Report to the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee

Report Reference: FCC-020-2009/10
Date of meeting: 25 January 2010

Epping Forest District Council

Portfolio: **Performance Management**

Subject: **Risk Management – Updated Corporate Risk Register**

Responsible Officer: **Edward Higgins (01992 564606).**

Democratic Services: **Gary Woodhall (01992 564470).**

Decisions Required:

(1) To note the updating of the Corporate Risk Register and the changes of scoring for three risks;

(2) To consider whether there are any new risks that are not on the current Corporate Risk Register; and

(3) To consider whether the tolerance line on the risk matrix should be amended.

Executive Summary:

The meeting of this Committee on 5 October 2009 agreed the addition of two new risks to the Corporate Risk Register. The register has subsequently been considered by the Risk Management Group on 1 December and the Corporate Governance Group on 23 December. These reviews identified a need to update some of the vulnerabilities and amend the scoring of three existing risks.

Reasons for Proposed Decisions:

It is essential that the Corporate Risk Register is regularly reviewed and kept upto date. The decisions are a necessary part of this well-established process.

Other Options for Action:

Members may suggest new risks for inclusion or changes to the scoring of existing risks.

Report:

1. The December meetings of the Risk Management Group and the Corporate Governance Group reviewed the risks and their scores to take account of any changes since 5 October. It was felt that the vulnerabilities for some risks had not been updated for sometime and were partially out of date and that circumstances had changed for three risks such that their scores should be increased.

2. The first risk suggested for amendment and an increase in scoring is risk 9, depot accommodation. This risk had previously been scored as E2 (very low likelihood, critical impact) and had concentrated on the overall availability of depot space. In view of increasing concern about overcrowding at the Langston Road Depot and potential conflicts between users, the wording of the risk has been expanded and the score increased to B2 (high likelihood, critical impact).

3. The second risk suggested for an increase in scoring is risk 17, significant amount of capital receipts spent on non revenue generating assets. This risk had previously been scored as D2 (low likelihood, critical impact). As the Capital Strategy adopted by Council on 22 December now gives top priority to “Meeting Housing Needs” it was felt that the likelihood of capital receipts being spent on non revenue generating assets had increased to C (significant).

4. The final risk suggested for an increase in scoring is risk 18, loss or theft of data. This risk had previously been scored as D2 (low likelihood, critical impact). There has been a well publicised breach of the Data Protection legislation due to a staff error in producing a confidential agenda. Similarly to risk 17, it was felt appropriate to increase the likelihood to C (significant).

5. Members are now asked to consider the attached updated Corporate Risk Register (Annex 1) and whether the risks listed are scored appropriately, whether there are any additional risks that should be included and whether the tolerance line needs to be amended.

Resource Implications:

No additional resource requirements.

Legal and Governance Implications:

The Corporate Risk Register is an important part of the Council’s overall governance arrangements and that is why this Committee considers it on a regular basis.

Safer, Cleaner, Greener Implications:

None.

Consultation Undertaken:

The Risk Management Group and the Corporate Governance Group have been consulted.

Background Papers:

None.

Impact Assessments:

<u>Risk Management</u>
If the Corporate Risk Register was not regularly reviewed and updated a risk that threatened the achievement of corporate objectives might either not be managed or be managed inappropriately.

<u>Equality and Diversity:</u>

Did the initial assessment of the proposals contained in this report for relevance to the Council’s general equality duties, reveal any potentially adverse equality implications?	No
Where equality implications were identified through the initial assessment process, has a formal Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken?	N/A

What equality implications were identified through the Equality Impact Assessment process?
N/A

How have the equality implications identified through the Equality Impact Assessment been addressed in this report in order to avoid discrimination against any particular group?
N/A