Risk Register

| No | Risk description | Impact | Probability | Impact | Impact Area | Mitigating Action | Post Mitigation Risk Rating |
|----|---|---|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Transformation causes disruption in core social work activity | Delayed or inappropriate assessments; ineffective social work practice; poor Ofsted inspection | L | Н | Social work practice | We have planned a phase approach to the transformation, starting with Early Help practices. This will reduce the pressure on safeguarding and permanence social work teams. We have also included significant transformation resource to smooth the transition period, including management backfill, a project lead, business support, and enablers in five different areas. This will ensure that there is consistent and full focus on core social work activities during the transformation period. | A |
| 2 | Partner agencies unable / unwilling to joint LIST project | Limited effectiveness of hub model to coordinate services for users | L | M | Early Help hubs | Torbay is the national leader on integration between health and social care services (starting with adult care). We have already undertaken significant partner engagement and identified clear interest in this model. We will conduct intensive partner engagement from the outset, with monthly meetings to maintain momentum. | G |
| 3 | Inability fo find suitable sites for hubs or issues with the sites | Hub model effectiveness weakened by use of inappropriate sites | L | M | Early Help hubs | Initial hub sites have already been identified. There are a wide range of back-up options, including Children's Centre sites, schools, and other facilities that would be suitable in each of the three key localities. | G |
| 4 | Delays in the set-up of the LIST and/or hubs | Delay in the benefits of the Early Help practices for users | M | L | Early Help hubs | Many of the key elements for this programme are ready to go - the LIST structure is in place; partners are engaged; and hub sites have been identiifed. We will bring on transformation resource (project lead, business support, enablers) immediately to ensure implementation according to plan | G |
| 5 | IT systems of different agencies unable to inter-operate | Reduced efficiency of operations; weakened ability to collect data and manage performance | M | M | Early Help hubs | We plan to adapt an existing system that has already been tested in multiple agencies | А |
| 6 | Hubs generate increased demand for services by being more accessible to users | Increased cost; reduced ability to respond quickly to demand | M | M | Early Help hubs | The LIST structure will enable more consistent and coherent threshold management across agencies. This will allow us to meet any increase in demand by ensuring referrals get access to appropriate services without duplication and without cycling through multiple inappropriate services | A |
| 7 | Staff not bought into to the hub model | Staff do not use hub model as an opportunity to improve coordination of | L | M | Early Help hubs | We will conduct a number of staff engagement sessions in small and large groups. Given Torbay's track record of integrated services, we believe staff will embrace this | G |

| | | services, reducing effectiveness of model | | | | opportunity. | |
|----|--|---|---|---|--------------------|--|---|
| 8 | Different stakeholders (e.g., children and young people, carers, families) not effectively engaged | Sub-optimal use of hubs by different groups; potential opposition to the model, leading to reduced political and public support | L | M | Early Help hubs | We are committed to co-producing this model with all relevant stakeholders. We have planned a number of co-production workshops from March to May to ensure key decisions are taken with the support of stakeholders | G |
| 9 | Budget and authority not fully devolved to LIST | Use of LIST structure as legal entity to hold budgetary and other responsibilities is key to achieving outcomes from this model | М | M | Early Help hubs | The LIST entity has political support. We will conduct intensive partner engagement to ensure the benefits of devolving budgets, staff, and other responsibilites are fully understood | A |
| 10 | Lack of effective joined-up governance / engagement from different agencies | Opportunities for improved coordination less likely to be realised | L | M | Early Help hubs | The use of LIST as an independent entity creates a structural link betweeen agencies, improving coordination | G |
| 11 | External events (e.g., Ofsted inspection, change in central or local government policy) disrupt transformation | Transformation either delayed or benefits reduced | M | M | Early Help hubs | Cross-party political support will be established up-front; we will proceed to a rapid launch of the hubs to gain momentum | A |
| 12 | Partner agencies attempt to recover any savings achieved by LIST to benefit their own budgets | If LIST cannot retain savings, its funding will be less sustainable in the longer term; it will also be harder to attract social investment | M | M | Early Help hubs | The business plan, which will include the retention of potential savings by hubs, will be agreed by partners up front | A |
| 13 | Programme not sustainable after DfE funding ends | Programme reduced in scale/scope post- DfE funding, reducing long-term benefits | M | M | Early Help hubs | We will appoint a business development officer to seek opportunities to raise new revenues post-DfE funding | A |
| 14 | Evaluation shows no significant positive impact or is not able to effectively measure impact | Loss of political / public support for continuation of programme | L | M | Early Help hubs | Data collection protocols will be established in conjunction with the evaluator up-front; an interim evaluation will be published to allow for course correction | G |
| 15 | Programme does not effectively scale | Limited wider impact of programme beyond Torbay Early Help referrals | M | M | Early Help hubs | Scaling workshops will start in September and will continue through to year 2; the LIST structure will be designed to enable scaling and replication in other areas | A |
| 16 | LIST strcture becomes additional layer, rather than reducing bureaucracy | Benefits of improved coordination, more rapid decision-making do not materialise | L | M | Early Help hubs | The LIST will control staff and budget, enabling it to effectively manage services without waiting for decisions from partner agencies; partners will provide strategic direction via LIST governance. The LIST entity will be within an existing structure, the Integrated Care Organisation (ICO) to avoid creating new layers | G |

| 17 | Interagency working remains difficult because the language, | Reduced benefits from improved | M | M | Early | The legal entity nature of the LIST creates a new, | A |
|----|---|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------|---|---|
| | culture, disciplines and performance frameworks of different | interagency working | | | Help hubs | transformational opportunity to integrate different working | |
| | agencies are deeply ingrained; hard to hold risk in the | | | | | practices, cultures, and performance frameworks into one | |
| | community without one agency "holding the reins" | | | | | structure. Our risk management approach will mirror existing | |
| | | | | | | Social Work Practices, which have proved the model can | |
| | | | | | | effectively hold risk in the community | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Interagency trust required for transformation may take longer | Delayed benefits from improved | L | M | Early | We have requested funding for "enablers" in different areas | G |
| | than expected | interagency working | | | Help hubs | (e.g., health, social care) to forge strong links between different | |
| | | | | | | agencies during the transformation phase. This will help to | |
| | | | | | | build trust and integrate working practices more quickly. | |
| | | | | | | | |