

# TfN Offer Risks

July 2024

Risk Manager: Daniella Della-Cerra-Smith

Head of Strategy, Policy and Research: Rachel Ford; Head of Technical Assurance, Modelling and Economics: Graham Kirby

The Audit and Governance Committee are encouraged to review the following risks prior to the meeting to allow for feedback during the corporate risk review/deep dive.

## **Purpose of Deep Dives:**

- Allow the Audit and Governance Committee to undertake a comprehensive review of selected risks
- Provide the opportunity to check and challenge selected risks in more detail to ensure completeness, integrity and accuracy of data
- Demonstrate that the Audit and Governance Committee provide due diligence in the assurance of risk management
- Recommend areas for consideration, if required.

## **Sample Deep Dive Questions:**

1. Is the risk description, cause and impacts articulated clearly?
2. Is the risk scored against TfN's Risk Management Criteria?
3. Are there controls, actions and fallbacks in place?
4. Are the controls, actions and fallbacks effective enough to achieve the target score?
5. Any additional comments/ areas for consideration?

# Background

- TfN has developed its 'offer' to support local partners with transport planning and launched the initial offer to local transport authorities (LTAs) in September 2023. The TfN Offer has continued to develop and expand as TfN tools have been completed and launched
- The TfN 'offer' is the services/deliverables and support we can provide to LTAs and other partners (such as other sub-national transport bodies, DfT and other government departments), as a 'regional centre of excellence'
- We have defined the 'offer' based on funding/resources made available to us in 2023/24 and 2024/25
- The 'offer' was informed by feedback from LTAs directly and internal TfN discussions.

# TfN Offer: Focus in DfT Grant letter

1. Rolling out TfN Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (EVCI) tool to other STBs
2. Developing a comprehensive suite of tools to support Local Transport Authorities on Local Transport Plans and Quantifiable Carbon Reduction (QCR)
3. Improving TfN capacity through strengthening policy teams and developing dedicated Technical Assurance, Modelling and Economic (TAME) team and business case support
4. Providing support to authorities on Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs), Business Case development and Scheme development
5. Development of a minimal viable Common Analytical Framework (CAF) product for other STBs.

# TfN offer: Aims

**Our 'offer' to local transport authorities (LTAs) and other partners is intended to provide:**

- A focal point for trusted data and evidence
- Technical expertise and analytical tools across economic, social and environmental factors
- Strategic 'thought leadership' and championing to address common opportunities and challenges
- Whole-system forward thinking
- Expert capability to support the case for local investment
- An open and objective broker, with statutory status, that facilitates collaboration to enable accelerated delivery on pan-regional priorities.

# The TfN offer – from updated brochure (Jan 2024)

Level	Description	Explanatory notes
Bronze	'Off the shelf' evidence and tools, available on our website or data that can be made available within 20 working days	This includes policy positions, Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (EVCI) and Transport-related Social Exclusion (TRSE) tools and other publications, which partners can access for their own use via the TfN website/other access routes. In addition, we expect to provide data from the Common Analytical Framework within 20 working days
Silver	General advice/guidance/training on the application of our tools; <u>and</u> (topic specific) pan-regional partner engagement/facilitation	This would include specific training/workshops on how to use our tools and analytical framework, as well as user guidance where appropriate. For example: pan-regional workshops on using/applying our TRSE tool, Quantified Carbon Reduction (QCR) dashboard and/or other TfN tools; and pan-regional partner workshops on common policy areas
Gold	Bespoke advice and/or support using our tools/evidence	This is where an LTA partner may ask for specific advice or guidance on a matter/scheme/project in their locality. It does not include direct delivery (e.g. of business cases or other appraisal/analysis work at this stage). Any request will be subject to available TfN/partner resources and considered against relevant criteria as to whether it can be supported.

# Programme for 2024/25

- Devise an improved triage and tracking process
- Continuation of legal approvals. Proactive approval of data sets rather than reactive
- Further development and trial of M&E processes
- New marketing and engagement approach with increased focus on building LTA capacity and LTP delivery incorporating:
  - Updated brochure & Appendix A
  - Online offer
  - Improved marketing strategy
  - Proactive design and roll-out of workshops
  - LTA survey



## 5 x 5 Threat Impact Scoring Criteria

Likelihood Criteria	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	≤5%	6-25%	26-50%	51-74%	>75%
Impact Criteria	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
<b>Cost (Tier 1 - £0-£2m Budget)</b>	£0 - £10k	£10k - £20k	£20k - £50k	£50k - £80k	£80k - £100k
<b>Reputation</b>	Minimal negative local media coverage quickly remedied /loss of trust and credibility	Minor negative local media coverage quickly remedied /loss of trust and credibility	Moderate negative regional media coverage/loss of trust and credibility	National short – term negative media coverage/considerable loss of trust and credibility	National long – term negative media coverage, significant loss of trust and credibility
<b>External Relationship</b>	Minimal strained relationship with partners/third parties	Minor strained relationship with partners/third parties	Moderate strained relationship with partners/third parties	Evidence of relationship issues with partners/third parties	Severe relationship issues with partners/third parties
<b>Quality</b>	Work is fit for purpose but may require minimal changes	Work is fit for purpose but may require minor changes	Moderate changes or specialist resource required to provide high quality outputs	Scope changes required to provide high quality outputs	Project outputs are not credible/robust, with no assurance and partners do not endorse reports
<b>Time</b>	0 – 1 month	1 – 3 months	3 – 9 months	9 – 12 months	12 – 18 months

## 5 x 5 Opportunity Scoring Criteria

Likelihood Criteria	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	≤5%	6-25%	26-50%	51-74%	>75%
Impact Criteria	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
<b>Cost (Tier 1 - £0-£2m Budget)</b>	£0 - -£10k	-£10k - -£20k	-£20k - -£50k	-£50k - -£80k	-£80k - -£100k
<b>Reputation</b>	Minimal positive local media coverage/ increase of trust and credibility	Minor positive local media coverage/increase of trust and credibility	Moderate positive regional media coverage/increase of trust and credibility	National short – term positive media coverage/considerable increase of trust and credibility	National long – term positive media coverage, significant increase of trust and credibility.
<b>External Relationship</b>	Minimal increase in TfN's relationships with partners/third parties	Minor increase in TfN's relationships with partners/third parties	Moderate increase in TfN's relationships with partners/third parties	There is considerable evidence that TfN's relationships with partners/third parties is increasing	Relationships with partners/third parties significantly increased, benefitting TfN's credibility
<b>Quality</b>	Work is high quality with minimal changes	Work is high quality with minor changes	Moderate changes and no additional specialist resource to provide very high-quality outputs	Scope changes not required to exceed high quality outputs	Exceeds credible/robust project output expectations, with assurance & partners endorse reports
<b>Time</b>	0 – -1 month	-1 – -3 months	-3 – -9 months	-9 – -12 months	-12 – -18 months

# Corporate Risk 999

Description						Actions						Owner		Due Date	
Mismatch between the TfN offer and resources TfN currently have in place, with partner and STB expectations exceeding capacity.						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner engagement to discuss scope requirements and log partner requests in central location.</li> <li>Internal working group to manage interdependencies, resource availability and progress. Using the PID to confirm the plans/trajectory of the TfN offer over 2024/25.</li> <li>Refinement of the triage process to better assess the specific requests and the requirements for TAME input in particular.</li> </ol>						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KD</li> <li>KD</li> <li>KD</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing</li> <li>Ongoing</li> <li>Aug 24</li> </ol>	
Cause															
Specialist requirements for resources, high demand from partners, poor internal co-ordination of workstreams, clash of priorities between TfN direct workstreams and 'extra' workstreams agreed with Partners and contribution funded, Clash of long-term work and short projects.															
Impact												Current Score		Target Score	
Poor staff morale/ impact on team wellbeing External relationships/ reputation of TfN affects Financial implications for consultancy support if required Impact on TfN ability to secure future funding or influence policy and local transport plans.												8		8	
Current Assessment						Target Assessment									
Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating	Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating				
Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	Low				



# TAME Risk

Description						Actions						Owner		Due Date	
Analytical outputs do not meet stakeholder expectations.						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish new processes in relation to triage and issue training to all TfN staff on new policies.</li> <li>2. Ensure TAME are resource is included from the kick off meetings. Monitoring and compliance checks performed (e.g. phishing attacks).</li> <li>3. Ensuring TAME quality assurance processes are applied in all TfN offer work.</li> <li>4. Developing monitoring and evaluation processes to support the TfN Offer.</li> </ol>						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CS/DN</li> <li>2. DN</li> <li>3. GK</li> <li>4. DN</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jun 24</li> <li>2. Sept 24</li> <li>3. Sept 24</li> <li>4. Sept 24</li> </ol>	
Cause															
Human error and engagement process incorrectly specifies outputs.															
Impact															
Adverse effects on TfN's reputation and external relationships.												Current Score		Target Score	
												15		11	
Current Assessment						Target Assessment									
Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating	Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating				
Medium	High	High	n/a	n/a	n/a	Low	High	High	n/a	n/a	n/a				

# Legal Risk 1000

Description						Actions						Owner		Due Date	
The process and governance for securing legal permissions to obtain, use and share data, is not embedded across TfN.						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting up OGL licenses, where possible, for any newly acquired TfN data.</li> <li>Manage the central database detailing data sources, licences and sharing permissions and share access with relevant project leads.</li> <li>Continue employee training for general data use and sharing guidance, as and when required, new TAME members and new project/contract managers.</li> <li>Identify TfN's data that may have restricted use and complete risk assessments for commercial use.</li> <li>Re-embed policy and procedure following updates, via project management framework rollout, including specific TfN Offer data owner training.</li> </ol>						1. GL		1. Mar 25	
<b>Cause</b>												2. GL		2. Mar 25	
Process for obtaining permissions may be too onerous for existing resources to complete. Lack of awareness of new processes. 3rd party organisations may not provide legal permissions/ without payment. Commercial restrictions on data. Inappropriate disclaimers on publicly available data or information.												3. JO		3. Mar 25	
<b>Impact</b>												4. GL		4. Mar 25	
Liability limitations/unintended consequences in how data/analysis is used, programme delays, loss of credibility for TfN, potential Legal implications and fines if data misused.												5. GL		5. May 24	
												<b>Current Score</b>		<b>Target Score</b>	
												11		8	
Current Assessment						Target Assessment									
Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating	Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating				
Low	High	High	n/a	High	Medium	Very Low	Medium	Medium	n/a	High	Very Low				

# Legal Risk 1002

Description						Actions						Owner		Due Date	
Legal challenges to TfN for providing outputs that are not 'fit for purpose'/ do not meet contractual obligations.						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Task group to embed legal requirements in the project management framework and associated templates, as part of a wider workstream on project management requirements. Rollout to take place early May.</li> <li>Identify contractual requirements when accepting work for partner/clients, after functional areas approach legal team.</li> <li>Legal to review implications of potential liabilities for partner contribution contracts.</li> <li>Ensure projects are thoroughly scoped and outputs are agreed with partner authority making a funding contribution.</li> <li>Evidence robust quality assurance of project outputs.</li> </ol>						1. JB		1. May 24	
<b>Cause</b>												2. JO		2. Mar 25	
Inappropriate contracts in place e.g. insufficient liability clause, which could lead to challenges to TfN outputs by third parties. Inappropriate disclaimers on publicly available data or information.												3. JO		3. Mar 25	
<b>Impact</b>												4. JO		4. Mar 25	
Adverse effect on external relationships and reputation and potential legal challenge.												5. JO		5. Mar 25	
								<b>Current Score</b>		<b>Target Score</b>					
								11		8					
Current Assessment						Target Assessment									
Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating	Probability Rating	External Relationship	Reputation	Financial Rating	Quality	Time Rating				
Low	High	High	n/a	Medium	Low	Very Low	High	High	n/a	Medium	Low				