

# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

## Finance & Resources - Nigel Howcutt

### FR\_F02 Delays to Capital programme



<b>Category:</b> Financial	<b>Corporate Priority:</b> Dacorum Delivers	<b>Risk Owner:</b> Nigel Howcutt	<b>Portfolio Holder:</b> Graeme Elliot	<b>Tolerance:</b> Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
4 Very Likely	2 Medium	8 Amber	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Not delivering major projects within the timeframe to which it has committed itself exposes the Council to</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>In particular, scrutiny is focused on those elements of the capital bid that experience indicates are the primary cause of delays to capital projects. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How robust are the assumptions on the estimated duration of the procurement exercise?</li> <li>• How realistic is the estimated time taken for contractors to deliver the works?</li> <li>• How realistic are the assumptions on officer availability to manage the project on time?</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>The following controls are in place with a view to</p>		<p>At Qtr 4 2017/18 the HRA outturn produced slippage of 28% and the general fund reported slippage of 34% an average slippage of 30%.</p> <p>At Quarter 1 2018/19 the Capital programme is reporting a 11% slippage in the £63m programme of works. This is broken down into a 10% HRA slippage and a general fund slippage of 12%. The vast majority of this slippage is caused by the delay on 5 or 6 key projects, that will be reviewed as part of the Quarter 1 Cabinet Financial report.</p>	

# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

reputational risk.	<p>developing a culture of scrutiny and challenge for officers to improve the accuracy of future bids:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly meetings take place between accountants and budget holders to monitor progress against original timeframes and costs;</li> <li>• Corporate Management Team (CMT) receive a monthly report on the progress of capital projects against anticipated timeframes;</li> <li>• Performance Group comprising Chief Officers and cabinet Members receive a monthly report on the progress of current projects;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>The 2018/19 capital programme profiling will be reviewed as part of the Qtr 1 monitoring period and AD's will be required to approve the profiling of these budgets and take accountability for delivery of these schemes within the projected timescales.</p>	
<b>Sign Off and Comments</b>		
<p>Sign Off Complete</p> <p>2018/19 Quarter 1 performance updated.</p>		

## FR\_F03 Variances in General Fund revenue budget

<b>Category:</b> Financial	<b>Corporate Priority:</b> Dacorum Delivers	<b>Risk Owner:</b> Nigel Howcutt	<b>Portfolio Holder:</b> Graeme Elliot	<b>Tolerance:</b> Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score



# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	2 Unlikely	2 Medium	4 Green
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>Accurate, well-controlled budgeting relates directly to the achievement of the Dacorum Delivers corporate objective, and indirectly, through the financial decision-making process, to the achievement of all of the Council's corporate objectives.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>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 Budget Holders on the robustness of their assumptions, from a range of audiences.</p> <p>It is intended that these controls will increase the opportunity for flawed assumptions to be exposed as soon as possible, as well as incorporating a stronger culture of financial management across the Council leading to continuous improvement in the setting of accurate budgets.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are two opportunities for OSCs to scrutinize the budget proposals and directly question the relevant officers before the budget report is finalized and considered by Cabinet and Council.</p> <p>Once approved, in-year budget performance is managed through monthly meetings between accountants and budget holders, which underpin monthly reports to CMT</p>		<p>The internal audit report in relation to budgetary control was undertaken in early 2018 and a full assurance was achieved in May 2018. The 2017/18 outturn reported a variance on the general fund net cost of service of only £89k, a variance of less than 1% of the net operating budget. This outturn suggest an accurate and efficient budget was set for 2017/18.</p> <p>In quarter 1 2018/19 the general fund is reporting a 4% budget pressure and services are working on plans to mitigate this pressure in year. The main financial pressure is the reduction in income on recyclables, linked to the downturn in the global market for recyclable products.</p>	

# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

	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.	
<b>Sign Off and Comments</b>		
Sign Off Complete The 2018/19 Quarter 1 budget monitoring has been completed and pressures have been highlighted for budget holders to address.		

## FR\_I02 Failure to optimise income generated by commercial assets

<b>Category:</b> Infrastructure	<b>Corporate Priority:</b> Dacorum Delivers	<b>Risk Owner:</b> Nigel Howcutt	<b>Portfolio Holder:</b> Graeme Elliot	<b>Tolerance:</b> Treating	
<b>Inherent Probability</b>	<b>Inherent Impact</b>	<b>Inherent Risk Score</b>	<b>Residual Probability</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>	<b>Residual Risk Score</b>
3 Likely	3 High	9 Amber	2 Unlikely	3 High	6 Amber
<b>Consequences</b>		<b>Current Controls</b>		<b>Assurance</b>	
<p>The council has a significant portfolio of commercially let properties, which provides one of the council's largest sources of income.</p> <p>Council officers must attempt to maximize 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 jeopardize the council's achievement of its corporate objectives of Regeneration and Dacorum Delivers.</p> <p>The continuing recession and the difficulties it brings for local businesses increases the likelihood of this risk crystallizing.</p>		<p>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 occurring reducing from a score of 3, which is shown in the Residual Probability (i.e. after controls implemented) being a 1.</p> <p>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</p>		<p>2018/19 Quarter 1 performance shows occupancy is at 96%, 1% above target and an improvement on the 2017/18 outturn position. The percentage of rent arrears is at 7%, 1% below the KPI of 8%. This is also 1% ahead of the year on year position.</p>	



# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

	<p>how it can impact on council income.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<b>Sign Off and Comments</b>		
<p>Sign Off Complete</p> <p>The commercial assets service is working hard to ensure that occupancy is maximized where possible, whilst also keeping rent arrears a minimal level.</p>		

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	Nigel Howcutt	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		<p>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 probability of the Council being unable to respond to such an emergency is reduced.</p> <p>- Annual review process. - Corporate business continuity process and procedures set out in emergency response toolkit.</p>		A CMT emergency planning exercise was conducted in October which all members of the Finance and Resources DMT attended.	
<b>Sign Off and Comments</b>					
Sign Off Complete					



# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

## FR\_R01 Council Tax and Business Rates collections rates drop below budget

<b>Category:</b> Reputational	<b>Corporate Priority:</b> Dacorum Delivers	<b>Risk Owner:</b> Nigel Howcutt	<b>Portfolio Holder:</b> Graeme Elliot	<b>Tolerance:</b> Treating	
<b>Inherent Probability</b>	<b>Inherent Impact</b>	<b>Inherent Risk Score</b>	<b>Residual Probability</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>	<b>Residual Risk Score</b>
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber
<b>Consequences</b>		<b>Current Controls</b>		<b>Assurance</b>	
<p>Distribution of collection fund to other preceptors is based on the budgeted collection level, if collection falls short this could lead to a cash flow issue within the Council's finances. The fund distribution is balanced after the end of the financial year.</p> <p>Reputational risk if collection rate falls significantly – this could also impact on future years' council tax base leading to increased budget pressures.</p> <p>Financial risk in relation to business rate retention scheme if rates collection falls below government set baseline.</p>		<p>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 minimize the ongoing negative impact on collection.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 forgetting to make a monthly payment.</p> <p>There is an active programme for taking formal recovery action against non payers.</p>		<p>At quarter 1 2018/19 the business rates collection rate is 28.7% against a target of 29%. There are outstanding business rates queries that are being dealt with that equate to 0.2% of this shortfall, and the year end outturn target of 98.4% is still expected to be achieved.</p> <p>The council tax collection rate is 30% against a target of 30.2% the annual target of 98.5% is still expected to be achieved.</p>	

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete



# Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 2018/19 Operational Risk Register.

The Business rates and council tax collection rates are marginally behind target with outstanding annual queries still being resolved, at present the year targets are still expected to be achieved.

## FR\_R02 Delays and errors in the processing of Benefits claims



Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:	
Reputational	Dacorum Delivers	Nigel Howcutt	Graeme Elliot	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	
<p>This risk links to the corporate objective Dacorum Delivers, focusing on an efficient and effective council.</p> <p>Customers could suffer personal hardship resulting from delays or errors in the processing of claims.</p> <p>Significant reputational risk associated with high-profile errors.</p> <p>Staff time spent on addressing unnecessary errors leads to duplication of effort and is an inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>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 optimize performance. By subjecting the process to this regular in-depth scrutiny the Service is able to reduce the probability of the risk crystallizing, hence the reduction between the Inherent Risk score (4) and the Residual Risk score (2) after the controls have been taken into account.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Average time taken for processing new claims and changes in circumstances forms part of monthly monitoring.</p> <p>Processes are in place to expedite cases where the</p>		<p>The time taken to decide a housing benefit claim in the 1st quarter 2018/19 was 22 days against a target of 20 days.</p> <p>The time taken to decide a housing benefit change event is 7.7 days against a target of 6 days, this first quarter performance does represent an improvement on last years 1st quarter by 0.1 days, but is still below where the service need to be.</p>	

Appendix 1 - Quarter 1  
2018/19 Operational Risk  
Register.

customer is vulnerable or facing eviction. These 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.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The targets set for housing benefit claims and housing benefit changes are very stretching targets, and the targets have been increased by 15% and 30% respectively over the last 2 years. Constant process reviews and performance monitoring are undertaken to enhance the service delivered to strive to achieve these targets.