rating from Ofsted. This acknowledges that children's services provide

Quality of education and care:

Children's services rated as "good" provide a good standard of education, care, and support for children.

Effective safeguarding:

Safeguarding practices are deemed to be effective, meaning children are protected from harm and their welfare is prioritized.

Positive impact on children and families:

The services have a positive impact on the lives of children, young people, and their families, with evidence of sustained improvement.

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)	Likelihood (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.
- Since the Good Ofsted rating and removal of Children's Social Care Statutory Intervention the governance for Children's Social Care has been reviewed and new accountability structures put in place, a new development plan has been put in place to drive forward the service in place of an Improvement Plan.
- 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.

- Partners have launched the Children and Young People's Partnership plan which clearly identifies the shared priorities for delivering improved services for our children, young people and families. 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 practice standards are maintained or improving. Governance processes introduced in 2022 continue to review practice and give increasing assurance that children are safeguarded. Ofsted in their ILACs Inspection 2024 confirmed that Children in BCP are safeguarded.
- 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 Children's Strategic Transformation Board through reporting by the Finance Manager.
- Ensure the BCP Council model of corporate support services and systems is fully conducive to the children's improvement journey.

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	2	8		

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 SEND and Alternative Provision Improvement Plan	2026
Action 2:	Deliver on the Education Improvement plan	June 2026
Action 3:	Sufficient suitable accommodation available for our care-experienced young people and placement choice of good quality locally for children in care	June 2026
Action 4:	Deliver on the new Children's Social Care Development Plan	April 2027

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	2	8		

Quarter Update

The SEND Care Quality Commission (CQC)/Ofsted Partnership inspection was carried out in December 2025. The outcome of this inspection was published February 2026. The report evidences significant improvements whilst acknowledging inconsistent delivery of services to children and their families. The result of this inspection means that the statutory notice from the Secretary of State will be removed, and we will not be considered by the DfE to be in intervention. Further improvements required will be considered as part of the management of the Alternative Provision and SEND improvement plan under business-as-usual governance.

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		Improvements verified through Ofsted and CQC inspection of both Children's Social Care and also SEND
Net Score		As above
Target Score		As above

Risk CR08 – We may fail to run a fair and open election/referendum

Risk Owner – Aidan Dunn, Chief Executive

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

Links to Corporate Objective(s): Connected Communities, Brighter Futures & Modern, Accessible and Accountable Council

Risk Information

The Council has a statutory duty to administer elections and referendums in accordance with electoral law, including the Representation of the People Act 1983, the Electoral Administration Act 2006, and subsequent amendments.

The Chief Executive is appointed as the Returning Officer (RO) and is personally legally responsible for the proper conduct of elections. Certain obligations fall personally on the RO and cannot be delegated or influenced by the Council.

Election timetables are fixed in law and cannot be altered by the Council, meaning planning and resourcing must be in place ahead of time regardless of any operational pressures.

Nature of the Risk

If sufficient staffing, resources, skills, or facilities are not available at the required time, the Council/RO may be unable to deliver an election that meets legal requirements for fairness, accuracy, transparency and accessibility.

Failure could lead to legal challenge, reputational damage or loss of public confidence.

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:

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

Assessment Level	Impact (I)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	4	4	16		New

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- **Strategic oversight:** Monthly election planning and progress reviews with the Chief Executive and key senior officers.
- **One-Council delivery approach:** Cross-departmental support from ICT, HR, Communications, Facilities, Finance and others to ensure sufficient resources.
- **Structured project planning:** Comprehensive election project plan with workstream leads and sub-groups monitoring progress against statutory deadlines.
- **Staffing and training arrangements:** Early recruitment, training, and contingency staffing across the council to ensure sufficient skilled polling and count staff.
- **Venue readiness:** Polling and count venues secured early and assessed for accessibility, suitability, and contingency availability.

- **Communications planning:** Clear communications plans for both the public and candidates including statutory notices, public messaging, and voter information such as Voter ID requirements.
- **External liaison:** Ongoing engagement with the Electoral Commission, Association of Electoral Administrators, partners, suppliers, police and regional networks for updates, advice and assurance.
- **ICT & systems readiness:** Pre-election testing of election management systems, equipment and data security with contingency plans for system failures.
- **Financial monitoring:** Regular review and tracking of election budgets, cost pressures and funding requirements.
- **Post-election learning:** Formal lessons-learned review after each poll with actions tracked to improve future delivery

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Net Score	4	2	8		New

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:		07/05/2026
List All Significant Actions Below:		
Action 1:	Secure and confirm all polling stations and count venues	06/03/2026
Action 2:	Complete recruitment and training of polling, postal vote and count staff	16/04/2026
Action 3:	Publish statutory notices and manage nominations process	29/04/2026
Action 4:	Ensure ICT and elections systems readiness (including voter ID checks, count system)	29/04/2026
Action 5:	Finalise logistics: equipment preparation, delivery plans, and ballot box dispatch	05/05/2026
Action 6:	Deliver polling, postal vote issue, verification, count and declaration of result	07/05/2026

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	4	1	4		New

Quarter Update

Good progress has been made this quarter across all key election activities. All core election staff have now been appointed, the count venue is fully booked, and the majority of polling stations are confirmed with only a small number awaiting final agreement.

Procurement for the print contractor has been completed and timelines have been secured. Sub-groups are meeting regularly and progressing workstreams to schedule, with strong engagement from internal services and external stakeholders.

Public engagement communications have commenced, including voter awareness activity, and we have begun delivering candidate awareness sessions to support prospective candidates.

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 inherent (unmitigated) risk remains unchanged, as the statutory complexity and consequences of failing to deliver a lawful election remain constant.
Net Score		Progress this quarter has reduced the likelihood of the risk materialising. The quarterly update includes key activity completed to reduce the potential risk.
Target Score		The target score remains appropriate. Current progress indicates that the planned mitigations are on track to bring the risk to the desired level in the required timeframe.

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

Risk Owner – Kelly Deane, Director of Housing & 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 Programme
- Homes for Ukraine(HfU)/ Ukraine Permanent Extension 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. There is also a growing portfolio of private rented properties in use as asylum accommodation in the conurbation.

Risks related to asylum and refugee resettlement include:

- Potential homeless presentations from Ukrainian refugees should the HfU scheme support from government (financial incentives to sponsors) be discontinued
- Potential homeless presentations from Afghan families given notice to leave their 9-month limited Ministry of Defence (MOD) accommodation
- 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 the 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
- Concerns around Community Safety from Bournemouth & Poole College
- Potential increase in activity of extremist groups

Gaza and Israeli conflict

In addition to the information provided above we are also monitoring any localised 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. The protests have continued weekly but 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. 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.

Home Office Engagement

The Home Office have recently engaged with the Chief Executive and relevant Directors to advise that they are moving towards increased engagement to ensure there is a triangulated approach between the government, councils and police with regard to community safety and cohesion.

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

- Conflict in Israel and Gaza and increasingly in the surrounding territories
- Home Office policy and related notices to vacate hotels
- 9-month limited transitional MOD accommodation offer for Afghan Resettlement Programme households
- National and local tensions around the asylum and immigration process and trend of increased protests
- Confirmation of Thank You Payments to hosts being discontinued once a Ukrainian guest has exhausted HfU visa and first Ukraine Permission Extension scheme period
- Mis- and dis-information circulating on social media unchallenged

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

- Heightened community tensions and inter-faith relationships
- Crime and disorder risks
- 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)	Likelihood (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)	Likelihood (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:	Recruitment of a Community Cohesion Officer (2-year fixed term)	Q4 2025/6
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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		

Quarter Update

During this quarter, pressures linked to national and global events have continued to impact Housing and related services. The volume and complexity of refugee, asylum and resettlement- related work remains high, with increased demand across asylum dispersal, refugee resettlement, Homes for Ukraine facilitation, and the monitoring of community tensions.

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		Underlying global pressures have not materially changed
Net Score		Although controls and mitigations continue, they have not reduced the actual level of pressure being experienced
Target Score		Conditions required to safely lower the target have not yet materialised

Risk CR28 – We may fail to adopt a Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Local Plan

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):

- High quality of life for all, where people can be active, healthy and independent
- Good quality homes are accessible, sustainable and affordable for all
- Employment is available for everyone and helps create value in our communities
- People and places are connected by sustainable and modern infrastructure
- Revitalised high streets and regenerated key sites create new opportunities
- Our green spaces flourish and support the wellbeing of both people and nature
- Climate change is tackled through sustainable policies and practice

Risk Information

The council has a statutory duty to prepare and maintain a Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led with succinct and up-to-date plans. Currently BCP Council is operating using the Local Plans of the predecessor authorities that include over 300 policies, a significant proportion of which are out of date.

The Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Local Plan will provide one plan that sets out the vision and planning framework for the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area for the next 15 years. It will provide the land use policies that help us to implement our commitment to address the climate and ecological emergency. It will confirm our strategic approach to the delivery of a range of development, including market and affordable housing, employment, tourism, community facilities and supporting infrastructure. The Local Plan has to balance these development requirements against the need to protect and enhance the built and natural environment. Once adopted, all planning applications will be determined against the Local Plan, making it the most important place-shaping document for the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area.

A Local Development Scheme was agreed by the Council in June 2025 which sets out the timeline to prepare the Local Plan by 2028 under the government's new planning system which requires plans to be prepared in 30 months. This includes a period of time for the soundness of the plan to be examined by the Secretary of State before it is adopted by the council.

There is a risk that the Local Plan will not be adopted by the end of 2028 as set out in the Local Development Scheme.

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

- Failure of the council to agree a spatial strategy to meet the development needs of the area, particularly in the context of the high housing target for the area (set by national policy), changes to national Green Belt policy and the possible options for development
- That the Plan is not supported by the Secretary of State at examination, which could be due to issues with the quality and extent of evidence required to support the plan, that the duty to cooperate has not been met or the spatial strategy is not robust to meet development needs
- Changing national policies and requirements in relation to Plan Making

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

Failure to adopt a new Local Plan will result in the policies from the predecessor local plans becoming increasingly out of date for decision making. Without a Local Plan to allocate new sites and demonstrate a five-year supply of land for housing there is 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' in favour of granting residential planning applications and resulting in less control over the location, scale, quality and design of development and any supporting infrastructure. There is also a result of a higher number of appeals to planning decisions and refused applications being approved on appeal.

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: Failure to have up to date policies to protect the environment, habitat sites, flood risk, climate change
- Social – Failure to deliver the homes needed to meet the needs of our communities
- Legal – Failure in statutory duty to prepare a Local Plan potentially leading to government intervention. Legal challenges in relation to applications determined in the absence of an up-to-date plan
- Political: Failure to deliver government policy
- Reputational: Reputational damage over the ability of the council to effectively plan for the area and determine applications.

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

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

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Report to Cabinet in May 2026 to set out proposed timetable and process
- Monitoring and management of the Local Plan by the Director of Planning and Transport
- Assigning resources and project management support to enable Local Plan delivery
- Providing regular progress updates to senior management and councillors
- Review of the existing evidence base and the early procurement of up-to-date evidence
- Working closely with relevant external organisations and delivery partners to obtain information as efficiently as possible
- Development of early engagement and communications strategy, including workshops with councillors, and wide public communications and consultation
- Completing the proposed Gateway stages under the new planning system which enables early engagement with the Planning Inspectorate on examination soundness issues
- Regular (monthly) Duty to Co-operate meetings with Dorset Council planning officers as a key neighbouring authority. Includes having a standing agenda and keeping meeting notes.

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)	Likelihood (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:	Procure evidence base	May 2026
Action 2:	Formally update Cabinet on timetable changes and agree governance arrangements	May 2026
Action 3:	Complete early engagement activity	Aug 2026
Action 4:	Complete Gateway 1	Aug 2026
Action 5:		
Action 6:		

Additional information released by government requires additional stages in the plan making process. Further guidance has also been released in relation to initiating the local plan process. The earliest these changes and the implications can be reported to Cabinet is May 2026. This has a knock-on effect on the completion dates for early engagement and the completion of Gateway 1.

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	3	2	6		

Quarter Update

At the end of November 2025 the government released further guidance relating to the new planning system, although the accompanying regulations have yet to be published. This guidance clarified the various stages in plan making under the new system and specified a range of requirements on sequencing of activities. While we will still be able to adopt a Local Plan given the new information, it cannot be completed by the end of 2028 and the timetable needs to be updated to reflect additional activities that are included in the guidance. This will be reported to Cabinet in May 2026. It is therefore anticipated that adoption will now take place in early 2029.

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 new information released setting out the process provides more certainty to plan makers. While there are additional activities required over those originally anticipated, including a scoping consultation stage, we can still adopt a Local Plan but the timetable needs to be updated and adoption will not be until early 2029.
Net Score		See above
Target Score		An updated timetable and Project Initiation Document will be taken to Cabinet in May 2026. This will allow us to make progress with plan making activity.

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 and development of digital skills and mindset
- 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 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)	Likelihood (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:

- BCP Corporate Strategy Delivery Board established to ensure maintained focus on continuous improvement and strategic delivery to meet Corporate Strategy objectives.
- Our Digital Strategy has been written and published, with the Data and Innovation Programme established in April 2025, signed off by the BCP Council Strategy Delivery Board to ensure robust governance.
- Phase 1 is now complete, having assessed our corporate capability to deliver our digital vision. Phase 1 delivered governance, data quality improvements, AI readiness, digital adoption and capability building. These are foundational enablers but are not yet embedded across the council. This has set the stage but does not complete the journey.
- Phase 2 builds on what we have learnt. Led by IT and Programmes and currently in scoping stage it focuses on continued embedding of the fundamentals - AI governance, data quality, digital adoption and capability—more broadly across the organisation, while continuing to provide insight, standards and governance.
- Additionally, Phase 1 highlighted the need for an organisational, not departmental, approach to improvement - a corporate programme to embed better ways of working, prioritise invest-to-save opportunities and scale innovation across services. We proposed the Continuous Improvement & Innovation Programme (CIIP) and this was agreed in October 2025 by our Corporate Strategy Board. This is now in scoping stage and slightly delayed as we look to resource Business Analysis capacity to support the initial discovery and feasibility of invest to save opportunities.
- It should also be noted that all programme activity has been and continues to be carried out ‘side of desk’ by resource within IT and Programmes, evidencing the commitment and passion the teams maintain to deliver innovation and our Digital Strategy. This is not sustainable and we will remain focused on how we address this.
- Resourcing/capacity (both within the core programme team and service areas) is on the programme risk register, and we actively review our corporate priorities with our Corporate Management Board (CMB) and councillors to ensure we are focused on delivering agreed priorities.
- Additionally, we will ensure we consider what the longer-term operating model for IT should be to ensure a sustained focus on continuous improvement for the organisation, to drive the continued aims of our Digital Strategy – ‘digital by design, driven by data and focused on people’.
- We have an established Members Digital Working Group which provides monthly updates to our members on outputs and the delivery of our Digital Strategy as well as associated programmes. Our aim is to continue to share insight and the progress of our digital strategy to meet the objectives of the BCP Council Corporate Strategy.
- Established our BCP Systems Ownership Framework to ensure ownership, both strategic and operational, of our corporate systems established during and since the Transformation Programme. CIIP will include a focus on a strategic roadmap for these systems and their outputs from a data and innovation perspective.

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)	Likelihood (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:	Continue Children's Transformation Programme – programme extended UNDERWAY	April 2026
Action 2:	Continue Adults' Transformation Programme UNDERWAY	April 2027
Action 3:	Develop and establish a new Data and Innovation Programme Phase 1 complete Phase 2 in scoping stage	Phase 1 complete Phase 2 being developed
Action 4:	Continue Strategic Corporate Management Board and Cabinet Members Digital Working Group (ensuring robust knowledge exchange)	Ongoing
Action 5:	Establish Corporate Continuous Improvement & Innovation Programme (CIIP)	April 2026

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	2	4		

Quarter Update

During Q3 we continued to strengthen our organisational resilience by progressing the core programmes that underpin our digital, data and continuous improvement agenda. Our work this quarter has focused on building capability, embedding governance, and maturing the controls.

We have continued to move into Phase 2 of the [Data and Innovation overview](#) programme, building on the strong foundations established in Phase 1. This has included progressing governance, data quality, digital adoption and AI readiness, all of which directly mitigate risks associated with data quality, cyber compliance and the safe use of emerging technology.

Following Corporate Strategy Board endorsement, the [BCP Continuous Improvement & Innovation Programme \(CIIP\)](#) has continued through scoping, with emphasis on developing sustainable programme capacity and identifying invest-to-save opportunities. This quarter we have focused on aligning directorates, capturing improvement areas, and establishing governance for tracking benefits and operational risks. This work directly addresses this corporate risk. We are standing up additional Business Analysis resource and an outline of the programme. The IT and Programmes Director is carrying out 1-1 conversations with all Directors to support engagement and the drive for the CIIP to be a shared corporate programme. We continue to strengthen governance and assurance with our Systems Ownership Framework.

We continued to embed digital skills and adoption activity through targeted capability building, Digital Champions support and organisation-wide engagement activities. During the quarter, efforts have focused on improving digital confidence, addressing known gaps in adoption of corporate tools, and preparing directorates for the next phase of digital maturity assessments.

Across Q3, these collective efforts demonstrated sustained progress in reducing operational, technological, and transformation-related risks, particularly through:

- stronger governance and consistent organisational standards
- clearer accountability for systems and data
- improved readiness for responsible AI and digital use
- early identification of efficiency opportunities through CIIP
- increased staff capability and confidence in using digital tools

Our direction of travel remains positive, though capacity constraints and the rate of organisational adoption remain areas to monitor and manage.

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 – Partnerships may not support delivery of the corporate strategy, objectives or priorities

Risk Owner – Isla Reynolds, Director of Marketing, Comms and 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 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22 Annual Governance Statements included partnership governance as a significant governance weakness. In 2021/22, the identified actions were:

“BCP Council Partnership governance will be strengthened through the development of the following:

- a. Agreement of a partnership definition
- b. Production and maintenance of a Corporate Partnership Register
- c. Establishment of corporate oversight of partnerships
- d. Production of corporate partnership guidance to supplement Financial Regulations, which can also be used for compliance purposes.”

This has also previously been raised by external audit. The issue was removed from the Annual Governance Statement for 2022/23 as partnership guidance has been produced and compilation of the Corporate Partnership Register was in process.

In relation to the action points above, the audit confirmed that:

1. Partnership definition had been agreed and included in the partnership guidance.
2. Corporate partnership guidance was available on the intranet.
3. A partnership register template has been produced, which includes a method of determining ‘significant’ partnerships. Of the 12 service areas who had existing partnership registers, 6 have now completed in the new format and saved in the designated corporate area. A standalone corporate partnership register has not been produced but it is, in effect, the aggregation of the individual service partnership registers.
4. Corporate oversight of partnerships has yet to be established.

In March 2025 Internal Audit liaised with the then recently appointed Head of Policy, Partnerships and Strategy, to ascertain the status of corporate partnership arrangements and the implementation of recommendations raised in the 2023/24 audit of this area. The Head of Service confirmed that a review of corporate partnership arrangements would be undertaken during 2025/26, with a view to ensuring full compliance with the recommendations, including a framework enabling corporate oversight.

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

- Lack of resources to 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

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

- Poor knowledge of its partnerships, the way they are governed and the value derived from them puts the council at risk in terms of resources, reputation, legal and financial impacts.
- Council is not compliant with its own policy and/or recommended guidance from Government/other organisations.

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	3	9		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Staff resource is now in place to drive this work forward
- Requests have been made to Directors to update their registers
- A report proposing corporate oversight via a framework will be presented to Corporate Management Board

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)	Likelihood (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:	Review and update the Partnership Register	April 2025 Completed
Action 2:	Templates to be circulated to Directors for review and update of the partnership register	Sept 2025 Completed
Action 3:	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	April 2026
Action 4:	Ensure framework is operational/provide relevant performance information facilitating corporate oversight	April 2026

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		

Quarter Update

Actions 1 and 2 have been completed. An update was taken to Corporate Strategy Delivery Board to ask for further information from services about partnerships, and it was agreed that, once this was gathered, an oversight of the data would be brought back to the Board. The Board will then decide whether this is a single overall risk about the framework or would be more suitable as a service-level risk about specific partnerships.

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

Risk Owner – Kelly Deane, Director of Housing & Public Protection/Rob Carroll, Director of Public Health & Communities

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

Emerging public concerns around areas including, but not limited to, 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 resources
- Community Safety Partnership (CSP) in place to tackle the 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
- Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership and Channel Panel.

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.

The Local Authority also has duties under the national CONTEST Strategy (Counter Terrorism) and uses evidence from Counter Terrorism Policing South West and national data to inform the work of the Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership.

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

- Reduction in resources to address community safety concerns
- Public perception of issues and local media reporting
- Changes to partner objectives, funding or behaviour
- Policy changes and funding opportunities following the 2024 change in government
- Global and political decisions, including asylum policies and conflict in the Middle East
- Growth of social media platforms and the online space as an avenue for exploitation

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
- Potential risk to exploitation from extreme ideology

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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Gross Score	3	2	6		

Mitigations in Place & Completed Actions

- Supporting Dorset Police in Clear, Hold, Build initiative, hotspot policing and key operations to enhance visible presence across the conurbation
- 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 - completed
- Ongoing grant funding from Department for Transport (DfT) for an anti-social behaviour (ASB) Community Safety Accreditation Scheme managing anti-social behaviour on the public transport network - completed
- Successful grant funding under the Bus Service Improvement Programme to install 250 CCTV cameras at the most used bus stops
- Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership working to raise awareness of Prevent and Contest with partners across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole
- Channel Panel for individuals at risk of being drawn into terrorism
- Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership to raise awareness of Prevent, the signs and symbols to look for and how to refer someone if appropriate
- Prevent Week of Action in October 2025 providing a range of webinars, information events and training for professionals, parents and carers, governors etc
- Independent Advisory Group with Dorset Police to gather information, concerns and monitor any community tensions
- Monthly and quarterly data reviews relating to crime and disorder and crime hotspots alongside an annual strategic assessment which sets the priorities for the work of the Community Safety Partnership

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)	Likelihood (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:	Continue Partnership Action Group and associated tactical delivery
Action 2:	Community Safety Partnership Executive Board to review Community Safety concerns
Action 3:	Agree new Key Performance Indicators for the Community Safety Partnership
Action 4:	Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership to revise its delivery plan for 2026
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)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Score (IxL)	Risk Matrix	Movement during Quarter
Target Score	2	1	2		

Quarter Update

The Pan-Dorset Prevent Partnership met in November 2025 and January 2026 to review the evaluation of the Prevent Week of Action 2025 which was delivered by BCP Council for the South West region with extremely positive feedback. The partnership has also reviewed the latest data and information from local and national counter-terrorism police to inform the delivery plan for 2026.

The Community Safety Partnership and associated delivery groups continue to meet and review data and intelligence to ensure that we are taking an evidence-based approach to addressing crime and disorder in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.

The Ten Days of Activism Against Gender Based Violence took place in November/December 2025 with over 40 events, drop-ins, seminars and workshops offered to professionals and the general public.

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		Crime and disorder fluctuates on a seasonal basis with increases in the summer months and decreases in the winter. Monitoring data on a rolling basis shows decreases in some crime types but not at a scale to remove the risk from the register.
Net Score		As above
Target Score		As above