

# Customer Service Centre Gateway Project

## PROJECT RISK ASSESSMENT – REVIEW OF HIGH LEVEL RISKS

February 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                    |
| API     | Application Programming Interface  |     |   |
| 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.<br/>M<br/>L</u>   | <u>Catego<br/>ry<br/>(FIMR)</u> | <u>Who</u> | <u>TTTT</u> | <u>Controls / Actions</u>  |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|--|
| <b><u>Financial/Economic Risks</u></b> |   |   |                                 |            |             |  |
| 8                                      | Outsource partners costs are more than expected                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impact on Council resources</li> <li>Budgetary pressures</li> </ul>                             | H                               | Financial  | AD          | Terminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed analysis of bid by Finance team</li> <li>Do not award if risk cannot be managed</li> <li>Commercial contract manager employed to manage contract performance, including costs and prevent cost escalation</li> </ul>               |
| 10                                     | Redundancy pay out within 1 <sup>st</sup> year of contract due to channel shift | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council incurs high redundancy costs</li> </ul>  | H                               | Financial  | AD          | Tolerate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified and considered within the financial analysis work undertaken on the costs of outsourcing</li> </ul>   |
| 29                                     | If kept in-house CSU does not get the investment (finance and human) to improve | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customer service deteriorates</li> <li>Efficiencies not realised</li> <li>Budget not balanced</li> </ul> | H                               | Financial  | AD          | Tolerate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisional Capital Strategy bids submitted to cover 2 key projects – CFM and Channel Shift</li> <li>CSU SD Plan identifies required improvements with timescales</li> <li>2013/14 budget would need to be reviewed post decision</li> </ul> |

## Customer Related Risks

|    |   |  |   |            |    |          |  |
|----|---|--|---|------------|----|----------|--|
| 62 | Loss of control of links with – customer service/community/ insight |  | H | Reputation | AD | Tolerate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed customer insight role and methodology specified in ITT which will help develop better links with customers and customer data</li> <li>Performance Management Framework will be in place</li> </ul> |
|----|---|--|---|------------|----|----------|--|

## 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"> <li>Poor quality service for customers</li> <li>Channel shift does not occur</li> <li>Savings not realised</li> </ul>   | H | Infrastructure                                | AD | Treat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Web improvement plan in place</li> <li>Web Strategy being developed</li> <li>ITT states specific channel shift aspirations and targets and DBC services aware of their roles in achieving these</li> </ul> |
| 65 | Web development does not achieve required improvements in service delivery                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Channel Shift not developed</li> <li>Contractor organization cannot achieve acceptable performance levels</li> <li>Poor service levels for customers</li> <li>Increased costs to Council</li> </ul> | H | Market / Reputation/Infrastructure/ Financial | AD | Treat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Web improvement plan in place</li> <li>We content officers in place and trained</li> <li>CSU Performance Management Framework tracks service delivery standards</li> </ul>                                 |
| 68 | Lack of ownership e.g. liability of systems support– particularly if CSU ICT is also outsourced.        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor issue resolution</li> <li>Poor system integration</li> <li>Poor service to customers</li> <li>Financial savings not realised</li> </ul>  | H | Infrastructure                                | AD | Treat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robust contract management required</li> <li>Specialist ICT team to evaluate ITT bids</li> <li>ITT states current CSU and Council IVCT systems and information asked for on API's.</li> </ul>              |