



Appendix A Revised Scoring for Corporate Risks

Impact Likelihood	Minor (1)	Moderate (2)	Serious (3)	Critical (4)	Catastrophic (5)
Very High (5)	Moderate (5)	Substantial (10)	Substantial (15)	Intolerable (20)	Intolerable (25)
High (4)	Tolerable (4)	Moderate (8)	Substantial (12)	Intolerable (16)	Intolerable (20)
Significant (3)	Tolerable (3)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (9)	Substantial (12)	Substantial (15)
Low (2)	Tolerable (2)	Tolerable (4)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (8)	Substantial (10)
Very Unlikely (1)	Tolerable (1)	Tolerable (2)	Tolerable (3)	Tolerable (4)	Moderate (5)



Appendix B Project RAID LOG Scoring Matrix



	Probability	Impact	Score
1	Unlikely to happen.	Low impact - will not affect project progress or deliverables.	High impact - will seriously disrupt project, cause significant extra cost or delays, severely affect the quality of the project's deliverables or greatly restrict its scope.
2	Fairly likely to happen.	Medium impact - may slow progress, cause more cost, affect the quality of the deliverables or somewhat restrict the scope of the project.	
3	Certain, very likely to happen.	High impact - will seriously disrupt project, cause significant extra cost or delays, severely affect the quality of the project's deliverables or greatly restrict its scope.	

Appendix C

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Key Actions	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score. (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk delivery manager
1 Financial	4	Failure to identify and deliver savings to meet the expected funding gap to 2018/19 and the uncertainty of funding both from year to year and beyond 2015/16 resulting in an unclear service delivery model for the future	<p>1) MTFP updated and rolled forward to 2019/20 which adds a further £0.9m to the Authority's original £7.1m funding gap.</p> <p>2) Taking into account agreed Phase 1 & 2 proposals from Changing the Service, Shaping our Future programme funding gap is reduced to a revised figure of £1.7m</p> <p>3) Opportunities for further collaboration with public sector partners being examined especially around support services</p> <p>4) Bids for capital funding made against CLG Fire / Local Authority Transformation Funds - results expected autumn 2014</p> <p>5) Ongoing work through ESFOA seeking to maximise income from council tax and non-domestic rates.</p> <p>6) Proposal for Business Rate Pool for consideration by Fire Authority 11 September 2014</p> <p>7) Improvement and Efficiency reserve established to fund transformation initiatives</p> <p>8) Service Transformation Team being established to manage delivery of all Phase 1-3 proposals.</p>	3	3	<p>9 (Moderate) Previous qtr (12)</p> 	Chief Fire Officer & Chief Executive	Treasurer
2 Technology	4	a) Sustained Technological failure and b) failure to deliver organisational change as a result of a lack of a robust and effective modern ICT infrastructure	<p>1. Business critical work to renew or replace risk critical equipment has been identified and costed. CMT have been appraised of these tasks and have supported the work (Jan 2014 CMT meeting), the critical works will be completed throughout the current financial year, with the intention of minimising disruption and inaccessibility of core systems whilst this work proceeds.</p> <p>2. The current ICT estate and staffing model will be sustained until a new operating model is delivered. The options under review include commercial and shared service opportunities and will seek to provide an affordable, secure, resilient and fully accessible ICT infrastructure. It is hoped to transition to a new state within 18 months from the appointment of the 3rd party support, has commenced July 2014.</p>	4	3	<p>12 (Substantial)</p> 	Assistant Chief Fire Officer	Assistant Chief Fire Officer

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Key Actions	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score. (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk delivery manager
3 Partnership	4	Sussex Control Centre does not deliver effective mobilisation service or planned savings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Regular monthly recorded meetings with Remsdaq 2) Successful Factory acceptance, Site and User acceptance tests will ensure specification and functionality tested at all stages 3) Milestone payments are not triggered until pass of acceptance tests and are staged. 4) Other FRS have contract with Remsdaq therefore market pressure to deliver 5) Remsdaq sub contractors are established in sector and are proven working systems 6) SCC Executive Governance Board meets quarterly to monitor the SCC and performance including budget performance and review Section 16 agreements 7) SCC go live will be subject to sign off by both Senior Users 8) Regular monthly financial reporting to SCC Project Board, Management Teams and Governance Boards 9) Savings target for 2014/15 revised to reflect delay in implementation 	3	4	<p style="text-align: center;">12 (Substantial)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↔</p>	Assistant Chief Officer until go live / Deputy Chief Fire Officer post go live	Sussex Control Centre (SCC) Project Manager until go live / Director of Response and Resilience post
			<p style="color: red;">Post go live</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Section 16 and SCC Concept of Operations provide the strategic operational framework for the SCC, including arrangements under which call handling, mobilisation and related functions are discharged. 2) SCC Operational Governance Board, made up of representatives of both East and West Sussex FRS, meets monthly to ensure that the Joint Control is effective, efficient and resilient and that any issues and areas of concern are reported and acted upon 3) ESFRS specific operational and performance matters considered at the monthly Response & Resilience management team meetings 4) A previously agreed review of shift times and proposed mid-shift begins in February to consider options for further improving SCC efficiency. 	4	2	<p style="text-align: center;">8 (Moderate)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↔</p>		

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Key Actions	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score. (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk delivery manager
4 Leadership	4	Failure to effectively lead/manage the service through a period of significant change as a result of lack of corporate capacity, management competences and poor staff engagement	<p>1) Undertake a review and realignment of corporate references and engage with Heads of Service/Function to review middle and senior managers' responsibilities and accountabilities. Review undertaken and presented to PO's on 16/6/14. Head of Performance Management to feedback PO's views and establish action plan.</p> <p>2) ACO and Head of Learning & Organisational Development (H of L & OD) to review leadership development to meet evolving and emerging needs. TBC once finalised</p> <p>3) ACO and Communications and Marketing Manager to review staff communication strategy to promote effective organisational communications. Work planned for 3rd & 4th quarter of 14/15 POD BP. Completed and will be considered in due course by CMT and FA in 2015</p>	3	2	6 (Moderate) 	Chief Fire Officer & Chief Executive	Assistant Chief Officer
5 Community	1	Longer term Industrial Action could impact on the ability to deliver services, impact on the relationships with the workforce and has the potential for reputational damage	<p>1) Constant Review of Business Continuity and Industrial Action Contingency Plans</p> <p>2) Maintain consultation and negotiation with trade unions</p> <p>3) Maintain effective communications</p> <p>4) Monitor impact on service delivery</p> <p>5) CFA advised of progress through regular updates and impact of changing FBU strategy on contingency plans and resilience</p> <p>6) Impact on training delivery L&OD have provided additional resource to manage training plans and expected long tail during and following IA/ASOS periods</p>	3	3	9 (Moderate) 	Deputy Chief Fire Officer	Director of Prevention and Protection

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Key Actions	Impact Score	Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score. (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk delivery manager
6 Communication	3	Key stakeholders including the public, members, employees and partners are insufficiently informed about/engaged in the difficult choices the Authority faces	1) ACO, Head of Performance Management and Communications and Marketing Manager to work with the Chairman, Vice Chair and the Fire Authority to engage with local communities, local authority partners, agencies and other organisations. Item for consideration at Members Seminar 2) Utilise a variety of media to support communication strategy. New communications strategy prepared.	3	2	6 (Moderate) 	Assistant Chief Officer	Head of Performance Management/ Communications Manager
7 Resource	6	Failure to maintain staff morale, motivation and attitudes will adversely impact on service delivery/ performance and the ability to successfully deliver service transformation/ ESFRS change programme	1) Support middle and senior managers to ensure regular meetings and engagement with staff and to review feedback from managers. Presentation to Members Seminar 29th Oct 2014 2) Ensure staff representative bodies are engaged with and informed of emerging issues. 3) Continue to develop communication opportunities including where appropriate, social media. New Communications Strategy	4	2	8 (Moderate) 	Chief Fire Officer & Chief Executive	Assistant Chief Officer/Head of Performance / Communications & Marketing Manager

Appendix D - ESFRS Corporate Projects Risk Report

Compiled 07/10/2014



	Project	Identified	Reviewed	Description	Probability (1-3)	Negative Impact (1-3)	Score	Mitigation	Owner
R1	Community Risk Management Database	22/09/2014	New	Industrial action by staff delays the project and makes it difficult to meet deadlines or deliver the outcomes.	3	3	9	Flexible planning, to mitigate disruption where possible.	Head of Protection & Prevention
R2	Data Warehouse	01/02/2013	21/07/2014	Quality and timeliness of information from Remsdaq to the DW team causes problems.	3	3	9	API documentation is not being updated and remains poor.	Assistant Chief Fire Officer
R3	JESIP (Junior Officer Training)	20/8/2014	New	Instructor resources may not be available due to competing demands and other uncontrollable issues	3	3	9	The deadline for completion will be extended to ease the resource pressures.	JESIP Delivery Lead
R4	Community Risk Management Database	22/09/2014	New	Work to bring Operational Risk scoring within the scope of the project could impact timescales, workloads and budget, unless further funding is identified.	2	3	6	CMT to be made aware that any extension to project scope will require increased budget, and may delay the main project	Head of Protection & Prevention
R5	Respiratory Protective Equipment	26/09/2014	New	Project expenditure could increase significantly.	2	3	6	Financial analysis of current operational procurement frameworks is being carried out .	Assistant Chief Fire Officer
R6	P-Cards	20/02/2014	19/09/2014	IMD is unable to commit sufficient resources to support the project.	2	3	6	Give IMD advance warning; obtain commitment re resourcing.	Contracts & Procurement Manager
R7	P-Cards	20/02/2014	19/09/2014	There is poor take-up and resistance to new working methods.	2	3	6	Ensure that reasons for P-Cards, and their advantages are understood. Arrange training for all staff who will be affected. Involve departments in Project Board.	Contracts & Procurement Manager
R8	P-Cards	20/02/2014	19/09/2014	SAP transfer – there may be problems with information transfer via SAP interface.	2	3	6	Ask Systems Analyst to attend Board. Contracts & Procurement Manager to write to new Head of IMD.	Contracts & Procurement Manager

	Project	Identified	Reviewed	Description	Probability (1-3)	Negative Impact (1-3)	Score	Mitigation	Owner
R9	JESIP (Junior Officer Training)	15/11/2013	06/08/2014	Industrial action impacts one or more prearranged training events.	3	2	6	Project has built in a slippage period to allow catch-ups and make the schedule more robust.	JESIP Delivery Lead
R10	GIS – Local GIS – SCC	07/07/2014 03/07/2014	07/08/2014	Windows 7 is not installed and ready to use when required by MapInfo.	2	3	6	We may be able to install Windows 7 without full compliance with current application control standards. If not, these projects probably won't proceed.	Development Services Manager
R11	Data Warehouse	27/01/2014	21/07/2014	No Disaster Recovery in place for Data Warehouse at present. The staff who were progressing this are not available due to sickness and the demands of SCC.	2	3	6	A backup service is installed, but EVA is still outstanding.	Assistant Chief Fire Officer
R12	Business Intelligence	20/03/2014	16/09/2014	IMD Transformation Programme and changes in staffing impact all project implementations in ESFRS, including this project.	2	3	6	Skills in Performance Management Team will become critical if the project is put on hold.	Head of Performance and Review
R13	Business Intelligence	20/03/2014	16/09/2014	The Data Warehouse is not available when the system is implemented, leading to complex interface issues.	3	2	6	We will have to implement a work-round e.g. data dump from Firewatch.	Head of Performance and Review
R14	Business Intelligence	10/07/2014	16/09/2014	Lack of policy on hosting options has impacted resources and could severely delay the project and impact the project budget.	3	2	6	Waiting for feedback from ACFO on hosting. Clarification from IMD on which hosting options they require us to take.	Systems Analyst