

## **GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 24 January 2024 at 9.30 - 11.30 am**

**Council Chamber, Council Offices, The Burys, Godalming**

### **Members:**

Cllr Paul Follows, Leader, Waverley Borough Council (Joint Chair)  
Cllr Julia McShane, Leader, Guildford Borough Council (Joint Chair)  
Cllr Joss Bigmore, Guildford Borough Council  
Cllr Brooker, Guildford Borough Council  
Cllr Tony Fairclough, Deputy Leader, Waverley Borough Council  
Cllr Fenwick, Guildford Borough Council  
Cllr Victoria Kiehl, Waverley Borough Council  
Cllr Peter Martin, Waverley Borough Council  
Cllr Danielle Newson, Guildford Borough Council  
Cllr Rehorst-Smith, Guildford Borough Councillor  
Cllr John Robini, Waverley Borough Council  
Cllr John Ward, Waverley Borough Council

## **A G E N D A**

- 1 **Apologies for absence and notification of substitutes**
- 2 **Disclosures of interests**
- 3 **Adoption of Minutes of the previous meeting** (Pages 3 - 8)

To agree the minutes from the last meeting held on 1 November 2023.

- 4 **Joint Risk Register: Task Group Report** (Pages 9 - 32)

This report presents the revised collaboration risk register, as proposed by the Joint Governance Committee's (the Committee's) Task & finish Group, for its approval and six-monthly review by the Committee.

### **Recommendation to Committee**

- 2.1 That the Committee approves the revised register suggested by the Task & Finish Group and officers and agrees any further changes.
- 2.2 That the Committee ask officers to prepare a heatmap for the 24 April 2024 Committee meeting. Showing changes in risks since this committee meeting.

2.3 It is recommended that a formalised process is adopted for Collaboration risk owners to provide updates on their respective risk mitigations. The recommended process being:

- Collaboration risk owners should provide updates on their respective risk mitigations at a Joint Management Team (JMT) meeting at least three weeks before the next Committee meeting. The T&CP standing agenda item at JMT will be used to review the register and receive updates on the mitigations.

## WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 1 NOVEMBER 2023

(To be read in conjunction with the Agenda for the Meeting)

#### **Present**

Cllr Paul Follows (Joint Chair)	Cllr Victoria Kiehl
Cllr Julia McShane (Joint Chair)	Cllr Peter Martin
Cllr Joss Bigmore	Cllr Danielle Newson
Cllr Brooker	Cllr John Robini
Cllr Peter Clark	Cllr John Ward
Cllr Fenwick	

#### **Apologies**

Cllr Rehorst-Smith

#### **Also Present**

Councillor Julian Spence

#### 20 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda item )

Councillor Follows advised that this was the adjourned meeting from 9 October 2023. He advised that the meeting was taking place at Waverley, as there was a planning inquiry taking place at Guildford, therefore Guildford were unable to host the meeting. Councillor Follows was nominated as the chairman for the meeting and no objections were noted.

Cllr Follows welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves.

#### 21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES (Agenda item 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Rehorst-Smith.

#### 22 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 2)

There were no disclosures of interests made.

#### 23 ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda item 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2023 were approved.

Councillor Martin raised a query relating to the Staff Survey. He advised the committee that the minutes of the meeting of the 17 March note that the 2022 Staff Survey results would be brought to the current meeting.

Officers apologised for the oversight and advised the Committee that it would be brought to the next meeting. Officer also noted that the upcoming Staff survey would include the new arrangements and would also be brought to the next meeting for the committee to review.

24 COLLABORATION RISK REGISTER REVIEW (Agenda item 4)

Councillor Follows informed the Committee that it would discuss the structure of the Collaboration Risk Register (CRR) first. He advised that he felt the CRR had too many columns which made it quite confusing to review. Councillor Follows felt that the target columns were unnecessary and should be removed. Councillor Follows commented on the Risk Strategy and felt that 28 risks were too many. He also advised that it would be helpful to add dates where risks were identified.

Councillor Follows invited Councillor Spence, the Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee to address the Committee. Councillor Spence agreed with Councillor Follows, advising that there are over 20 risks, and some of the risks could be merged. Councillor Peter Martin addressed the Committee, he also agreed with the comments, noting that the targets and further planned action columns were confusing, he agreed that one or two of the risks could be merged.

Councillor Bigmore addressed the Committee, and he commented on the difference between action priorities and risk appetite. He also queried the ratings column and how a risk would move from high to medium. Councillor Spencer informed the Committee that he had previously been a Chief Risk Officer. He advised that the appetite was important but was happy with where the inherent residual risks were now. Councillor Spencer queried the control measures which he felt were key to control. He expressed that currently, it seemed to be more like a narrative than a risk register.

Councillor Follows suggested a task and finish group be formed for a short period to support officers with the structure and the deliverables for the CRR. He suggested that the task group be formed of Councillors from both Guildford and Waverley and nominated himself, Councillors Kiehl, Bigmore, and Booker. He also thought that it was important that Councillor Spence as the chair of the Waverley Audit and Risk Committee and Councillor Bellamy as chair of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee should be co-opted into the task and finish group meetings.

Ian Doyle, Joint Strategic Director of Transformation and Governance addressed the Committee. He advised that he agreed with the comments and would welcome support from a task and finish group. Councillor Kiehl addressed the Committee and queried whether it was a living document, who reviewed the register, and who else viewed the register. Ian Doyle confirmed that it was the Joint Governance Committee that would view and be responsible for reviewing the CRR.

Moving to the CRR deliverables, Councillor Bigmore queried risk no.1 on the Register: the partnership lacks clear objectives. He suggested that they had completed the initial work and that they were now out of mandate and queried what the next steps were. Responding to Councillor Bigmore's comments, Robin Taylor, Joint Executive Head of Organisational Development addressed the Committee.

He advised that his team was now working on the vision statement, project plan, and funding options. Robin Taylor informed the Committee that several recommendations would be brought forward, including recommendations on how the two Councils will work together and plans for joint governance arrangements.

Councillor Follows advised the committee that there would be an All-Councillor briefing and formal discussion in late November. Councillor Brooker addressed the Committee, and he informed the Committee that he was not a fan of the collaboration and had particular concerns with risks no. 5, 8, 11, 13, and 25. He commented on the officer split and sought reassurance on the practicalities of this. Councillor Follows highlighted the risk of undoing the collaboration and noted that the task and finish group would evaluate all the risks as part of its objectives.

Councillor Robini addressed the Committee, he highlighted a communication risk with the public. He felt that more communication was required to ensure public support for the collaboration. Councillor Follows noted that external communication would improve when the internal communication and understanding of councillors and staff were improved. He noted that it was important to articulate the financial savings and that there would be internal and external comms messages emanating in the next few weeks.

Councillor Peter Clark addressed the Committee, and he commented on the risk of people misunderstanding the comms messages both internally and externally. Councillor Martin informed the Committee that the Conservative Party did not support the collaboration, but he would do what he could to support this work. He advised that the Committee should be cautious about combining difficult risks. Councillor Ward agreed that there were too many columns on the CRR and agreed that merging some of the risks was sensible. He also agreed that the comms message to the public should be clear so that they are well-informed about the collaboration.

Councillor Bigmore was concerned that risk no.10 should be a higher risk. Councillor Follows agreed and noted that a number of the capacity and resources risks had already had an impact and should be reevaluated and mitigated. Councillor Robini felt that I.T. should be a higher risk, noting that there was no shared platform. Councillor Follows advised that it was a high priority and would be tackled one service area at a time. Councillor Follows noted that it was a very large task and there was a fundamental update required to the Members' interfacing basics.

Councillor Martin noted the risks concerning governance, and he commented on simultaneous Executive meetings. He also commented on the joint management resources, over-stretched capacity, and one council's priorities over the others. About the proposed governance arrangements, Councillor Follows advised that this was something that the Joint Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Susan Sale, was working on and would be communicated in a language everyone could understand.

Tom Horwood, Joint Chief Executive, addressed the Committee and confirmed to the Committee that the Joint Management Team (JMT) was not paid for by GBC,

however, the weighted balance of tasks was not equally balanced either, e.g., that the Environmental Services work at GBC was larger than that of WBC. He noted that modifications had been made under the relevant areas by the section 151 Officer during the budget setting to reduce the disparities.

Tom Horwood informed the Committee that all the members of the JMT were fulfilling their contractual obligations. He noted that the JMT had been in place for just over one year and this had allowed them the time to understand what changes needed to be made.

Councillor Martin asked how the JMT ensured that any one council was not monopolising the time of officers. Robin Taylor explained that the JMT worked in a pattern of ebb and flow and responded to tasks as needed. Robin Taylor also advised that the JMT had significant experience in responding to issues i.e., the Guildford Financial event. Robin Taylor advised the Committee that in reality, the JMT would deal with situations as they arose i.e., ebb and flow which would continue to change and impact risk and would continue to exist. Ian Doyle advised the committee that Robin Taylor had described a real risk and that the CRR was a live document.

Councillor Victoria Kheli addressed the Committee, she advised that she was surprised that there were only two red risk indicators relating to capacity resources considering the quantity of work and the proposed timeline. She also suggested that the financial situation and commentary be circulated to Members of the Committee. Councillor John Robini commented on the number of Committees that Senior officers needed to attend and suggested that officers attend via Zoom where possible.

The Committee resolved to the following:

1. The Joint Governance Committee reviewed and noted the report and proposed a Task and Finish Group to review further changes and provide a steer pending a review from Finance.
2. The Committee appoints a Task and Finish Group to support Officers in undertaking a comprehensive review of the Collaboration Risk Register including risks; mitigations and scoring, with a view to making it more succinct and focused on the key threats to the success of the Collaboration.
3. That a new Task and Finish Group be appointed and shall be formed from Members of the Joint Governance Committee.

25 UPDATE: ON THE INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENTS (IAA'S) (Agenda item 5)

Susan Sale, Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services introduced the item, she informed the Committee Members that the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) had been extended to now include arrangements for temporary sharing of staff. She advised that the two documents, in respect of the JMT and the Temporary Shared Staffing, would be amalgamated and the Terms of Reference for the Committee are being amended to reflect its expanded remit and responsibilities.

Councillor Peter Martin addressed the Committee and he noted that he had not had sight of the full IAA and that he had searched the Council website and had not been able to locate a copy.

Susan Sale explained that the IAA was drafted before she started at the Council and once amended would ensure that members had access. She noted that the IAA is the legal document that sets out the parameters for the JMT, it was not currently a part of the constitution of either council.

The Committee resolved to the following:

1. To note the report and the update on both the IAA agreements with Guildford Borough Council.

26 REFRESHED REPORT: AMENDMENTS TO THE GUILDFORD AND WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) (Agenda item 6)

Susan Sale Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services addressed the Committee and introduced the item. She informed the committee that as per her comments on the previous items, the Committee's Terms of Reference required updating to reflect the JGC's new responsibilities to review the Temporary Shared Staffing IAA.

Susan Sale noted that there were also a number of other minor amendments which included periodic review periods, frequency of meetings, quorum, procedures for electing a Chairperson in the absence of both Co-Chairs and voting.

The Leader suggested a further amendment to the use of substitutes under clause 8, he felt that it would be beneficial for the Group Leaders to nominate a main substitute. Officers noted that formal substitutes could limit the Committee's flexibility. The Committee members discussed the suggestion and felt that it would be beneficial to have formally appointed substitute members and the TOR should be amended to reflect this.

Members discussed the proposed reduction of the member's quorum. Members queried reducing the number from 7 to 4 and wonder if this was too low. Officers advised the members that the quorum level across both councils was a quarter and that 4 was consistent with the other committees across both councils.

The Committee resolved to the following:

1. Note the report and the proposed amendments.
2. Provide feedback and comments to the Joint Constitutional Review Group, including their comments regarding Clause 8, The appointment of formal substitutes.
3. Amend Clause 8 to appoint formal substitutes.

4. That the Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services be delegated authority to amend both the Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Constitutions accordingly.

27 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING (Agenda item 7)

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as the 24 January 2024.

**The meeting commenced at Time Not Specified and concluded at Time Not Specified**

**Chairman**



# **Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council**

**Report to:** Joint Governance Committee

**Date:** 24 January 2024

**Ward(s) affected:** All

**Report of Director:** Transformation & Governance

**Author:** Robin Taylor

**Tel:** 01483 523108

**Email:** [robin.taylor@waverley.gov.uk](mailto:robin.taylor@waverley.gov.uk)

**Executive Portfolio Holder/ Lead Councillor responsible:** Cllr Morson (GBC)  
and Cllr Kiehl (WBC)

**Email:** [Carla.morson@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:Carla.morson@guildford.gov.uk);

[Victoria.kiehl@waverley.gov.uk](mailto:Victoria.kiehl@waverley.gov.uk)

**Report Status:** Open

## **Proposal of revised Collaboration Risk Register – Task & Finish Group of JGC**

### **1. Executive Summary**

1.1 This report presents the revised collaboration risk register, as proposed by the Joint Governance Committee's (the Committee's) Task & finish Group, for its approval and six-monthly review by the Committee.

- 1.2 The original register was last presented to the Committee in November 2023. Since then, it has been reviewed and revised by the Task & Finish Group and officers.
- 1.3 The Task & Finish Group have met twice (4 and 11 December 2023) since the last Committee meeting in November 2023.
- 1.4 This report also presents a suggested formalised process for Collaboration risk owners (officers) to provide updates on their respective risk mitigations.
- 1.5 The original register and the revised register are part of the agenda reports pack.

## **2. Recommendation to Committee**

- 2.1 That the Committee approves the revised register suggested by the Task & Finish Group and officers and agrees any further changes.
- 2.2 That the Committee ask officers to prepare a heatmap for the 24 April 2024 Committee meeting. Showing changes in risks since this committee meeting.
- 2.3 It is recommended that a formalised process is adopted for Collaboration risk owners to provide updates on their respective risk mitigations. The recommended process being:
  - Collaboration risk owners should provide updates on their respective risk mitigations at a Joint Management Team (JMT) meeting at least three weeks before the next Committee meeting. The T&CP standing agenda item at JMT will be used to review the register and receive updates on the mitigations.

### **3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:**

- 3.1 The Committee's role is to undertake a formal review of the risk register and make any changes.
- 3.2 At the reconvened 1 November 2023 meeting, the Committee agreed the recommendation for *'officers to undertake a comprehensive review of the risk register, including risks; mitigations and scoring, with a view to make it more succinct and focused on the key threats to success of the collaboration.'*
- 3.3 The Task & Finish Group agreed updates on risk mitigations should come from risk owners and a formal process should be developed to achieve this.

### **4. Exemption from publication**

No

### **5. Purpose of Report**

- 5.1 The purpose of this report is to present the revised register for the Committee to fulfil its function to:
  - undertake a six-monthly formal review of the collaboration risk assessment;
  - review current and target impact and likelihood scores;
  - make any changes to the list of risks and mitigation actions.

### **6. Strategic Priorities**

- 6.1 The collaboration between Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils will enable both Councils to better deliver their strategic priorities by achieving financial savings and making our services more sustainable. Effective risk management is vital to achieving the objectives of the

collaboration and therefore supporting both councils to deliver their strategic priorities.

## **7. Background**

7.1 In July 2021 both Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council agreed to explore collaboration beyond a joint management team. An initial analysis of strategic risks related to the collaboration was developed into a collaboration risk register. Since its review by the Committee in November 2023, the register has been revised by the Task & Finish Group and officers and is presented alongside this report for review and approval by the Committee.

7.2 The Task & Finish Group and officers have completed the following since the Committee meeting in November 2023:

- reduced duplication/repetition by revising all risks and combining those with similar causes and impacts;
- included an 'Examples of risk' column, to capture the possible examples of each risk and set out what materialisation of the risk would look like;
- merged 'current control measures' and 'further planned actions' columns to create singular 'Mitigations' column, separated into 'current' and 'planned' mitigations;
- revisited RAG ratings for each 16 high level risks, according to those original risk ratings;
- added 'Original risk' column to reflect where revised risk derived from in original risk register;
- revised 'related risks column' in reference to new risks;
- removed target risk columns;
- created a 'Glossary' sheet, explaining terms and acronyms from reviewed risk register, including a column for relevant risk;
- as requested by the Task & Finish Group, 'total overall current risk rating value' and 'total overall residual risk rating value' have been added to the risk register.

- 7.3 Due to the changes made by the Task & Finish Group, the revised risk register includes new risks and combines risks which have similar causes and impacts, therefore risk numbers have changed from the original register. The date of 24 January 2024 will be against each risk when the revised register is approved by the Committee. From then on new risks will be dated with the date they are agreed at a Committee meeting.
- 7.4 As per recommendation 2.2, once these risks are approved, any changes will be illustrated in a heatmap at subsequent Committee meetings.
- 7.5 It is important to remember not all risks are able to be fully mitigated, sometimes due to external influences and other times due to level of impact if the risk were to materialise, regardless of likelihood. For some risks the likelihood may be low or very low, but the impact will remain high regardless of mitigating action. The scoring of the risk will therefore remain high, despite it being unlikely.

## **8. Consultations**

- 8.1 The revised register is presented in this report following its review by the Task & Finish Group, the Strategic Director for Transformation and Governance, Executive Head of Organisational Development, Business Transformation Manager (WBC) and Graduate Management Trainee (WBC).

## **9. Key Risks**

- 9.1 There is a risk the register will not be monitored by all appropriate stakeholders should the Committee fail to fulfil its function of reviewing the register on a six-monthly basis.
- 9.2 Officers continue to monitor the risks and mitigations within the register as the collaboration progresses. Ownership of the register currently sits with CMB, providing responsive reaction to

developments and proactive mitigations to reduce risks, including any resources that may need to be assigned.

## **10. Financial Implications**

- 10.1 The financial risks to the collaboration and actions to mitigate these risks are listed in the register (appendix 1).
- 10.2 There is a financial gap between current and future mitigations. Current mitigations have budget, future mitigations do not necessarily have budget allocated. Therefore, some of the future mitigations in appendix 1 will require financial investment. Requests for funding will be submitted where budget or resource is required beyond current provision.
- 10.3 Business cases for specific collaboration projects will provide detail on costs and savings through the financial business case.

## **11. Legal Implications**

- 11.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

## **12. Human Resource Implications**

- 12.1 The HR risks to the collaboration and actions to mitigate these are listed in the register (appendix 1).

## **13. Equality and Diversity Implications**

- 13.1 This duty has been considered in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from this report.

## **14. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications**

- 14.1 One of the objectives of the collaboration and partnership is to better enable both councils to achieve their carbon neutrality

targets. Working closely together across the two boroughs, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils have enhanced opportunities to deliver their carbon neutrality goals.

14.2 This report and appendix 1 have no direct climate change implications.

## **15. Summary of Options**

15.1 The Committee is asked to approve the reviewed risk register attached as appendix 1.

## **16. Background Papers**

16.1 None

## **17. Appendices**

17.1 Appendix 1 – Revised Collaboration Risk Register (PDF version)

Appendix 1a - Revised Collaboration Risk Register (Excel version)

17.2 Appendix 2 – Risk Register Glossary

17.3 Appendix 3 – Original Collaboration Risk Register

Please ensure the following service areas have signed off your report.  
Please complete this box, and do not delete.

Service	Sign off date
Finance / S.151 Officer	
Legal / Governance	
HR	
Equalities	
Lead Councillor	
CMB	
Committee Services	



Term	Meaning	Dates	Risk no.
<b>Risk owners</b>			
JCX	Joint Chief Executive		1,2,3,6,11,1 2,13,15,16
Leaders	Leaders and Deputy Leaders		1,2,11,16
Joint S151 Officer			3
CMB	Corporate Management Board (JCX and Joint Strategic Directors)	Held fortnightly	3
JMT	<b>Joint Management Team</b> (CMB + Joint Executive Heads of Service) First phase - established in Oct 2022.	Meetings held fortnightly	7,8,9,10,12, 14,16,17
EHoS	Executive Heads of Service		
<b>Member Groups</b>			
O&S	Overview & Scrutiny	Meetings 5 times a year	
SEMs	<b>Simultaneous Executive Meetings</b> , agreed in the T&CP Report. Separate meetings of the two Councils' Executives, with identical agendas to include matters relating to the T&CP, held at the same time and in the same meeting room. Allowing the Executives to debate matters collectively and hear the views of the other prior to making their decisions. A separate vote is taken on each agenda item, meaning that each Executive retains its sovereignty and independent decision making.	Frequency TBC	2,7
JGC	<b>Joint Governance Committee</b>	Held at least every 6 months Next meeting in Feb 2023	1,14
<b>Officer Groups</b>			
T&CP Team	Single shared programme management team of officers including subject matter experts (HR, IT, Finance, Policy, Legal, Comms) Providing input into programme but also gaining understanding of decisions/direction	Held fortnightly	4
T&CP Board	Transformation and Governance Director, Community Wellbeing Director, EHs of Finance, Communications and Customer Services, Organisational Development, Legal and Democratic Services Reports into EPB and provides officer decisions and direction to the T&CP.	Held monthly	16
EPB	<b>CMB: Enterprise Portfolio Board.</b> Enterprise-wide oversight and decision making of business as usual and change portfolio (including costs). Clear programme reporting mechanism for both councils. Meets monthly	Held monthly	4,9
<b>Mitigations</b>			
T&CP	Transformation and Collaboration Programme		
T&CP Programme Structure	<a href="#">T&amp;CP Programme Structure</a> . Clear road map of actions with timescales, workstreams and assumptions.	First draft agreed by Executives November 2023	1,12
T&CP Programme plan	Tasks and milestones of T&CP		12
T&CP Report	Report with annexes setting out vision, objectives, programme structure, programme resources, achievements so far, programme initiation document	First draft agreed by Executives November 2023	13
First phase	JMT in place from Oct 2022, including Joint S151		2,3,8,10,12, 16
Vision and objectives	<a href="#">Shared Vision Statement</a>	First draft agreed by Executives November 2023	1,2,10,16
Joint comms plan	Comms plan for the Transformation and Collaboration Programme for GBC and WBC		11
HR Workforce Strategy	Corporate strategy to cover recruitment, retention and training		6
Shared HQ options analysis	Analysis of the options relating to colocation		1,7
Shared staffing structure options analysis	Analysis of the options relating shared workforce		1,8
PAM	Performance Agreement Meetings, appraisals and one to ones between officers	Held annually	
IAA	<b>Inter-Authority Agreement.</b> Which sets out clear protocols/clauses for dispute resolution and termination with an appropriate notice period to allow for transition. Clear, early and agreed mechanism for cost and savings apportionment enshrined. Reviewed at least six-monthly by JGC.		1,2,3,8,12,1 6
Joint Constitutions Review Group	To review constitutional and governance structures	18 Dec 23 21 Mar 24 06 Jun 24 19 Sep 24	
Shared IT Strategy	Strategic statement of how IT will be harmonised/compatible.		11

Joint IT Way Forward Group

Strategic officer board designed to consider plans moving forward for harmonised/reconciles ICT platform or working with both current platforms.

11

**Mitigation titles**

Current

What we are currently doing to mitigate a risk

Planned

What we are planning on doing to mitigate a risk and have budget and resource to do

Future

What we need to do to mitigate a risk but don't currently have budget or resource for

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the partnership lacks clear objectives	1	which results in inefficiency and mission creep, which results in stakeholder dissatisfaction and misunderstanding and undermines benefits	<b>Completed:</b> adopt and communicate a shared vision statement; develop the vision statement into clear metrics and expectations, agreed by all partners; implement IAA; JMT roadmap achieved on time <b>Ongoing:</b> scoping of shared staff and shared HQ projects; clear road map of actions with milestone dates/goals to be put together; programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; maps of both organisations being drafted for the 'as is' in order to develop the 'to be'. Current pause in light of Guildford financial situation	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	To confirm and document how both authorities will function, in terms of people, processes and technology, so that further change, transformation and collaboration activity in both councils will strategically align with that planned approach	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	3,7
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the councils will not <b>continue</b> with any collaboration	2	which results in foregoing any <b>further</b> benefits of partnership, which results in greater pressure on the councils' financial challenge, service sustainability and pressure on the staff that are already joint. Cost and reputational damage. Impact on efficiency, workload, morale, reputation and service delivery.	Completed: JMT now in place, first stage of collaboration complete. Ongoing: programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; focus more aggressively on each council's individual transformation programme; identify more options for efficiency, income, savings and potentially service reductions.	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	Inclusion of gateway reviews at each stage before progressing to the next. Clear business cases to be presented to Council and frequent communications to public re: benefits. Ongoing review to be by the partnership governing board in future. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	3
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the two councils disagree on an important aspect of the partnership	3	which results in dissatisfaction with the partnership and mistrust, which results in the partnership ending or being delayed.	Completed: agreed vision statement that is reviewed at least annually by both Council Executives; an agreed Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA) which sets out protocols for dispute resolution and termination with an appropriate notice period. Ongoing: quarterly progress updates to O&S at each authority on progress of the collaboration; CMB members in close contact with key councillors. Options analyses being drafted	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Regular opportunities for councillors to meet across boundaries, both formally and informally. Continue with Joint Governance Committee, reviewing IAA on a regular basis.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	1,2,7

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that costs and savings of projects will not be apportioned fairly	4	which results in mistrust, which results in dispute and distraction.	<b>Completed:</b> a clear, early and agreed mechanism for cost and savings apportionment, enshrined in the IAA e.g. JMT; regular clear accounting of savings and costs to the relevant committees. <b>Ongoing:</b> cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases	Joint S151 Officer	Business case development for opportunities identified and agreed by both councils.	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	5,11
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that JMT resource will not be apportioned fairly	5	which results in mistrust, which results in dispute and distraction. The Council fails to achieve milestones of objectives for either authority	<b>Completed:</b> Joint S151 in place and weighted cost sharing protocols agreed for JMT members. <b>Ongoing:</b> close monitoring during familiarisation period whilst new structure embeds	Joint chief Executive/CMB	Action plans implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Regular review and communication, to raise concerns, between lead members and CMB. Recognise ebb and flow to respond to needs of orgs and priorities. Regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers, ensuring that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority.	6 - Very High	2 - Significant	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	4,9,11,19
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership	6	Which results in lower-than-expected benefits realisation and reputational harm, increasing in impact with closer collaboration.	<b>Completed:</b> Clear agreement of priorities and objectives; JMT in place, partnership is sufficiently in place to mitigate this likelihood; clear clauses on termination in the IAA with an appropriate notice period to allow for transition. <b>Ongoing:</b> regular contact between councillors in the Executives and wider Councils; proactive communications with all stakeholders and the public; strong governance and oversight as per the IAA requirements.	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Ensure mechanism in governance arrangements for backbench councillor input. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered. Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils	3 - Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	7,26
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that future political change leads to a serious change of partnership direction	7	Which results in a change in direction or a termination, which could lessen or increase benefits of collaboration.	<b>Ongoing:</b> engage all councillors throughout the transition process, with openness among all participants; identify where the disagreements and different priorities exist and be ready to adapt to them should a change occur; communications plan being drafted	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Prepare communication plan about collaboration for councillors around election cycles to ensure the new intake are aware of the collaboration and address concerns. Establish aims/vision of partnership at early stage of each new municipal cycle.	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	1,6,3,18

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that officer capacity will be over-stretched during the transition	8	Leading to lack of focus, which results in negative impacts on service delivery, partnership progress and morale.	<b>Completed:</b> Created a single shared programme management team. <b>Ongoing:</b> build in investment during the earlier phases, potentially including external support; set clear timetable and pace, agreed by both councils, with appropriate resources and succession planning; develop early a programme of HR support for resilience, strategies for dealing with change, and team building.	Joint Management Team	Need clearly funded invest to save strategy for collaboration project. Additional staff resource procured to support key aspects of the project (e.g., HR and ICT consultancy resource) Appropriate business support to be put in place. Change to culture of councillors and officers to focus on prioritisation to support delivery of collaboration. Keep JMT structure change under review. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	9,10,19,22
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that the collaboration will impact on current projects/programmes which be delayed by diversion of capacity.	9	Leading to delays in achieving key objectives, which results in harm to the beneficiaries of those programmes.	<b>Ongoing:</b> individual council work programmes and corporate/service plans in place; clear programme management and reporting to senior management and councillors on progress of current service plans; adjusted work progs to suit current priority; financial recovery plan for GBC to progress its priorities; GBC has clear programme reporting through EPB; WBC has agreed service plans.	Joint Management Team	Early investment in the partnership so that it is not displacing resource from other key priorities. Review with councillors the existing priorities and agree where displacement may take place in a planned and agreed way. Identify any additional resource needed to support programme and project management in both authorities	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	4,8,23
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that due to concerns about the collaboration, knowledgeable officers may leave and we fail to recruit in a buoyant market.	10	Leading to missing information and dilution of 'corporate memory', which results in delays and confusion. Capacity gaps leading to service failure and impact on other staff	<b>Ongoing:</b> development of HR Workforce Strategy and plan, effective management of, and communication with, staff; maintain external contacts through Surrey networks	Joint Chief Executive	Continue to monitor the staff changes across the partnership particularly at management level. Proceed and deliver Programme at pace.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	8,22

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that one council's priorities will (or will be perceived to) dominate for a period	11	Which could result in conflict amongst members, resentment and potential dissolution of the partnership	<b>Ongoing:</b> regular communication with both Executives on specific local issues and priorities that arise; Joint S151 in place and weighted cost sharing protocols agreed for JMT members; joint comms plan being drafted	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	Action plan implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Shared annual business plans for each service agreed by the councils, clearly articulating the apportionment on planned projects. Transformation & Collaboration Programme to include actions to promote positive working culture in both orgs	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	4,5
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that working across two councils leads to increased travel	12	Which results in wasted time and negative impact on the environment.	<b>Ongoing:</b> encourage video-conferencing and home working; scheduling of committee calendars combined where possible; options analysis for single office for both councils underway	Joint Management Team	Standardised policies, approach and training to hybrid working across both authorities. Single location should be considered for any shared service and tools and systems harmonised. Consider further expanding electric vehicles within the fleet(s). Agreed protocol aimed at reducing multiple officer attendance at committees as well as consideration of earlier committee meeting start times e.g. 6pm and the implementation of guillotine time restriction	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	15
FINANCIAL	There is a risk that expected savings, beyond that of the JMT, cannot be realised at one or both councils	13	Which results in unexpected further pressure on services and undermines the partnership.	<b>Ongoing:</b> regular communication to both councils as to plans and progress; agreed IAA; JMT savings have been achieved; Joint S151 has been appointed and working towards standard financial reporting; criteria for business cases are being developed and will include cost sharing prior to approval	Joint Management Team	Standard financial reporting, forecast and assumptions to be used. Robust business cases documenting allocation of costs and savings. Standardisation of business cases and project management methodology. Detailed business cases to verify the savings identified in the LPP financial feasibility study. Savings based on movement from 2021-22 base budget for each council. Achieve political direction across both councils on single officer structure	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	4 - Devastating	High	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	14,23

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
FINANCIAL	There is a risk that costs of collaboration are prohibitively high	14	which results in a threat to the viability of some aspects of the collaboration for either or both councils, which results in an unviable partnership and reputational impact.	<b>Ongoing:</b> clear communication with councillors and the public throughout the partnership (comms plan being drafted); cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases	Joint Management Team	Avoid pursuing prohibitively expensive projects. Sensitivity analysis on estimates. Councillor involvement in working groups to look at each service/business case. Identify and include transition costs in business cases as they are developed. Agree and document a common approach to rate-of-return and cost/benefit sharing. Change the phasing of transition to reduce the impact of unexpected new costs that arise. Focus first on those areas that present the biggest 'win'	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	13,17,27
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that different HR and service policies lead to confusion and duplication,	15	resulting in inefficiency or failures of governance	<b>Completed:</b> decision made on employment policies that will apply to members of the JMT <b>Ongoing:</b> strong engagement with unions	Joint Management Team	Strong combined target operating model and cultural framework. A programme of policy harmonisation and standardisation wherever possible, recognising that this huge task will take time. A single shared intranet hub for managers to consult policies, with cross-references where they are different. Regular communication of policy changes. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure (decision on options analysis)	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	12,16
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that support functions and processes remain disparate during the collaboration leading to mis-application of policies/processes	16	resulting in confusion and potential challenge to decision-making.	<b>Completed:</b> Vision statement for both authorities contains the commitment to harmonise internal policies and procedures unless there is good reason not to <b>Ongoing:</b> strong and regular communication from the senior political and management; mapping of 'as is' to devise the 'to be'	Joint Management Team	Strong combined target operating model and cultural framework. A plan for an early harmonisation of HR, IT and change management functions and key policies, with accompanying significant financial investment. A single intranet. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure as a priority for support functions	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	15,20,27

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
SYSTEMS	There is a risk of failure to address the different legacy IT platforms	17	Which would lead to duplication/conflict in system usage within a shared service, resulting in inefficiency, anxiety and increased cost and increased risks in case management/ audits, customer service	<b>Ongoing:</b> review the costs and benefits of the current IT systems and their current contractual obligations; formation of IT Way Forward Group meeting (GBC and WBC) to collaborate.	Joint Management Team	Prioritise the transition programme based on the cost/benefit analysis. Develop and implement a new shared IT strategy that is focused on supporting the partnership and identify the resources required and return-on investment that is possible. Cost/benefits analysis will be a key part of business cases for change, including for IT.	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	14,23,27
CULTURE	There is a risk that councillors do not feel ownership of the collaboration	18	which results in mistrust and concerns about sovereignty, which results in destabilisation of the partnership.	<b>Completed:</b> clear and agreed governance principles and processes, including how councillors will be engaged in decision-making and scrutiny via existing committees or, if desired, shared committees. <b>Ongoing:</b> regular communication with councillors, parish councils and the public; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils, joint comms plan being drafted	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Harmonisation of roles and terms of reference of key council committees across councils e.g., CGSC / Audit committee ToRs to be similar. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered. Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity. O&S will scrutinise prior to final options being put to Executives	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	7
CULTURE	There is a risk that councillors will perceive that officers are less available to them	19	which results in delays and dissatisfaction, which results in harm to the how councillors perform in their role	<b>Ongoing:</b> clear expectations to be agreed, acknowledging that shared staff serving two councils may sometimes not be available; ensure that support to affected senior managers, via technology and assistants, is in place and supported adequately; consider developing an SLA between councillors and officers; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils. Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Guidance to be issued to councillors on how to make contact. Clear protocols on accessibility and building of resilience across officer tiers, so that the critical ward councillor role is prioritised throughout any transitions. Regular review and communication, to raise concerns, between lead members and CMB. Regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers, ensuring that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	5,8



Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
CULTURE	There is a risk that different officer cultures and organisational structures may hinder collaboration	20	which results in lack of prioritisation for the changes required, which results in delay, inefficiency and dissatisfaction.	<b>Completed:</b> recruitment of JMT clear direction from senior political and officer leadership. <b>Ongoing:</b> investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; agreed initial staff sharing arrangements; aligning structures where possible in preparation for collaboration	Joint Management Team	Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework along with performance management framework. Councillors to show leadership to support the collaboration. Recruitment of joint officers to reflect the required culture subject to business cases. An articulated change strategy including expected behavioural norms. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	16,21
CULTURE	There is a risk that officers may not trust those from the partner council	21	which results in failure to share key information and attrition, which results in delay and unhealthy cultures and behaviour.	<b>Completed:</b> Performance management meetings harmonised. <b>Ongoing:</b> clear direction from the political and senior management leadership as to the way forward; investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; best practice sharing opportunities and investment in building new teams through collaboration and current working environments.	Joint Chief Executive	Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework along with performance management framework. Councillors to show leadership to support the collaboration. Harmonise performance management processes. Consider data sharing agreement/terms to provide staff confidence in information sharing. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	20,22
CULTURE	There is a risk that employees will become increasingly anxious	22	which results in negative impacts on morale, which results in impact on service delivery, mental health concerns and loss of staff	<b>Ongoing:</b> a clear direction of travel from the political leaderships, with messages delivered consistently and clearly; regular communication from senior management and transparency with employees and unions about the plans, progress and impact on affected staff; review regularly the impact on service performance and be prepared to support and resource accordingly; continue with effective communication and briefing of staff and Councillors. joint comms plan being drafted. Monitor exit interviews & recruitment data; investment in HR support, investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change.	JCX / HR Managers	Progress to be swift so period of uncertainty minimised. Costing will affect this. (related to JMT). Acknowledging time to progress collaboration Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework. Promoting wellbeing activities Development of tier 4 manager development sessions	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	8,10,21

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
CULTURE	There is a risk that current programmes, project or systems, or past decisions are being implemented in a fixed way which constrains partnership options	23	Which results in compromises in the short term and failure to achieve the collaboration aims.	<b>Ongoing:</b> clear communication with the Executives; be prepared to be bold if the business case holds, with an agreed process for cost-sharing if necessary; phase the partnership accordingly; assessing partnership risk of collaboration opportunities	Joint Management Team	New business cases reviewed and clearly assessed how far there are new opportunities, as well as constraints, arising from legacy decisions; whether they permit or block a 'best of breed' approach and for how long.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	9,13,17
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that residents/ businesses will be confused between the two councils' services	24	Leading to miscommunication, which results in inefficiency.	<b>Ongoing:</b> clear communication on the nature and extent of the partnership, and the continuing importance of the role of ward councillors; points of access to access services need to be clear - e.g., Guildford residents can still access via GBC website and same for Waverley. Joint comms plan being drafted, including proposed joint branding. Comms leads from GBC and WBC on T&CP Team	JCX / Comms Leads	Review customer service points of access at each stage of collaboration. ICT synchronisation so that customers notice no change.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that significant events impact the collaboration	25	Leading to significant diversion of attention, which results in delays to the partnership transition	<b>Completed:</b> JMT recruited, T&CP Board established to manage and keep on track. <b>Ongoing:</b> clearly documented progress of the partnership; other collaboration agreements are being considered	Joint Management Team	An early and agreed plan for handling such an event.	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	26
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that the Government will restart 'local government reorganisation' leading to structural uncertainty and diversion from the collaboration's priorities	26	Which results in the abolition of the two councils and disruption to service delivery.	<b>Ongoing:</b> given that any future model is likely to include Guildford and Waverley within the same structure, plan the current collaboration so that it could also adapt to and be a strong voice within a new enforced unitary; regular communication with other government stakeholders (councils, DULHC, MPs) on the progress of this partnership.	JCX / Leaders	Ensuring work to design operating model and creating transformation creates a strong foundation for discussions about future LG reorg (relates to vision statement)	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	6,25

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January)	Other related risks
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that there is not an appropriate IT solution to enable the collaboration	27	Which would result in a threat to benefits realisation, operational service delivery and decision making, in addition to impacts on service delivery and inefficient working, especially as the collaboration progresses to realise the expected benefits	<b>Ongoing:</b> Formation of ICT board to consider plans moving forward for a harmonised/reconciled ICT platform or working with both current platforms	Joint Management Team	To confirm and document how both authorities will function, in terms of people, processes and technology, so that further change, transformation and collaboration activity in both councils will strategically align with that planned approach	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	14,16,17
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that there is not sufficient expertise and knowledge regarding collaborative working currently within staffing	28	Which could result in slow progress, uninformed decision-making and unnecessary risk		Joint Management Team	Request investment to bring in necessary expertise to inform collaboration	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	

This page is intentionally left blank

Theme	Risk	Revised Risk no	Consequence	Examples of risk	Mitigations	Risk owner	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Original risk(s)	Related risks	RAG comments
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the partnership lacks clear objectives (24.01.24)	1	which results in mission creep, inability to prioritise workstreams and success criteria, and/or the partnership ending or being delayed	Unclear success criteria for differentiating between options  the two councils disagreeing on an important aspect of the partnership.  future political change leads to a serious change of partnership direction.	<b>Current:</b> Shared Vision Statement reviewed at least annually by both council Executives; Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), new intake of councillors briefed on Collaboration; all councillor emails around milestones; T&CP Programme Structure; Programme Plan; SEMs  <b>Planned:</b> Business cases will be assessed according to agreed success criteria; CMB members in close contact with key councillors; regular joint informal Executive meetings scheduled	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX)/ Senior Cllr: Leaders	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	1,3,7	2,11	
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk collaboration ends (24.01.24)	2	Which results in greater financial pressure on both councils due to lower-than-expected benefits realisation, and reputational harm, increasing in impact with closer collaboration.	either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership and undo the current collaborative arrangements (e.g. JMT).  either or both councils will not continue with any collaboration	<b>Current:</b> First phase complete (JMT); Shared Vision Statement; IAA; SEMs; interim shared staffing arrangements agreed; adoption of T&CP  <b>Planned:</b> Regular contact between councillors in the Executives and wider councils; proactive comms with all stakeholders and the public; include gateway reviews at each stage before progressing to the next; ensure mechanism in governance arrangements for backbench councillor input; potential to focus more on each council's individual transformation programme; review of IAA  <b>Future:</b> Successful delivery of workstreams and business cases in the programme	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), 151 Officer and, Monitoring Officer Senior Cllr: Leaders	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2,6	1	As the collaboration progresses and moves forward, consequently there would be more to undo if the collaboration ended
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk collaboration will not be (legally and financially) fair (24.01.24)	3	which results in mistrust, dispute, distraction, and conflict amongst members	unfair costs, savings, resource from joint officers	<b>Current:</b> IAA; clear accounting through budget reports; weighted cost sharing protocols agreed for JMT members.  <b>Planned:</b> Business case development with cost and savings apportionment set out; action plans implemented where significant issues arise; CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs  <b>Future:</b> Keep cost allocation under review in budget planning; recognise ebb and flow to respond to needs of orgs and priorities; shared service management plans	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors and Joint S151 Officer	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	4,5,11		
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk collaboration will be perceived as unfair (for Councillors, staff, residents) (24.01.24)	4	which results in loss of motivation; bad feeling towards other council; complaints;	staff morale impact, increase in complaints, increase call-ins	<b>Current:</b> Regular comms between lead members and CMB  <b>Planned:</b> Joint comms plan in development  <b>Future:</b> Recognise ebb and flow to respond between lead members and CMB; transparency about the collaboration with O&S	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), HR Leads, Comms Leads Senior Cllr: Leaders	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	5 - High	2 - Significant	High			
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk service delivery/pre-existing work suffers due to pressures associated with collaboration (24.01.24)	5	resulting in negative impacts on service delivery, and morale.	officer capacity will be overstretched, distracted or unfocused during the transition  losing knowledgeable staff, corporate memory  BAU time taken up with collaboration work  reduced performance	<b>Current:</b> All staff briefings, T&CP  <b>Planned:</b> Option analysis for shared staffing in development; workforce Strategy in development; reporting on progress of current service plans; adjusted work programmes to suit current priority; keep JMT structure change under review; mechanism for EHoS' to report back to JMT on staff pressures  <b>Future:</b> Limited temporary resource agreed in T&CP Report; strategies for dealing with change; clearly funded invest to save strategy for T&CP; change to culture of councillors and officers; consider staff survey related to collaboration; consider staff induction item on collaboration	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Director (Transformation) & Governance) and Joint Executive Head of Service (Organisational Development) and HR leads	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	8,9,10	6,13,15	
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk non-collaborative projects and programmes of the council suffer due to collaborative work (24.01.24)	6	delays in achieving key objectives, which results in harm to the beneficiaries of those projects/programmes.	Current projects/programmes which may be delayed by diversion of capacity.  Reduced performance.	<b>Current:</b> T&CP Programme Structure; clear programme reporting for both councils through EPB (Enterprise Portfolio Board); clear Shared Vision Statement  <b>Planned:</b> Mitigations in each council's project/programme risk registers; option analysis for shared staffing in development; adjusted work programmes to suit current priority; keep JMT structure change under review  <b>Future:</b> Limited temporary resource agreed in T&CP Report; clearly funded invest to save strategy for T&CP; consider staff survey related to collaboration to achieve change to culture of councillors and officers	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	9	5	

Theme	Risk	Revised Risk no	Consequence	Examples of risk	Mitigations	Risk owner	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Original risk(s)	Related risks	RAG	Comments
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that the collaboration will not achieve its objective of delivering zero net carbon by 2030 (24.01.24)	7	which results in reduced likelihood of each council achieving its zero net carbon ambitions and continuation of carbon production	carbon output for both councils remaining above zero	<b>Current:</b> SEMs; working from home used as much as possible; committee calendars are combined where possible  <b>Planned:</b> Options analysis for shared HQ in development; standardised policies, approach to hybrid working; paper on harmonising Agile Working Policies going to CMB, 2 January 2024; consider further expanding electric vehicles within the fleet(s); agree protocol aimed at reducing multiple officer attendance at committees and consideration of earlier committee meeting start times.	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	12			
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk staff lack knowledge and expertise regarding collaboration (24.01.24)	8	Which could result in slow progress, uninformed decision-making and unnecessary risk	Reduced performance  Slow progress of the collaboration at both councils	<b>Current:</b> All staff briefings; dedicated Business Transformation team (WBC);  <b>Planned:</b> Next JGC meeting (January), to discuss T&CP resource; learning and development for staff (BT team and level below Executive Heads - including targeted comms)  <b>Future:</b> Investment to bring in necessary expertise to inform collaboration; strategies for dealing with change; fully resourced BT Teams at WBC & GBC	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors and Executive Heads of Service and HR Leads	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	28			
FINANCIAL	There is a risk expected collaboration savings cannot be realised at one or both councils (24.01.24)	9	which results in unexpected further pressure on services and undermines the partnership.	expected savings, beyond that of the JMT are not brought to bear or the sums required cannot be achieved through collaborative work	<b>Current:</b> First phase completed (JMT); T&CP Structure; updated MTFPs  <b>Planned:</b> Options analysis for shared staffing in development; regular communication to both councils as to plans and progress; joint S151 working towards standard financial reporting; criteria for business cases being developed  <b>Future:</b> Delivery of projects; fully resourced BT Teams at WBC & GBC	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors and Joint S151 Officer	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	4 - Devastating	High	13	9		Impact of not making the savings will be bigger as time passes and the budget gaps widen
FINANCIAL	There is a risk that costs of collaboration are prohibitively high (24.01.24)	10	which results in a threat to the viability of some aspects of the collaboration for either or both councils.	Effective and efficient IT solutions cannot be afforded  expert and specialist advice cannot be afforded  dual licences for software/programmes; IT kit for staff and councillors  costs relating to changing contracts cannot be afforded (e.g. compensation or redeployment and redundancy)	<b>Current:</b> EPB; flexibility within the T&CP to respond to available resources (Economic Case options of scaling up and down)  <b>Planned:</b> Transition cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases; avoid pursuing prohibitively expensive projects; sensitivity analysis on estimates; agree and document a common approach to rate-of-return and cost/benefit sharing; change the phasing of transition to reduce the impact of unexpected new costs that arise	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors and Joint S151 Officer	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	14	8		
SYSTEMS	There is a risk of errors borne from inefficiencies of using different platforms and processes across the two councils (24.01.24)	11	resulting in inefficiency, misuse of data and/or failures of governance	Inappropriate and ineffectual use of platforms or processes;  support functions and processes remain disparate during the collaboration leading to mis-application of policies, increase in data breaches or illegitimate decision-making	<b>Current:</b> Options analysis for shared staffing in development; reviews of constitutional and governance structures (by Joint Constitution Review Group); Joint IT Way Forward Group meeting  <b>Planned:</b> Strong and regular communication from the senior political and management; develop and implement a new shared IT strategy  <b>Future:</b> A programme of policy harmonisation and standardisation wherever possible; a single shared intranet hub; data sharing approach	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Strategic Director (Community Wellbeing) and Joint Executive Head of Service (Communications & Customer Services) <b>Senior Cllr:</b> Leaders	4-Medium	2- Significant	Medium	3-Critical	2- Significant	Medium	15,16,17,27	13,15		
CULTURE	There is a risk that the councillors do not feel engaged or informed regarding the collaboration and the changes it brings (24.01.24)	12	which results in mistrust, concerns about sovereignty, and unnecessary further changes in future.	Increase call ins and challenges to decisions, and an unhealthy level of change	<b>Current:</b> Commitment to consult O&S; clear and agreed governance principles and processes; SEMs agreed  <b>Planned:</b> Joint comms plan being developed; regular communication between CMB with councillors, parish councils and the public; networking meetings in both councils; ward councillor role prioritised throughout transitions  <b>Future:</b> Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees; councillor briefing sessions	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors <b>Senior Cllr:</b> Leaders and Portfolio Holders for Organisational Development	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	18,19	1		

Theme	Risk	Revised Risk no	Consequence	Examples of risk	Mitigations	Risk owner	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Original risk(s)	Related risks	RAG	comments
CULTURE	There is a risk the differences between the two councils hinder the collaboration (24.01.24)	13	which results in lack of prioritisation for the changes required and results in failure to share key information and attrition.	officers may not trust those from the partner council and inability to find compatible ways of working; duplication for senior staff.	<b>Current:</b> Initial staff sharing arrangements agreed; performance management meetings harmonised; IAA; clear political direction as to the way forward <b>Planned:</b> Options analysis for shared staffing structure in development <b>Future:</b> Identify best practice sharing opportunities; joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework; develop an articulated change strategy including expected behavioural norms; consider staff survey related to collaboration	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Executive Heads of Service	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	20,21	9		
CULTURE	There is a risk the changes and the work required to achieve them will cause staff wellbeing to deteriorate (24.01.24)	14	which results in negative impacts on morale, which impacts on service delivery	employees will become increasingly anxious and stressed, mental health concerns and loss of staff	<b>Current:</b> All staff briefings; HR monitoring exit interviews & recruitment data; Wellbeing Group promoting wellbeing activities (WBC); T&CP report release investment for T&CP limited resource <b>Planned:</b> Joint comms plan in development; transparency with employees and unions about plans, from senior management; regularly review impact on service performance; period of uncertainty minimised by progress <b>Future:</b> Investment in HR support, investment in organisational change management; Joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework; Tier 4 (WBC)/Band 6 (GBC) manager development sessions; less subjective survey/measure of staff wellbeing; promotion of wellbeing activities across both organisations	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), HR Leads	6 - Very High	2 - Significant	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	22	5		
CULTURE	There is a risk collaboration options are restricted by current or past decisions or non-aligned decision making processes	15	Which results in compromises in the short term and failure to achieve the collaboration aims	current programmes, projects or systems, or past decisions are implemented in a fixed way that is costly, time-consuming or legally difficult to undo)	<b>Current:</b> EPB; regular monitoring of service plans; T&CP risk register, reviewed by JGC, informal joint Executive meetings, aligned specific Council meetings <b>Planned:</b> Review constraints through business cases and those arising from legacy decisions, phase Programme accordingly, SEMs	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Executive Heads of Service	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	23			
EXTERNAL	There is a risk residents will be negatively impacted by the collaboration (24.01.24)	16	Resulting in dissatisfaction with services and reputational damage	residents will be confused between the two councils' services businesses will be confused between the two councils' services inconvenience, confusion and/or cost to residents	<b>Current:</b> Comms leads from GBC and WBC in T&CP Team. <b>Planned:</b> Joint comms plan in development, including joint branding; points of access for service users clear <b>Future:</b> ICT synchronisation, so customers notice no change; review customer service points of access at each stage of collaboration; recognition of comms around individual business cases	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Comms Leads	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	24	5		
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that significant events impact the collaboration (24.01.24)	17	leading to significant diversion of attention from the collaboration's priorities	the Government will restart 'local government reorganisation', national political change, change in political in one of both authorities or senior leadership	<b>Current:</b> First phase completed (JMT); T&CP Board; IAA; Shared Vision Statement. <b>Planned:</b> Plan current collaboration so it could adapt; regular communication with government stakeholders (councils, DULHC, MPs) on progress of partnership	<b>Primary officer owner:</b> Joint Chief Executive (JCX), Joint Strategic Directors and Executive Heads of Service <b>Senior Cllr:</b> Leaders	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	25,26	1		

Theme	Risk	Revised Risk no	Consequence	Examples of risk	Mitigations	Risk owner	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Original risk(s)	Related risks	RAG comments
-------	------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------	------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------	--------------

**Likelihood**

Score	Likelihood	Indicators
1	Almost impossible	Less than 1% chance of occurring Has happened rarely/never before
2	Very low	1-10% change of occurring Only likely to happen once in three or more years May have happened in the past
3	Low	10-20% chance of occurring Reasonable possibility it will happen in the next three years Has happened in the past
4	Medium	20-50% chance of occurring Likely to happen at some point in the next one-two years Circumstances occasionally encountered
5	High	50-80% chance of occurring Almost certain to happen within next 12 months Regular occurrences frequently encountered
6	Very high	Above 80% chance of occurring Inevitable it will happen within the next 6 months No influence/control over event occurring

**Impact**

Score	Impact	Indicators
1	Small	Loss <£200k Trivial breach or non-compliance Insignificant injury (first aid) Negligible disruption/unnoticed by service users Insignificant damage
2	Significant	Loss from £200k-£500k Isolated legal action or regulatory breach Minor injury (medical attention) Small disruption/inconvenience to service One-off adverse local publicity
3	Critical	Loss >£500k- £1m Sustained legal action or (limited) regulatory fine Serious injury (not life threatening) Substantial, short-term disruption/inconvenience to service Short-term, but wide reaching adverse publicity
4	Devastating	Loss >£1m Major legal action or regulatory sanction Death(s) or multiple serious injuries Major, sustained disruption/serious inconvenience to service Major, long-term damage

**Risk Matrix**

Likelihood		Impact			
		Small	Significant	Critical	Devastating
		1	2	3	4
Very high	6	5	12	18	24
High	5	5	10	15	20
Medium	4	4	8	12	16
Low	3	3	6	9	12
Very low	2	2	4	6	8
Almost impossible	1	1	2	3	4

Total overall current risk rating value 158

Total overall residual risk rating value 112