

Appendix 3

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE SERVICE – CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Summary of corporate risks and associated scores

Risk No.	Description of Risk	Risk Rating				Direction of Travel
		L	I	Score: L x I	LEVEL	
1	The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain the positive engagement of its employees, resulting in an inability to deliver its key priorities and objectives Risk Owner: Director, (Human Resources)	4	3	12	H	↔
2	The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain an effective ICT provision (excluding its mobilising and communication services) resulting in significant disruption to its ICT functionality Risk Owner: Director (Corporate Services)	3	3	9	M	↔
4	The Fire Authority would be unable to ensure that proper controls are established whilst working in partnership with other agencies/groups, resulting in a significant impact upon its financial standing, reputation and ability to deliver key objectives Risk Owner: Director (Operations)	3	2	6	M	↔
5	The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of extensive disruption to normal working methods Risk Owner: Director (Technical and Operational Support)	4	3	12	H	↔
6	The Fire Authority would be unable to ensure that operational incidents are dealt with using appropriate levels of resource and personnel, resulting in an inability to deliver a safe and effective emergency response function Risk Owner: Director (Technical and Operational Support)	2	4	8	M	↔
7	The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of insufficient or ineffective key assets, such as buildings and vehicles Risk Owner: Director (TOPS) / Director (Finance and Procurement)	2	3	6	M	↑
8	The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively due to a lack of funding or the misuse of funds e.g. fraudulent activity Risk Owner: Director (Finance and Procurement)	3	3	9	M	↔
9	The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of insufficient or ineffective human resources Risk Owner: Director, Human Resources	3	3	9	M	↑
10	The Fire Authority would be unable to manage its responsibilities under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order and associated legislation, resulting in a decline in non domestic fire safety standards or legal action being taken against the Authority Risk Owner: Director (Technical and Operational Support)	3	2	6	M	↔
11	The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain its command and control function, resulting in an inability to receive, process and respond to emergency calls effectively Risk Owner: Director (Technical and Operational Support)	2	4	8	M	↔
13	The Fire Authority suffers a significant health, safety or environmental failure, resulting in legal challenge and/or litigation Risk Owner: Director (Technical and Operational Support)	2	4	8	M	↔

Definition

Those risks that, if realised, would seriously affect the Authority's ability to carry out its core functions or deliver key objectives

Comparative view of corporate risks

LIKELIHOOD >>>	4			1,5	
	3		4, 10	2, 8,9	
	2			7, 13	6, 11
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		IMPACT >>>			

Review Schedule

	HIGH RISK - periodic review every 6 weeks
	MEDIUM RISK - periodic review every 3 months
	LOW RISK - periodic review every 6 months
	VERY LOW RISK - periodic review every 12 months


The grid (left) provides an overview of the risk scores. The colour coding gives an indication of the review period for each risk, based upon the above review schedule. Target risk scores are recorded on the relevant Corporate Risk Management Action Plan. Target scores identify the Authority's appetite for each risk.

Date: January 2012 Summary of significant changes to the Corporate Risk Register

There have been no significant changes the the corporate risk register this quarter. The risk rating of all corporate risks remains as reported in October 2011.

All risks: General assessment provided by risk owner as to direction of risk i.e. increasing or decreasing

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

L	Likelihood: an estimation of the probability that a particular risk will occur (or a measure of the time period within which that risk is likely to occur), taking into account the preventative control measures already in place.
I	Impact: a measure of the most likely effect or reasonably foreseeable result if a particular risk occurs, taking into account the mitigating control measures already in place.
Level	An assessment of the overall level of exposure to a particular risk. This assessment assists in the prioritisation of resources and determines the frequency of risk review/reporting.
	Assessment by risk owner as to anticipated direction of risk score i.e. increasing or decreasing, over the next 12 months.

Corporate Risk Register Amendments January 2012

Risk 1- The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain the positive engagement of its employees, resulting in an inability to deliver its key priorities and objectives.

Emerging Issues	There are no emerging issues. However the likelihood of risk realisation remains at 4, the highest score achievable on the risk matrix, as the realisation of the risk as a consequence of industrial action remains. This overall risk score is rated as 'High', generating an overall risk score of 12.
Changes to control measures	<p>A number of additional preventative controls have been introduced to enhance the Service's engagement arrangements.</p> <p>The Service has reviewed its Employee Relations Framework, which was submitted to JCP in January. It is intended to submit the framework to Members at February's meeting of the Authority.</p> <p>In terms of BuS communication, the intention to undertake a series of 'Market Place' events to provide information on key BuS work packages is reflected as an additional control.</p> <p>An additional control, has been added to the risk log to reflect the tiered approach to be taken to managing through and addressing the issues identified in the Employee Opinion Survey.</p> <p>The Service recognises that formal IPDRs and the less formal regular appraisal of staff performance both play parts in keeping staff effectively engaged. Currently IPDR training for managers is being rolled out across the Service and this is reflected on the risk log.</p>
Assurances	A number of assurance dates have been amended and updated.

Risk 2 – The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain an effective ICT provision (excluding mobilising and communications), resulting in significant disruption to the organisation's ICT functionality

Emerging Issues	None. The overall risk score is unchanged at 9. The risk level remains at Medium.
Changes or additions to control measures	<p>In order to prevent the loss of systems, hardware/software a preventative control measure has been added to reflect that an Orange bearer is in place to avoid loss of systems and mobile data. Currently an upgrade to new Airwave bearer is being undertaken and this will provide greater resilience.</p> <p>The Service has been issued with a TEA 2 licence by the cabinet office. This licence provides the Authority to operate Airwave communication systems.</p>
Assurances	No updates.

Risk 4 – The Fire Authority would be unable to ensure that proper controls are established whilst working in partnership with other agencies/groups, resulting in a significant impact upon the organisation's financial standing, reputation and ability to deliver key objectives.

Emerging Issues	<p>None. The overall risk score remains at 6. The risk level remains at medium.</p> <p>The way the Service manages its partnership risks is currently being audited as part of the annual internal audit of our risk management arrangements. The findings of this review are likely to be confirmed in February 2012.</p>
Changes to control measures	Following assessment no updates are required this quarter
Assurances	Assurances not updated this quarter.

Risk 5 – The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of extensive disruption to normal working methods.

Emerging Issues	There are no emerging issues. However the likelihood of risk realisation remains at 4, the highest score achievable on the risk matrix, as the realisation of the risk as a consequence of industrial action remains. This overall risk score is rated as 'High', generating an overall risk score of 12.
Changes to control measures	No additions have been made to controls during this review period. However, Business Continuity plans have been reviewed and refreshed throughout the last quarter and the industrial action climate continues to be monitored. The Service prepared for and came through the 30 th November action without serious issues and learnt lessons. The Business Continuity Management Team (BCMT) meeting framework was established and enacted as was a multi agency Strategic Coordination Group. A debrief is set for early February. However, should any further industrial action take place then the potential for risk realisation remains considerable
Assurance s	Assurances have been updated throughout the log.

Risk 6 – The Fire Authority would be unable to ensure that operational incidents are dealt with safely and effectively, using appropriate levels of resource and personnel.

Emerging Issues	None. The overall risk Score remains unchanged at 8 and the risk remains at Medium.
Changes and additions to control measures.	There have been no additions or changes to the control measures currently in place.
Assurances	None.

Risk 7 – The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of insufficient or ineffective key assets, such as buildings and vehicles.

Emerging Issues	<p>The overall risk score remains unchanged at 6. The risk level remains at Medium. However, the Fleet Manager has raised a concern regarding the future ability of the Service to effectively maintain its fleet due to suspension of the Service's vehicle replacement programme and the consequential impact that this has had on the age of the fleet.</p> <p>Work is ongoing with ACO Walton to determine to what level of investment is required in the VRP. However, the current levels of control in place are deemed sufficient and proportionate to the risk at this time.</p>
Changes and additions to control measures	The ongoing BuS Facilities Management work package provides an additional control through the delivery of an integrated, flexible, value for money approach to the management of its building assets and associated services.
Assurances	None updated.

Risk 8 – The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively due to a lack of funding or the misuse of funds e.g. fraudulent activity.

Emerging Issues	The risk score remains at 9. The overall risk level is Medium.
Changes and additions to control measures	<p>References have been updated throughout the log.</p> <p>Addition controls have been introduced to reduce the likelihood of risk realisation as a consequence of funding reduction. Specifically, a reserve has been identified to manage potential costs arising from service review and staff related issues. Also, the lobbying at a Ministerial, Parliamentary at a DCLG level is ongoing with the Association of Metropolitan Fire and Rescue Authorities (AMFRA) and this has been reflected on then risk log.</p>
Assurances	Assurances have been updated throughout the risk log.

Risk 9 – The Fire Authority would be unable to deliver the core objectives of preventing, protecting and responding effectively as a result of insufficient or ineffective employees.

Emerging Issues	The overall risk score is unchanged (9) and the risk level remains at Medium. The title of this risk has changed to provide more clarity to read ‘...insufficient or ineffective employees’.
Changes to control measures	<p>A number of additional controls have been put in place to provide additional protection against risk realisation.</p> <p>Specifically the Service has is developing a redundancy selection criteria which will enable, as far as is practically possible, the Service to retain the right level of resources with the appropriate skill sets and behaviours should a redundancy programme be implemented.</p> <p>In support of the Service’s reorganisation, redeployment and redundancy strategy, the Service has implemented a redeployment and regional protocol to inform all personnel of employment opportunities in regional FRS’ .</p> <p>In support of its recruitment strategy the Service is currently developing a Progression Model. Also, opportunities.</p> <p>An additional control, has been to reflect the tiered approach to managing through and addressing the issues identified in the Employee Opinion Survey.</p>
Assurances	Assurances updated throughout plan.

Risk 10- The Fire Authority would be unable to manage its responsibilities under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order and associated legislation, resulting in a decline in non domestic fire safety standards or legal action being taken against the Authority.

Emerging issues- Change to risk score	The overall risk score has been maintained at its current level of 6. The risk rating is Medium.
Changes and additions to control measures	<p>The risk relating to the Authority’s statutory duties to provide fire safety advice and enforce legislative fire safety within the non domestic sector continues to be managed; in line with Programme Board directives the staffing levels within Protection are being maintained through an internal recruitment and selection process and a number of operational officers are receiving fire safety training to help support local risk reduction activities. The revised Risk Based Inspection Programme (RBiP) continues its development with the support of the ICT Team; implementation later this year will enhance the Authority’s proactive approach to risk reduction in the commercial sector. A robust plan to deal with Fire Safety issues linked to the forthcoming Olympic Games has been implemented and is being monitored on a regular basis. Internal assurance of a number of existing policies and procedures is ongoing, with corrective action being implemented as appropriate’.</p>
Assurances	Assurances updated.

Risk 11 – The Fire Authority would be unable to maintain its command and control function, resulting in an inability to receive process and respond to emergency calls effectively.

Emerging Issues	<p>Following a request from ACO Walton, Jim Whittingham met with the Fire Control Management Team to determine whether the current risk rating and level of control were appropriate. At this meeting the risk rating and score of medium (8) was confirmed as correct.</p> <p>However, it was agreed that in light of the potential increase in workload generated by a number of BuS Work Packages (OSG, BRV, LRFC for example) and the Staffordshire collaboration project to undertake further work to provide assurance to the Board that the current level of controls in place are sufficient or identify additional controls to effectively manage this risk. This work will be undertaken in January/February 2012.</p>
Changes and additions to control measures	No changes
Assurance	No assurances updated in this quarter.

Risk 13 – The Fire Authority suffered a significant health, safety or environmental failure, resulting in a legal challenge and/or litigation

Emerging Issues	<p>None. The overall risk score is 8 and is unchanged. Therefore, the risk level remains at Medium.</p> <p>Following on from an incident involving water run off, an assessment of current likelihood of risk realisation has been undertaken. Whilst, given the current level of intelligence, it is understood that this incident is unlikely to result in a legal challenge/ Service litigation or significantly damage the Service Brand a number of additional preventative controls are required to be implemented to enhance current control arrangements.</p> <p>These are detailed below.</p>
Changes and additions to control measures	<p>A number of additional preventative controls are to be implemented to reduce the likelihood of risk realisation as a result of excessive or undesirable pollution/waste/damage to the environment caused by fire service activities.</p> <p>Specifically these are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve communication arrangements between the environment agency and the Service ▪ Revise mobilisation arrangements of Hazardous Materials Environmental Protection Officers and introduce specific communication responsibilities to enable for environmental considerations to be fully considered by Incident Commanders and the Environment Agency ▪ Raise environmental awareness through specific communication <p>Feedback from environmental incidents is to be included in debrief and to inform incident learning via operational debrief. Intelligence will be fed into the Strategic Training Group</p>
Assurances	None

