

Report to the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Report Reference: FPM-002-2011/12.

Date of meeting: 20 June 2011.

Portfolio: Finance and Economic Development

Subject: Risk Management – Corporate Risk Register

Responsible Officer: Edward Higgins (01992 564606).

Democratic Services: Gary Woodhall (01992 564470).

Recommendations:

- (1) To note the updating of the Corporate Risk Register;**
- (2) To consider the proposed new risk for inclusion in the Corporate Risk Register;**
- (3) To consider whether there are any new risks that are not on the current Corporate Risk Register; and**
- (4) To consider whether the tolerance line on the risk matrix should be amended.**

Executive Summary:

The Corporate Risk Register has been considered by both the Risk Management Group on 16 May and the Corporate Governance Group on the 1 June. The reviews identified one new item for inclusion on the Corporate Risk Register and one risk where the scoring should be reduced.

Reasons for Proposed Decisions:

It is essential that the Corporate Risk Register is regularly reviewed and kept up to date.

Other Options for Action:

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

Report:

1. Members are presented with the latest version of the Corporate Risk Register (Appendix 1). The register has been updated to include the items agreed at the meeting of this Committee on 21 March. The above line risk clusters have also been updated to illustrate links with the Medium Term Aims 2011-2015 and the Council Key Objectives 2011-2012.

2. New risk - Following receipt of the findings of a survey and risk analysis of the North Weald Airfield Bund, both the Risk Management Group and the Corporate Governance Group have considered the potential risk. The survey was carried out to establish the stability of the bund and the risk to the M11 motorway. The findings of the report suggest that there is no immediate concern of failure and the overall risk of failure is low to moderate. There are two sections which are of low risk of failure where the slump would reach the kerb of the M11, it is

not felt that a slump would pass beyond the hard shoulder. A report detailing the results and options available to the Council is being prepared for Cabinet.

3. Both Groups have recommended that the risk be considered for inclusion within the Corporate Risk Register with the suggested score of D3 (Low Likelihood/Marginal Impact) which is below the tolerance line. Details of the risk can be seen in Appendix 2.

4. Risk 9, Depot accommodation has previously been scored as B2 (High Likelihood/Critical Impact). In view of the work undertaken by the officer Asset Management Co-ordination Group and the North Weald Airfield and Asset Management Cabinet Committee it was felt appropriate to now reduce that score to D2 (Low Likelihood/Critical Impact).

5. Members are now asked to consider the attached updated Corporate Risk Register 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.

6. Members are also asked to consider the inclusion of the suggested new risk, North Weald Airfield Bund and whether the risk has been scored appropriately.

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:

Risk Management

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.

Equality and Diversity

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.