

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: October 2011 Summary of significant changes to the Corporate Risk Register

Risk 1 and Risk 5. The overall score of these risks remains at 12 (HIGH) as a consequence of the likelihood associated with the realisation of both risks being scored 4 in July 2011. A number of additional controls have been put in place to enable the Service to effectively plan for and manage through periods of industrial action and this is reflected on the risk logs for 1 and 5. The Business Continuity Management Team (BCMT) meeting framework has been established and enacted. The cross functional BCMT will manage, co-ordinate and enable for the implementation of all plans, process, structures and frameworks to prepare for and manage through periods of industrial. The role of BCMT is reflected as an additional control across Corporate Risks 7 (security of premises/fleet) and 8 (finance) 11 (command and control) .

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. |