

Project Name: OneTeam Transformation Programme  
Version Date: 06.02.24

| No. | Programme/<br>Workstream/<br>Driver | Description of Risk  | Potential Impact   | Baseline Score |            |                    | Mitigating Actions   | Risk Owner | Revised Score  |                    |                    | Latest 31.01.24 |                   |                   | Trend | Notes   |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------|------------|--------------------|--|------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|
|     |                                     |  |  | Impact         | Likelihood | Initial Risk Score |  |            | Revised Impact | Revised Likelihood | Revised Risk Score | Latest Impact   | Latest Likelihood | Latest Risk Score |       |   |
| R15 | HR and Workforce Development        | Policy framework and terms and conditions are not resolved   | Slippage and reduction in staff morale   | 5              | 4          | 20                 | HR and Workforce Development Workstream will specifically address this risk and considered within service reviews  | HR & WD WL | 3              | 2                  | 6                  | 3               | 1                 | 3                 | ↓     | 1.2.23 - Key terms and conditions agreed by both Council Dec 22. 29.11.23 - Work continuing to complete Ts & Cs. 31.01.24 - Plan to implement over coming year.                   |
| R29 | Programme                           | The programme no long delivers the benefits targets required by one partner authority, e.g. lack of savings against services with an imbalance in resource between councils.                                     | One partner withdraws from the Transformation Programme preventing completion and delivery of benefits for OneTeam and the other partner.  | 5              | 4          | 20                 | A number of growth bids have been presented as part of service reviews impacting required savings for the relevant authority in each case. This is under discussion with the Programme Board to ensure expectations of all are managed and clear direction is given where savings are not possible to deliver.             | PS         | 5              | 3                  | 15                 | 5               | 4                 | 20                | ↑     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Estimate of future service review profiles suggests increased challenge in delivering savings based on team structure alone.                      |
| WR1 | Timescales/ Resource & Finance      | Insufficient time within the Check & Challenge process to review and recheck business Cases before submission to Project Team/Programme Board.   | Lack of clarity/accuracy of the proposal, including financial information, being progressed.   | 5              | 4          | 20                 | Ensure Check & Challenge group is updated on actions taken following the Check & Challenge session and that final versions of business cases are shared.   | SDWL       | 5              | 2                  | 10                 | 5               | 1                 | 5                 | ↓     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Project Team feedback to Check & Challenge group implemented.   |
| WR2 | Timescales/ Process                 | Business cases are submitted for approval without complete information/documentation to ensure approval milestones are met, e.g. job evaluations.  | Expected benefits are not possible to deliver, potential additional costs are incurred and service reviews may have to be revisited. Ultimately the success of the programme will be undermined.   | 5              | 4          | 20                 | The requirement for all business cases to be complete before proceeding is clearly stated. Any changes following each stage (e.g. Check & Challenge), must be reported back to that group for final approval before proceeding further.  | SDWL       | 5              | 2                  | 10                 | 5               | 2                 | 10                | ↔     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Expectations continue to be set for each stage of submission.   |
| WR3 | Resource & Finance                  | There is insufficient resource to complete service reviews or implementation.  | Business as usual is impacted and/or programme delivery is delayed, which may also impact budgets if savings aren't delivered in a timely manner.  | 5              | 4          | 20                 | SDWL continues to work with directors to identify where additional resource could be applied from the programme to alleviate this risk.  | SDWL       | 3              | 2                  | 6                  | 3               | 2                 | 6                 | ↔     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Programme review to confirm approach to proceed. Resource implications will need to be understood.  |
| WR4 | Staff Morale                        | The level of demand on officers to deliver ongoing significant change (not just for OneTeam) while maintaining service levels is cumulatively reducing staff resilience.   | Staff do not feel valued or that they are an asset to the organisation(s). Potential opportunities from the OneTeam programme are not understood as staff are overwhelmed, risking low morale, higher sickness and turnover.   | 5              | 4          | 20                 | A number of support resources are available, but clear and ongoing communication from CLT and team managers is essential to support staff and monitor individual situations and concerns. BBC FAIR & RDC Executive report regarding support for the organisation based on analysis of staff turnover etc. also available.  | SRO        | 3              | 3                  | 9                  | 3               | 3                 | 9                 | ↔     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Programme review to confirm approach to proceed. Resource implications will need to be understood.  |
| WR5 | Staff Morale/ Leadership/ Process   | Perception of inconsistent or limited communication from Directors and Managers fuels uncertainty, anxiety and lack of trust amongst staff.  | Staff uncertainty and discontent increases sickness, turnover, decreases productivity and generally negatively across the organisation. Creates difficulty to deliver the Programme and operationally and staff disengage from the process also impacting the benefits achievable. | 5              | 4          | 20                 | Corporate communications and HR continuing to work with CLT to ensure regular and consistent messaging via a variety of channels. BBC FAIR & RDC Executive report regarding support for the organisation based on analysis of staff turnover etc. also available.  | HR&WF      | 5              | 3                  | 15                 | 5               | 3                 | 15                | ↔     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Mitigating action ongoing.  |
| WR6 | Staff Morale                        | Uncertainty over the likely outcome of service reviews as well as concerns and fears around the process make it challenging for managers to maintain and build optimism, even as reviews progress.               | Staff uncertainty and discontent increases sickness, turnover, decreases productivity and generally negatively across the organisation. Creates difficulty to deliver the Programme and operationally and staff disengage from the process also impacting the benefits achievable. | 5              | 4          | 20                 | Corporate communications and HR to develop Internet and other content to support officers' understanding of processes, e.g. consultation to improve understanding and manage expectations. BBC FAIR & RDC Executive report regarding support for the organisation based on analysis of staff turnover etc. also available. | HR&WF      | 5              | 3                  | 15                 | 5               | 4                 | 20                | ↑     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Programme review to confirm approach to proceed. Latest staff communications dependent on outcome and will be essential to ongoing staff support. |
| WR8 | Leadership                          | Perceived lack of ownership and direction for the Programme and changing objectives undermine support for individual services reviews, e.g. whether savings, joint working, sustainability etc are the priority. | Business cases are presented and approved or not without application of the methodology and the ability to prioritise the design principles, potentially risking failure of the Programme and/or rejection at later  | 5              | 4          | 20                 | The governance of Check & Challenge, Project Team and Programme Board review ensures all key parties have the opportunity to challenge every business case. Assessment of the likely financial models (growth or saving) for all business cases currently in progress to be completed.                                     | SDWL       | 4              | 4                  | 16                 | 4               | 4                 | 16                | ↔     | 19.12.23 - New risk. 31.01.24 - Programme review to confirm approach to proceed.  |

**Definitions**

| Impact           | Likelihood     | Key  | Name, Position  |
|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 1 Minor Slippage | Rare           | Project Sponsor                            | Jonathan Stephenson, CEO                              |
| 2 Minor          | Unlikely       | Senior Responsible Officer                 | Emily Yule, Strategic Director                        |
| 3 Moderate       | Moderate       | HR & Workforce Development Workstream Lead | Nichola Mann, Acting Director - People and Governance |
| 4 Major          | Likely         | Service Delivery Workstream Lead           | Greg Campbell - Director - Policy & Delivery          |
| 5 Catastrophic   | Almost Certain | Communication & Engagement Workstream Lead | Leona Murray-Green, Comms Manager                     |

| Risk Score               |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Risk score has increased | ↑ |
| Risk score is unchanged  | ↔ |
| Risk score has decreased | ↓ |