

		Insert name and date of meeting in this box. EXECUTIVE 3rd DECEMBER 2008	Agenda Item No.
Title		Risk Register	
For further information about this report please contact		Mary Hawkins	
Service Area		Living, Lifestyles & Resources Directorate	
Wards of the District directly affected			
Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006		No	
Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number		Executive July 2008, Minute 270	
Background Papers		CMT report November 2008	

Contrary to the policy framework:	No
Contrary to the budgetary framework:	No
Key Decision?	No
Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number)	No

Officer/Councillor Approval		
With regard to officer approval all reports <u>must</u> be approved by the report authors relevant director, Finance, Legal Services and the relevant Portfolio Holder(s).		
Officer Approval	Date	Name
Relevant Director	12 Nov 08	Mary Hawkins
Chief Executive		Chris Elliott
CMT	12 Nov 08	
Section 151 Officer		Is author
Legal	11 Nov 08	Peter Oliver
Finance		
Portfolio Holder(s)	18 Nov 08	Michael Doody
Consultation Undertaken		
None		
Final Decision?		Yes
Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report sets out the latest update of the Corporate Risk Register for those items that score 12 or more.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 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.

3. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The Executive should be aware of its overall responsibility for managing the activities of the Council, and a key element of this is the management of risk.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTION CONSIDERED

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

5. BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 The risk register sets out when the realisation of risks might have financial consequences. One of the criteria for severity is based on the financial impact.

6. POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 6.1 The register is based on the Council's corporate priorities and key strategic projects that now reflect the decisions of the February Executive and the new Corporate Strategy.

7. BACKGROUND

- 7.1 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 to be monitored and reported to the Executive on a quarterly basis. The Audit and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee suggested some refinements to the register and it now includes a timescale for the further actions required to bring the risk back to an acceptable level. As this is the first summary report under the new Corporate Strategy for this time only it has not been possible to identify changes to the last summary report.
- 7.2 The corporate risk register considers all risks to the Council's operations, key priorities, and major projects. Individual services also have their own risk register which helps inform this process.
- 7.3 The register was last reviewed by CMT on 11 November 2008. The register is reviewed in full on a quarterly basis. This full register was reported to the July 2008 Executive, with the Risk Management Progress report.
- 7.4 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.. As a matter of good practice these organisations have now been asked for their own risk registers, so that these are also reviewed on a more formal basis by the Council. It is now understood that both these organisations are actively developing a risk register.

- 7.5 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