#### Risk Matrix

		l							
		Low	Medium	High	Extreme				
	Unlikely	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)				
Fiobability	Possible	Low (2)	Low (4)	Medium (6)	Medium (8)				
Probability	Likely	Low (3)	Medium (6)	Medium (9)	High (12)				
	Almost Certain	Low (4)	Medium (8)	High (12)	High (16)				



March 2016 (Final)

## Central

### Inherent Risk

			impact														
Risk Reference	Nature / Descrip	Nature / Description of Risk Risk Owner	Risk Owner	Probability	Impact	Risk Score		Actions to Mitigate Risk	Transfer detail Additional Detail	LA / Hub	Escalation from LA detail (if necessary and date)	Following Mitigation		Date appear on ER'		W Date taken off ERW Register	
													Probability	Impact	Risk Score	_	
1	Failure to comply or Audit recommendati		Managing Director and Section 151 Officer	Unlikely	Medium	2	Treat and Mitigate	Tracking progress against recommendations and have track record of swift actions on previous recommendations. This aspect is low risk.  Further action between PCC and SCC to manage new risks.  Further action to receive quarterly assurance from each LA. Better communication between directors and finance staff in own LA.	N/A	Swansea LA qualifications in Audit Report and potential WG claw back 14-19. Swansea underspend for PDG. Internal audit report notes issue countinues to be a risk - sample size small In grants testing.	Swansea	N/A	Unlikely	Low	1	March 2015	
2	Local Government Re may result in LAs bei different Consortium	ng placed in	<del>Lead Leader</del>	<del>Unlikely</del>	<del>Medium</del>	2	<del>Tolerate</del>	Would require planning to accept a new partner or agree an exit strategy for existing partner. This is long term and preparation time will be sufficient.	WG Wonitor on-going issues in	ERW work is planned and monitored with LGR considerations. Suggest taking off register as risk is- lower now	<del>N/A</del>	<del>N/A</del>	<del>Unlikely</del>	<del>Medium</del>	£	<del>March 2015</del>	<del>Mar 16</del>
3	Estyn visits result in I placed in follow up / measures or requirin attention	special	Chief Education Officers	Likely	High	9	Transfer to 3rd Party / LA	Robust self evaluation and monitoring at LA level, with regional strategies to support.  Pembrokeshire support network established by ERW by mutual consent. Review of evidence work reaims of concern.	Place on Pembrokeshire Risk Register	C Email sent	Pembrokeshire	N/A	Likely	High	9	March 2015	
4	Contributory LAs do commitment as outli Functions Framewor	ined in the	Directors / MD	<del>Unlikely</del>	Medium	2	Treat and Monitor	Clear expectations of services- and standards to be delivered, in line with Legal Agreement.			<del>N/A</del>	<del>N/A</del>	<del>Unlikely</del>	Low	4	March 2015	<del>0ct-15</del>
5	Inspection of Region  LA finds less than add standards, provision	equate	Managing Director and 6 Directors	Likely	High	9	_	alternative support lead ChAd for schools causing concern required in LA. all alliance members tke ownership on detaila and accountability. Effective BP in place.  Clear plan for improvement as part of improvement planning, but heightned urgency pre	All	Risk for all LAs but specifically Pembrokeshire, where pace of improvement has not been good enough and high proprtion of secondaries causing concern.	All	N/A	Unlikely	Medium	2	March 2015	
6	Insufficient capacity Team and Challenge to deliver Business P standard	Adviser Team	Directors and Managing Director	Likely	High	9		inspection. Taken swift effective Effective planning Central Team capacity to coordinate and facilitate change. position remains same and is critical  Discuss with all Directors 24/07/15. All agreed capacity and restructure of Central Team. Improved planning and training on key workload issues. Challenege adviser capacity agreed to maintain at full Sept 2015	N/A	Review leads to need to reaffirm frm all LAs the commitment as set out in legal agreement Joint committee paper on camparing regions is likely to raise issue and further action is likley. Central team caacity discussion with LD 14/10/16	Pembrokeshire; Carmarthenshire, Sswansea, Ceredigion	N/A	Likely	High	9	March 2015	

#### Risk Matrix

	Impact								
		Low	Medium	High	Extreme				
Probability	Unlikely	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)				
	Possible	Low (2)	Low (4)	Medium (6)	Medium (8)				
	Likely	Low (3)	Medium (6)	Medium (9)	High (12)				
	Almost Certain	Low (4)	Medium (8)	High (12)	High (16)				



March 2016 (Final)

# Central

#### Inherent Risk

Risk Reference	Nature / Description of Risk	Risk Owner	Probability	Impact	Risk Score		Actions to Mitigate Risk	Transfer detail Additional Detai	LA / Hub	Escalation from LA detail (if necessary and date)	Following Mitigation			Date appear on ERW Register	Date taken off ERW Register
											Probability	Impact	Risk Score		
7	Governance and Legal footing of ERW found to be ineffective at securing consistent improvement across all LAs by Estyn / WAO / WG / Self Evaluation	Managing Director, Directors and Monitoring Officer	Possible	High	6	Treat and Mitigate	Evidence of effective communication, planning and accountability. Impact on outcomes is clear. Remaining risk is system knowledge by external stakeholders. Action by LA to respond to identified risks in Register	Additional comms brief scheduled. Review pap effectiveness of govern underway	er on N/A	N/A	Possible	Mediun	4	March 2015	
8	Support and intervention coupled with local plans and strategies do not lead to improvement in PCC	Lead Chief Exec., Lead Director, Managing Director and PCC Corporate Leadership Team	Likely	High	9	Treat and Mitigate	plans agreed and committed to by Exec in Dec 2015. network underway and chaired by Lead Chief exec. Estyn and WG sighted of plans - work to action necessary	agreement between MI Director as to support f key schools causing cocnern. Remains conc revieiwing support pro for key schools. Duplica remains a concern.	ern n Pembs iced		likely	High		October 2015	
9	Failure to address or implement key areas of ERW BP	MD / Chairs of Priority Boards	likely	High	3	Treat	Focus on bringing pace to groups through effective minutes/actions.increased central capacity to monitor quality and actions/ focus.  Target additional support for Support for Learning Groups.	All alliance members s adhere to agreed coc conduct, BP actions an agreement. Capacity is central team , and capa LAs to respond to Le Agreement commitme SLAS	le of I Legal sues in city of gal		likely	Medium	2	March 2015	