

		AGENDA ITEM NO.																																								
Report Cover Sheet																																										
Name of Meeting:		Executive																																								
Date of Meeting:		10 th December 2007																																								
Report Title:		Risk Register																																								
Summary of report:		To review the Corporate Risk register items which have a medium risk rating and above																																								
For Further Information Please Contact (report author):		Mary Hawkins																																								
Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Policy Framework:		No																																								
Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budgetary framework:		No																																								
Wards of the District directly affected by this decision:		All																																								
Key Decision?		No																																								
Included within the Forward Plan?		No																																								
Is the report Private & Confidential		No																																								
Background Papers:		None																																								
Consultation Undertaken																																										
Below is a table of the Council's regular consultees. However not all have to be consulted on every matter and if there was no obligation to consult with a specific consultee they will be marked as n/a.																																										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Consultees</th> <th>Yes/ No</th> <th>Who</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Other Committees</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward Councillors</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Portfolio Holders</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Cllr Coker</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Councillors</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Warwick District Council recognised Trades Unions</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Warwick District Council Service Areas</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project partners</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parish/Town Council</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highways Authority</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residents</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizens Panel</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other consultees</td> <td></td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Consultees	Yes/ No	Who	Other Committees		n/a	Ward Councillors		n/a	Portfolio Holders	Yes	Cllr Coker	Other Councillors		n/a	Warwick District Council recognised Trades Unions		n/a	Other Warwick District Council Service Areas		n/a	Project partners		n/a	Parish/Town Council		n/a	Highways Authority		n/a	Residents		n/a	Citizens Panel		n/a	Other consultees		n/a
Consultees	Yes/ No	Who																																								
Other Committees		n/a																																								
Ward Councillors		n/a																																								
Portfolio Holders	Yes	Cllr Coker																																								
Other Councillors		n/a																																								
Warwick District Council recognised Trades Unions		n/a																																								
Other Warwick District Council Service Areas		n/a																																								
Project partners		n/a																																								
Parish/Town Council		n/a																																								
Highways Authority		n/a																																								
Residents		n/a																																								
Citizens Panel		n/a																																								
Other consultees		n/a																																								

Officer Approval		
With regard to officer approval all reports must be approved by the report authors relevant director, Finance Services and Legal Services.		
Officer Approval	Date	Name
Relevant Director(s)	author	Mary Hawkins
Chief Executive		n/a
CMT	19 Nov	
Section 151 Officer		author
Legal		n/a
Finance		n/a
Final Decision?		Yes
Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)		

1. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 1.1 The Executive considers the Corporate Risk Register for those items scoring 12 and above which is attached at Appendix 1 , and considers if any further actions should be taken.

2. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 The June 2005 Executive considered a report on Risk Management and asked for all items which score 12 or above on the Corporate Risk Register be monitored and reported to the Executive on a quarterly basis. At its last meeting the Audit and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee suggested some refinements to the register and it now shows in bold items that have changed from the last report, as well as a timescale for the further actions required to bring the risk back to an acceptable level. The Executive had asked how the risk scores could be reduced; the actions required are designed to reduce the risk scores.

- 2.2 The corporate risk register considers all risks to the Councils operations, key priorities, and major projects. Individual services also have their own risk register which helps inform this process.

- 2.3 The register was last reviewed by CMT on 6 November 2007; it is reviewed in full on a quarterly basis. This full register was reported to the July 2007 Executive, with the Risk Management Progress report. Further reporting of those items marked 12 or above is scheduled as follows in the current municipal year:

CMT
Feb 6

Executive
Mar 25

- 2.4 CMT specifically considers significant partnership risks at every review of the corporate risk register. CMT considers that there are currently two major partnerships where there is significant financial and business link to the Council, and they are the Crime and Disorder partnership and South Warwickshire Tourism. Issues concerning both of these partnerships have been raised through the Council's Corporate risk register, as senior officers are familiar with the issues both are dealing with. However, as a matter of good practice they have now been asked for their own risk registers, so that these are also reviewed on a more formal basis. Both the LSP and LAA are major partnerships for the Council and as both are currently under review it is proposed that risk registers are developed in relation to both when the renewed partnership targets are agreed.
- 2.4 Items not included in the last report are shown in bold, and the items which would no longer show as a risk to report are shown with a strikethrough. CMT now consider risks in relation to capacity for support services, especially legal services, as well as the EDRMS project and building on excellence to be in a higher risk area. The reference to the call centre is no longer considered a medium risk, and is shown with a strike through as it was reported last time but will not be reported again if the improved performance continues. The abandonment level has reduced from 19% in April to 5% in October, and the waiting time has been reduced from an average of 1minute 43 seconds to 38 seconds. Although the latter is still above the original target it is not causing such a high level of complaints.

- 2.5 The scoring criteria are judgemental and are based on the likelihood of something occurring, and the impact that might have. The following are used as a basis for forming these judgements.

Likelihood

Ratings based on likelihood of frequency of occurrence and apply to all factors

- 1 - Most unlikely to ever happen
- 2 - Could happen very occasionally e.g. every 30 years/generation
- 3 - Could happen within 5 - 30 years
- 4 - Likely to happen every 3 -5 years
- 5 - Almost certain to happen at least once a year

Severity

Financial factors

Ratings based on budgetary impact

- 1 - No or very small budgetary effect
- 2 - Can be accommodated within budgets
- 3 - Relatively small (say £50,000ish) which would require budget supplement
- 4 - Significant effect on budget - £100,000 - £200,000
- 5- Very significant effect on budget £200,000 or more

Health and safety factors

Ratings based on level of injury sustained

- 1 - Incident with very limited consequences
- 2 - Minor injury
- 3 - Incapacitating injury
- 4 - Loss of limb
- 5 - Fatality

Legal ratings

Ratings based on prospect of litigation arising from Council error

- 1 - No or very small prospect of litigation
- 2 - Small prospect of litigation
- 3 - Reasonable prospect of litigation
- 4 - Very high prospect of litigation
- 5 - Certain prospect of litigation

Political sensitivity

Ratings based on level of embarrassment arising from Council error

- 1 - No or very limited embarrassment

- 2 - Small amount of embarrassment
- 3 - Medium but passing embarrassment
- 4 - Significant and sustained embarrassment
- 5 - Total loss of confidence by public

Service delivery – disruption ratings

Ratings based on level of disruption, whether service is statutory and level of effort required to recover

- 1 - No or very limited disruption
- 2 - Small amount of disruption of a non-statutory service easily recovered from
- 3 - Small amount of disruption to a statutory service or fair amount of disruption to a non-statutory service
- 4 - Large amount of disruption of a statutory service requiring significant effort to recover from
- 5 - Long term failure to deliver statutory service

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 No alternative options were considered because this was a specific request from the Executive.

4. POLICY AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 The register is based on the Council's corporate priorities and key strategic projects.
- 4.2 The risk and effect columns highlight how the risks relate to the Policy and Budget Framework, and whether they have any environmental impact.