TO: **EXECUTIVE – 13th FEBRUARY 2006**

SUBJECT: **QUARTERLY CORPORATE RISK REGISTER REVIEW**

FROM: **STRATEGIC DIRECTOR (CORPORATE RESOURCES)**

1.   **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

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

1.2   A further report is presented for review to the 12TH June , 2006 Executive.

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.

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.

Mary Hawkins
Strategic Director (Corporate Resources)

BACKGROUND PAPERS
None

Areas in District Affected: All

Executive Portfolio Area and Holder: Corporate and Strategic Leadership
                                           Councillor Bob Crowther

Key Decision: No

Included in Forward Plan: No

If Yes, method of consultation:

For further information about this report please contact:
Contact Officer: Mary Hawkins Tel: (01926) 456400 (Direct Line) E-Mail: mary.hawkins@warwickdc.gov.uk

K:\Committee reports\Exec 24 Oct 05\risk management.doc

5. BACKGROUND

5.1 This register was last reviewed by CMT on 14th December 2005, it is reviewed on a quarterly basis.

5.2 The new CPA Use of Resources Assessment includes at Level 3 the following requirement

"The risk management process specifically identifies risks in relation to partnerships and provides for assurances to be obtained about the management of those risks."

CMT discussed this point and agreed that they would include a specific heading for Partnership Risk in order to remind them to ensure all partnership issues are addressed. However the embedding of risk management has meant that partnership issues have been included when an integral part of other projects.

5.4 The scoring criteria are set out below:

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

<u>Ratings based on prospect of litigation arising from Council error</u>

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

<u>Ratings based on level of embarrassment arising from Council error</u>

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

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

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

5.5   The item on the register relating to Procurement has put back the target date for a report on the strategy to March '06 from September '05. Due to the workload of the Strategic Director (Community Resources) over the last six months with the absence of a Head of housing Strategy, the introduction of choice based lettings and the new use of resources assessment there has been a delay in progressing this work.

5.6   Many members attended training on risk management in January of this year, in order to better understand the process and their role. One of the issues raised at the sessions has been the Council's approach to managing in the event of an influenza pandemic. This is covered by business continuity work, and CMT will need to consider this further in the light of any guidance issued by the Health Authority.