## **ASSESSMENT OF RISKS**

The MTFS will always contain a significant degree of risk. The finance system within which the city council works is complex and sensitive to a range of variables. There is relative uncertainty over the level of government funding after 2015/16 which will be determined after the 2015 General Election but it is inevitable that all local authorities will experience further significant reductions in government grants. In general, factors that can have a material effect on the financial position of an authority include:

- The lack of certainty in future resource levels and future grant distribution models
- Changes in function & funding
- Changes in how services are funded
- Changes in the economy including the impact on business rates income
- The level of future successful appeals against the business rating list
- Levels of house building on both council tax and new homes bonus
- Achievement of performance targets for performance related funding
- Climate change
- Unmanaged service pressures
- Decisions on council tax

Risks to the MTFS arise from both external and internal factors. External risks include, for example, Government policy decisions that have an adverse impact on the council. External risks are generally the most difficult to manage and plan for.

Internal risks can also arise for a number of reasons, such as cost overruns or changing priorities. They may also be influenced by external factors. It is vital to have adequate mechanisms to manage internal risks if financial stability is to be achieved. There are a number of ways in which the effects of risks can be managed and these are set out in the following risk table. Furthermore, the city council's MTFS aims to minimise the impact of some of the major financial risks and impact on the delivery of the city's Corporate Plan commitments.

However, the forecasts within the MTFS are based on assumptions that reflect the most likely position based on current knowledge and therefore there are also opportunities if any of the forecasts overstate actual expenditure or under-estimate actual income.

| Risk                        | Likelihood    | Impact         | Risk  | Possible Impact on             | Mitigation / Management      |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                             | of            |                |       | Financial Strategy             |                              |
|                             | occurrence    |                | (L)   |                                |                              |
|                             | (L)           | (I)            | X (I) |                                |                              |
| Potential Risks affecting   | 2015/16 onwai | rds            |       |                                |                              |
| Collection of council tax   | 3             | 4              | 12    | Would require reductions in    | Close monitoring of the      |
| falls due to the continuing |               | 0.1% reduction |       | the budget for the following   | collection fund, including   |
| squeeze on household        |               | in council tax |       | year                           | council tax payers under the |
| budgets and further         |               | collection =   |       |                                | CTR scheme and changes       |
| changes to discounts and    |               | £0.1m          |       |                                | to discounts and             |
| exemptions agreed in        |               |                |       |                                | exemptions. Additional debt  |
| December, resulting in a    |               |                |       |                                | collection resources         |
| deficit on the collection   |               |                |       |                                | provided and appropriate     |
| fund                        |               |                |       |                                | communication, advice and    |
|                             |               |                |       |                                | collection strategies agreed |
|                             |               |                |       |                                | to minimise impact           |
| Council tax base is lower   | 3             | 3              | 9     | Would require reductions in    | Close monitoring of the      |
| than anticipated e.g.       |               | 0.1% reduction |       | budgets for the following year | collection fund and checking |
| lower number of new         |               | in council tax |       |                                | validity of exemptions and   |
| properties / more student   |               | collection =   |       |                                | discounts particularly new   |
| exempt properties / more    |               | £0.1m          |       |                                | property developments,       |
| discounts awarded /         |               |                |       |                                | student numbers, CTR         |
| higher numbers entitled     |               |                |       |                                | discounts and empty          |
| to CTR discounts,           |               |                |       |                                | discounts.                   |
| resulting in a deficit on   |               |                |       |                                | Working with further         |
| the collection fund         |               |                |       |                                | education establishments to  |
|                             |               |                |       |                                | develop more dedicated       |
|                             |               |                |       |                                | student accommodation        |

| Risk  | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence<br>(L) | Impact<br>(I)   | Risk<br>(L)<br>X (I) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy   | Mitigation / Management   |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|---|
| Increased insurance<br>premiums as a result of<br>national or international<br>storm damage claims<br>over the longer term  | 4                                     | 3<br>30% increase =<br>£0.13m                                   | 12                   | Would require compensating savings to be identified in 2015/16 and future years.   | Consider options such as<br>retendering and self-<br>insurance to minimise<br>potential cost increases<br>Continued emphasis on risk<br>management to help prevent<br>future claims |
| Long term borrowing<br>rates higher than<br>anticipated   | 3                                     | 2<br>0.1% higher =<br>£0.02m for £20m                           | 6                    | Would increase borrowing<br>costs budget over the long-<br>term<br>Would hinder business cases<br>involving borrowing and make<br>invest to save schemes less<br>financially attractive    | Closely monitor long term<br>borrowing rates and future<br>borrowing requirements to<br>help identify the best time to<br>borrow  |
| <ul> <li>Services fail to operate<br/>within set budgets due to:</li> <li>Increased service<br/>demand</li> <li>Price variations</li> <li>Unachieved income<br/>levels</li> <li>Unachieved savings</li> </ul> | 3                                     | 4<br>1% overspend<br>on net GF<br>budget = £2.20m<br>in 2015/16 | 12                   | Departmental service<br>pressures that can only be<br>met through additional<br>resources, such as the risk<br>provisions, or savings<br>elsewhere in the budget.<br>Reduction in reserves | Monitor corporate critical<br>budgets and overall budget<br>through TBM.<br>Identify action plans to<br>mitigate cost pressures.  |

| Risk  | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence<br>(L) | Impact<br>(I)  | Risk<br>(L)<br>X (I) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy  | Mitigation / Management   |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|---|---|
| Waste tonnages higher<br>than projected resulting in<br>additional disposal costs   | 2                                     | 4<br>1% increase in<br>tonnage per<br>annum = £0.7m<br>p.a. over life of<br>contract   | 8                    | Would increase the waste<br>disposal budget and<br>compensating savings would<br>need to be identified<br>elsewhere in the budget   | Provision for higher<br>tonnages made in<br>assessment of waste PFI<br>reserve<br>Monitor and identify specific<br>areas of growth and<br>undertake waste<br>minimisation and further<br>recycling measures |
| Continuing squeeze on<br>household incomes and<br>difficult trading conditions<br>on the high street has a<br>greater than anticipated<br>impact on collection of<br>income and commercial<br>rents | 3                                     | 4<br>1% reduction in<br>income = £1m<br>1% reduction in<br>commercial rents<br>= £0.1m | 12                   | Services would need to<br>identify compensating savings<br>and in particular look at<br>whether expenditure could be<br>reduced in those income<br>generation areas or<br>alternatively reviewing fees<br>and charges tariffs and<br>policies in year | Identify action plans to<br>mitigate income and rent<br>shortfalls  |

| Risk   | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence<br>(L) | Impact<br>(I)  | Risk<br>(L)<br>X (I) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy   | Mitigation / Management  |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| The uncertainties within<br>housing market, changes<br>in housing benefit and<br>welfare reform create<br>spending pressures<br>within the budget e.g.<br>homelessness | 4                                     | 4<br>10% increase in<br>net<br>homelessness<br>budget = £0.4m      | 16                   | Would create additional<br>pressures in the Housing<br>Strategy and potentially other<br>related budgets which would<br>need to find compensating<br>savings                           | Assess the potential impact<br>of proposed changes to the<br>housing benefit system /<br>welfare reform and plan and<br>lobby accordingly. A range of<br>additional discretionary<br>funds set aside to be<br>directed to most appropriate<br>area as needed |
| Reduction in Better Care<br>Fund (BCF) through<br>failure to achieve<br>performance targets may<br>impact on CCG funding<br>for protection of social<br>care           | 3                                     | 4<br>CCG amount<br>subject to<br>achievement of<br>targets = £1.3m | 12                   | Would reduce the CCG's<br>flexibility of funding to support<br>Adult Social Care and<br>therefore impact on the<br>councils financial position.  | Working with Health on the<br>Better Care Fund plan<br>through the Health &<br>Wellbeing Board   |
| Major civil incident occurs<br>e.g. storm, flooding, riot  | 2                                     | 4<br>Estimated<br>"Bellwin"<br>threshold =<br>£0.7m                | 8                    | Budget overspend/reduction in<br>reserves<br>Pressures on other budgets<br>The council would have to<br>meet the costs of uninsured<br>risks in addition to the<br>"Bellwin" threshold | Ensure adequate levels of<br>reserves to cover threshold<br>expenditure<br>Ensure appropriate<br>insurance cover is in place<br>and that the Insurance Fund<br>is sufficient to cover<br>uninsured risks   |

| Risk   | Likelihood<br>of  | Impact  | Risk         | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy   | Mitigation / Management  |
|--|-------------------|---|--------------|--|--|
|  | occurrence<br>(L) | (I)   | (L)<br>X (I) |  |  |
| Severe winter weather<br>places additional<br>spending pressures on<br>winter maintenance and<br>other budgets across the<br>council | 3                 | 3<br>Depends on<br>severity of<br>weather event<br>and length of<br>cold snap | 9            | Need to use reserves in one-<br>off risk provisions  | Advance planning to<br>minimise possible disruption  |
| Cost overruns occur on schemes in the agreed capital programme   | 2                 | 3<br>1% cost overrun<br>on total<br>programme =<br>£1.2m                      | 6            | Reserves or other capital<br>resources redirected to fund<br>overspend<br>Unable to meet capital<br>investment needs | Effective cost control and<br>expenditure monitoring.<br>Flexibility within programme<br>to re-profile expenditure if<br>necessary.                    |
| Capital receipts lower<br>than anticipated   | 3                 | 4<br>10% reduction in<br>receipts = £1.0m<br>in 15/16                         | 12           | Fewer resources available for<br>transport programme,<br>workstyles and other strategic<br>funds                     | Flexible capital programme<br>that allows plans to be<br>reduced or re-profiled.<br>Alternative site disposal<br>plans capable of being<br>accelerated |

| Risk  | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence<br>(L) | Impact<br>(I)   | Risk<br>(L)<br>X (I) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy  | Mitigation / Management  |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Income from business<br>rates is lower than<br>expected due to<br>successful rating appeals<br>/ redevelopment of<br>existing sites gives<br>temporary reduction /<br>collection performance<br>declines                            | 3                                     | 3<br>1% of forecast<br>retained<br>business rates<br>income = £0.5m | 9                    | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year | Make appropriate provisions<br>in resource forecasts<br>Respond to CLG<br>consultation on appeals<br>Close monitoring of business<br>rates yield and collection<br>Consider measures to<br>encourage growth in local<br>businesses |
| The council fails to<br>reduce its carbon<br>footprint resulting in<br>higher than anticipated<br>energy costs and need to<br>purchase more<br>allowances than<br>anticipated under the<br>CRC scheme<br>Further risks affecting 20 | 3                                     | 2<br>Allowances<br>budget =<br>£0.360m                              | 6                    | Would reduce resources<br>within budgets creating the<br>need to find additional savings    | Continue developing council<br>carbon budgets for services<br>and report / monitor<br>alongside financial budget.<br>Programme of investment to<br>reduce carbon footprint<br>across the council                                   |

| Risk   | Likelihood       | Impact   | Risk  |  | Mitigation / Management   |
|--|------------------|--|-------|--|---|
|  | of<br>occurrence |  | (L)   | Financial Strategy   |   |
|  | (L)              | (I)  | X (I) |  |   |
| Pay assumptions for<br>2016/17 onwards are<br>lower than agreed pay<br>awards and other pay<br>related costs   | 3                | 3<br>0.5%<br>change in<br>pay award<br>= £0.7m                       | 9     | Immediate impact on reserves<br>if pay provisions are<br>insufficient to meet increased<br>ongoing costs arising from<br>Pay Modernisation, pay<br>awards and/or impact of the<br>Living Wage.<br>This would require reductions<br>in the budgets for the following<br>year/s to repay reserves. | Monitor progress on pay<br>award negotiations and<br>wider national settlements.<br>Monitor progress of pay<br>negotiations on a frequent<br>basis and update financial<br>forecasts regularly. |
| Cash reductions in<br>remaining unringfenced<br>government grants in<br>2016/17 and beyond<br>causing additional budget<br>pressures                                       | 3                | 3<br>5% reduction in<br>unringfenced<br>government<br>grants = £0.8m | 9     | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year  | Provisions for reductions<br>made in resource forecasts<br>Develop strategies to identify<br>priorities and mitigate impact<br>of reductions  |
| Reduction in Dedicated<br>Schools Grant following<br>review of existing formula<br>and possible introduction<br>of a national model for<br>distribution between<br>schools | 3                | 4<br>1% reduction in<br>DSG =<br>£1.56m                              | 12    | Additional pressure on schools budgets   | Respond to consultation<br>papers and lobby<br>Government on impact<br>Early discussions with<br>Schools Forum on potential<br>impact   |

| Risk   | Likelihood<br>of  | Impact  | Risk         | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy  | Mitigation / Management   |
|--|-------------------|---|--------------|---|---|
|  | occurrence<br>(L) | (I)   | (L)<br>X (I) |   |   |
| Reduction in Pupil<br>Premium Grant (PPG)<br>following review of its<br>introduction in 2010/11<br>and performance of<br>disadvantaged pupils<br>over the period                       | 3                 | 3<br>10% reduction in<br>PPG = £0.930m                              | 9            | Additional pressure on schools budgets  | Respond to consultation<br>papers and lobby<br>Government on impact<br>Early discussions with<br>Schools Forum on potential<br>impact   |
| Care Act funding being<br>insufficient to cover the<br>additional costs of new<br>responsibilities including,<br>assessment,<br>safeguarding and the cap<br>on the cost of social care | 3                 | 4<br>Modelling<br>suggests the<br>shortfall could be<br>up to £0.4m | 12           | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year | Close monitoring of the likely<br>caseload through the<br>assessment process.<br>Make representations to<br>Department of Health to<br>ensure sufficient funding is<br>made available |
| Funding for Public Health<br>responsibility reduces<br>following introduction of<br>new distribution formula   | 4                 | 4<br>2015/16 Grant =<br>£18.7m                                      | 16           | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year | Monitor progress of<br>discussions on new<br>distribution formula and<br>lobby for changes to achieve<br>the best outcome for the city  |

| Risk   | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence | Impact   | Risk<br>(L)  | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy  | Mitigation / Management   |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------|---|---|
|  | (L)                            | (1)  | (Ľ)<br>X (I) |   |   |
| New Spending Review<br>and/or changes to the<br>grant distribution system<br>leads to greater<br>reductions in B&HCC<br>funding from 2016/17<br>onwards                      | 3                              | 4<br>1% reduction in<br>Settlement<br>Funding<br>Assessment<br>= £1.0m | 12           | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year   | Lobby with LGA over future<br>spending totals<br>Lobby for greater overall<br>share of funding assessment   |
| Business Rates<br>Revaluation due to be<br>implemented in on 1 April<br>2017 leads to new<br>successful Business<br>Rates appeals  | 5                              | 4<br>1% of forecast<br>retained<br>business rates<br>income = £0.5m    | 20           | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year<br>Protection from safety net at<br>7.5% below baseline funding | Lobby CLG for changes to<br>the Business Rates<br>Retention scheme<br>Liaison with VOA<br>Monitor the impact of<br>appeals throughout the<br>remaining revaluation period |
| Government changes to<br>business rates (e.g. cap<br>on multiplier, enhanced or<br>new reliefs) are not fully<br>funded through ongoing<br>section 31 compensation<br>grants | 3                              | 4<br>Estimated value<br>of Section 31<br>grant 2015/16 =<br>£4.2m      | 12           | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year   | Lobby CLG to ensure any<br>new measures impacting on<br>business rates income are<br>fully funded   |

| Risk  | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence | Impact   | Risk<br>(L) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy   | Mitigation / Management  |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------|--|--|
|   | (L)                            | (I)  | X (I)       |  |  |
| Changes to National<br>Insurance contributions in<br>2016/17 are not matched<br>by an increase in the<br>funding totals for local<br>government | 3                              | 4<br>Estimated<br>increase in NI of<br>£2.2m for GF  | 12          | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year  | Lobby CLG and Treasury to<br>ensure additional burden is<br>fully funded   |
| Energy and fuel prices<br>increase above budgeted<br>provision  | 3                              | 2<br>10% increase to<br>the general fund<br>= £0.35m | 6           | Would reduce resources<br>within budgets creating the<br>need to find additional savings<br>However, higher electricity<br>prices would mean that the<br>share of electricity income<br>from Energy From Waste plant<br>will increase to offset some of<br>the cost increase | Reduce consumption and<br>implement measures to<br>generate energy<br>Monitor energy/fuel market<br>for contracts closely<br>Risk provisions and service<br>pressures provide some<br>cover for higher inflation |
| Investment interest rates lower than anticipated  | 3                              | 3<br>0.1% lower =<br>£0.1m                           | 9           | Would need more reserves to cover any shortfall in the investment interest budget  | Keep investment strategy under constant review   |

| Risk  | Likelihood<br>of<br>occurrence | Impact  | Risk<br>(L) | Possible Impact on<br>Financial Strategy  | Mitigation / Management  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------|---|--|
| Further transfer of<br>schools from local<br>authority to free schools<br>and academies | <u>(L)</u><br>4                | (I)<br>3<br>10% transfer of<br>pupils<br>Reduced<br>Business Rates<br>income =£0.1m<br>Reduced<br>Education<br>Services Grant<br>=£0.3m | X (I)<br>12 | Would require an increased<br>budget gap to be addressed in<br>the following financial year | Sell central education<br>services to new free schools<br>and academies to help<br>replace loss of Education<br>Services Grant.<br>Reduce costs where<br>possible. |

| C | ົ |
|---|---|
| C | > |

Likelihood: 1 – Almost impossible, 2 – Unlikely, 3 – Possible, 4 – Likely, 5 – Almost certain. Impact: 1 – Insignificant, 2 – Minor, 3 – Moderate, 4 – Major, 5 – Catastrophic or fantastic. Risk (L x I): 1-3 Low, 4-7 Moderate, 8-14 Significant, 15-25 High.

## **Opportunities**

Incentives within the current grant distribution system are:

- Business Rates Retention scheme Retaining 49% of business rates growth above the baseline funding level
- New Homes Entitlement to New Homes Bonus Grant for 6 years
- New Homes Increase in council tax resource
- Improve the local economy Reduce Council Tax Reduction caseload and increase council tax resources