

## EAST SUSSEX FIRE AUTHORITY

**Panel:** Scrutiny and Audit  
**Date** 5 June 2019  
**Title of Report** 2018/19 Fourth Quarter Corporate Risk Register Review  
**By** Assistant Director Resources/Treasurer  
**Lead Officer** Warren Tricker, Finance Manager

---

**Background Papers** Scrutiny and Audit Panel 31 January 2019, 2018/19 Third Quarter Corporate Risk Register Review

---

**Appendices** Appendix A RAID Log Scoring Matrix  
Appendix B Corporate Risk Register and Mitigation Plans

---

### Implications

<b>CORPORATE RISK</b>	√	<b>LEGAL</b>	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>		<b>POLICY</b>	
<b>FINANCIAL</b>		<b>POLITICAL</b>	
<b>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		<b>OTHER (please specify)</b>	
<b>HUMAN RESOURCES</b>		<b>CORE BRIEF</b>	

---

**PURPOSE OF REPORT** To report on the latest quarterly review of Corporate Risk

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** The Authority has in place established procedures for ensuring that corporate and business risks are identified and managed. The Corporate Risk Register was refreshed early in 2018/19 with support from external risk experts.

Risks are scored against a 4x4 scoring matrix as shown in Appendix A.

The review of corporate risks is an ongoing process and reports are presented on a quarterly basis. The updated position is shown in Appendix B.

The process for reporting Project Risks is being changed. Such risks will be reported through the Programme Management Officer and escalated to the Corporate risk when relevant.

This report discusses the fourth quarter position. It shows the Panel the business risks identified and how they have or are being mitigated.

This Report incorporates issues raised at the Quarter three Scrutiny and Audit Panel meeting on 31 January 2019.

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel is recommended to:

- a) Note the Q4 Corporate Risk Register including changes made since Q3
  - b) Identify any issues where it requires further information or assurance
-

## 1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report brings the fourth quarter Corporate Risk Management Mitigation Plan. Corporate business risks are considered by SLT quarterly and reported to Scrutiny and Audit Panel for consideration.

## 2. **FOR DISCUSSION**

### 2.1 **Proposal to remove R1 GDPR non-compliance - Corporate Risk Owner The Deputy Chief Fire Officer (DCFO)**

- 2.1.1 Compliance Programmed for 2018/19 Q3 now in completed and added as a mitigation. The latest GDPR compliance audit took place in November 2018 and although the final report has not as yet been released, the organisation received a **Reasonable Assurance** rating.

- 2.1.2 The risk has been closely monitored in the corporate risk report as well as at the Scrutiny and Audit Panel. The risk has been reviewed and SLT agreed that it should be removed from the Corporate Risk Register.

### 2.2 **R8 Failure to effectively mobilise (Sussex Control Centre) - Corporate Risk Owner The Assistant Chief Fire Officer (ACFO)**

- 2.2.1 New mitigation, appointment of new Project Manager to facilitate and support the to manage both the Exit workstream and Project 21.

### 2.3 **New Risk - Health and Safety across the organisation**

- 2.3.1 This new risk reflects how recent incidents have highlighted the risk to security and safety of the Service's employees and property.

- 2.3.2 Normal operations at Maresfield Training Centre include breathing apparatus training involving the burning of wood. There has been dissatisfaction locally with the impact the smoke from this training is having which has escalated to the point where there has been damage to Authority premises and delegates' safety put at risk.

- 2.3.3 Officers have acted, working closely with the police and the Traveller Liaison Officer to establish a relationship to avoid further disruption to the site and day to day activities.

- 2.3.4 This risk has been added to the register to focus on the continued delivery of training to allow Firefighters to be able to respond with Breathing Apparatus capabilities. Alongside this maintain a high level of security of staff and all ESFRS sites.

## 3. **FOR INFORMATION**

### 3.1 **'Uncertainty about the UK's exit from the EU and its short term impacts - Corporate Risk Owner The Assistant Chief Fire Officer (ACFO)**

- 3.1.1 The Panel queried whether the threat and risk assessment could be shared with Members in confidence.

- 3.1.2 This Pink Paper Report has now been shared to provide the Authority with a briefing on preparedness in advance of the UK exiting from the EU without a negotiated deal.

3.2 **Collaboration - Corporate Risk Owner AD Training & Assurance.**

3.2.1 The Panel also welcomed the inclusion a risk in respect of Collaboration, as had been previously requested by Members.

3.2.2 This will continue to be regularly reviewed during SLT meetings

3.3 **R10 Inability to respond effectively to a cyber incident – Corporate Risk Owner The Deputy Chief Fire Officer (DCFO)**

3.3.1 Aristi have provided a findings report of gap analyse conducted against ISO27001:2013 Information security Management Systems requirements.

3.3.2 Work is now being undertaken with Aristi to convert into a risk treatment plan, as part of the ongoing Information Security Strategy.

## 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)	Tolerable (4)

### Corporate Risk and Project Raid Log Scoring Matrix

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 B

Risk Title	Causes	Mitigations	Mitigated Risk Score	Actions	Review Date	Corporate Risk Owner
2 Health & Safety non-compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy and practices not effective</li> <li>Policies not followed</li> <li>Inconsistent implementation</li> <li>H&amp;S approach is not effectively targeting the highest risk areas</li> <li>Lack of proactive / preventative measures to reduce likelihood</li> <li>Face fit testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training programmes in place</li> <li>Policies in place</li> <li>Appropriate systems exist</li> <li>Changes to the management and staffing structure</li> <li>Governance for Health, Safety &amp; Wellbeing</li> <li>Revised estates policy for management of contractors</li> </ul>	Impact = 4 Likelihood = 2  Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health and Safety policy frame work review</li> <li>Health and Safety peer review and implementations of findings</li> <li>Process of recruiting for Estates Project Manager</li> </ul>	September 2019	AD Health and Safety
3 Future financial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing funding stream (uncertainty)</li> <li>Failure to identify and deliver savings</li> <li>Difficult to predict future needs / resources required</li> <li>Changes in legislation increasing burden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2019/20 budget agreed</li> <li>MTFP updates and reporting</li> <li>Efficiency Strategy agreed</li> <li>75% BRP Pilot bid successful</li> <li>Continued monitoring of Business Rates Retention proposals.</li> <li>Delivery of savings monitored and reported to SLT and members</li> <li>Resource Planning meeting to monitor operational establishment</li> <li>Establishment and use of general and earmarked reserves to manage financial risk</li> <li>Collaboration through ESFOA to protect shared income streams e.g. Council Tax and Business Rates</li> <li>Use of financial reserves to manage risks e.g. drawdown of £0.625m to manage financial implications of Sussex Control Centre Project</li> </ul>	Impact = 2 Likelihood = 3  Score = 6 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action agreed by SLT to reduce forecast Revenue overspend for 2018/19</li> <li>Further development of the actions set out in the Efficiency Strategy</li> <li>Initial discussions at SLT to identify potential savings options for 2020/21</li> <li>Review of IRMP including operational response review to start 2019/20</li> <li>Lobbying in advance of Comprehensive Spending Review via NFCC and local MPs</li> </ul>	May 2019	AD Resources / Treasurer

Risk Title	Causes	Mitigations	Mitigated Risk Score	Actions	Review Date	Corporate Risk Owner
4 Failure to delivery of IT Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs higher than originally thought and payback period longer</li> <li>Ageing equipment with compatibility issues / legacy systems</li> <li>Lack of change management capacity</li> <li>Ineffective contract management</li> <li>Lack of funding</li> <li>Competing priorities</li> <li>Lack of willingness to transform service delivery</li> <li>Lack of business ownership</li> <li>Business unable to resource concurrent major changes projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed IT Strategy</li> <li>Active monitoring and reporting of programme delivery and status to SLT and members</li> <li>Alignment of IT Strategy with Corporate Plan to highlight resource / capacity gaps</li> <li>Effective project governance with escalation presses</li> <li>Talent strategy for resourcing of IT projects</li> <li>Actual planned project spend revived on regular basis</li> <li>IT Strategic Board in place</li> </ul>	Impact = 3 Likelihood = 2  Score = 6 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resetting of IT Strategy underway</li> <li>Review of ITG Business Engagement function to ensure fit for purpose</li> <li>Development of digital / innovation stream within IT Strategy</li> </ul>	30 June 2019	AD Resources / Treasurer
5 Ability to meet developing legislative requirements evolving from central fire safety regulatory reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy or legislative changes that are likely to arise from reviews and investigations</li> <li>Unknown burdens on service delivery</li> <li>Likely increased funding required</li> <li>Knowledge and capability needed</li> <li>Lack of capacity and capability</li> <li>inability to adapt service delivery models</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of firefighter business safety</li> <li>Competence framework for business safety officers</li> <li>Business Safety Review to refresh structure to ensure appropriate capacity and contingency"</li> <li>Continue to monitor developments from Hackitt and Moore Bick reviews and potential legislative / regulatory changes</li> </ul>	Impact = 2 Likelihood = 3  Score = 6 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refresh and publish a new Protection Strategy to take account of the emerging issues.</li> <li>Allocate ESFRS officers to national working groups to steer and understand the implications of the proposed national changes.</li> </ul>	April 2019	ACFO
6 Effective workforce planning e.g. professional services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasingly difficult to recruit into professional services</li> <li>HR policy flexibility (grades/salaries)</li> <li>Recruitment pool processes</li> <li>Already lean workforce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of Strategic Workforce planning process (new action reads – embed and reinforce WFPP)</li> <li>To explore and introduce a market supplement process for professional service jobs (new action reads – review contracts and policy to embed this process. Continue to consider the wider recruitment market to assess salary points for specialist posts).</li> <li>Recruitment and selection framework</li> <li>Process Improvement Project to deliver efficiencies in roles and policy supporting lean workforce</li> </ul>	Impact = 2 Likelihood = 4  Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locating resources with ITG to ensure employee data is GDPR compliant from a HR perspective.</li> <li>Redesign current talent pool process at each operational level within the Organisation</li> <li>Develop a strategic workforce planning process.</li> <li>To explore and introduce a market supplement process for professional service jobs</li> <li>To re-engineer the recruitment and selection processes for professional services</li> </ul>	April 2019	AD HR&OD

Risk Title	Causes	Mitigations	Mitigated Risk Score	Actions	Review Date	Corporate Risk Owner
8 Failure to mobilise effectively (Sussex Control Centre)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legacy software incompatibility with newer versions</li> <li>Full specification not effectively implemented</li> <li>SCC incident / system failure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>System went live for ESFRS resources on 20th March 2018 following satisfactory testing phases (FAT, SAT, OAT, UAT)</li> <li>Fall-back and business continuity arrangements designed, tested and operating (this includes fully functional secondary control at Maresfield)</li> <li>Refreshed approach to approach to attendance management</li> <li>Additional resources made available due to project extension</li> <li>BAU and Project Budgets increased due to extension and to ensure resilience across both areas.</li> </ul> <p>new project manager appointed</p>	Impact = 4 Likelihood = 2  Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further audits and remediation plans for MDTs, Wi-Fi and SEE equipment</li> <li>Scenario planning for future options / outcomes underway</li> <li>Exit Strategy for WSFRS being developed</li> </ul>	Jan 2019	DCFO
9 Failure to manage the effects and impacts of a major loss of staff event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of engagement with unions / staff</li> <li>Poor / ineffective consultation practices</li> <li>Ineffective communications</li> <li>Lack of business continuity</li> <li>PlanningPandemic Flu</li> <li>Major travel disruption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review outcomes of Retained Firefighters Union report</li> <li>Introduction of the On-call action learning set</li> <li>Establish a resilience group to refresh the resilience contingency plans and loss of staff protocols.</li> <li>Establish regional loss of staff working group to share best practice and assist in contingency planning"</li> </ul>	Impact = 3 Likelihood = 3  Score = 9 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce a revised Business Continuity Plan for major loss of staff</li> <li>Develop a continuity handbook for staff to assist in managing the early stages of a major loss of staff.</li> <li>Engage with key staff to understand the landscape of staff availability during these events</li> <li>Deliver an EMT exercise to test the plans and response by the key staff within the continuity plans.</li> </ul>	April 2019	ACFO
10 Inability to respond effectively to a cyber incident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of effective BCP in place</li> <li>Underestimation of risk likelihood</li> <li>Poor policies and procedures</li> <li>Human error</li> <li>Lack of staff awareness (e.g. phishing)</li> <li>Poor protection of systems leading to increased severity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intend to progress the IT Risk Treatment Plan</li> <li>IT Health Checks are undertaken by third party security</li> <li>The Information Security Management Forum to meet on a regular basis</li> <li>Information Security e-learning in place</li> <li>Integrated Aristi report now received and action report based on findings</li> </ul>	Impact = 4 Likelihood = 2  Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information Security Strategy to be developed</li> <li>External provider Aristi appointed to support development of new IS Framework</li> <li>Working with Aristi to convert report into a risk treatment plan</li> </ul>	May 2019	DCFO



Risk Title	Causes	Mitigations	Mitigated Risk Score	Actions	Review Date	Corporate Risk Owner
11 Failure to deliver key corporate projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of adherence to governance</li> <li>Lack of experienced staff managing projects</li> <li>Inability to recruit two vacant posts in the team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment of programme management office</li> <li>The PID was signed off in June 2018 by the PMO Set Up Board</li> <li>Current 'as is' project related processes have been documented and signed off in the end of June 18.</li> </ul>	Impact = 3 Likelihood = 3 Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMO processes are being drafted and key templates are being developed to support best practice</li> <li>Analysis of current Boards is underway</li> <li>Project processes and templates, along with project manual note nearing completion before undergoing consultation.</li> <li>Recruitment of Project Manager and Business Analyst identified</li> <li>Identifying appropriate recruitment channels through agencies to address current vacancies</li> <li>Reviewing job descriptions</li> </ul>	April 2019	DCFO
12 Uncertainty about the UK's exit from the EU and it's short term impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic shock and impact on funding</li> <li>Supply chain problems</li> <li>Disruption around ports and port access routes</li> <li>Civil unrest</li> <li>Increased risk to vulnerable groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic &amp; Tactical Coordinating Groups established and ESFRS decision log and concept of operations in place</li> <li>Multi-agency table top exercise and risk review process established.</li> <li>Engaged with Sussex Resilience Forum which is leading local planning</li> <li>Brexit Gold Group established</li> <li>Existing Business Continuity plans being reviewed</li> <li>Linking with work being carried out nationally through NFCC</li> <li>Risk / impact assessment developed</li> <li>Assessment of supply chain risk</li> </ul>	Impact = 2 Likelihood = 4 Score = 8 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff awareness and communications plan in place</li> <li>Key staff training and workshops completed and necessary actions included within risk assessment Member and Corporate briefing completed</li> </ul>	April 2019	ACFO
13 Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaboration fails to deliver desired outcomes</li> <li>Resources required to support collaborative activities not justified by improvements in efficiency and / or effectiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaboration Framework agreed and in place</li> <li>Priorities agreed for 2018-21</li> <li>Regular tracking of collaboration activities through business performance system</li> <li>Governance in place e.g. 3F and Integrated Transport Function (ITF)</li> <li>Legal advice on formal collaboration agreements</li> </ul>	Impact = 3 Likelihood = 2 Score = 6 Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular review of collaborative activities through SLT and S&amp;A Panel</li> </ul>	April 2019	AD HR&OD

Risk Title	Causes	Mitigations	Mitigated Risk Score	Actions	Review Date	Corporate Risk Owner
<p>14 Security and safety of staff and visitors on ESFRS sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to buildings and assets</li> <li>• Injury to Personnel</li> <li>• Service Delivery: Unable to deliver training and requalify personnel if interruption continues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Measures implemented in affected areas of STC when burning i.e. PPE, Cordons.</li> <li>• The use of Community Order prohibiting protagonist from attending Authority premises</li> <li>• Increased safety officers</li> <li>• Temporarily ceased lay flat testing to Air Quality Testing</li> </ul>	<p>Impact =3 Likelihood = 2</p> <p>Score = 6 Moderate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with Traveller Rep, ESCC Rep and Sussex Police to discuss concerns.</li> <li>• Review of whole site security in conjunction with Estates.</li> <li>• Traveller Community Engagement, education and information around work and function of STC.</li> <li>• Independent Air Quality Testing Report to be undertaken.</li> <li>• Project long term review of live fire training facilities</li> </ul>	<p>September 2019</p>	<p>AD Training &amp; Assurance</p>