OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

Finance & Resources - David Skinner

FR_CPC01 Failure to comply with procurement legislation and internal controls

Category:	Corporate Priority:		Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
Reputational	Dacorum Delivers		David Skinner	Graeme Elliot	Treating
Inherent Probability	**Inherent Impact**	**Inherent Risk Score**	**Residual Probability**	**Residual Impact**	**Residual Risk Score**
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	1 Very Unlikely	4 Severe	4 Green

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
• The Council would face an increased risk of legal challenge from unsuccessful bidders • Contracts could be set aside by the courts • The Council could face financial penalties under the Remedies Directive • The delivery of contracts could be delayed • Lack of a robust and transparent procurement process • Unable to demonstrate value for money • All of the above would result in damaging the Council's reputation	• The Commissioning & Procurement Standing Orders (CPSO's) have been re-written to complement the Public Contract Regulations 2015. • The CPSO's have been written to simplify the processes for officers to follow. • All OJEU tenders must be supported by an officer of the Commissioning & Procurement team. • All procurement officers that manage the OJEU tenders are professionally qualified.	• The CPSO's are regularly updated following any policy notes or guidance as issued by Crown Commercial Services • Awareness training on the CPSO's is offered to all GM's and their teams. • Procurement officers keep abreast of changes in legislation and best practice within the industry. • Internal audit have completed a draft report on Contract management that is still in discussions between officers and the internal auditors. • The internal audit report has been finalised and provided a full and substantial level of assurance on contract management.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The work of the team in scrutinising contracts and ensuring compliance with legislation is reflected in positive assurance from Internal audit as previously reported to the audit committee. The team are currently working on a number of high value contracts i.e. the Multi Storey Car Park, Car Parking Enforcement and the Leisure review and their assurance work is critical to delivering compliant contract awards.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

FR_CPC02 Continued Non-Authorised procurement expenditure					
Category: Reputational	**Corporate Priority:** Dacorum Delivers		**Risk Owner:** David Skinner	**Portfolio Holder:** Graeme Elliot	**Tolerance:** Treating
Inherent Probability	**Inherent Impact**	**Inherent Risk Score**	**Residual Probability**	**Residual Impact**	**Residual Risk Score**
4 Very Likely	2 Medium	8 Amber	1 Very Unlikely	3 High	3 Green

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
• This expenditure may result in the Council being in breach of procurement legislation • This increases the risk of legal challenge and the Council could face penalties under the Remedies Directive • Lack of a robust procurement process may increase the risk of fraudulent activity • Potential for non-compliance with relevant legislation such as H&S • Poor financial management • All of the above would result in damaging the Council's reputation	• The CPSO's have been re-written to complement the Council's Financial Regulations with regards to officer authorisation levels. • The CPSO's clearly define the processes that must be followed by officers when procuring goods, services and works. • Contracts have been set up for corporate requirements.	• Working with colleagues in finance to implement a 'No PO No Pay' policy. • Working with colleagues in finance to roll out the 'Electronic Purchasing Card'. • Awareness training on the CPSO's is offered to all GM's and their teams.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The continued success of "No PO No Pay" is continuing with improved compliance levels. The percentage of trade creditor invoices being paid within 30 days has reduced slightly to 95.5% from 97.6% in quarter 1. This performance is consistent with the same point last year and reflects the vacancies, leave and sickness levels over the summer period.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

FR_F02 Delays to Capital programme					
Category: Financial	**Corporate Priority:** Dacorum Delivers		**Risk Owner:** David Skinner	**Portfolio Holder:** Graeme Elliot	**Tolerance:** Treating
Inherent Probability	**Inherent Impact**	**Inherent Risk Score**	**Residual Probability**	**Residual Impact**	**Residual Risk Score**
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	4 Very Likely	2 Medium	8 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
Many of the major projects within the Capital Programme are fundamental to delivery of the Council's corporate objectives. Therefore significant delays can impact on the achievement of the corporate plan. Financial decision-making is negatively affected if the timing of projects in the Capital Programme is wrong. This can result in lost investment income or increased interest costs as the Council moves closer to the point where it will need to borrow. The estimated delivery date is considered as part of the decision to allocate capital funds to one project over another. If estimated timings are not accurate, there is a risk that the allocation of funds is not being decided on appropriately. If inaccurate project management is tolerated, there is a risk that the culture of financial management across the Council will be negatively affected which will have consequences for wider financial decision-making. Not delivering major projects within the timeframe to which it has committed itself exposes the Council to	The controls that have been implemented to mitigate this risk target the robustness of capital bids both at the time they are submitted and throughout the delivery phase of the projects. In particular, scrutiny is focussed on those elements of the capital bid that experience indicates are the primary cause of delays to capital projects. These include • How robust are the assumptions on the estimated duration of the procurement exercise? • How realistic is the estimated time taken for contractors to deliver the works? • How realistic are the assumptions on officer availability to manage the project on time? The rationale behind this approach is that an increased culture of challenge will lead to more realistic programming of future capital projects, and therefore a reduced likelihood of slippage. The following controls are in place with a view to	The 2013/14 Final Outturn showed that the slippage of capital projects was around 30% against the Original Budget approved by Members in February 2013. This is an improvement on previous years where slippage against Original Budget has been around 60%. As at the end of Quarter 2 2014/15 (the mid-point of the year), the capital forecast on the General Fund is broadly on budget, with no material slippage reported at this stage. Slippage on the HRA capital programme is forecast to be well below 5%. The budget position as at Quarter 3 was reported to Cabinet in February 2015. The report showed that forecast net slippage on the General Fund Capital Programme was low at around 3%. Forecast slippage on the HRA Capital Programme has, however, increased significantly since the Quarter 2 forecast, at around 25%. The Provisional Outturn was reported to Cabinet in may 2015. The report showed that slippage against the full year budget on the General Fund Capital Programme was around 10%. Outturn on the HRA shows slippage of

reputational risk.	developing a culture of scrutiny and challenge for officers to improve the accuracy of future bids: • Capital Strategy Steering Group (CSSG) comprising senior officers from across the Council required to challenge new bids for robustness ahead of recommendation to Members; • Monthly meetings take place between accountants and budget holders to monitor progress against original timeframes and costs; • Corporate Management Team (CMT) receive a monthly report on the progress of capital projects against anticipated timeframes; • Performance Group comprising Chief Officers and cabinet Members receive a monthly report on the progress of current projects; • Reports go to Cabinet and all Overview and Scrutiny Committees (OSC) every quarter. These reports have been redesigned to focus on the more immediate risk of in-year delivery, highlighting higher risk areas to invite closer scrutiny from Members.	around 24%. These are addressed in more detail in the sign-off notes, below. 2014/15 Confirmed slippage into 2015/16 was Â£10.1m or 10% of the total approved capital programme according to the 2014/15 approved accounts. The Provisional Outturn was reported to Cabinet in May 2016. The report showed that slippage against the full year budget on the General Fund Capital Programme was around 28%. Outturn on the HRA shows slippage of around 5%. 2015/16 Confirmed slippage into 2016/17 was £8.1m or 28% of the total approved capital programme according to the 2015/16 approved accounts. As at the end of Quarter 2 2016/17(the mid-point of the year), the capital forecast on the General Fund is broadly on budget, with no material slippage reported at this stage. Slippage on the HRA capital programme is forecast to be 8% or c£2m. AS at the end of Quarter 3 the HRA capital programme is on track with no material slippage. The forecast for the General Fund is reporting slippage of 5% (£873k). The Provisional Outturn was reported to May Cabinet. It shows the HRA capital programme is forecasting slippage of 29% (£7,881k). The General Fund is on track reporting slippage of 8.6% (£1,844k)

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		2017/18 As at the end of quarter 1 forecast slippage for Capital schemes for the general Fund is 27%. The HRA capital programme is forecasting 22% slippage. Reports to Cabinet for September will re-profile the programme to reflect the latest updated position. As at the end of Quarter 2 slippage for the HRA is forecast to be £717k or 2% of the capital programme. The General Fund is forecast to overspend by c£1.7m or 19%. However if you remove the grant payments to registered providers of c£2.5m then there would be slippage of c£830k or 9%

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The action plan to rephrase the capital budgets has been actioned and the HRA is now back on track to reflect a more accurate position for monitoring the approved capital budgets. The General Fund will be back within acceptable tolerances following approvals for supplementary capital approvals for the grant payments.

FR_F03 Variances in General Fund revenue budget

Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
Financial	Dacorum Delivers	David Skinner	Graeme Elliot	Treating

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	2 Unlikely	2 Medium	4 Green

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
Accurate, well-controlled budgeting relates directly to the achievement of the Dacorum Delivers corporate objective, and indirectly, through the financial decision-	The following controls aim to reduce the probability of there being a variance in the General Fund Revenue Budget by ensuring that there is strong challenge put to	The Council's budgetary controls are assessed each year by Internal Audit. In January 2013, the Council received a 'Full' level of assurance.

making process, to the achievement of all of the Council's corporate objectives. Inaccurate budgeting negatively affects the Council's ability to make evidence-based decisions. A significant underspend at year-end could indicate that funds have been needlessly diverted from a competing priority. A significant overspend at year-end could result in reserves being used to support lower priority objectives. Both of these could result in reputational damage for the Council. Failure to address the causes of inaccurate budgeting could negatively impact the Council's culture of financial management, which in turn increases the risk of poor financial decision-making.	Budget Holders on the robustness of their assumptions, from a range of audiences. It is intended that these controls will increase the opportunity for flawed assumptions to be exposed as soon as possible, as well as inculcating a stronger culture of financial management across the Council leading to continuous improvement in the setting of accurate budgets. The annual budget-setting process consists of an ongoing scrutiny process in which senior officers from across the Council, together with the Financial Services team, challenge the following year's budget bids from Group Managers. This scrutiny process is augmented by the Budget Review Group (BRG), consisting of Chief Officer Group and representatives from the Portfolio Holder group, which provides early Member-level challenge. There are two opportunities for OSCs to scrutinise the budget proposals and directly question the relevant officers before the budget report is finalised and considered by Cabinet and Council. Once approved, in-year budget performance is managed through monthly meetings between accountants and budget holders, which underpin monthly reports to CMT and quarterly reports to Cabinet and OSCs. The Council's Financial Regulations provide a guide to all budget-holders and are subject to annual review.	A further Internal Audit on the Council's budgeting process, undertaken in September 2014, resulted in a 'Substantial' level of assurance. Despite this being a lower mark than the exceptional one achieved in the previous audit, it should be noted that it remains a good result. The recommendations of the Internal Auditor that led to the reduced marking were not systemic in nature, and they do not pose a material threat to the overall control environment of the budget-setting process. Efforts have, however, been redoubled, and the causes of the recommendations have been addressed. An Internal Audit report on the Council's 'Main Accounting' function was presented to Audit Committee in February 2015, in which a 'Full' level of assurance was awarded. This audit covered a range of areas including integrity of transactions, manual adjustments, and year-end procedures. All of these areas contribute to the accuracy of the in-year monitoring reports that the Finance team is able to produce. Consequently, Members can draw assurance from this audit opinion that the chances of this risk crystallising are reduced by the robust financial management procedures the Council has in place. Final confirmed outturn for 2014/15 was within £48k of budget (after contributions to and from reserves) as reported to Audit committee and approved as part of the audited accounts and was consistent with the budget monitoring over the preceding year.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		An Internal Audit report on the Council's 'Budgetary Control' function was presented to Audit Committee in April 2016, in which a 'Full' level of assurance was awarded. This audit covered a range of areas including budget setting; budget upload; budget monitoring and savings realization; budget alterations and virements; and management information. All of these areas contribute to the accuracy of the in-year monitoring reports that the Finance team is able to produce. Consequently, Members can draw assurance from this audit opinion that the chances of this risk crystallising are reduced by the robust financial management procedures the Council has in place. The 2015/16 audit of Core Financial Systems was also reported to have either Full or Substantial levels of assurance. Final confirmed outturn for 2015/16 was within 2% of budget (after contributions to and from reserves) as reported to Audit committee and approved as part of the audited accounts and was consistent with the budget monitoring over the preceding year. Provisional Outturn reported to Cabinet in May 2016 demonstrated that the Council was on target (after contributions to and from reserves). Additional income was included within the outturn reported to Cabinet and meant that additional contributions could be made to reserves. The 2016/17 Statement of Accounts were approved by Audit Committee on the 20th September and the Council received an unqualified opinion from the auditors on

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		the 29th September with no material changes to the accounts presented in June.
Sign Off and Comments		
FIN03 is GREEN and is projecting a favourable variance of £70k. There is an additional £125k favourable variance in reserve movements and non-controllable items which means that the quarter position is consistent with both the quarter 1 forecast and the 2016/17 outturn position.		

FR_I02 Failure to optimise income generated by commercial assets

Category:	Corporate Priority:		Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
Infrastructure	Dacorum Delivers		David Skinner	Graeme Elliot	Treating
Inherent Probability	**Inherent Impact**	**Inherent Risk Score**	**Residual Probability**	**Residual Impact**	**Residual Risk Score**
3 Likely	3 High	9 Amber	2 Unlikely	3 High	6 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
The council has a significant portfolio of commercially let properties, which provides one of the council's largest sources of income. Council officers must attempt to maximise income from these assets whilst avoiding the risk of vacant properties and increasing bad debts, which could arise if rents are set too high, and would jeopardise the council's achievement of its corporate objectives of Regeneration and Dacorum Delivers. The continuing recession and the difficulties it brings for local businesses increases the likelihood of this risk crystallising.	The following controls aim to mitigate the risk of under-performance of the Council's commercial assets by maintaining good communication links between relevant Council services, and by regularly monitoring performance against targets (see KPIs CP01 and CP02) to ensure that underperformance is identified and addressed as quickly as possible. The existence of these controls has led to the 'Inherent Probability' of this risk occuring reducing from a score of 3, which is shown in the Residual Probability (i.e. after controls implemented) being a 1. Estates officers responsible for negotiating rent reviews hold monthly meetings with the Debtors team to track current bad debtors. This increases their understanding of the economic pressures businesses are facing, and	The year-end performance figures for 2013/14 demonstrate that occupation rates are above target (98.8& against a target of 95%), and that the level of arrears is also better than target (at 7.32% against a target of 9.5%). The year-end performance figures for 2014/15 demonstrate an occupation rate of 98.3% against a target of 95%. The level of arrears is at 6.5% against a target of 9.5%. Quarter 1 performance for 2015/16 are above target and demonstrate an occupation rate of 98.66 versus a target of 95%. The level of arrears has increased slightly to 7.3% versus a target of 9%.

	how it can impact on council income. There are currently Corvu performance targets to maintain the number of voids (empty properties) below 5%, and to keep the rent arrears below 10%. Failure to meet either of these targets would prompt further investigation.	Q2 occupation levels are holding up well at 98.49% and arrears are being held within acceptable levels at 8.1%. Q3 occupation levels are marginally down at 97.99% and arrears have improved significantly by 1.7% to 6.4%. Q4 occupation rates have increased slightly to 98.49% and arrears have reduced from 6.45 down to 5%. Q1 occupation rates have reduced slightly to 97.99% versus a target of 95% and arrears have slightly increased to 7.3% versus a target of 8.8% Q2 occupation rates are 97.32% versus a target of 95% and arrears are at 8.1% versus a target of 8.8%. Investment property income is exceeding target and is £324k ahead of the Q2 result for 2015/16. Q3 occupation rates are 97.16% versus a target of 95% and arrears have reduced to 5.3% against a target of 8.8%. Investment property income is slightly ahead of target by 1% (£42k). 2016/17 Q4 occupation rates have stabilized at 97.16% versus a target of 95% and arrears have increased slightly to 7.3% against a target of 8.8%. Investment property income is exceeding target by £475k. **2017/18** Quarter 1 performance for 2017/18 is above target and demonstrate an occupation rate of 96.99 versus a target of 95%. The level of arrears has increased slightly to 7.94% versus a target of 7.5%.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		Quarter 2 performance for 2017/18 is above target and demonstrate an occupation rate of 97.99% versus a target of 95%. The level of arrears has increased slightly to 9.33% versus a target of 8.5%.

Sign Off and Comments
Sign Off Complete Delivery on both occupation rates and arrears levels continues to be strong but with a slight deterioration in arrears. This is a result of arrears on one significant tenant who historically pays late but does pay. Investment property income is exceeding target by 4% (£114k) as a result of turnover based rents exceeding historic trends and improved methods for the recovery of service charges.

FR_I04 Failure to maintain an effective business continuity plan for all relevant service areas

Category:	**Corporate Priority:**	**Risk Owner:**	**Portfolio Holder:**	**Tolerance:**
Infrastructure	Safe and Clean Environment	David Skinner	Graeme Elliot	Treating

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
Disruption caused by service failure leading to hardship for individuals, potential loss of business and significant reputational damage	These controls are implemented to ensure that the Council is adequately prepared and able to continue providing key services in the event of an emergency situation. Through this control, the probaility of the Council being unable to respond to such an emergency is reduced. - Annual review process.	A CMT emergency planning exercise was conducted in October which all members of the Finance and Resources DMT attended.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

	- Corporate business continuity process and procedures set out in emergency response toolkit.	

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Departmental business continuity plans have been reviewed to reflect the move to the Forum and will be monitored for on-going changes.

FR_R01 Council Tax and Business Rates collections rates drop below budget

Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
Reputational	Dacorum Delivers	David Skinner	Graeme Elliot	Treating

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
Distribution of collection fund to other preceptors is based on the budgeted collection level, if collection falls short this could lead to a cashflow issue within the Council's finances. The fund distribution is balanced after the end of the financial year. Reputational risk if collection rate falls significantly – this could also impact on future years' council tax base leading to increased budget pressures. Financial risk in relation to business rate retention scheme if rates collection falls below government set baseline.	The following controls aim to identify as quickly as possible if the Council is falling behind on its collection rates target for the year. If a problem is identified, the Council is then able to invoke a range of options to minimise the ongoing negative impact on collection. Profiled monthly collection rates are monitored monthly - see KPIs RBF04 and RBF05. Reasons for variances are then investigated in order to address problems quickly as possible. Direct debit payment is recommended for all customers – a pre-filled instruction is sent to all non-DD payers with their annual bill or a first bill for a new taxpayer. The direct debit method reduce the risk of under-collection because it eliminates the risk of a payer	The full year Council Tax Collection Rate for 2013/14 (Performance Indicator RBF05) was 97.7% against a budget of 97.5%. The full year Business Rates collection rate in 2014/15(Performance Indicator RBF04) was under budget at 98.1% against a target of 99%. Q1 Council Tax collection rates is 30.2% versus a target of 30.1% Q1 Business Rates collection is 30.2% versus a target of 24.8% Q2 Business rates collection is 52.6% achieved versus a target of 51.5%. Council tax collection is on target at 58%.

	forgetting to make a monthly payment. There is an active programme for taking formal recovery action against non payers.	Q3 Business rates collection is 77.2% and is running at 0.5% ahead of target. Council tax collection is at 86.2% which is 0.2% off target but is a 0.1% improvement from the same period last year. Internal Audit have performed a routine assessment of the control environment within Council Tax collection and have given an assurance of Full/Substantial . This is a good result and has highlighted a number of minor improvements that can be made to the timeliness of some work. This does however provide assurance to members that the fundamental design and operation of the control processes are robust. Members can gain additional assurance from the routine Internal Audit assessment of Business Rates as being at Full/Substantial levels. Council tax collection for 2015/16 was 98% which is 0.3% improvement on 2014/15. Business rate collection was 98.3% narrowly missing the target of 99% but improving on the 2014/15 performance by 0.2%. Q1 Business Rates collection is 27.7% which is exactly on target and Council tax Collection is 30.4% which is 0.2% up on target. Q2 Business Rates collection is 52.3% which is ahead of target (51.6%)and Council tax Collection is 58.2% which is 0.2% up on target.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		Q3 Business rates collection is slightly ahead of target(76.2) at 77.5%. Council tax collection is broadly on target (86%) at 86.2%. Internal audit have presented two reports to audit committee giving 3/4 full levels of assurance to members on Council Tax and NNDR. 2016/17 Q4 Business Rates collection is slightly below target (98.4%) at 97.9%. Council tax collection is ahead of target (98.1%) at 98.4%. **2017/18** Q1 Business Rates collection is 29% which is ahead of target of 27.7% and ahead of the same point last year. Council Tax Collection is 30.2% which is 0.2% down on target and the same point last year. Q2 Business Rates collection is 51.9% which is just behind target of 52.3%. Council Tax Collection is 58% which is 0.2% down on target and the same point last year.

Sign Off and Comments
Sign Off Complete The team continues work to improve Business Rates Collection rates and coupled with the assurance statements from internal audit on the sound control environment will allow them to continue to develop the approaches required to deliver the high levels of collection required. The drop in Council Tax collection reflects the increasing trend towards payment in 12 instalments instead of the traditional 10 instalments. The team are working to look at re-profiling the collection rate to reflect the emerging trend but need a longer time series of data to model the future profile.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

FR_R02 Delays and errors in the processing of Benefits claims					
Category: Reputational	**Corporate Priority:** Dacorum Delivers		**Risk Owner:** David Skinner	**Portfolio Holder:** Graeme Elliot	**Tolerance:** Treating
Inherent Probability	**Inherent Impact**	**Inherent Risk Score**	**Residual Probability**	**Residual Impact**	**Residual Risk Score**
4 Very Likely	3 High	12 Red	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
This risk links to the corporate objective Dacorum Delivers, focussing on an efficient and effective council. Customers could suffer personal hardship resulting from delays or errors in the processing of claims. Significant reputational risk associated with high-profile errors. Staff time spent on addressing unnecessary errors leads to duplication of effort and is an inefficient use of resources. Government subsidy for housing benefit expenditure is based on external audit certification of the claim made. There is financial risk if errors on cases are identified during their testing. Communications with claimants needs to be well written and jargon-free in order to reduce the risk of repeat queries which puts pressure on limited staff resources.	The controls in place aim to mitigate this risk by closely monitoring performance to assist with effective decision-making around resource allocation. This is a heavily process driven service area and close monitoring also helps to identify bottle necks in the process which need to be improved to optimise performance. By subjecting the process to this regular in-depth scrutiny the Service is able to reduce the probability of the risk crystallising, hence the reduction between the Inherent Risk score (4) and the Residual Risk score (2) after the controls have been taken into account. Quality checking and individual performance management is in place. These mean that each officer has targets for their personal productivity and accuracy, and information from quality checks is fed back in order to sustain improvement. Average time taken for processing new claims and changes in circumstances forms part of monthly monitoring. Processes are in place to expedite cases where the customer is vulnerable or facing eviction. These	The successful and continuously improving management of this risk can be seen in the improved performance of KPI RBF01a - Average Time Taken to Decide a New Benefit Claim. Performance for the full year 14/15 was 22.9 days, which was within the target of 23 days for the first time. This represents an improvement of 4.5 days over the 27.4 days average in 2014/15, and an improvement of 9.9 days against the 12/13 result of 32.8 days. It should be noted that these improvments have been achieved without additional resource. It has purely been the result of improved process design and increased efficiency. Average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing benefit is 22.7 days versus a target of 23. This is the first quarter since the same period last year where the target has been met. Average time taken to decide a change event in Housing Benefit is at 12.3 days versus a target of 13.0.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

	processes start when a case is identified within benefits, or by customer services, homelessness, housing etc. Monthly meetings are held between senior officers within Finance & Resources to monitor detailed performance levels at each stage of the claims process. This enables intermediary targets to be set for discrete elements of the process, which in turn enables the more effective monitoring which has resulted in significantly improved performance over the last 6 months.	Q2 performance has been very good in relation to new claims. The team have achieved 19.6 days versus a target of 23 days. Q3 performance has been very good. New claims are now being processed within 17.4 days versus a target of 23 days. This is an improvement of 9.2 days on the same period last year and 2.2 days improvement on the previous quarter. The average time taken to decide on a change event in Housing benefit is 10.8 days versus a target of 13 days. This is an improvement of 5.6 days on the same period last year and an improvement of 1.5 days on the previous quarter in this year. Q4 performance has been very good. New claims are now being processed within 18.4 days versus a target of 23 days. This is an improvement of 6.2 days on the same period last year. The average time taken to decide on a change event in Housing benefit is 4.9 days versus a target of 13 days. This is an improvement of 2.2 days on the same period last year and an improvement of 5.9 days on the previous quarter in this year. This reflects the inclusion of calculations relating to annual benefit uprating and rent changes but is still better than last year when similar changes occurred. Q1 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 20.8 days versus a target of 20 days. This is still 1.9 days better than the same point last year. The average time taken to decide a change event is 8

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		days versus a target of 11.5 and is 4.3 days better than the same point last year. Q2 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 17.4 days versus a target of 20 days. This is an improvement of 2.2 days on the same point last year. The average time taken to decide a change event is 9.9 days versus a target of 11.5 and is 5.4 days better than the same point last year. Q3 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim has improved to 15.3 days against a target of 20 days. This is an improvement of 2.1 days on the previous quarter. The average time taken to decide a change event is 9.3 days against a target of 11.5 days. This shows an improvement of 0.6 days on the previous quarter. Q4 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim increased to 22.6 days against a target of 20 days. This was an increase of 7.3days on the previous quarter and reflects the resourcing shortages experienced during the year. The average time taken to decide a change event is 3.2 days against a target of 11.5 days. This shows an improvement of 1.7 days on the same period last year. **2017/18** Q1 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 19.9 days versus a target of 20 days. This is 0.9 days better than the same point last year. The average time taken to decide a change event is 7.8 days versus a target of 10 days and is 0.2 days better

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2017

		than the same point last year. Q2 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 24.3 days versus a target of 20 days. The average time taken to decide a change event is 11.5 days and is on target.

Sign Off and Comments
Sign Off Complete The reduced performance in Quarter 2 reflects the high number of vacancies with the service coupled with the summer annual leave factor. The service are working to implement new ways of working to mitigate the continued trend of high staff turnover. The risk score is maintained at amber to reflect the risk of performance continuing to reduce if we are unable to recruit new staff.