

Corporate Risk Management Summary

Report of the Chief Fire Officer

For further information about this report please contact Paul Raymond, Chief Fire Officer, on 01743 260201, or Martin Timmis, Head of Operations and Risk, on 01743 260285.

1 Purpose of Report

This is the fourth Annual Corporate Risk Management Summary Report to Members. These reports aim to inform Members about the corporate level risk management work that has been undertaken during the previous twelve months, as well as summarising the risk environment in which the Service is currently operating.

2 Recommendations

The Fire Authority is asked to note the contents of this report.

3 Background

Ongoing monitoring of the Authority's corporate risk management work is a responsibility of the service's Chief Officer's Group (COG) formerly Policy Group and is also a delegated responsibility for the Strategy and Resources Committee. However, risk management best practice guidance also indicates that the full Fire Authority should receive a summary report on at least an annual basis.

Because this report only comes to the full Fire Authority on an annual basis, much of the report consists of detailed explanation of the information contained in each section. The Risk Manager will be available to answer any questions Members may have about the risks described in this report.

4 Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A reporting exemptions

The public of Shropshire have a right to know that their Fire and Rescue Authority is taking appropriate measures to deal with risks that could potentially impact on its ability to deliver an effective emergency service. However, there are certain risks to which the Authority is exposed, the public disclosure of which could in itself present a risk to the Authority. For this reason, although an 'Open Session' version of this report will always be made available, where an assessment against the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A indicates it would be appropriate, any exempted information would be excluded. Exempted information would then be incorporated in a separate 'Closed Session' report. 'Open Reports' will include all information about sensitive risks that is not likely to compromise the Authority (Risk ID, risk assessment results, Risk Owner), with only the sensitive information being exempted (Risk Description and any control measures included).

This approach should help to ensure that the public has as much information as possible about the risk environment the Authority is operating in, whilst at the same time limiting any damage that could be caused through its inappropriate use.

5 Setting the Authority's Risk Acceptance and Risk Tolerance levels

The assessment of risk is based on the analysis of the potential for the risk to do harm (the detrimental impact on the Authority) and the likelihood that the risk will occur. The potential impact on the Authority is measured against three criteria:

- a. Financial impact;
- b. Reputational impact; and
- c. Impact on the ability for the Authority to deliver its corporate aims and objectives.

Table 1 shows the three levels of impact against which S&WFA assesses corporate risk. The assessment results in an impact level of low, medium or high (corresponding to an 'impact score' of 1, 2 or 3) against each of the criteria. The impact with the highest score would be used to calculate the overall risk level. Table 2 goes on to show the assessment criteria in terms of likelihood. Again this results in a level of low, medium or high, with corresponding 'likelihood scores' of 1,2 or 3.

Impact level	Score	Descriptor for each impact type
High	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial impact on the Authority likely to exceed £75,000 b. Significant stakeholder concern c. Significant impact on the Authorities Strategies and on the Fire and Rescue Services operational activities
Medium	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial impact on the Authority likely to be between £25,000 and £75,000 b. Moderate stakeholder concern c. Moderate impact on the Authorities Strategies and on the Fire and Rescue Services operational activities
Low	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial Impact on the Authority likely to be less than £25,000 b. Low stakeholder concern. c. Low impact on the Authority's strategic or operational activities

Table 1 – S&WFA Impact assessment ratings.

Likelihood level	Score	Description
High	3	Likely to occur each year or more than 25% chance of occurrence.
Medium	2	Likely to occur in a ten year time period or less than 25% chance of occurrence.
Low	1	Not likely to occur in a ten year period or less than 2% chance of occurrence.

Table 2 – S&WFA Likelihood assessment ratings.

The overall 'Risk score' is then calculated by multiplying the highest 'Impact score' by the 'Likelihood score', resulting in a 'Risk score' range of 1 to 9. Those risks scoring 1 (very low risk) should attract minimal effort in their control (although they should continue to be monitored), whilst those scoring 9 (very high risk) obviously require a lot more attention.


The purpose of risk management is not to eliminate all risk; as well as taking an inordinate amount of effort and resources to attempt to do this, it is ultimately impossible to achieve. Instead, risk management aims to reduce the risk to a level that the Authority is prepared to tolerate. This will vary depending on the Authority's current level of 'Risk Appetite' and is defined by the Authority setting its '**Risk Tolerance Level**'. This level essentially acts as a target, with any risks higher than this level attracting appropriate effort and resources in an effort to reduce it to below this level. This target therefore acts as a management indicator, with greater levels of monitoring being required for those risks above the level, than for those below it.

In addition to the upper level, it is also appropriate for the Authority to set a lower level target, known as the '**Risk Acceptance Level**'. Any risks assessed as being lower than this level should attract minimal effort and resources. This helps to ensure that resources are not wasted trying to reduce risks unnecessarily.

Members have previously agreed the following risk levels:

- **‘Risk Acceptance Level’ = 1**
- **‘Risk Tolerance Level’ = 5**

These are shown graphically in graph 1 below. This graph also describes the risks that sit either side of these levels.



Graph 1 – S&WFA’s levels for Risk Acceptance and Risk Tolerance.

The remainder of this report provides summary data on the current contents of the Authority’s Corporate Risk Register.

6 Risk Management progress

This section includes information about all events that have led to the current status with the Authority’s Corporate Risk Management system.

- **July 2009**
The Service’s Executive Group met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible.

The Fire Authority received the last Annual Corporate Risk Management Summary report.

- **August 2009**
The Service’s Risk Management Group met and discussed all matters relating to the Service’s risk environment and outcomes from audits undertaken by Internal Audit.

- **September 2009**
The Service's Executive Group met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible.
- **October 2009**
The Service's Executive Group met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible.

Officers from across the region, who are working on the Regional Fire Control Project, came together to discuss and re-assess all risks involved in the project.

The Risk Manager met with the Shrewsbury Programme Manager to discuss and assess all of the programme's risks.

The Risk Manager attended a Local Resilience Forum looking at Business Continuity across the whole of the West Mercia area.

- **November 2009**
The Service's Partnership Assessment Group met to discuss all matters relating to the partnerships in which the Service is involved. This included a review of each partnerships potential risks.

Internal Audit audited the Authority's Risk Management procedures.

The Risk Manager and the Corporate Services Manager attended a seminar looking at business continuity and its relationship with insurance.

The Risk Manager met with the Shrewsbury Programme Manager to discuss and assess all of the programme's risks.

The Executive Group met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible.

The Service's Risk Management Group met and discussed all matters relating to the Service's risk environment and outcomes from audits undertaken by Internal Audit.

- **December 2009**
The Risk Manager attended an ALARM seminar looking at the involvement of Members in Corporate Risk Management.
- **January 2010**
The Risk Manager met with the Shrewsbury Programme Manager to discuss and assess all of the programme's risks.

The Service's Risk Management Group met and discussed all matters relating to the Service's risk environment and outcomes from audits undertaken by Internal Audit.

- February 2010**
The Treasurer and Risk Manager met with Internal Audit to discuss progress against the Audit Programme.

The Risk Manager met with the ICT Manager and Suppliers to discuss the improvement programme for ICT resilience.

The Service's Executive Group met to discuss the various risks, for which they are responsible.
- March 2010**
The Service's Health and Safety Committee met.

The Chief Officer's Group (COG – replacement for the Executive Group) met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible.

The Service's Risk Management Group met and discussed all matters relating to the Service's risk environment and outcomes from audits undertaken by Internal Audit. The meeting was attended by Internal Audit.
- April 2010**
The (new) Risk Manager coordinated the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) Assurance Process with all relevant officers.

The Service's Risk Management Group met and discussed the results of the AGS process, agreeing the draft AGS statement and Improvement Plan for forwarding to the Audit and Performance Management Committee.

In addition:

- The **Strategy and Resources Committee** received Corporate Risk Management Summary Reports in September 2009, January and May 2010;
- The **Risk Management Group** met and discussed all matters relating to the Service's risk management procedures in August and November 2009 and March 2010, which included implementing a new monitoring regime for audit recommendations;
- The **Partnership Assessment Group** met to discuss the management procedures that govern all of the Service's partnerships in November 2009 and June 2010; and
- The Service's **Chief Officer's Group** met to discuss the various risks for which they are responsible in throughout the year

7 New Risks

There has been one new threat added to the Corporate Risk Register since the last annual report. Summary details of each of these risks are included in the table below. These risks are listed in the order they were identified, starting with the most recent.

Opportunity or Threat	ID	Risk Description	Raised by	Risk Owner	Pre-Risk Result	Action Required	Control Owner	Post-Risk Result
Threat	76	If new legislation is published, that relates to the Service, and it is not appropriately actioned, then the Service could be penalised with potential consequences on its finances and reputation.	Risk Management Group	Paul Raymond	2	Officers should be reminded that they are responsible for ensuring they are aware of any new legislation relevant to their field (April 2010). Officers will be reminded about the need to declare any new legislative requirements that they have become aware of, during the Services significant meetings. The Risk Manager will maintain information within this generic risk, about the work officers are undertaking to implement new legislation. Officers will be specifically asked to consider any new legislation that has/may occur as part of the Annual Governance Statement assurance process each year (annually in April).	John Redmond	1

8 Closed Risks

Two risks have been closed since the last year's Annual Report. Details of these risks are provided in the table below.

ID	Risk Description	Opportunity or Threat	Risk Owner	Date closed	Reason for closure
60	Organisation structural changes to the council in Shropshire, as a result of the recent Local Government White Paper, could present potential opportunities to the way the Fire Authority achieves its strategic objectives, depending on the shape and structure any new Unitary Authority.	Opportunity	Alan Taylor	6/7/2009	1. Unitary Strategy Development Boards have now closed and have handed over to normal working; 2. Now need to ensure good relationships maintained with new structure at both strategic and operational levels; 3. Shropshire Council now up and running. Risk now considered to be business as usual. Risk can therefore be closed.
69	If the Authority does not take full account of the implications of Comprehensive Area Assessment and the new local government performance management framework, then its reputation as a strong performing Authority could be impacted.	Threat	Paul Raymond	13/11/2009	The Service received excellent results from this year's new CAA process, which clearly demonstrates that we have managed the changes from CPA to CAA effectively. The risk may therefore be closed.

9 Current entries in the Corporate Risk Register

This section provides an overall summary of all entries in the Fire Authority's electronic Corporate Risk Register. Table 2 below includes previous, as well as current, figures for comparative purposes.

Descriptor	Number	Comment
Total number of entries	48	Previous figure 47 This will increase over time. The rate at which it increases will demonstrate how active the Risk Management process is.
Total number of threats	44	Previous figure 43 Comment as above
Total number of opportunities	4	Previous figure 4 Comment as above
Total number of closed entries	28	Previous figure 26 Comment as above
Number of 'live' threats	18	Previous figure 19 Whilst we do not want to discourage risk reporting, we would want this to remain within a manageable number. Identifying the optimum number of manageable risks to have in the risk register will come through experience to be gained over the coming months and years.
Average risk level of all currently 'live' threats.	5.17	Previous figure 5.42 This is on a scale where 1 is minimal risk, through to 9, which is maximum risk. Although there will inevitably be times when this figure increases (especially in the early stages of managing high risks), we would be looking for this figure to show a general downward trend. This would demonstrate that the Fire Authority is successfully managing its risks.
Number of 'live' opportunities	2	Previous figure 2 We would be looking for this figure to increase, but again not to the extent that it becomes unmanageable. Inclusion of opportunities in the risk register is an area that is under development within both this and other fire authorities' risk registers. The importance and usefulness of this side of risk management is expected to increase as the Fire Authority's risk management process matures.
Average level of opportunity	6.5	Previous figure 6.5 Scale of 1 to 9 We would tend to want this figure to grow.


10 Graphical representation of the Corporate Risk Register

This section aims to provide Members with an overall impression of the level and type of risk environment in which the Fire Authority is currently operating.

Graph 1 shows the impact that the risk control measures, currently in place, are having on each of the individual threats and opportunities that are currently 'live' in the risk register. This graph compares the CURRENT level of risk with the TARGET level of risk considered to be achievable if all control measures were fully implemented. As such, this graph provides Members with an indication of how much more work those controlling the risks think they have to do to get the risk down to its lowest practicable level.


Members should note that, whilst the aim of risk control for 'threats' is to reduce the level of risk, the purpose of risk control for 'opportunities' is actually to increase the likelihood and/or benefit to be gained.

Detailed information about each of the threats and opportunities shown in Graph 1 is provided in the appendix.



Graph 1 - Risk levels for all 'live' threats and opportunities in the Corporate Risk Register.

Graph 2 maps all of the **threats** against their corresponding likelihood and impact ratings, based on the level of control CURRENTLY in place. Graph 2 does not include the two 'Opportunities'. It therefore presents a picture of the **known** risk that currently exists in the Fire Authority. The numbers in the upper right corner of each section of the graph are the Risk Identification numbers for the risks that sit in that particular portion of the graph. These numbers correlate to the Risk ID numbers given in the detailed risk summary table included as the appendix to this report.




Graph 2 - Overall risk levels with current levels of control in place

11 Overall Summary

Whilst graphs 1 and 2 show that there are 10 risks that are currently assessed as being above the Fire Authority's 'Tolerance Level', this does not demonstrate which of the three impact assessments (financial, reputational or service objectives) is at greatest risk. Indeed, some of these risks could have a potentially significant impact on more than one of these areas. Graph 3 attempts to demonstrate this by showing how many risks are above the 'Tolerance Level', assuming firstly (in the blue column) that we had no risk controls in place and secondly (in the yellow column) that we have the current level of risk controls in place. Each of the three separate areas of impact, i.e. finance, reputation and objectives, is depicted in the graph.

'Intolerable' risks faced by the Fire Authority



Graph 3 - Number of 'Intolerable' risks to which the Fire Authority is currently exposed, as assessed against each risk impact type

The graph suggests that if the risks currently in the Risk Register actually materialised, they are likely to impact on finance and Reputation to a greater extent than on service objectives. It also shows that the control measures currently in place are more effective at managing down the risk to reputation and objectives, than they are for the financial impacts.

The most significant risks currently facing the Fire Authority are Risks 17, 66, 72 and 74. Details of these particular risks, including how they are being dealt with, are summarised in the remainder of this section.

Figure 1 – Risk 17

Risk ID:	17
Risk Description:	If the Part-time Workers Regulations Employment Tribunal goes against Fire Authority's, then there is potential for the Authority to have to pay significant sums of money out in court costs, and backdated pension contributions.
Risk Owner:	Paul Raymond (Chief Fire Officer)
Control Owner:	Keith Dixon (Treasurer)
Risk Score based upon:	
a. NO Controls in place:	9
b. ALL Controls in place:	9
c. CURRENT Controls in place:	9
Actions taken to date:	
	Employer Circular 03/08 reported that the Retained Firefighters had been discriminated against under the P/T Workers Regulations. This was reported to CFA on 30th April 2008. Liability appears to be limited to the introduction of the P/T Workers legislation, which was in 2000.
	Government has assured Fire Authorities that Pension Account Administrators will be involved in the negotiation that needs to take place to progress this issue. CLG advise matters are being handled by the Local Government Employers. However due to the sensitivities involved in the negotiating process the Service has not been able to get any further information on how this is progressing at this time.
	The financing of this risk has been reviewed as part of the 2009/10 budget process, and the sums earmarked to cover this risk have been put into a general reserve dealing with 'Pensions and other staff issues'.
	NJC Circular 2/10 has exposed costs of £150,000 to £200,000 to settle compensation for unequal terms and conditions. Correspondence with CLG indicates employer pension costs of about £800,000, although it is not clear whether this will be met from employers' contributions or a lump sum. There is no further evidence to date but plans are being considered to look at increasing the reserve from the current £350,000 when closing the 2009/10 accounts.

Figure 2 – Risk 66

Risk ID:	66
Risk Description:	If the FireLink/FireControl projects are not effectively managed they may have a significant impact on current and future service delivery. Risks relate to effective management of costs, resources and functionality, prior to, during and post-implementation. Amalgamation of risks ID. 26, 32 and 47
Risk Owner:	Paul Raymond (Chief Fire Officer)
Control Owner:	Chief Officer's Group
Risk Score based upon:	
a. NO Controls in place:	9
b. ALL Controls in place:	3
c. CURRENT Controls in place:	9
Actions taken to date:	
	<p>In February 2008 an initial meeting, held with various departmental practitioners from within the Brigade, took an overview of the RMB RCC risk register and previous risks included in the Corporate Risk Register.</p> <p>In May 2008 a report on the outcomes from the discussions by the practitioners was taken to Policy Group. It was agreed that the Executive Group should meet to discuss this issue on a regular basis. They developed a Risk Action Plan to deal with all aspects of this issue. The Executive Group have now met and discussed progress with their Risk Action Plan on nine separate occasions.</p> <p>Towards the end of 2008, the National Project Team moved the completion date back to reflect delays in some aspects of the project. Shropshire's implementation date moved back by 9 months, to 14th February 2011. This delay has potential implications on the Shrewsbury Project and, for this reason, the consideration given to both risks, by the Executive Group, has now been brought in line.</p> <p>In November 2009, a Governmental Select Committee was tasked with doing a 'quick review' of the National Project. The inquiry gathered evidence up to February and released its report on the 1st April 2010, making several recommendations. The report does not identify any changes to the current timeline for completion, with Shropshire cutover date to the RCC being January 2012.</p> <p>Although no information has been received on changes to the current timeline of the FiReControl project the recent change of government may have an impact on the overall project.</p>

Figure 3 – Risk 72

Risk ID:	72
Risk Description:	If the Shrewsbury project is not effectively managed it may have a significant impact on current and future service delivery. Risks relate to effective management of costs, resources and functionality, prior to, during and post-implementation.
Risk Owner:	Paul Raymond (Chief Fire Officer)
Control Owner:	Chief Officer's Group
Risk Score based upon:	
a. NO Controls in place:	9
b. ALL Controls in place:	9
c. CURRENT Controls in place:	9
Actions taken to date:	
	<p>The initial Executive meeting was held on 14th July, during which the initial risk assessment was conducted. A Risk Action Plan (RAP) was developed for this risk, which captures the risks identified to date.</p> <p>A programme has been established to deliver the required works associated with the refurbishment of the site. These activities include moving departments and functions off site, the appointment of an architect, management of the design process and construction works, and management of the site during these works within the agreed overall budget.</p> <p>On the 26th March 2010 Paveaways Ltd, were appointed as the building contractor for the development of Shrewsbury Headquarters, Fire Station and Workshops. Phase 1 of the Construction Project (Workshops refurbishment) commenced on 26th April 2010 and is currently scheduled for completion early August 2010.</p> <p>Workshops, Stores and Technical Services have been successfully moved off site and relocated to the TA Centre at Sundorne. The Fire Safety Department and District Managers have moved to Hafren House, Shelton.</p> <p>All activities and projects are being co-ordinated by a Programme Manager who has developed a Programme Brief and Programme Plan. The Programme Brief and Plan ensure that the programme has corporate sponsorship and support, appropriate controls and reporting streams and adopts Management of Risk (MOR) methodology.</p> <p>The current programme is due to be completed by December 2011.</p>

Figure 4 – Risk 74

Risk ID:	74
Risk Description:	If the material economic uncertainties that exist in the country were to materialise, then the ability for the Service to meet its stated aims and objectives could be severely curtailed.
Risk Owner:	Paul Raymond (Chief Fire Officer)
Control Owner:	Chief Officer's Group
Risk Score based upon:	
d. NO Controls in place:	9
e. ALL Controls in place:	9
f. CURRENT Controls in place:	9
Actions taken to date:	
Hazards from this risk relate to:	
i. Financial	
- Threat to 3rd year settlement	
- Reduced future year's settlements	
- Impact on Shrewsbury project - loss of funds from sale of land	
- Wellington - potentially lose the opportunity	
- Changes to exchange rates - additional cost of imports	
- Lower interest rates - reduced investment returns	
- But, opportunity for reduced cost and price increases	
ii. Suppliers	
- Loss of critical suppliers (BA, Communications and Financial services)	
- Loss of single source suppliers (hydrant keys)	
- Potential for loss of Shrewsbury building contractors	
iii. Impact on targets	
- Most service delivery targets are likely to be impacted in some way	
The Service received the planned 3 rd year Grant Settlement. Whilst the risk of further Government action in year cannot be ruled out, the main issue facing the Service is more likely to be from the completely new settlement which is likely to be announced in November/December 2010.	
The Supplier Management Plans for our critical suppliers, are being reviewed.	
Whilst it is too early to know what the long term impact on our targets will be, there has been no discernible impact to date.	

12 Legal Comment

There is no legislative duty for the Fire Authority to assess the risks to which its business objectives are faced. Corporate Risk Management does, however, form a fundamental element of good corporate management practices.

The Fire Authority has the power to act as proposed in this report. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the provisions of Schedule 12A of Local Government Act 1972 are correctly applied.

13 Equality Impact Assessment

Officers have considered the Service's Brigade Order on Equality Impact Assessments (Personnel 5 Part 2) and have determined that the information contained within this report is purely historical summary data. As such it contains no proposals for changes to current policies and procedures which could involve discriminatory practices or differential impacts upon specific groups. An Initial Equality Impact Assessment has, therefore, not been completed.

14 Appendix

Detailed information on all current entries in the Corporate Risk Register

Implications of all of the following have been considered and, where they are significant (i.e. marked with an asterisk), the implications are detailed within the report itself.

Business Continuity Planning	*	Legal	
Capacity		Member Involvement	*
Civil Contingencies Act		National Framework	
Comprehensive Area Assessment	*	Operational Assurance	
Efficiency Savings		Retained	
Environmental		Risk and Insurance	*
Financial	*	Staff	
Fire Control/Fire Link		Strategic Planning	
Information Communications and Technology		West Midlands Regional Management Board	
Freedom of Information / Data Protection / Environmental Information		Equality Impact Assessment	
Integrated Risk Management Planning	*		

**Detailed information on all current entries in the Corporate Risk Register
(in order of 'Current Risk' level)**

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Threat	74	If the material economic uncertainties that exist in the country were to materialise, then the ability for the Service to meet its stated aims and objectives could be severely curtailed.	Paul Raymond	COG	9	9	9	
Threat	17	If the Retained Firefighters "Working Time" court case goes against Fire Authority's, then there is potential for the Authority to have to pay significant sums of money out in court costs, and backdated pension contributions (Emp Circular 20/2005).	Paul Raymond	Keith Dixon	9	9	9	
Threat	66	If the FireLink/FireControl projects are not effectively managed they may have a significant impact on current and future service delivery. Risks relate to effective management of costs, resources and functionality, prior to, during and post-implementation. Amalgamation of risks ID. 26, 32 and 47	Paul Raymond	COG	9	3	9	26, 32, 47

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Threat	72	If the Shrewsbury project is not effectively managed it may have a significant impact on current and future service delivery. Risks relate to effective management of costs, resources and functionality, prior to, during and post-implementation.	Paul Raymond	COG	9	9	9	
Threat	75	If the "opt-out" option the UK currently holds from the European Working Time Directive is removed, then this could have an impact on the availability of RDS staff.	Louise McKenzie	Lisa Vickers	6	4	6	
Threat	35	Information exempt from publication by virtue of the Local Governments Act 1972, Schedule 12A, paragraph 4.	Paul Raymond	John Redmond	6	3	6	12, 23, 36
Threat	11	If the county suffers a harsh winter, then there is a chance that the Service will not be able to deliver an appropriate level of service to the people of Shropshire.	Steve Worrall	Martin Timmis	9	6	6	20

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Threat	20	If the organisation is not able to use its buildings, its people and/or its other resources due to a disaster scenario, then it is unlikely to be able to deliver essential services to the communities of Shropshire (not including strike action).	Paul Raymond	Martin Timmis	6	4	6	35, 11
Threat	64	If the implications of the Government's proposals for the Long Term Capability Management of all 'New Dimensions' assets (as described in FSC 26/2007) are not fully considered, then there is a risk that the Authority's budgets may be detrimentally impacted into the future.	Paul Raymond	John Redmond	6	6	6	33
Threat	68	If the Brigade does not have policies and procedures, relating to water rescue incidents, that effectively balance the risks to staff versus the risk to the public, then the Fire Authority could be subject to prosecution under health and safety law or a significant loss in reputation.	Steve Worrall	Martin Timmis	9	2	6	

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Threat	51	If the Brigade's data quality systems lack the appropriate quality processes and controls, then the Brigade's funding and its allocation of resources against stated objectives may be compromised.	Steve Worrall	Ged Edwards	9	1	6	21, 16, 26, 44, 48
Threat	65	If the implications of the various ICT projects, currently ongoing in the Brigade, are not coordinated, then there is a risk that the individual projects will not be implemented effectively.	Steve Worrall	Ged Edwards	6	1	4	
Threat	70	If Equality and Diversity is not fully mainstreamed and integrated into all Authority activities, there will be adverse impact on financial, ethical and service delivery issues.	Paul Raymond	Lisa Vickers	9	2	3	
Threat	21	If the Authority does not meet all financial regulations, then it may be subject to fraudulent activity, unnecessary or illegal (ultra-vires) expenditure.	Paul Raymond	Keith Dixon	9	3	3	

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Threat	44	There are risks inherent in the Fire Authority working in partnership with other agencies/groups. If these are not properly controlled they could potentially impact on the financial standing and reputation of the Fire Authority.	Paul Raymond	John Redmond	6	1	3	30, 32, 41
Threat	76	If new legislation is published, that relates to the Service, and it is not appropriately actioned, then the Service could be penalised with potential consequences on its finances and reputation.	Paul Raymond	John Redmond	6	1	2	
Threat	12	If neighbouring brigades suffer industrial action, then the support from those brigades during large incidents in our county is likely to be reduced thereby impacting on our ability to deal with incidents effectively.	John Redmond	Martin Timmis	2	2	2	35, 36
Threat	16	If the Brigade does not have appropriate procedures in place to meet the requirements of the Data Protection Act, then it may be subject to penalties.	Steve Worrall	Louise Goodhead	6	1	1	

Threat or Opportunity	Risk ID	Description	Risk Owner	Control Owner	Risk with NO Controls	Risk with ALL Controls	Current Risk	Links to other risks
Opportunity	48	If the Authority does not monitor its budgets closely then it could miss the opportunity to reinvest identified under-spends where this occurs in its various budgets, or take action to deal with any loss of service that may have occurred.	Paul Raymond	Joanne Coadey	3	9	9	
Opportunity	33	If the Authority is not clear as to the rules that apply to Governments specific Funding, then it could miss the opportunity to seek additional funding for the activities it is required to undertake in order to meet the Government's Modernisation Agenda and local priorities.	Paul Raymond	Keith Dixon	4	4	4	64