

BUSINESS RISK ASSESSMENT

RISK ASSESSMENT COMPLETED BY PROGRAMME MANAGER

ROMULUS SPONSORS

Chris Pope and Andrew BlakeHerbert

CORE OBJECTIVE TO SHARED SUPPORT SERVICES - NEWHAM AND HAVERING

Risk No.	Details of Risk Event	Negative / Positive Consequences	Date Raised	Current Assessment of Risk			Mitigating Actions / Controls	Controlled			Risk Owner	% Complete	Status
				Consider controls already in place				When ALL controls are implemented					
				Impact	Likelihood	Risk Rating		Impact	Likelihood	Risk Rating			
R3	TOM does not meet the needs of Newham and Havering services supported by back office services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each LAs clarity as to vision, benefits and detail of proposed TOM are inconsistent, - services not buy into services, implementation jeopardised. 	14/11/2012	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement through discussions with Board as to requirements and buy in to the project - clear comms and engagement plan Data analysis, cost: benefit analysis, market research and workshops carried out to inform preferred TOM. Key stakeholders consulted Key stakeholders are mapped and engaged with effectively throughout development of TOM. 	1	2	2	SS/TH	65%	Open
R4	Benefits of TOM are not clearly identified or understood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOM options, and their benefits not clearly identified; Local Authorities do not engage with TOM and its implementation Options appraisal, including cost: benefit analysis not robust, or not completed due to lack of data, leading to poor costing of model Appropriate benefit performance measures not developed for success of model. 	14/11/2012	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits identification and mapping are reviewed and developed; benefits communicated to key stakeholders; benefits are reviewed during TOM development, and through implementation stage as part of implementation plan All data is supplied re contracts, staffing, skills-mapping. As'-is' service mapped and understood Reviewing performance measures, and developing most appropriate performance measures to measure success and impact of new TOM. 	1	2	2	SS	65%	Open
R5	All Stakeholders are not engaged or engagement is not effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All key stakeholders are not mapped which could hinder successful implementation Key services that will be required to implement the model may not be identified, to ensure their appropriate involvement at the right time Senior stakeholders do not have a common understanding of the benefits of the TOM, and do not fully engage with its development Services across LAs, do not understand or agree with benefits of TOM Staff do not understand the benefits of this model, and resist its implementation. 	14/11/2012	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identify all stakeholders, and map their influence and interest. Develop a communications and consultation approach/and implement this, during the TOM development and implementation stages e.g. legal and HR - who will be required to implement model Engage with senior stakeholders asap to understand level of buy-in, and their requirements. Engage with services to ensure their requirements, and how to effectively secure their engagement through model development, and implementation Develop and implement staff comms and engagement plan - to inform them about Development of TOM, and its implementation, including its impact on them, and how it will be implemented. 	2	3	6	ALL	50%	Suggest Close
R6	Implementation plan does not provide clear route map: actions, timescale, and resources to successful implementation of TOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of TOM does not identify realistic timeframe nor resources to deliver it, which may lead to reputational risk, and resistance. 	14/11/2012	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop business case that clarifies approach, options appraisal, resource requirements, project team R&R Identify Implementation Manager/Director to lead implementation. 	1	2	2	SS	45%	Open
R7	Misunderstanding of the role of the Joint Committee / Political changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Government legislation dictating alternative approaches Political or senior management changes resulting in different approaches Inability of participants to understand what the project involves Political divide - "our way is better than yours" Reputational or crisis issue splits the authorities. 	08/04/2013	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear comms with Members Joint agreement and delivery of key messages Early agreement on key decisions Evidence of benefits. 	4	1	4	CP/ABH	30%	Open
R8	ICT/Systems do not facilitate new shared processes and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems not delivering objectives Reluctance or technical difficulties with migration to single system Timing of IT alignment. 	08/04/2013	2	2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already have a joint Head of ICT Common IT platforms Provide training and development Technical/Process(es)/People. 	2	2	4	GC	40%	Open
R10	Conflicting priorities of the stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tensions between Benefit Sharing between partners Conflicting benefits i.e. what is good for one may be bad for the other Other new initiatives take priority Partners disagree on certain aspects Lack of clarity in relation to client demands of new service LBN worries over migration to ERP. 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Clarity in the Business Case Agreed objectives and targets The dispute resolution mechanism Not revisiting decisions made without reason. 	3	2	6	CP/ABH	50%	Open
R11	Breakdown in stakeholder relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of worsening T&Cs and housekeeping Sabotage – made to go wrong Misleading each other – not being open and honest Lack of senior manager sign up Lack of experience, capacity and/or capability Trade Union opposition The admin/client overhead Delays of other projects impacting on resources Change in CE, SRO, Programme Manager Relationship breakdown between equivalent staff in each organisation as they jockey and compete for positions against one another Self preservation interests of participants out weigh the interest of the project – turkeys voting for Christmas. 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Honesty Transparency Clear expectations Clear, consistent and simultaneous Comms. Staff engagement Trade Union engagement Training and development Consistent HR policies and processes 	3	2	6	ALL	30%	Open
R12	Partnership is unable to agree on Service Specification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two differing views of the end solution No facility available to argue/agree the service is required and the costs Politicians change their minds midstream One direction of travel benefits one partner and not the other. 	08/04/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult/determine customer requirements Recognition of different needs 	3	2	6	SS/TH	0%	Open

R14	Breakdown in stakeholder relationship creating negative communication issue (sabotage)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to respond to requests for information Misinformation to staff and TU's Directors insurmountable difference of opinion Lack of buy in Union disruption Varied responses from TU branches Deliberately requesting FOI's Leaks 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop story and vision Stakeholder Analysis Robust Comms Plan Clear, consistent, simultaneous Messages Confidence outwardly displayed by Programme team Flexibility Effective consultation Strong leadership 	3	2	6	TS	30%	Open
R15	Inability of Partnership to adopt new ways of working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TUPE T&Cs Location of staff – moving or not Level of support given Getting staff in both boroughs to genuinely feel that they are working in a shared working approach Seen as not having a local government – people are attached to their council Not dealing with the all important housekeeping issues such as car parking impact on the overall project – diverting attention Transport costs Failure to align LBN and LBH structures etc. 	08/04/2013	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comms Culture Staff engagement (within limits) Identifying what is reasonable. 	2	2	4	ALL	30%	Open
R16	Programme fails to deliver benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision (and Specifications) is 'woolie' and 'airy fairy' Benefits unachieved Lack of key milestones and early wins Failure to assure clients that service will deliver and at an affordable price Only completing half – and the impact on reputation and staff morale Impact of failure on other projects. 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective project management and governance Strong client Effective governance Managers to meet DIY expectations Training and development Shared knowledge Appropriate scenarios. 	2	2	4	SS/TH	0%	Open
R17	Communications Plan and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy not in place/not executed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not being on the front foot Not preparing FAQs in advance Letting the TUs dictate the project Not being honest Lack of consistency between the messages going to LBN and LBH Allowing cracks to form by issuing inaccurate or vague messages Rumour Mill is more valuable to staff than official Comms Negative press in local newspapers. 	08/04/2013	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop story and vision Stakeholder analysis Robust Comms Plan Clear, consistent, simultaneous messages Confidence outwardly displayed by Programme team Flexibility Effective consultation Strong leadership 	3	2	6	TS	70%	Open
R18	Loss of key staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key players depart Focus changes Influential staff departures. 	08/04/2013	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succession Plan Anticipation 	3	2	6	CP/ABH	0%	Open
R19	Lack of staff commitment/co-operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff become difficult Staff pick and choose what they want to do The unofficial leaders and influencers are not project representatives Not wanting to/unable to travel to new locations Failure to manage expectations We've seen these things fail before. 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective and common comms One message to both staff groupings Getting the "leaders inside the tent" Opportunity to shape the destiny Identify and recruit champions Transparency Honesty Appropriate scenarios 	3	2	6	ALL	0%	Open
R20	Lack of TU commitment /cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff strike Staff work to rule Too big a leap - systems completely different to existing Lack of training and development at the key stages in the project journey Not accepting or communicating that failure has occurred - impacts on staff perception "we cant trust them to tell us facts" TU branches not on same page. 	08/04/2013	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being on the 'Front Foot' One Message to both branches of all Trade Unions Transparency Honesty Build Trust and Confidence by Efficient Governance Appropriate Scenarios In readiness for Divide and Conquer (the two boroughs) tactics 	2	2	4	BW	0%	Open
R21	Lack of implementation resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver financial savings as per FBC profile Failure to deliver service reviews Failure to deliver system improvements . . 	30/09/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Board, Programme team Business Case has sufficient investment resources built in Commitment to change Implementation plan Benefits realisation. 	2	2	4	CP/ABH	40%	Open
R22	Management resistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal challenges Lack of governance Managers not working to the new structure – always referring to people from the old structures Lack of buy in Managers lobbying for an alternative model. 	08/04/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipating the questions and having the answers Comms Developing the appropriate scenarios. 	2	2	4	CP/ABH	10%	Open
R23	Conflicting Terms and Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different pay, leave, expectations of work, work patterns, flex, etc. 	08/04/2013	2	4	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition and acceptance these are important to staff and crucial to the Programme. Effective mapping of the differences. 	2	4	8	BW	0%	Open
R25	Housekeeping (location, car parking, subsistence, transition etc. etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues that matter to staff Lack of a quick resolution of these impacts on delivery times of core project. 	08/04/2013	2	4	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition and acceptance these are important to staff and crucial to the Programme. Effective mapping of the differences Early determination of the common stance. 	2	4	8	SS	0%	Open

R26	Culture clashes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politicians having a differing approach to employee relations Them and us -What do you expect its Havering - What do you expect its Newham - We told you it would fail - Employees not on same page Lack of flexibility, Lack of discipline Breakdown of the two borough relationship. 	08/04/2013	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One message comms Shared Programme team Clear aims and objectives Encourage other instances of working together by the two boroughs Detailed procedures and processes. 	2	2	4	BW	10%	Open	
R27	Vision is not actioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Words not actions. Lack of clarity on what the client can afford, and wants 	08/04/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic Project Plan, timescales and milestones Regular reporting to sponsors and members Effective comms to staff and Trade Unions. 	2	1	2	SS/TH	20%	Open	
R28	Do not understand client requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of regular reporting and challenge 	08/04/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement and dialogue Development of SLAs Determination of what can they afford? Determination of what can they get, for what they can afford? Can it? (be delivered) Determining low cost or high quality? 	2	2	4	SS/TH	10%	Open	
R29	Dependant IT system (Oracle) is not implemented for go live April 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a separate but dependant project. If this approach and system is not adopted then the full benefits may not be realised. (this risk impacts on the speed and delivery of the new shared service not on the ability to implement the programme as a whole) 	11/06/2013	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oracle R12 to be implemented for LBH by Dec 13 and LBN by Oct/Nov 14 - the LBN date has changed from the initial plan (Apr 14) and has been accounted for in the Business Case savings forecast and service review schedule - providing the Oct/Nov date is met the current expected programme benefits can still be achieved Romulus formally linked to One Oracle Project Regular status reporting of One Oracle project One Oracle Programme Plan in place Appropriate resources in place for One Oracle at LBH and LBN Consideration of conflicting resource requirements of the two programmes Early warning of risks reported to Romulus Board. 	3	3	9	GC	20%	Open	
R30	Lack of commitment to standardise and streamline processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If commitment to this vision and of new ways of working is not there through the implementation phases of the programme, then the benefits may not be fully realised. 	11/06/2013	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop story and vision Stakeholder analysis Robust comms plan Clear, consistent, simultaneous messages Confidence outwardly displayed by Programme team Flexibility Effective consultation Strong leadership 	3	2	6	CP/ABH	50%	Open	
R31	Level of financial savings stated in the Business Case will not be realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The savings have been calculated at this point of the programme using a standard shared service formula which is based on the savings achieved in other programmes. As such this is subject to deviation when applied on each project and presents a risk to achieving the level of savings stated in the Business Case. 	11/06/2013	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test the BC level of financial savings and assumptions in the Full Business Case Undertake deep dive service reviews to understand expected level of savings for ICT and Property during BC Undertake service reviews for other services during implementation to fully achieve savings and improvements. Programme Board to receive regular reports on progress of service reviews 	2	3	6	CP/ABH	40%	Open	
R32	Inability of internal stakeholders to think radically enough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That alternative models and improvements are considered to provide the best, most efficient and viable shared service. 	19/06/2013		3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOM workshop to be externally facilitated to give a commercial insight. Change management plan in place. Programme open to new ideas and ways of working. 	2	2	4	SS	20%	New
R34	One Oracle solution does not meet the needs of Romulus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> System does not meet HR hierarchy needs of Romulus. Extra costs from Capgemini are incurred to implement a solution which meets its needs 	19/06/2013		2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirements of Romulus to be discussed early with the One Oracle Programme and planned into the work. 	2	2	4	SS	0%	New