

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

Report to the Executive Board

Date: 27th July 2016

Subject: Annual Risk Management Report

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. Our vision is for Leeds to be the best city in the UK: one that is compassionate with a strong economy that tackles poverty and reduces the inequalities that still exist. A corporate risk is something that, if it occurred, could impact on this vision and our best city and best council ambitions. It is essential that we understand, manage and communicate the range of risks that could threaten the city and the vital services provided by the council, so that we're better placed to prevent them from happening and to reduce the impact if they do.
2. This annual report updates the Executive Board on the nine most significant risks currently on the corporate risk register and summarises their level of risk and the arrangements in place to manage them, including the accountable executive member and director. This summary report is supplemented by a more detailed annual assurance report covering each of the nine risks that is publicly available through the council's website.

Recommendations

Executive Board is asked to note the annual risk management report and the assurances given on the council's most significant corporate risks.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This annual report updates the Executive Board on the council's most significant corporate risks and summarises the arrangements in place to manage them and further work planned. The assurances provided are an important source of evidence for the Annual Governance Statement, due to be signed by the Council Leader in September.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The previous annual corporate risk management report was provided to Executive Board on 15 July 2015. Since then, the corporate risk register has continued to be reviewed and updated in accordance with the council's Risk Management Policy and in line with the Best Council Plan outcomes and priorities. The remainder of this report focuses on the management of the most significant risks currently on the corporate risk register.
- 2.2 It is supplemented by the annual assurance report on the council's risk management arrangements considered on 24th June 2016 by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee. The Audit Committee report focuses on the policies, procedures, systems and processes in place to manage risks at corporate, directorate, service and project levels. No issues were identified.
- 2.3 With regard specifically to corporate risks, in April 2016 KPMG issued a report on their analysis of local authority corporate risk registers (including that of Leeds City Council). The review considered the most frequently featured risks across local authorities' registers to enable organisations to consider whether any potential risks should be added to their own registers and whether they are given sufficient priority. It also considered the arrangements in place to maintain and review registers against 6 criteria:
- Are risks scored on impact and probability / likelihood
 - Are risks allocated to lead officers
 - Are mitigating controls in place
 - Does the register identify movement of risk
 - Is there clarity on when specific risks will be reviewed
 - Are risks allocated to leading members
- 2.4 KPMG concluded that Leeds' corporate risk register compares well to those of other comparable councils and complied with all the criteria above except 'risks allocated to members'. This has now been actioned with all corporate risks assigned to the relevant lead portfolio member.

3 Main issues

Corporate Risk Management

- 3.1 The council's risks stem from a variety of sources, many of which are out of our direct control: for example, global events such as an economic downturn and climate change present immediate as well as longer-term challenges. Closer to home, we often have to respond quickly to changes in government policy and must also recognise and meet the evolving needs of our communities, particularly those of vulnerable people. Such changes, and the uncertainties they may bring, can pose threats that we need to address but also bring opportunities to exploit. Both aspects of risk management rely on the council working effectively with partners across the public, private and third sectors.

- 3.2 All council risks are managed via a continuous process of identification, assessment, evaluation, action planning and review, embedded at strategic and operational levels and for programmes and projects. All staff and elected members have responsibility for managing risks relevant to their areas, including Scrutiny Boards, Community Committees and partnership boards.
- 3.3 This annual report considers the strategic level: the arrangements in place to manage the council's corporate risks. Corporate risks are those of significant, strategic importance that require the attention of the council's most senior managers and elected members. Each of the corporate risks has one or more named 'risk owner(s)', members of the Corporate Leadership Team and a lead portfolio member who are accountable for their management. The Executive Board as a whole retains ultimate responsibility.
- 3.4 Each corporate risk has a current rating based on a combined assessment of how likely the risk is to occur – its probability - and its potential impact after considering the controls already put in place. When evaluating the impact of a risk we consider the range of consequences that could result: effects on the local community, staff, the services we provide, any cost implications and whether the risk could prevent us meeting our statutory and legal requirements.
- 3.5 A consistent '5x5' scoring mechanism is used to carry out this assessment of probability and impact which ensures that the risks are rated in the same way. Target ratings are also applied for each risk that show the lowest scores possible for the risk. These are used to compare the gap between 'where the risk is now' to 'how low the risk can go' and so help determine whether additional actions are needed to manage the risk down to the target level. There are some risks that, whilst the council can manage their probability down to low levels, the impact, should it arise, will always be high. These 'red' rated risks reflect the high priority afforded to them by the council should they arise.
- 3.6 Action plans are in place for all risks in line with their ratings: the greater the risk, the more we try to do to manage it if it is in our control and if that would be the best use of resources. The council recognises that the cost and time involved in managing the risk down to nothing may not always be the best use of public money and we factor this in when developing our risk management action plans. The risks are reviewed and updated regularly through horizon scanning, benchmarking and in response to findings from inspections and audits, government policy changes and engagement with staff and the public. The council's corporate risk register is formally reviewed each quarter by the Corporate Leadership Team and, since February 2016, the latest corporate risk map has then been made publicly available via the Leeds Observatory and also published on the council's Intranet risk management webpage.
- 3.7 The nature of risks is that they come and go as the environment changes. However, there are a set of 'standing' corporate risks that will always face the council and which are the focus of the annual risk management report:
- Safeguarding Children
 - Safeguarding Adults
 - Health and Safety
 - City Resilience
 - Council Resilience
 - Financial management: this risk covers in-year and longer-term financial forecasting
 - Information Safeguarding

- 3.8 They can be roughly split into two types: those that could principally affect the city and people of Leeds and others that relate more to the way we run our organisation internally. An example of a 'city' risk includes a major disruptive incident in Leeds or breach in the safeguarding arrangements that help protect vulnerable people; these are often managed in partnership with a range of other organisations. An example of a more internal 'council' risk is a major, prolonged failure of the ICT network.
- 3.9 The annual report discusses these 'standing' corporate risks plus two additional risks currently of high significance - air quality and major flooding - in more detail and provides assurance on how the council, often in partnership, is managing them. The full report is available on the council's website and summarised at Appendix 1.

EU Referendum

- 3.10 At the time of writing, the country faces a period of political, fiscal and economic uncertainty following the results of June's EU referendum with potentially wide-ranging implications/uncertainties. The effects for local government and local communities will emerge over the coming months and years with possible risks – including opportunities - at this point in time around the economic outlook impacting on levels of trade and investment; rising inflation; interest rate volatility; the labour market; and the UK's legislative and regulatory framework.
- 3.11 In response, the corporate risk around 'economic growth lag, increasing inequalities' has been raised and is now at a similarly significant level as the other nine corporate risks reported here. A specific assurance report has not been prepared for inclusion in this annual corporate risk report due to timing issues; however, the Board is referred to a related report on today's agenda, 'Leeds City Council's initial response to the referendum on the UK's membership of the EU' for further information.
- 3.12 Work will continue through the authority's ongoing risk management processes to assess, evaluate and mitigate any potential impacts to the council and the city and the corporate risk register updated. At the request of the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee at its meeting 24th June 2016, a report providing assurance on the arrangements in place to identify and manage any risks emerging as a consequence of the vote to leave the EU will be provided later this year.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 The corporate risk assurances have been subject to consultation with key officers for each objective / risk respectively, the Corporate Leadership Team and portfolio members.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 This is an assurance report with no decision required. Due regard is therefore not directly relevant.

4.3 Council policies and the Best Council Plan

- 4.3.1 The risk management arrangements in place support compliance with the council's Risk Management Policy and Code of Corporate Governance, through

which, under Principle 4, the authority should take 'informed and transparent decisions which are subject to effective scrutiny and risk management'.

- 4.3.2 Effective management of the range of risks that could impact upon the city and the council supports the delivery of all Best Council Plan outcomes and priorities.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 All council risks are managed proportionately, factoring in the value for money use of resources.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 The council's risk management arrangements support the authority's compliance with the statutory requirement under the Accounts & Audit Regulations 2011 to have 'a sound system of internal control which facilitates the effective exercise of that body's functions and which includes arrangements for the management of risk.'
- 4.5.2 Both the detailed assurances on the management of the council's most significant risks and assurances on the council's risk management arrangements are publicly available through the council's website. In addition, the latest corporate risk map will continue to be published.
- 4.5.3 This report is subject to call in.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 This report supports the council's Risk Management Framework in providing assurances on the managing of the authority's most significant risks.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The corporate risk register houses the council's most significant risks that could impact upon our Best City / Best Council ambitions, outcomes and priorities. Robust and proportionate arrangements are in place to mitigate the risks, considering both the probability of each risk materialising and the consequences if it did. Assurances on the nine most significant risks, including the seven 'standing risks' are given through this annual corporate risk management report and provide an important source of evidence for the Annual Governance Statement due to be signed by the Council Leader in September.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 Executive Board is asked to note the annual risk management report and the assurances given on the council's most significant corporate risks.

7 Background documents¹

- 7.1 There are no background documents.

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

Appendix 1: Summary assurances on the management of the council's most significant risks

1. Safeguarding Children

Local authorities have a legal duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. These duties fall within the remit of the Director of Children's Services under section 18 of the Children Act 2004. Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children covers protecting children from maltreatment, preventing impairment of children's health or development, and ensuring that children are growing up in circumstances that are consistent with the provision of safe and effective care. This duty places important responsibilities on local authorities, both directly through providing or commissioning safeguarding services such as children's social work, but also strategically, through their responsibility as the lead agency for promoting better joint working between all local services and communities.

The potential consequence of a significant failure in safeguarding is that a child or young person could be seriously harmed, abused or die. Secondary effects of this include reputational damage, legal and financial costs and management and staffing time. The council is strongly committed to improving the safeguarding of children and young people and this is a clear priority in our Best Council Plan and partnership plans. The most thorough independent assurance for this risk was the external inspection by Ofsted in early 2015: Leeds was rated as 'good' overall with the 'leadership and management' sub area receiving an 'outstanding' rating.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Risk of harm, accident or death to a child linked to failure of the council to act appropriately according to safeguarding arrangements.	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Director of Children's Services
	<i>Executive member</i>	Councillor Mulherin - Executive member for Children and Families
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high

2. Safeguarding Adults

Local authorities have a legal duty under the Care Act 2014 to safeguard adults at risk of abuse and neglect and to make enquires about any such allegations with the Director of Adult Social Services in each local authority area charged with leading partnership arrangements. This is enacted through a Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) that consists of three core statutory partners: the local authority, the NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and the Police.

The main consequence of a significant failure in safeguarding is that an adult at risk suffers violent abuse, serious harm and/or ultimately death. This would be a failure in the local authority's legal and ethical duty in safeguarding its citizens. The consequences that could impact on the city council and/or the city if safeguarding processes are not followed include reputational damage, legal and financial costs (such as the payment of compensation) and also management and staffing time.

In Leeds, the independently chaired SAB works closely across a number of strategic partnerships to manage this risk, specifically the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB), Health and Wellbeing Board and the Safer Leeds Executive. In addition the council's Cross-Council Safeguarding Group ensures that the whole council takes its safeguarding duties (both adults and children) seriously. Leeds has worked with other local authorities in the development of the North and West Yorkshire Multi-Agency Safeguarding Adults policy and procedures. These were revised in 2015 to ensure they are compatible with the requirements of the Care Act 2014.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Failure of (a) staff in any council directorate to recognise and report a risk of abuse or neglect facing an adult with care and support needs in Leeds; (b) staff in adult social care to respond appropriately, in line with national legislation and safeguarding adults procedures	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Director of Adult Social Care
	<i>Executive member</i>	Councillor Charlwood - Executive member for Health, Wellbeing & Adults
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 4 (Probable), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: Very high
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 3 (Moderate). Overall rating: High

3. Health and Safety

The council has wide-ranging responsibilities to prevent the risk of health and safety failures that could result in death, injury, legal challenge and significant reputational damage. Under the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974), the council has a responsibility to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare at work of all its employees and those affected by the work that we do. These responsibilities cover:

- As a duty holder with large numbers of employees;
- As a service provider with large numbers of clients, visitors, pupils etc;
- As a landlord with a large portfolio of buildings and land;
- As a regulator through environmental health; and
- As a large scale procurer of goods and services which can influence safety through the supply chain.

The main duties of any employer can be summarised as providing: safe systems of work; safe plant, equipment and substances; safe workplaces; risk assessments and training/instruction/supervision. A range of health and safety controls are in place to manage this risk including a Health and Safety Policy and adoption of performance standards (both jointly agreed with the trade unions), employee accountability, audit reviews and an annual action plan which sets out priorities for the year. In October 2015 the council's Internal Audit section carried out a review of Corporate Health and Safety and gave an audit opinion of 'Good assurance' for the control environment and for compliance with the control environment.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Risk of an health and safety failure resulting in death, injury, damage or legal challenge (either criminal or civil)	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Deputy Chief Executive
	<i>Executive member</i>	Councillor J Lewis, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources & Strategy
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: High
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: High

4. City Resilience

Under the Civil Contingencies Act (2004) the council has both a statutory duty and a community leadership role to ensure that the city collectively does all it can to enhance its resilience and manage its vulnerabilities. This involves regional and city-wide partnership working to identify, assess, prevent, prepare, respond to and recover from emergencies and disruptions.

The risk of significant disruption in Leeds is a combination of two factors: the causative event and the way in which Leeds as a city responds to this event. Disruptive events include civil unrest, adverse weather and problems with keeping transport networks operational. Management of this risk seeks to ensure a secure and resilient Leeds, protecting our people, economy, environment, infrastructure, territory and way of life from all major risks that could affect us directly.

The West Yorkshire Resilience Forum (WYRF) is the council's principal partner organisation for city resilience. The aim of the WYRF is to co-ordinate the actions and arrangements between responding services in the area to provide the most effective and efficient response to civil emergencies when they occur. The WYRF Community Risk Register is key to identifying resilience risks that may impact on the city. This register forms the basis of multi-agency emergency planning and is used by the WYRF and its partner organisations to review the risks to ensure that they are being appropriately managed. Identified and assessed risks are channelled into work programmes undertaken by the WYRF and its partner agencies - including the council - to determine the most effective means of managing the risk.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Risk of significant disruption in Leeds	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Deputy Chief Executive
	<i>Executive members</i>	Councillor J Lewis, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources & Strategy
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: High

5. Council Resilience

Leeds City Council has a legal responsibility under the Civil Contingencies Act (2004) to have arrangements in place to keep delivering critical services in the event of an emergency, as well as those functions that are important to the welfare and security of the community. The council does this through an organisational-wide Business Continuity Programme that also assesses the resilience of partner and contracting organisations.

The risks or threats to council services come from a wide range of sources including severe weather, industrial action, pandemic outbreak, flooding, fire, utility failure, ICT outage and supply chain failure. However, regardless of the source, the impact will generally be on the council's people, premises, ICT and their suppliers and providers of goods and services. By focussing on the impact, the consequences of the disruption on critical services can be assessed and business continuity plans developed to document what needs to be done to protect the service should a disruptive or emergency incident occur. Business continuity plans are regularly reviewed and exercised at local and multi-agency levels.

Council services requiring business continuity plans are those assessed as being most critical through completion of a Business Impact Analysis; there are currently 84 services identified as most critical. Additional council-wide arrangements are in place to respond to industrial action and ICT services.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Risk of significant disruption to council services	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Deputy Chief Executive
	<i>Executive member</i>	Councillor J Lewis, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources & Strategy
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: High

6. Financial Management

The ongoing challenge of reshaping and delivering council services within significantly reduced funding levels remains a significant risk in both the short- and medium-term and so we have two

Better risk management. Better decisions.
Better outcomes.

corporate risks on this: one that considers the in-year risk, and another around future financial forecasting. Failure to adequately plan, both longer term and annually and to manage the budget in-year carries a number of specific risks:

- That the council is unable to set a legal budget by the due date;
- That the budget does not reflect council priorities and objectives;
- That the budget does not adequately resource pressures and increases in demand;
- That the budget includes savings which are not deliverable;
- That unplanned or reactive measures would be needed in-year to deliver savings;
- That the council falls into negative reserves or that reserves are used impacting upon the medium-term financial strategy; and
- Should the audit of the council's Statement of Accounts contain damaging comments, this would negatively impact upon the authority's reputation and could potentially result in increased audit and government inspections.

The duties of the council's Section 151 officer – in Leeds, the Deputy Chief Executive - are crucial in how we manage these risks: he is charged with reporting to Council on the robustness of the estimates and adequacy of financial reserves; certifying that the accounts are a true and fair view of the council's financial position; and ensuring that the council's financial systems accurately record financial transactions and enable the prevention and detection of inaccuracies and fraud. Financial risks are managed through strategic financial planning, budget preparation and setting, in-year budget monitoring, closure of accounts and audit inspections.

At their meeting of the 24th June 2016, the council's Corporate Governance and Audit Committee (CGAC) received two audit reports providing independent assurance of the council's financial management arrangements:

- KPMG's (the council's external auditors) Interim Audit Report and Technical update concluded that, "There are no major issues raised in KPMG's interim audit which would impact on the level of audit work required to certify the Council's financial statements".
- The council's Internal Audit Annual Report and Opinion for 2015/16 provided an overall conclusion that, on the basis of the audit work undertaken during the 2015/16 financial year, the internal control environment (including the key financial systems, risk and governance) is well established and operating effectively in practice.

Corporate risks: financial management		
Accountability	Officer	Deputy Chief Executive
	Executive member	Councillor J Lewis, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources & Strategy
Corporate risk: in-year budget		
Risk description	Council's financial position goes into significant deficit in the current year resulting in reserves (actual or projected) being less than the minimum specified by the council's risk-based reserves policy	
Evaluation	Current	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 3 (Moderate). Overall rating: High
	Target	Probability: 1 (Rare), Impact 2 (Minor). Overall rating: Low
Corporate risk: Financial forecasting		
Risk description	Failure to reasonably estimate the financial 'envelope', both annually and in the medium-term	
Evaluation	Current	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 3 (Moderate). Overall rating: Medium
	Target	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 3 (Moderate). Overall rating: Medium

7. Information Safeguarding

Information is an asset like any other; we need it to do business and without it, business would stop. Getting things right with information produces better quality information and delivers it to the right people at the right time. This allows service quality to be maintained or improved and assists in the identification of opportunities. Failing to manage information properly can be a root cause of non-compliance with the council's legal duties, including human rights law, confidentiality, service specific legislation (adoptions law, children's law, Council Tax law, etc.) and access to information (Freedom of Information and Data Protection). However, the most significant risk associated with a failure in information safeguarding is death or serious harm that could have been prevented if data and information had been properly managed and disclosed.

The council manages these risks through a range of policies and procedures, guidance and mandatory training for staff, ongoing reviews and internal and external inspections. The Deputy Chief Executive, through his role as the council's Senior Risk Information Owner (SIRO – the person with ultimate responsibility for information risk in the council), has ultimate responsibility for the authority's information safeguarding arrangements, assisted by the Information Management Board and staff with specific information management responsibilities.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Risk of harm to people, partners or the council from wrongful disclosure, theft or damage to information held.	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Deputy Chief Executive
	<i>Executive member</i>	Councillor J Lewis, Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources & Strategy
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 3 (Moderate). Overall rating: High
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 2 (Unlikely), Impact 2 (Minor). Overall rating: Low

8. Major flooding

In recent years there has been an increasing awareness of the destructive impact and devastating consequences of flooding on individuals, communities and the economy. While the council has no statutory duties around flood prevention, it is required under the European Union Flood Directive (2009) to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management (LFRMS). The council also has responsibilities as a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and has the legal power to make landowners remove watercourse obstructions.

Leeds adopted its LFRMS in 2014. This provides information on the approach the council and other partner agencies will take in managing flood risk in the city. The purpose of the LFRMS is to guide the flood risk management activities undertaken by key partners operating in the metropolitan district of Leeds including Leeds City Council, the Environment Agency (EA), Yorkshire Water Services and the Highways Agency.

Activities include:

- Spatial planning and development control;
- Investigating flooding incidents, assessing flood risk and developing and promoting schemes to alleviate flood risk;
- Developing and maintaining a register for recording, monitoring and maintaining flood risk assets;
- Improving engagement with internal and external partners to raise awareness of the LFRMS;
- Involving local communities in decision making; and
- Improving plans for multi-agency emergency response and recovery.

Corporate risk		
Risk description	Leeds fails to take effective measures to reduce the risk of flooding across the District that has a significant impact on homes, business, land and infrastructure.	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Director of City Development
	<i>Executive member</i>	CLlr Richard Lewis, Executive member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 4 (Probable), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 5 (Highly significant). Overall rating: Very high

9. Air Quality

The seriousness of current air pollution levels and their impact on public health is now much better understood. We are all exposed to air pollution to some extent and this is having a harmful effect on the health of individuals, reducing life expectancy and increasing health inequalities. Improving air quality will also mitigate the financial risk to the council if a material fine is imposed for failing to meet air quality targets by 2020.

There is now categorical evidence that long-term exposure to everyday air pollutants contributes to cardiovascular disease (CVD, including heart diseases and stroke), lung cancer, and respiratory disease (including asthma and chronic bronchitis). The heaviest burden is borne by those with greatest vulnerability and/or exposure: the elderly, children, pregnant women and those with cardiovascular disease and/or respiratory disease are more susceptible to air pollution than others while those who spend more time in highly polluted locations will be affected more. There are no absolutely safe levels of the main pollutants of concern. Any improvement in air quality will therefore have positive health consequences.

Long term it is very clear that only concerted partnership action across a range of measures will provide the kind of comprehensive solutions to the air quality issues within the city. These measures include traffic demand management techniques, encouraging more sustainable travel and actions to reduce vehicle emissions.

Corporate risk: Air Quality		
Risk description	Failure to meet air quality standards by 2020 results in a significant fine for the council.	
Accountability	<i>Officer</i>	Director of Environment and Housing
	<i>Executive member</i>	CLlr Yeadon, Executive member for Environment and Sustainability
Evaluation	<i>Current</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 4 (Major). Overall rating: High
	<i>Target</i>	Probability: 3 (Possible), Impact 2 (Minor). Overall rating: Medium