

**Policy & Resources Panel
Agenda Item No. 073
Appendices A, B, C and D**

CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Scoring for all Corporate Risk and Project RAID Log

Appendix A

Impact / Likelihood	Moderate (1)	Significant (2)	Serious (3)	Critical (4)
Certain/High (4)	Tolerable (4)	Moderate (8)	Substantial (12)	Intolerable (16)
Very Likely (3)	Tolerable (3)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (9)	Substantial (12)
Low (2)	Tolerable (2)	Tolerable (4)	Moderate (6)	Moderate (8)
Unlikely (1)	Tolerable (1)	Tolerable (2)	Tolerable (3)	Moderate (4)

Corporate Risk and Project Raid Log Scoring Matrix

Appendix B

Impact	Moderate	Significant	Serious	Critical
Score	1	2	3	4
Financial	≤ £10000	≤ £100,000	≤ £500,000	≤ £1 m +
Reputation	Damage limitation	Adverse Publicity	Poor Reputation	Complete loss of public confidence
Service Delivery	would not restrict or service delivery	Could restrict service delivery or restrict delivery of an ESFRS Aim	Could stop service delivery or unable to delivery an ESFRS Aim	Would affect service delivery to our communities

Likelihood	Unlikely	Low	Very Likely	Certain/High
Score	1	2	3	4
Frequency	One case reported in the past 5 years, may re-occur if only limited control measures are not applied and continued monitoring. (0-24% probability)	One or two cases in the past 2 - 5 years or may re occur if not all control measures are not applied within the next 6 months and continue to monitor. (25-49% probability)	One or two cases in past 2 years or expected to happen if controls measures are slow being applied, and failure to monitor progress. (50-74% probability)	One or more cases in past 2 years. Failure to take immediate action could impact on service delivery or safety of personnel/ community. (75-100% probability)

Appendix C

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post 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 2021/22 and the uncertainty of future funding resulting in an unclear service delivery model for the future.	4	4	16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MTFP updated September 2016 and indicates balanced budget for 17/18 and 21/22 with some flexibility in intervening years. Assumes 1.94% p.a. increase in Council Tax and delivery of all agreed savings including Riding at Standard. 2) Government has commenced consultation on 100% devolution of Business Rates – situation being monitored alongside impact of budget announcements which impact on BR income i.e. extension of small business rate reliefs, RPI to CPI and move for all schools to become academies. 3) Delivery of savings monitored on a monthly basis ensuring savings delivery now subject to closer monitoring and latest position built into revised MTFP. Opportunities for further collaboration with public sector partners being examined especially around support services and through Emergency Services Collaboration Project. 4) Bridging the Savings Gap project underway to ensure delivery of Changes to Ridership and other associated savings. Work is also being carried out to review the management of the operational pay budget and the pressures identified through budget monitoring. 5) Ongoing work through ESFOA seeking to maximise income from council tax and non- domestic rates. 6) Business Rate Pool approved by CLG – monitoring risk posed by NHS Trusts seeking charitable relief and also impact of other changes to BR including 2017 valuation on prospects for Pool beyond 2016/17. ESFOA to review position w/c 9 January 2017 in advance of DCLG deadline. 7) Improvement and Efficiency reserve established to fund transformation initiatives. 8) Work started on the review of the IRMP will more clearly link service provision to the public, to the MTFP. 9) Efficiency Plan approved by the Home Office to secure multi-year funding offer providing some certainty to aid financial planning 	3	3	9 (Moderate)	CFO	AD Resources/ Treasurer

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
2 Technology	4	<p>1) Sustained Technological failure, and</p> <p>2) Failure to deliver organisational change as a result of a lack of a robust and effective modern ICT infrastructure and a lack of supported infrastructure and systems through fewer and less skilled staff.</p> <p>3) Failure to manage effective transition to new outsourced service</p>	4	4	16	<p>1) IMD transformation will deliver secure and resilient IT provision through external provider telent.</p> <p>2) Service delivery with telent Technology Services went live 18 November and delivery being monitored closely initially under hyper-care arrangement</p> <p>3) Client management function.(ITG – Information Technology Group) in place from 18 November to manage interface with both business and suppliers.</p> <p>4) Delivery of contract milestones being monitored closely through ITG and IMD Transformation Board</p> <p>5) Internal governance model agreed by CMT, with Service Management Board meeting monthly from December to review contract performance and IT Strategy Group meeting on quarterly basis from Feb 2017. Periodic reports will be made to CMT and Scrutiny & Audit Panel.</p> <p>6) An Interim IMD Manager with relevant experience of transitions to support the Service in place September 2016.</p> <p>7) As part of the 2016/17 Budget Report, Members agreed to set up a £2m IMD Transformation reserve to fund the anticipated one off costs of implementation.</p> <p>8) Detailed review of IT budget for current year and 2017/18 and beyond underway to feed into budget setting process.</p> <p>9) Reliance on temporary resources and consultancy being scaled down as ITG takes ownership of external contract.</p> <p>10) An Outline IMD Strategy has been developed and will be progressed to a final version ready for Member approval in Q1 2017. This will set out how the Authority will deliver against its ambition for IMD transformation and include high level costings to allow overall investment decisions to be made.</p>	4	2	8 (Moderate)	DCFO	AD Resources / Treasurer

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
3 Partnership	4	1) Sussex Control Centre does not deliver effective mobilisation service or planned savings 2) Failure to deliver full specification for MOB's leading to contractual issues.	4	4	16	<u>Remsdaq Project</u> 1) The Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) is now preceded by a joint pre-FAT program overseen by the SCC Implementation Project Board. 2) The Site and User Acceptance Tests will ensure specification and functionality tested after installation at Hayward's Heath. 3) Any milestone payments are not triggered until pass of acceptance tests and these are staged. 4) SCC 'go live' will be subject to sign off by both Senior Users, and the 'switchover' operation will be agreed and validated by SCC Implementation Project Board 5) Regular monthly progress and financial reporting to SCC Implementation Board, both Management Teams and the Executive Governance Board. 6) Savings target for 2016/17 revised to reflect delays in implementation. 7) Additional resources made available due to extension of the go live date to ensure interim service is maintained in accordance with Section 16, these costs are shared. 8) The project has been subjected to scrutiny by internal audit – report findings are now progressed and monitored by the SCC Implementation Board. 9) Additional support in the form of a Project Consultant now in place to refresh and refocus project management arrangements 10) The maintenance contract for the 3Tc legacy system has now been extended 11) The Home Office have commissioned an external review of the project to date to consider matters related to the delay in implementation. The outcomes from this review will provide further support to the Service in relation to delivering the project 12) Recommendations from HO report have now been captured within an action plan overseen by SCC Implementation Board	4	3	12 (Substantial)	ACFO	AD OS&R

						<p><u>Business as usual</u></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 reps of Services, 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 relevant management team meetings.4) SCC staffing is a significant concern. Current establishment levels and working arrangements are challenging for staff and managers. There is higher sickness levels and potential increase in attrition. Current arrangements include fixed term contracts, zero hour contracts, and there are plans to move forward with dual operator training. These arrangements will be reviewed once 4i is installed, tested and operational5) Senior Management meetings with local managers and rep body officials have identified a number of actions to resolve outstanding issues and improve local processes				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post 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	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Planning & Improvement AD and Communications and Marketing Manager to review staff communication strategy to promote effective organisational communications. Completed and will be reviewed 2016 following restructure. 2) Members are to consider proposals for a Talent Management Scheme to address and support mitigations on future risks and succession planning. Now part of the restructure programme – ACFO to develop with AD HR&OD 3) Restructure to address a number of strategic roles and management structures. 2 New POs started June 2016 (DCFO & ACFO). Restructure complete and reported to Members. 4) Develop a strategy to ensure a clear, effective sustainable framework for future staff engagement. 5) Develop an Organisational Development Strategy which will include leadership as a key component alongside a workforce and career development plan 	3	3	9 (Moderate)	CFO	ACFO

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
5 Community	1	1) Longer term Industrial Action (IA) could impact on the ability to deliver services, impact on the relationships with the workforce and has the potential for reputational damage 2) Short to medium term impact of Action Short of Strike (ASOS)	3	3	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Constant Review of Business Continuity and Industrial Action Contingency Plans. 2) Maintain consultation and negotiation with trade unions. 3) Maintain effective communications with staff 4) The FBU has made a legal challenge to the FPS 2015 on the grounds of potential discrimination – the NJC is managing the claim on behalf of all FRS on a shared cost basis and has signed up Bevan Brittan LLP to act on our collective behalf. 5) FBU have advised no industrial action to take place under this dispute until at least June 2017 6) Related BC and Industrial Action Contingency Plans to be reviewed during third quarter 2016/17. 	2	3	6 (Moderate)	ACFO	AD OS&R

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post 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.	3	3	9	<p>1) Stakeholder and staff pre engagement sessions regarding the development of the new IRMP were held Consultation closed on 7th November and the results will be considered by the Fire Authority in December. Different communication methods were utilised and the reach of the consultation is estimated at being</p> <p>Newspapers online/print Brighton Argus reach per issue 32,000 Herald reach per issue 12,250 Observer series reach per issue 18,000 Total newspaper reach of 62,250</p> <p>Social media Twitter (unpaid) 11,000 Facebook (unpaid) 3,800 Facebook (paid) 113,200 Total social media reach 128,00 Mail out Total households reached 10,100 Estimated Total overall reach of communications activities 200,350</p>	2	2	4 (Moderate)	DCFO	AD Planning & Improvement
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.	4	3	12	<p>1) Support middle and senior managers to ensure regular meetings and engagement with staff and to review feedback from managers.</p> <p>2) Ensure staff representative bodies are engaged with and informed of emerging issues.</p> <p>3) Continue to develop communication opportunities including where appropriate, social media and new Communications Strategy.</p> <p>4) Staff briefings and engagement for SHQ relocation proposals.</p> <p>5) Trade Union and management briefings in place October 2015 to discuss outcome of local consultations on savings proposals – proposals accepted by trade unions and implementation being considered for April 2016.</p> <p>6) Bridging the savings board is now managing implementation with engagement of staff and rep bodies from 1st April 2016.</p> <p>7) Develop a strategy to ensure a clear, effective sustainable framework for future staff engagement.</p> <p>8) Programme of PO and CMT visits to all staff groups and stations.</p>	3	3	6 (Moderate)	ACFO	CMT

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
8 Leadership/ Resource	4,5,7	Failure to successfully relocate ESFRS to shared Headquarters building with Sussex Police in Lewes	3	3	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) CFA Members and SHQ staff have been fully sighted on the reasons (opportunity and cost) for this relocation and the likely changes regarding technology and dispersal locations. 2) Funding for the one off costs of the project both revenue and capital has been agreed. Additional funding for IT requirements also agreed. 3) Programme Board in place and supported by programme management resource from ESCC. Programme management arrangements have been reset over recent months to ensure they are effective 4) 5) The CFA and PCC are committed to this collaboration project. Joint management team meetings between ESFRS and Sussex Police have been put in place. Sussex Police is represented on the Programme Board. 6) Engagement and Communications activity increased as key decisions by Board / CMT are taken which will impact on staff. 7) Key activity around relocation site refurbishment, scanning & storage, IT provision and travel plan / staff relocation costs expected by December Board meeting to firm up project costs and timelines. 8) Travel Plan to be submitted to CFA for approval 8 December 2016. 9) Action taken to mitigate risk of delays in vetting process for staff moving to shared HQ in Lewes. 	3	2	6 (Moderate)	DCFO	AD Resources / Treasurer

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
9 Health and Safety	1,2,4,7	<p>1) An incident occurring which could impact on the health & safety of our staff, specifically in a training environment & the risk of HSE intervention</p> <p>2) The Authority's H&S approach is not effectively targeting the highest risk areas</p>	4	3	12	<p>1) An action plan has been put in place in response to the Accident Investigation report which will reduce the risk of recurrence of heat stress incidents in a training environment.</p> <p>2) Changes to the management and staffing structure at CMT and STC agreed and started.</p> <p>3) The Authority has agreed to £300k capital scheme to make improvements to its 4 BA Chambers (incl those at STC).</p> <p>4) Broader changes are being made to our H&S approach following a H&S Peer Review carried out by a third party.</p> <p>5) Restructure of H&S Team approved by CMT.</p> <p>6) Changes to governance structures for Health, Safety & Wellbeing approved by CMT and being put in place</p>	3	2	6 (Tolerable)	DCFO	AD Training & Assurance

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
10 Operation Tin	1,2,4,7	Potential risk to the health & wellbeing of current and ex-employees and their families relating to the presence of asbestos identified at the Brighton Bombings in Oct 1984. Consequent potential financial, legal or reputational risk to the Authority.	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ESFRS representation on Sussex Police Gold Group 2) ESFRS / WSFRS Op Tin Gold Group, agreed terms of reference and joint working arrangements. Completed 3) Identify personnel who may be affected or families that may require assurance and emotional support. 4) Establish procedures and implement communication channels for insurance claims and legal requirements subject to various legislations, including but not limited to The Health and Safety at Work Act 1978 and The Data Protection Act 1998 - Completed 5) Ensure appropriate health, wellbeing advice, support and guidance available for all personnel who may be affected. In place 6) Risk may be further reduced subject to insurance and legal arrangements, in place 7) Ensure effective communication with all staff groups to update on progress of this work. 8) Final report for Op Tin Closure expected in Qtr 3 	2	2	4 (Moderate)	DCFO	ACFO
<p>Approved for Removal CMT Qtr 3</p>											

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
New Risk 11 ESMCP	3	1) Failure to complete transition readiness requirements in line with Home Office expectations by September 2018 resulting in failure to transition before August 2019	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SE Regional Transition Governance Plan identifies project management, planning, funding and governance arrangements including reporting process providing assurance to HO 2) Local project management and governance arrangements overseen by Project Board chaired by CMT member 3) Joint ESFRS / WSFRS Project Manager recruitment process now underway 	3	3	9 (Moderate)	ACFO	AD OS&R

Number / Reference	Aligned to ESFRS Aim	Strategic Risk	Pre Impact Score	Pre Likelihood Score	Pre mitigation scoring	Key Actions	Post Impact Score	Post Likelihood Score	Current Status (by colour) and total score (Previous score shown)	Corporate Risk Owner	Risk Delivery Manager
New Risk 12 Pensions Administration	1,2,4,7	Failure to comply with statutory requirements and performance standards for administration of Firefighter Pension Scheme. Possible sanction by the Pension Regulator (TPR).	3	3	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breach of Pension Act as result of failure to meet deadline for production of Annual Benefits Statement reported to TPR who confirmed no intention to take action at this stage. 2. Officers have met with representatives from Orbis our pension administration provider to raise concerns regarding compliance / performance 3. Orbis has presented improvement actions to local FPS Pension Board and now attend on a quarterly basis to report progress and report on performance. 4. Officers to track progress through bi-monthly contract review meetings with Orbis. 5. New agreement to reflect all financial services provided by Orbis to be put in place by 31 March 2017. 	3	2	6 (moderate)	ACFO	AD HR&OD / AD Resources / Treasurer

	Project	Identified	Reviewed	Description of Risk	Initial Likelihood Certain - 4 Very likely - 3 Low - 2 Unlikely - 1	Initial Impact Critical - 4 Serious - 3 Significant - 2 Minor - 1	Initial Score (9-16)	Mitigation	Likelihood after Mitigation	Impact after Mitigation	Residual Risk Score (9-16)	↓↑	Owner
R1	SCC	22/10/2015	16/11/2016	<p>If the software does not pass Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) 7, Remsdaq and the project will need to investigate alternative solutions and replan. However, some mitigations have been actioned (See RAID V7)</p> <p>Score is on the basis of both previous experience and current improvements.</p> <p>We still haven't scoped the design freeze. 16 functions left out, so timeline may well mean software is not ready for FAT.</p>	3	4	12	<p>Some work has been done on the solution relating to the practical design freeze requested by Remsdaq.</p> <p>Remsdaq has produced a timeline for FAT and for implementing the software.</p> <p>Remsdaq and the SCC Project team have invested money and time in a successful outcome and have engaged to overcome obstacles.</p> <p>For now we will wait to see the outcome.</p>	3	4	12	↑	ACFO
R2	SCC	26/05/2015	16/11/2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Loss of key staff due to retirement, resignation or sick leave etc 2) Project MapInfo and Gazetteer skills are needed – could be shared East / West 3) PM has requested an MDT Co-ordinator role and ESFRS is discussing options for this. 4) Loss of ESFRS or WSFRS resource capacity, mobilising system and MDTs expertise. 5) High levels of stress among staff 	4	4	16	<p>Board agreed in principle that further resource is required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) New programme management arrangements are in place. 2) Board will review options for supporting the project and providing Gazetteer options. 3) Develop a target operating model to identify which resources are IT specialists and should be provided by IT section, and which are SCC roles. 4) New appointments to be made. 5) Workload monitoring taking place. 	3	4	12	↓	ACFO
R3	SCC	22/10/2015	16/11/2016	Risk of legal action from supplier.	3	4	12	<p>Legal advice has clarified the situation and enabled a positive reset of the working relationship with Remsdaq, resulting in improved co-operation. We are following advice.</p> <p>ACFO to write to supplier, but will engage with them first.</p>	3	3	9	↑	ACFO
R4	SCC	05/09/2016	16/11/2016	Lack of training means system use remains at basic level and efficiencies are not captured; buy in for new system is affected	3	3	9	Training for technical staff and users at go-live.	3	3	9		ACFO
R5	IMD Transformation (R15)	March 2015		<p>Links between IMD Strategy and ESFRS Business Strategy unclear. E.g. General understanding exists of move towards CRM / Firewatch, but not set out in a strategy. Business requirements tend to be driven by technology requirements.</p> <p>This may lead to difficulties in accurately defining IT requirements to inform technical specifications, with subsequent impacts on programme outcomes and deliverables.</p>	4	3	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Business strategy now clearly articulated in new purpose and commitments and IRMP consultation. 2) New IT strategy will draw on business strategy and approval will be sought from CMT in December 2016 and Members Jan / Feb 2017 3) New IT Governance arrangements will align with planned Programme Management Office structures / processes to ensure IT Strategy and IT input to projects managed effectively. 	3	3	9		Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer

	Project	Identified	Reviewed	Description of Risk	Initial Likelihood Certain - 4 Very likely - 3 Low - 2 Unlikely - 1	Initial Impact Critical - 4 Serious - 3 Significant - 2 Minor - 1	Initial Score (9-16)	Mitigation	Likelihood after Mitigation	Impact after Mitigation	Residual Risk Score (9-16)	↓↑	Owner
R6	IMD Transformation (R43)	July 2016		Insufficient Authority resource to manage telent through current and upcoming phases. Supplier may need management and direction, to ensure progress and control costs.	4	3	12	1) Client management function (ITG) now in place. 2) telent delivery against key contract milestones being closely monitored. 3) New governance structures will commence over next few months to monitor performance and delivery against IT Strategy and outsource contract. 4) IT Strategy will include high level costings and all business cases will need to identify internal and external (telent) resources required to deliver.	3	3	9		Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer
R7	IMD Transformation (R52)	August 2016		Changes resulting from the new service implementation/requirement definition, are not effectively managed through ESFRS. Insufficient consideration of business impact resulting in poor change implementation.	4	3	12	Ensure sufficient resource is committed to understanding, translating and communicating the business impact of implementation changes. Further key mitigation is effective training and planning for training in advance of key service changes.	3	3	9		Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer
R8	IMD Transformation (R59)	10/10/2016		PSN accreditation process not yet started, so time is tight for completing all IT and business changes to be accredited. Long lead time item which requires external support. Take up of ESN services could be delayed as a result (or exemption might be needed).	3	3	9	1) IT representation on ESN Board 2) Considering preparatory security healthcheck in advance of formal ESN Healthcheck 3) ESN / PSN flagged with telent as key deliverable.	3	3	9		Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer

- SHQ Relocation, ESMCP, Savings Implementation Group, Firewatch, RPE and Radios – these projects have no risks scoring 9 or above
- Community Risk Management is on hold pending IMD Transformation
- Firewatch Phase 2 start date to be reviewed, so no risk log yet
- IRMP workstreams currently in initial planning stages, so risk logs not available yet