Risk Supporting Statement: SR17   **Risk Owner: Director of Community and Children's Services**

		Gross Risk	R
Risk	Safeguarding relating to the protection of adults at risk adults and children - risk of failure of city of London Safeguarding Policy and/or practice leading to death, serious injury or harm.	**Likelihood**	**Impact**
	Links to: Strategic Aim SR2 and Key Policy Priority KPP2	3	5
Detail	Failure to follow the arrangements in place designed to prevent harm to children and adults at risk could leak to harm to our service users and risk of damage to the City of London's reputation, possible investigation and lack of public confidence in the services provided.		

Issues	Controls
Some weaknesses have been identified in embedding safeguarding across the City of London and within the schools located within the City. Training with funding provided from the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board for governors has commissioned and will be ongoing, the first session has been delivered.	An initial meeting of the safeguarding sub-committee of the Community and Children's Services Committee took place in September 2013 to overview policies and arrangements for safeguarding within the City of London. A Safeguarding Policy is being presented to the Chief Officers Group on 19 March for approval. An awareness raising campaign will be launched in April signposting staff, partners and the public to the safeguarding policy which will be made available on the website with a list of FAQs. Primarily the risk sits with Adults and Children's Services but other departments provide services to children and adults at risk and Community and Children's Services department will be working with departments such as Libraries, Culture and Heritage and Open Spaces to embed safeguarding best practice. Training and support will be provided to safeguarding champions to be appointed from appropriate departments. Social Care is also working with other partners such as health, housing, the City of London Police and the voluntary sector commissioning training and monitoring reports of harm. Social care is meeting on a termly basis with City schools including the Guildhall School of Music & Drama and training for school governors has commenced.

Summary		Net Risk	A
Work is ongoing to embed safeguarding issues within the City of London and Schools located in the City. This will be supported by the introduction of the Corporate Safeguarding Policy, when approved, and the implementation of the associated training and communication plans. Annual reports on both Adult and Children's safeguarding have been reported to the Safeguarding sub committee in September to report on progress and to update the cross partnership training planned.		**Likelihood**	**Impact**
		1	5
		Control Evaluation	
		A	

Guidance Notes

The following notes have been prepared to assist users of this document.

Risk Register Headings	Description
Risk No.	Unique reference for the risk.
Risk Details	Description of the risk.
Gross Risk	Assessment of the risk before taking into account any existing mitigating controls, Likelihood and Impact having been assessed against the risk assessment framework.
Risk Owner	Officer responsible for the overall management of specific risks
Control Owner	Officer responsible for coordinating the activity to control the risk
Existing Controls	Controls in place to mitigate the risk.
Net Risk	Assessment of the risk having taken into account the mitigating controls in place.
Risk Status & Direction	Overall status of Red, Amber or Green calculated in accordance with the assessment of Likelihood and Impact, having applied the risk assessment matrix.
Planned Action	Details of further action required to mitigate the risk to an acceptable level.
Control Evaluation	An assessment of the adequacy of controls in place

Ratings	Risk Status	Control Evaluation
R	High risk, requiring constant monitoring and deployment of robust control measures.	Existing controls are not satisfactory
A	Medium risk, requiring at least quarterly monitoring, further mitigation should be considered.	Existing controls require improvement/Mitigating controls identified but not yet implemented fully
G	Low risk, less frequent monitoring, consideration may be given to applying less stringent control measures for efficiency gains.	Robust mitigating controls are in place with positive assurance as to their effectiveness

Guidance Notes

Likelihood Scores	Description
1 Rare	Robust mitigating controls in place, the risk may occur only in exceptional circumstances, (e.g. not likely to occur within a 10 year period or no more than once across the current portfolio of projects).
2 Unlikely	Adequate mitigating controls in place, the risk may occur in remote circumstances (e.g. risk may occur once within a 7-10 year period or once across a range of similar projects).
3 Possible	Reasonable mitigating controls in place, but may still require improvement. External factors may result in an inability to influence likelihood of occurrence (e.g. risk event could occur at least once over a 4-6 year period or several times across the current portfolio of projects).
4 Likely	Mitigating controls are inadequate to prevent risk from occurring, the risk may have occurred in the past (e.g. risk event could occur at least once over a 2-3 year period or several times across a range of similar projects).
5 Almost Certain	Mitigating controls do not exist or are wholly ineffective to prevent risk from occurring. The risk has occurred recently or on multiple past occasions (e.g. risk event will occur at least once per year or within a project life cycle).

Impact Scores	Description
1 Insignificant	An event where the impact can be easily absorbed without management effort.
2 Minor	Impact can be readily absorbed although some management input or diversion of resources from other activities may be required. The event would not delay or adversely affect a key operation or core business activity.
3 Moderate	An event where the impact cannot be managed under normal operating conditions, requiring some additional resource or Senior Management input or creating a minor delay to an operation or core business activity.
4 Major	Major event or serious problem requiring substantial management/Chief Officer effort and resources to rectify. Would adversely affect or significantly delay an operation and/or core business activity or result in failure to capitalise on a business opportunity.
5 Catastrophic	Critical issue causing severe disruption to the City of London, requiring almost total attention of the Leadership Team/Court of Common Council and significant effort to rectify. An operation or core business activity would not be able to go ahead if this risk materialised.

Strategic Risk Profile

		Likelihood				
		Rare (1)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Almost Certain (5)
Impact	Catastrophic (5)	Amber	Red	Red	Red	Red
	Major (4)	Amber	Amber	Amber	Red	Red
	Moderate (3)	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Red
	Minor (2)	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber
	Insignificant (1)	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber

Key	**Red / High Risk**	**Amber / Medium Risk**	**Green / Low Risk**