

Customer Service Centre Gateway Project PROJECT RISK ASSESSMENT

Annex A
January 2013

Key to abbreviations:

FIMR	Financial; Infrastructure; Market; Reputation	CRM	Customer Relationship Management System
TTTT	Tolerate, Treat, Transfer or Terminate Risk	CMT	Corporate Management Team
GM	Group Manager	CSU	Customer Service Unit
AD	Assistant Director	CSC	Customer Service Centre
CM	Contract Manager (To be appointed)	ITT	Invitation to Tender
SD Plan	The CSU Service Delivery Plan 2013 – 2017 (A detailed Service Plan has been developed using the outcomes required by the ITT. It sets out details of how the Council will deliver the service in the future. This has been signed off by the Portfolio Holder, Corporate Director and Assistant Director of Finance)		

<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H. M L</u>	<u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>	
Financial/Economic Risks							
1	CSU unable to make required savings if kept in house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council budget not balanced Efficiencies and modernization not realised Reduced service to customers 	M	Financial	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSU Service Delivery Plan 2013 - 2017 (SD Plan) identifies strategy for achieving savings Channel shift strategy allows savings to be realised through more customer interaction being undertaken via less expensive channels
2	Tender Proposal is outside budget provision	In House operation and project delivery remains most cost effective	M	Financial	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan used to develop service 2013 – 2017 Winning bid recommendation meets financial criteria
3	Costs associated with a legal challenge following non-award of contract	Financial strain on Council funds	L	Financial	AD	Tolerate	Evaluation criteria clear in ITT and robust evaluation process adhered to in line with criteria. Cabinet report recommendation will be based on the outcome of the evaluation process.

<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
4	Unsuccessful bidders look to reclaim costs of their bids	L	Financi al	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITT criteria clear Contract conditions well specified Process managed by multi disciplinary group External legal advice taken in development of process
5	Private provider goes bankrupt	M	Financi al	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial evaluation undertaken by procurement team Business continuity covered in evaluation criteria
6	Risk of escalating costs due to unplanned events/inhouse areas/ back office failures.	H	Financi al	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidable Contact programme being developed
7	At VfM review outsource partner requests substantial increase in fees	H	Financi al	CM	Term inate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation at VfM Review in year 3
8	Outsource partners costs are more than expected	H	Financi al	AD	Term inate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not award
9	Tender is not priced properly as services not fully specified in Tender	H	Financi al	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation
10	Redundancy pay out within 1 st year of contract due to channel shift	H	Financi al	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considered within the financial comparison work undertaken
11	Not providing Value for Money - not clear how services will be affected by legislative changes. EG. Universal Credit etc	H	Financi al	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislative change included in the evaluation criteria Arrangements for payments to contractor included in Contract Governance board will manage service changes

	<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
12	DBC will pay for providers profit through giving expert advice from back office services – there is no provision for surcharges back to the provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best value not achieved through Council contract 	M	Finance		Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service agreements in place from January 2013 Governance board will manage changes to the service
13	Effect of introducing Universal Credit/losing housing repairs calls is more significant than expected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outsource partner requests contract renegotiation 	M	Finance	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost model not based on number of calls Detailed response required on subject as part of ITT
<u>Service Delivery Risks</u>							
14	If outsourcing fails, the Council will lose opportunity to have a CRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in potential efficiencies in CSU Customer Service deteriorates Insight and improvement opportunities are limited 	M	I/structure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan identifies CRM requirement for service improvement and included in future strategic plan Provisional Capital Strategy bid submitted
15	If provider fails and contract is terminated, could lose info. on CRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A need to ensure access to CRM and period to invest in new CRM 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be included in contract negotiations to ensure no loss of information
16	CSU unable to make required improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer service deteriorates Efficiencies not realized Budget not balanced 	M	I/Structure and Finance	GM /C M	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan identifies required improvements Channel shift strategy identified PMF established for external contractor
17	Service becomes Hemel Centric if services removed or reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services at Berkhamsted and Tring are reduced Some residents become socially excluded Possible Equality issues 	M	Reputation and Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality impact Assessment undertaken Assisted self-serve options available in SD Plan and included in ITT Communications plan explains service changes Tailored options developed to reduce social exclusion issues

	<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
18	Inability to provide service for other public services due to being outsourced – preventing achievement of PSQ vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less potential to make savings across public sector orgs • Less opportunity for co-operation • Less comprehensive service to local community • Less capacity for cost sharing • 	H	Infrastr ucture / Financi al	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate negotiation / tendering exercise to be undertaken with other public sector organisations as part of the PSQ project, if relevant
19	Welfare Reforms and Changes to local Housing Allowance creates additional calls/face to face customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face to face and call volumes increase and performance fails • Cost of service increases • Contract renegotiation 	H	Infrastr ucture /Reputa tion / finance	AD	Tran sfer / treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management Framework • Contract Terms and Conditions • PID developed for Welfare Reform project
20	Universal Credit – central government gives green light changing how benefits are dealt with leading to potential increase/decrease in calls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face to face and call volumes increase/decrease and supplier may dispute figures • Performance failure 	H	Infrastr ucture/ Reputat ion / finance	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management Framework • Contract Terms and Conditions • PID developed for Welfare Reform project
21	Outsourced service prioritises profit above service to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer service deteriorates 	M	Reputat ion	CM	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract management • Performance Management Framework
22	Service Areas holding on to customer service administration activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSU unable to generate enough volume to make a justifiable operation 	M	Financi al	CM T	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust strategic leadership from CMT • Strong Service Level Agreements
23	Creating a culture in the new provider of passing calls to the back office to falsely improve performance whilst creating additional work in service areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer rates to back office service areas increases due to customers creating impacts on council officers 	M	Financi al Infrastr ucture	CM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract Management • Service Agreements

	<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
24	"Specialist" officers from other services are not based in the CSC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced levels of customer service Increased 'back office' costs associated with avoidable contact Increased costs in CSU in wasteful transfers 	H	Reputat ion / financia l	GM	Tran sfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan includes current model of specialist advisers given space within HH CSC Negotiation with winning provider to be undertaken to provide this
25	If the service is not outsourced, no active management for common errors (eg payments getting lost for planning applications)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidable Contact not reduced Financial savings not made 	H	Reputat ion / financia l	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues Log will manage 'system failure' to resolution Service Level Agreements in place from January 2013 will develop better issue resolution
<u>Political Risks</u>							
26	Lack of Member support of decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of support for new arrangements 	M	Infrastr ucture	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet and Performance Board OSC papers
27	Opposition from trade unions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal of support by staff Industrial action by staff 	M	Infrastr ucture	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular fortnightly meetings with TU Regular staff meetings and communications
28	In-house improvement plan does not receive Member support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key investments do not receive necessary funding 	M	Financ e	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan specifies investment required to provide service CS bids submitted and noted in Capital Progm
29	If kept in-house CSU does not get the investment (finance and human) to improve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer service deteriorates Efficiencies not realised Budget not balanced 	H	Financi al	AD	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisional Capital Strategy bids submitted SD Plan identifies required improvements

Performance Risks

30	Outsourced provider does not do what they said they would do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Levels are poor Customer satisfaction reduces Council Transformation agenda not delivered 	L	Finance/Reputation	CM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Framework Contract between provider and Council includes non-performance criteria
<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>	
31	Outsource partner does not run the operation to the level of service expected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor customer service Poor reputation 	L	Financial	CM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Management Performance Management Framework
32	PLs and targets drive behaviour of provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer Service deteriorates Public Service element and identity decreases 	M	Reputation	CM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
33	Dip in performance in first 12 months due to implementation and providers reducing budgets (as requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor quality service for customers 	H	Reputation	CM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Framework to manage this with financial penalties possible for continued poor performance
34	Outsourced provider does not improve performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service levels are poor customer satisfaction reduces Customer experience is impacted 	L	Reputation	CM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Framework Contract between provider and Council includes non-performance criteria
35	Contractor brings in other external business and this has impact on performance ratings and quality of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced customer service 	L	Reputation	CM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Management Performance Management
Project Risks							
36	Preferred Bidder withdraws prior to Cabinet decision	Have to go to second bidder award	M	Rep't'n / fin/ Market	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of outsourcing arrangement via CMT and Performance Board
37	Bidders withdraw interest prior to ITT deadline	Reduced number of bidders, worst case 1 bidder left no competition	M	Reputation / Market	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet decision Review of outsourcing arrangement via CMT and

							Performance Board
38	Bidders ask for additional time to submit bids	Delay in awarding contract	L	Finance Market	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bids received by due date
<u>Risk</u>		<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
39	Not evaluating the option for a third model for CSU – that of moving specialist advisors to services rather than CSU model – potential cost benefits not evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible loss of consideration of different options for management Cost savings not established 	L	Finance / infrastructure	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet decision to adopt this model for CSU Cabinet decision on how to proceed will resolve this approach
40	Risk not considering 3 rd option (as above) prevents sharing services made easier.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible loss of consideration of different options for management Cost savings not established 	L	Finance / infrastructure	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet decision to adopt this model for CSU
41	Council not ready or able to manage contract if outsourcing fails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor customer service Performance reduction 	H	Reputation	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Planservice plan developed that details the service that will be delivered in event that outsourcing does not happen Revised Business Continuity Plan required to be developed
42	Unsuccessful bidders challenge contract award decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award of contract delayed Compensation if proved failure in process 	L	Finance / reputation	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITT criteria clear Contract conditions well specified Process managed by multi disciplinary group External legal advice taken in development of process
43	Poor process as risk assessment was not completed at the beginning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste of time and resource Threat of legal challenge as process was unclear 	L	Reputation	AD	Terminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning points from process captured for subsequent projects Generic contract conditions developed for future

	of the project						work
44	Risk that technology within retained organisation does not fit with investments in technology in CSU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mismatch in technology • Poor customer service 	M	Infrastructure	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICT strategy
<p>Staff/ Employees Related Risks</p>							
	<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
45	Loss of staff in CSU (skills/knowledge) pre and post Cabinet decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer service reduced • Recruitment needs add additional work onto managers • Loss of local knowledge • 	H	Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications strategy • Staff Reference Group
46	Loss of staff productivity through disengagement /stress / loss of goodwill /turnover/ sickness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High absenteeism • Low morale • Lack of engagement • Poor customer service 	H	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Reference Group • 'Dacorum Delivers' for staff information • Fortnightly meetings with Unison • Sickness Absence monitoring and management
47	Immediate loss of staff at time of outsource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of skills • Poor performance 	H	Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff engagement through staff reference group / team meetings / communications
48	Staff may leave if service kept in house as disillusioned with Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of skills • Poor performance 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff engagement through staff reference group / team meetings / communications
49	Loss of staff engagement (desire to work for /represent local govt)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor customer service • Poor Council reputation 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Treat /Transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff engagement through staff reference group / team meetings / communications
50	Loss of local jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on local economy 	M	Financial	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITT covers potential for additional work to be brought to Dacorum to prevent redundancies • ITT states Council's priority to local employment
51	Staff training/ development /expertise impacted if	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced quality service to 	L	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of CSU specified in ITT

	outsourced through weaker links with location	customers					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation will consider Call Centre location and local links • Staff development considered as part of evaluation criteria
52	Separation of CSU into Call Centre and CSCs – structure – loss of jobs/Service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced quality service to customers • Lack of employment options • Council strategy on local financial wellbeing and growth impacted 	M	Infrastr ucture	GM	Tran sfer / Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of CSU specified in ITT • Evaluation will consider Call Centre location and local links
<u>Risk</u> <u>Consequence</u> <u>H M L</u> <u>Catego ry (FIMR)</u> <u>Wh o</u> <u>TTTT</u> <u>Controls / Actions</u>							
53	Telephone/f2f locations split – impact on service delivery (preventing multi skilling, cross training etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced quality service to customers • Lack of employment options • DBC strategy on financial wellbeing and growth impacts 	M	Infrastr ucture	GM	Tran sfer / Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of CSU specified in ITT • Evaluation will consider Call Centre location and local links
54	Housing Repairs contract reduces call volumes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidders may dispute volumes originally presented 	L	Financ e	GM	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volumes checked and confirmed prior to ITT release
<u>Customer Related Risks</u>							
55	Berkhamsted and Tring Centre's lose reception for buildings and area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of service to local people • Costs increase to develop 'reception' areas 	H	Financ e	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is outside the scope of this project but needs to be considered as an effect of any changes at Berkhamsted and Tring
56	Customer perception of contact with speaking to a Council employee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers may become disengaged from their Council 	L	Reputat ion	GM	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council communications will need to be robust • CSU staff and processes will need to have visible and audible 'cues' that relate to the Council
57	Reduction in customer satisfaction within the CSU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers identify poor service in CSU causing a bad reputation for the Council 	L	Reputat ion	GM	Toler ate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management Framework will help manage performance • Council performance manage the contract
58	Reduction in customer satisfaction across the organisation through reduced customer insight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly planned services • Financial savings missed • Poor Reputation 	L	Reputat ion / financia l	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Customer insight Strategy to be considered • Development of Customer Insight performance measures to be considered

59	Lack of customer consultation in development of project (eg: does the customer prioritise being seen quickly over getting a comprehensive response with good quality info)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers react to changes Customers do not support channel shift Customers want other options of interaction not included in project 	M	Reputation	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to service will have a clear communication strategy attached to encourage customers to be involved CSU operation and performance was consulted upon at 2012 Listening Days
<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>	
60	Risk that notes become less meaningful / more scripted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced capacity for staff to deliver service in best interests of customer Less job satisfaction 	L	Reputation / Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Framework
61	Communications with customers impacted by adverse media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor reputation Drop in performance 	M	Reputation	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communications plan in place prior to decision
62	Loss of control of links with – customer service/community/ insight		H	Reputation	AD	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Framework will be in place Customer Insight role will help develop better links with Customers
63	Outside organisations will lose free support provided by CSU (e.g. tourist information, foodbank, herts young homeless, Mitie)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced customer service Social welfare role reduced Disadvantaged communities become more isolated 	H	Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate / Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be discussed during the 'mobilisation' period with the supplier if outsourced Levels of support identified within service SLA's

Technological, Web Development and Channel Shift Risks

64	Move to implement channel shift is not properly managed and customers cannot access the CSU as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor quality service for customers Channel shift does not occur Savings not realized 	H	Infrastructure	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web improvement plan in place Web Strategy being developed
65	Web development does not achieve required improvements in service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channel Shift not developed Contractor organization cannot achieve acceptable performance levels Poor service levels for customers Increased costs to Council 	H	Market / Reputation/Infrastructure/Financial	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web improvement plan CSU Performance Management Framework
	Risk	Consequence	H M L	Category (FIMR)	Wh o	TTTT	Controls / Actions
66	Website is not enabled to take transactions leading to the ability for customers who wish to channel shift to on-line not being able to.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phone calls and face to face visits do not reduce creating unnecessary costs in the front line service delivery operation 	M	Infrastructure / Finance / Reputation	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website Improvement plan being developed
67	Non - adoption of CRM across the council impacts the business case	Leads to fragmented business intelligence and customer insight	M	Infrastructure	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement from CMT to use Customer intelligence through CRM Organisational Transformation Working group
68	Lack of ownership e.g. liability of systems – particularly if ICT is also outsourced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor issue resolution Poor system integration Poor service to customers Financial savings not realized 	H	Infrastructure	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust contract management required
69	In house – plans to improve the CSU via CRM are unsuccessful due to difficulty of integrating key systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money is wasted on a system which does not fulfill its purpose 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SD Plan includes financial cost of researching and integrating the systems properly

75	The Council loses sight of input/support CSU provides for DBC (emergencies/elections)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of staff for corporate projects 	L	Financial	AD	Tolerate	Business continuity support is part of the contract.							
76	Increased back office work load- reduced cooperation between services leading to impacted service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer rates to back office service areas increases due to customers creating impacts on council officers 	M	Financial Infrastructure	CM	Treat / Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Management Service Agreements 							
77	Loss of partnership between CSU and other services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced service to local people 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Service Agreements 							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Risk</u></th> <th><u>Consequence</u></th> <th><u>H M L</u></th> <th><u>Category (FIMR)</u></th> <th><u>Wh o</u></th> <th><u>TTTT</u></th> <th><u>Controls / Actions</u></th> </tr> </thead> </table>								<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>
<u>Risk</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>H M L</u>	<u>Category (FIMR)</u>	<u>Wh o</u>	<u>TTTT</u>	<u>Controls / Actions</u>								
78	CSU aspirations and plans do not match back office service assumptions, aspirations and plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mismatched service provision Poor service to local community Financial loss 	M	Infrastructure / Finance	AD	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Agreements with services 							
79	If keeping service in house, implementation process of changes will continue to take time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor performance Higher costs 	M	Infrastructure	GM	Tolerate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Agreements SD Plan - service plan commits to implementation within timescales 							
Physical Risks														
80	Security of building and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff injury Building damage Customer care is reduced 	M	Infrastructure / Finance / Reputation	GM	Treat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiation with provider and FM contract manager required 							