AUDIT COMMITTEE – 27TH NOVEMBER 2018

Report of the Head of Strategic Support

Part A

RISK MANAGEMENT (RISK REGISTER) UPDATE

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with details of the interim Strategic Risk Register produced for 2018/19 and to provide an update on progress with the review of the Risk Management Framework.

Recommendation

The Committee notes the report.

<u>Reason</u>

To ensure the Committee is kept informed of progress against the strategic risks that should they crystallise would cause the Council to be unable to operate and/or provide key services leading to a significant adverse effect on public wellbeing'.

Policy Justification and Previous Decisions

The interim Strategic Risk Register for 2018/19 was approved by Cabinet on the 14th June 2018. Cabinet resolved that the Audit Committee monitor progress against those risks on the register by receiving and considering monitoring reports on a quarterly basis.

Implementation Timetable including Future Decisions

Reports will continue to be submitted to the Committee on a quarterly basis.

Report Implications

The following implications have been identified for this report.

Financial Implications

None

Risk Management

There are no specific risks associated with this decision.

Background Papers: None

Officer(s) to contact:

Adrian Ward (01509) 634573 adrian.ward@charnwood.gov.uk

Shirley Lomas (01509) 634806 shirley.lomas@charnwood.gov.uk

Part B

Background

- 1. In accordance with the Committee's work programme the Committee receives monitoring reports in respect of the Councils risk management arrangements. The reports provide a detailed commentary against the risks included in the strategic risk register.
- 2. The current interim strategic risk register is provided for information at Appendix A. This shows the position as at 30th June 2018. The register was not reviewed at the end of Quarter 2 (September 2018) as the review of the Council's Risk Management Framework had commenced.
- 3. The Council's current risk matrix is shown at Appendix B to assist the Committee in considering the status of the identified strategic risks.

Review of the Risk Management Framework

- 4. During March 2018, the Council was subject to a Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Challenge review. One of the recommendations (Recommendation 7) arising from the review was for the Council to:
 - Establish risk appetite and strengthen approach to risk management. To provide stronger assurance around risk and identify a risk tolerance level that is right for Charnwood to further its commercial activities.

To address this recommendation, it was decided that the Council's risk management framework would be reviewed and a revised risk management framework and strategy, including the risk register format, proposed to Members.

- 5. Work has been undertaken to research best practice in risk management to inform the review of the risk management framework and develop proposals for senior management and Members consideration.
- Proposals for 'risk appetite' and for amendments to the framework were presented to and agreed by the Senior Management Team during October 2018. These proposals were taken forward for consideration to the Risk Management Group (Corporate Management Team) and to the Cabinet Member Briefing in November 2018.
- Following the completion of the review a revised Risk Management Strategy and Strategic Risk Register will be proposed to Cabinet. This is scheduled for December 2018.

Appendices

Appendix A – Strategic Risk Register 2018/19 as at 30th June 2018.

Appendix B – Current Risk Matrix

APPENDIX A - Strategic Risk Register 2018/19 as at 30th June 2018

						considered. Hybrid Mail – the bu	ant therefore wider options are being siness case was approved by the Project and awaits sign off by the Programme eeting.
SR2	Inadequate data sharing and data security arrangements.	 Ineffective processes for sharing of data with appropriate agencies/authorities leading to safeguarding failure. Theft or loss of data Viral attack Improper disclosure of confidential information. Disposal of IT equipment Non – communication between parties e.g. of data security incidences. Failure to comply with GDPR requirements. 	 Major reputational damage Loss of public confidence in the organisation. Inability to operate key business processes 	4 (Probable)	5 (Severe)		 Current Controls & Actions Policies and processes are in place for interagency referrals and data sharing in safeguarding matters. Membership and attendance at meetings of county wide group involving district. Implementation Group (DIG), a county wide group involving district, borough and county councils within Leicestershire and the Local Safeguarding Children's Board that brings together all the main organisations who work with children and families in Leicestershire. Annual IT Health Checks including penetration testing. Data Protection guidance and training for staff. IT Security Policies in place. Plans in place to meet Government standards (PSN/GDPR) Protective marking and security controls on emails which allow appropriate labelling of protect and restricted information. Staff and Member training on Information Security Policies and practice and sign up to policies – implementation of annual sign up. Training of key staff with designated information Security responsibilities Data Protection Officer in place Improvement Plan signed off by Information Commissioners Office July 2017. Completed January 2018. Refresher data protection training provided and has been completed by all staff. Information Asset Register and processes for its management in place. Roles and responsibilities of senior officers have been reviewed. Information management processes have been reviewed to ensure compliance with GDPR.

3 (Possible)	4 (Major)	12 ↑↑

	1. Information Asset Register to be completed to include data sharing agreements.1. Aug 2018Info resp bee thei2. Project initiated January 2018 to ensure full compliance with Payment Card2. Jan 2019The		Current Status : Information Asset Register is in place but there are gaps in respect of data sharing agreements. Heads of Service have been asked to provide the data sharing agreements in place in their service areas.		Services					
			2. Jan 2019		The project plan was presented to the ICT Steering Board in May 2018.		Strategic Director of Corporate Services			
SR3	Inadequate civil contingency arrangements resulting in failure to respond appropriately to a major incident.	 Major incident/catastrophic event Terrorism threat Flooding External fuel shortage Pandemics Major failure of power and other utilities within the Borough and wider area. Major civil unrest. Lack of adequately trained staffed to respond to an emergency. 	 Inability to deliver key/critical services e.g. benefits, refuse collection, homelessness applications, emergency repairs. Increased short term demand for services e.g. housing - alternative accommodation, repairs. 	2 (Unlikely)	5 (Severe)	10 ↑ ↑	 Current Controls & Actions Participation in the Local Resilience Forum Emergency plans in place for major events e.g. flood, fire and mass evacuation. Emergency planning documents and contacts available on Resilience Direct website. Testing of emergency plans e.g. flood exercise. Business Continuity arrangements as for Strategic Risk 1. 24/7 call out arrangements for senior managers and Emergency Management Officer. LRF call out documents updated. Rolling LRF programme of training and exercising for major incidents, recovery process and emergency centres. Participation in LRF lead teleconferencing on likelihood of terrorist threat being heightened and all partners response should this occur. Participation in Events Safety Advisory Group. SMT/CMT on call duty rota in place 	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8
	Future Actions Planned: 1. Increase numbers of staff trained to both support emergency centres and fulfil loggist role.				:	Current Status: Two members of staft loggist training.	f have been identified to complete the	Responsible Strategic Dire Services.		porate

APPENDIX B – RISK MATRIX

		Remote 1	Unlikely 2	Possible 3	Probable 4	Highly Probable 5
	Severe 5	5 ↑	10 个个	15 ↑ ↑	20 1 1 1	25 ↑ ↑ ↑
I M	Major 4	4 =	8	12 12	16 ↑ ↑ ↑	20 ↑ ↑ ↑
MPAC	Moderate 3	3 =	6 个	9 ↑	12 ↑ ↑	¹⁵ ♠♠
Ť	Minor 2	2 =	4 =	6 ↑	8	10 ↑ ↑
	Insignificant 1	1 =	2 =	3 =	4 =	5

LIKELIHOOD

Table 1: Description and definitions of the LIKELIHOOD of the RISK occurring

Scale / Level	Descriptor	Description
1	Remote	May only occur in exceptional circumstances
2	Unlikely	Is unlikely to occur, but could occur at some time
3	Possible	Fairly likely to occur at some time, or in some circumstances
4	Probable	Will probably occur at some time, or in most circumstances
5	Highly Probable	Is expected to occur in most circumstances

Table 2: An example of the description and definition of the IMPACT of the RISK should it occur (these are not set in stone – they are merely a guide)

Risk	Scale	Effect - Service Delivery	Effect - Financial	Effect Health & Safety	Effect – Environment	Effect – Reputation
Severe	5	Severe disruption to CBC. Loss of service	Severe financial loss >£1,000,000	Loss of life. Intervention by HSE	Significant local, national and/or international environmental	Extensive coverage in the national press and broadsheet

		delivery for more than seven days			damage	editorial, and/or a national TV item
Major	4	Major disruption to CBC – serious damage to CBC's ability to service its customers. Loss of service for more than 48 hours but less than 7 days	Major financial loss >£100,000 -<£1,000,000	Extensive / multiple injuries. Intervention by HSE	Major damage to the local environment	Coverage in national broadsheets, the press, and/or low national TV reporting
Moderate	3	Noticeable disruption to CBC – some customers would be affected. Loss of service no more than 48 hours	High financial loss >£25,000 - <£100,000	Violence, threat or major injury - medical treatment required. Intervention by HSE	Moderate damage to the local environment	Coverage in the national tabloid press and/or extensive front page coverage in local press, and/or TV
Minor	2	Some disruption to internal business only - no loss of customer service	Medium financial loss >£5,000 - <£25,000	Minor injury - first aid treatment only required	Minor damage to the local environment	Minimal reputation damage. Minimal coverage in the local press
Insignificant	1	Insignificant disruption to internal business – no loss of customer service	Low financial loss <£5,000	No injuries	No, or insignificant environmental damage	No reputational damage