

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To brief the committee on the updated Corporate Risk Register.

2 Recommendations/for decision

- 2.1 To review the Corporate Risk Register Appendix 2 and identify any issues for further consideration

3 Corporate Risk Register - Supporting information

- 3.1 The Audit Committee has a role to monitor the effectiveness of risk management and internal control across the Council. As part of discharging this role the committee is asked to review the Corporate Risk Register.
- 3.2 The Corporate Risk Register provides evidence of a risk aware and risk managed organisation. It reflects the risks that are on the current radar for Transition Board. Some of them are not dissimilar to those faced across other local authorities.
- 3.3 The risk register has been refreshed and updated taking into account the Commercial AVDC programme. The style of reporting has also been revised.
- 3.4 The Corporate risk register was discussed by Transition Board on the 6th July 2016. The risks and ratings were reviewed and further consideration given to how effectively the risks are being managed and where further action is required.
- 3.5 The risk register is reviewed on a two monthly basis by Transition Board and reported to the Audit Committee.

4 Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 To allow members of the Audit Committee to review the Corporate Risk Register.

5 Resource implications

- 5.1 None

Contact Officer Tamsin Ireland Business Intelligence and Assurance
Officer
Tel: 01296 585004

Background Documents None

Corporate Risk Register Update

The Corporate Risk Register (CRR) shows the key risks to the Council and the actions that are being taken to respond to these risks. The CRR is reviewed on a regular basis by Transition Board following detailed review and updating by the risk owners.

Responsibility for updating the CRR and ensuring actions are taken to mitigate risks is a corporate responsibility but operational responsibility for ensuring this happens rests with the Directors and the Business Assurance Manager.

The latest refresh takes into account the new Commercial AVDC Programme. Since the previous review in September 2015, four new risks have been added to the register, one has been removed and a number of other risks have been subsumed into other overarching risks resulting from the Commercial AVDC Programme.

New risks added:

New Risk (Ref)	Comment
Depot & workshop development project fails to deliver objectives (5).	Depot & workshop development is high strategic priority for the Council
Performance data and associated data collection systems are not sufficiently robust to provide accurate information to support effective decision making (12)	Business Intelligence review is underway, during times of change accurate performance data is critical.
Fraud, financial impropriety or improper business practices	Added to corporate risk register in accordance with CIPFA guidance.
Failure to manage and deliver as a qualifying authority the requirements of the SLA for HS2 (16).	Ongoing strategic priority.

Risks removed / consolidated:

Risk (Sept 2015)	Comment
New Homes Bonus	No longer considered corporate risk
Cloud based technology solutions do not meet complex service change requirements	Captured under Business Continuity (9)
New models of service delivery may not achieve savings	Captured within Commercial AVDC (1) and Commercialisation (2)
Ability to orchestrate our growth ambitions/plans	Captured within Commercial AVDC (1) and Commercialisation (2)
Infrastructure funding shortage	Captured within Commercial AVDC (1) and Commercialisation (2)
Change Management	Captured within the Commercial AVDC risk (1) & Organisational resilience (3)

There are 16 risks on the corporate risk register. The Residual risk rating is summarised as follows:

Low risk	Moderate risk	High Risk	Extreme risk
3	6	4	2

Risk Matrix

Impact	5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25
	4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
	3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
	2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
	1	Negligible	1	2	3	4	5
Score			Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very Likely
			1	2	3	4	5
			Likelihood				

	1-3	Low Risk	Acceptable risk; No further action or additional controls are required; Risk at this level should be monitored and reassessed at appropriate intervals
	4 - 6	Moderate Risk	A risk at this level may be acceptable; If not acceptable, existing controls should be monitored or adjusted; No further action or additional controls are required.
	8 - 12	High Risk	Not normally acceptable; Efforts should be made to reduce the risk, provided this is not disproportionate; Determine the need for improved control measures.
	15 - 25	Extreme Risk	Unacceptable; Immediate action must be taken to manage the risk; A number of control measures may be required.






Risk Ratings - Impact

Score	Descriptor	Compliance	Finance	Health and safety	Internal Control	Political	Reputational	Staffing & Culture
1	Negligible	No or minimal impact or breach of guidance/ statutory duty	Small loss risk of claim remote	Minor injury; Cuts, bruises, etc.; Unlikely to result in sick leave	Control is in place with strong evidence to support	Parties work positively together with occasional differences; Members & executive work co-operatively	Rumors; Potential for public concern	Short-term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (<1 day)
2	Minor	Breach of statutory legislation; Reduced performance rating from external/internal inspector	Loss of 0.1-0.25 per cent of budget; Claim less than £20k	Moderate injuries; Likely to result in 1-3 days sick leave	Control in place with tentative evidence	Parties have minor differences of opinion on key policies; Members and executive have minor issues	Local media coverage short term reduction in public confidence; Elements of public expectation not met	Low staffing level that reduces the service quality
3	Moderate	Single breach in statutory duty; Challenging external or internal recommendations or improvement notice	Loss of 0.25-0.5 per cent of budget; Claims between £20k - £150k.	Major injuries; More than 3 days sick leave – notifiable to HSE	Control in place with no evidence to support	Members begin to be ineffective in role; Members and Executive at times do not work positively together	Local media coverage – long term reduction in public confidence	Late delivery of key objective/service due to the lack of staff; Low staff morale; Poor staff attendance for mandatory/key training
4	Major	Enforcement action; Multiple breaches of statutory duty; Improvement notices; Low performance ratings	Uncertain delivery of key objectives/loss of 0.5 – 1.0 percent of budget; Claims between £150k to £1m	Death; Single fatality	Partial control in place with no evidence	Members raise questions to officers over and above that amount tolerable; Strained relationships between Executive and Members	National media coverage with key directorates performing well below reasonable public expectation	Uncertain delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff; Unsafe staffing level or competence; Loss of key staff; Very low staff morale; No staff attending training
5	Catastrophic	Multiple breaches in statutory duty; Prosecution; Complete system changes required; Zero performance against key priorities and targets	Non delivery of key objective/loss of >1 percent of budget; Failure to meet specification/slippage; Loss of major income contract	Multiple deaths; More than one Fatality	No control in place	Internal issues within parties which prevent collaborative working; Que from members shift resources away from corporate priorities	National media coverage, public confidence eroded; Member intervention/action	Non-delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff; Ongoing unsafe staffing levels or competence; Loss of several key staff; Staff not attending training on ongoing basis

Risk Rating – Likelihood

	Likelihood	Likelihood Descriptors	Numerical likelihood
1	Rare	May occur only in exceptional circumstances	Less than 10%
2	Unlikely	Do not expect it to happen/recur but it is possible it may do so	Less than 25%
3	Possible	Might happen or recur occasionally	Less than 50%
4	Likely	Will probably happen/recur but it is not a persisting issue	50% or more
5	Very Likely	Will undoubtedly happen/recur, possibly frequently	75% or more

Capacity to Manage

Capacity to Manage	Alert	Description
Full		Full – all reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate the risk and are operating effectively. The cost / benefit considerations on implementing additional controls have been considered and no additional actions are proposed.
Substantial		Substantial – there are sound arrangements to manage the risk with some scope for improvement. Arrangements have had a demonstrable impact in reducing either the likelihood or consequence of the risk.
Moderate		Moderate – there are a number of areas for improvement in arrangements that would help to demonstrate effective and consistent management of the risk.
Limited		Limited – there are significant areas for improvement in arrangements that would help to demonstrate effective and consistent management of the risk.
None		None – there are a lack of clear arrangements in mitigation of the risk.