	<p><b>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</b></p> <p><b>AUDIT PENSIONS AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b></p> <p><b>(27th June 2013)</b></p>
<p><b>TITLE OF REPORT</b> Combined Risk Management Highlight report</p>	
<p><b>Report of the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</b></p>	
<p><b>Open Report</b></p>	
<p><b>For Review &amp; Comment</b></p> <p><b>Key Decision:No</b></p>	
<p><b>Wards Affected: None</b></p>	
<p><b>Accountable Executive Director:</b> Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</p>	
<p><b>Report Author:</b> Michael Sloniowski, BiBorough Risk Manager</p>	<p><b>Contact Details:</b>  Tel: 020 8753 2587  E-mail:  michael.sloniowski@lbhf.gov.uk</p>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report updates the Committee of the risks, controls, assurances and management action orientated to manage Enterprise Wide risks.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The committee consider the current h&f Sovereign Strategic, Change and Operational risks as outlined in the report.
- 2.2. The committee note the TriBorough and BiBorough risks such as they may affect h&f as outlined in the report.
- 2.3. The committee approve the Enterprise Wide Risk & Assurance register (**Appendix 1**)

## 3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1. This report updates Members on the risk management issues identified across council services and follows changes in the reporting process to Committee to meet Corporate Governance requirements for Enterprise

Risk Management as outlined in the 2012 guidance 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government'. Effective risk management continues to help the council to achieve its objectives by 'getting things right first time' and is a key indicator of the 'Corporate Health' of the council.

#### **4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 4.1. Local government has been undergoing significant change and the environment in which it works is increasing in complexity. In addition to the continuing economic and financial challenge, the Localism Act and other key legislation has brought new roles, opportunities and greater flexibility for authorities.
- 4.2. Local authorities are changing the way in which they operate and undertake service provision. Public services are delivered directly, through partnerships, collaboration and through commissioning. Shared services and partnership boards have come into existence. The introduction of new structures and ways of working provide challenges for managing risk, ensuring transparency and demonstrating accountability.
- 4.3. Good governance enables an authority to pursue its vision effectively as well as underpinning that vision with control and the management of risk.

#### **5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

##### **5.1. TRI-BOROUGH RISK MANAGEMENT DELIVERY**

5.1.1. H&F Risk Management was included as a service, along with Internal Audit and Counter Fraud, in the Corporate Services Programme. A Strategy to manage TriBorough risks has been developed collaboratively with Westminster City Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. This is presented in a separate report to the Committee for their consideration. This brings together TriBorough Strategic Risk Management through a Joint Strategy Statement and Policy.

5.1.2. Following a period of consultation with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea the current H&F Risk Manager has been appointed as Bi-borough Risk Manager. The reporting line of the BiBorough Risk Manager will be to the recently appointed BiBorough Director of Audit. The cost of the BiBorough Risk Manager post will be shared equally between the two Councils.

##### **5.2. ENTERPRISE WIDE RISK AND ASSURANCE REGISTER**

5.2.1. The Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register has been updated following the review of Departmental submissions and have been reviewed by the Hammersmith & Fulham Business Board. It remains an indicator of 'Corporate Preparedness'.

The full version accompanies this paper for Members information at **Appendix 1**.

### 5.3. H&F - STRATEGIC RISKS PERSPECTIVE

#### **Tri-borough Facilities Management (TFM) project**

- 5.3.1. The Tri-borough Facilities Management (TFM) project was approved by Hammersmith & Fulham and Westminster cabinets on Monday 13 May. This follows approval from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea cabinet on 2 May.
- 5.3.2. Amey, one of the UK's leading public services providers, is the preferred supplier to manage the facilities management services on behalf of the three Tri-borough councils.
- 5.3.3. The TFM contract will run for ten years (with an option to extend for a further three years) and includes building security, maintenance and repairs as well as catering, landscaping, cleaning and reception services.
- 5.3.4. Transfer of Undertakings and Protection of Employment (TUPE) regulations will apply for facilities management staff across the three councils. Amey is expected to meet with staff between June and September, with TFM due to go live from October this year.
- 5.3.5. No services will be closed as a result of TFM. The greatest changes will be behind the scenes and these implementation risks will need to be carefully managed.
- 5.3.6. To ensure that Amey perform well and manage risk effectively a small Tri-borough client side team will be set up to manage the TFM contract. An appointment has been made for the Head of the Client Side Team, subject to references. The Client Side Team will be made up of roughly 22 staff and will be hosted by the Royal Borough Kensington and Chelsea. The team will be led by a new head of Tri-borough Facilities Management, reporting into Michael Clark, Lead Director TFM.

#### **TriBorough Managed Services**

- 5.3.7. Tri-Borough Managed Services (sometimes known as Programme Athena) is the programme of work to develop a fully outsourced managed services solution for a number of corporate services. This includes Finance & Procurement, HR, Property and Asset Data Management, Business Intelligence and E-Sourcing.

- 5.3.8. In January 2013 the Tri-borough Managed Services Programme reached a significant milestone by awarding a framework agreement to British Telecom (BT) to provide Finance and HR services. This decision follows an intensive joint procurement phase with a selected panel from across the three Tri-borough councils.
- 5.3.9. The Managed Services Programme Management Office has produced a (draft) top level plan, known as the Blueprint, and a (draft) Microsoft project plan. The Finance and HR Project Managers (Michael Blythin and Francis Solomon-Knox) have been asked to provide detailed tasks that will support it. This will be followed by a workshop that will start to identify the various dependencies. The June meeting of the Managed Services Board will then approve the full baseline plan.

## **ICT Programme**

### **Pace of Change**

- 5.3.10. As organisational changes are implemented, there is an expectation that ICT will respond and provide the enablers to the new service offerings but this is not always a straightforward exercise, as the requirements themselves can change quickly over time leading to the need to redesign ICT solutions.

### **Interdependencies**

- 5.3.11. A further area that is impacting on the complexity of delivering the new tri-borough service enablers, is the growing number of interdependencies between major change programmes such as Managed Services, Total FM, CLCH community services integration and the tri-borough ICT strategy implementation. These interdependencies take the form of multiple demands on the same skilled resource, the need to align ICT solutions and approaches to delivery, communication between the programmes and to business stakeholders, including third parties and the cumulative impact of multiple programmes impacting on the same service areas within similar timeframes. This can give rise to serious complexity which needs to be navigated. Awareness, effective governance, active resource management and escalation is required to ensure all such interdependencies are captured and managed by each programme.

### **Accountability and service engagement**

- 5.3.12. ICT Programme governance has been established with clear accountability and senior leadership. The programme has

changed the Chief Information Officer accountability, with Howell Huws now in place as the lead CIO for ASC, and Jackie Hudson providing oversight as the tri-borough lead advisor for ICT. Customer feedback demanding a single point of contact for strategic development is now being met. The ICT response is to now establish a strategic relationship manager for ASC on a secondment basis. ASC will have a say in that appointment.

## **Public Health Integration**

5.3.13. From Monday 1 April the responsibility for Public Health in local areas transferred from Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to local authorities. The Tri-borough Public Health Service is hosted at Westminster City Hall with public health staff transferred there this March. Risks, includes those associated with promoting healthy living and enabling people in our local area to live healthy lives, are required to be considered by every council team when starting a new project, revising a policy or commissioning a service;

- How does this work improve the health and wellbeing of our residents/visitors?
- How does this work reduce health inequalities within the local area?

5.3.14. Health and Wellbeing Boards are also being established. These boards are new local bodies that bring people together and commission services jointly in a way which reflects the wider factors of health such as housing, air pollution and employment. Each borough will have its own Health and Wellbeing Strategy which sets out how services will be commissioned and the priorities which are central to improving health in the local area. These strategies will focus on tackling the tough issues that require partners to work together and will complement the role that Council services will play in putting health at the heart of everything undertaken.

## **Global Financial uncertainty and economic instability**

5.3.15. A high level of financial uncertainty and economic instability, nationally and attached to the Eurozone remains a key risk for the Council.

5.3.16. There is more positive news from the previous quarter Strategic risk update and the outlook on economic growth in the UK this year that is now expected to be greater than 1%, up from the Bank's previous estimate of 0.9%.

- 5.3.17. Sir Mervyn King added: "This hasn't been a typical recession and it won't be a typical recovery. Nevertheless, a recovery is in sight." Inflation has been above the 2% target since December 2009, and currently stands at 2.8%. The stubbornness of inflation to remain above target is one of the reasons why the Bank has not expanded its bond purchasing scheme, or quantitative easing. Doing so could push inflation higher. But while the Bank said the outlook was slightly rosier than it was three months ago, the underlining picture remained subdued. "The economy is likely to see a modest and sustained recovery over the next three years," the Bank said, though it added that the recovery would "remain weak by historical standards".
- 5.3.18. Weak demand from the eurozone also prompted the Bank to note that the "main risks to the recovery continue to emanate from abroad".
- 5.3.19. But as austerity replaces indulgence across Europe, an emerging risk and realisation of mis-selling scandals has become apparent. The most recent scandal came out in April, when it was announced that the UK energy supplier SSE was being fined £10.5m (€12.3m) for "failing to prevent sharp-selling practices by its selling agents". The regulator for the energy industry, Ofgem, said that its findings "show SSE failed its customers, mis-sold to them and undermined trust in the energy supply industry".
- 5.3.20. More recently the allegations of collusion in the Oil industry and including BP and Shell face claims they have been fixing prices for more than a decade. It follows a raid on the offices of BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Norway's Statoil by European anti-trust regulators.

#### 5.4. H&F - OPERATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

##### **Key Risk Indicators**

- 5.4.1. Risk indicators are an important tool within operational risk management, facilitating the monitoring and control of risk. In so doing they may be used to support a range of operational risk management activities and processes, including: risk identification; risk and control assessments; and the implementation of effective risk appetite, risk management and governance frameworks.

## Health and Safety

- 5.4.2. The Corporate Safety Unit and BiBorough Risk Manager have jointly developed a formal risk register to manage Health and Safety risk. The document is now being reviewed periodically by the Corporate Safety Unit with input from the BiBorough Risk Manager. This now forms an independent and new assurance on Health & Safety for the council and is the model is also being adopted as good practice by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

## Information Management

- 5.4.3. Information security incidents are recorded by the Information Management team and are reviewed periodically by the cross departmental Information Technology Security Operations Group ( ITSOG ). A security incident is an event that has an actual or potential adverse effect on the computer, network or user resources, compromises data or where there has been damage or loss of equipment. During the last calendar year, 2012 there have been 37 incidents. This is a rise of 13 from 2011 and is primarily due to increased awareness and improved reporting across staff as a direct result of Information Governance training and communications. The Childrens Services Department were attributed to 15 of the 37 incidents. Issues are escalated by the Information Manager at ITSOG meetings together with any mitigations or actions necessary.
- 5.4.4. The Information Management incident experience is attached as **Appendix 2**.

## Procurement

- 5.4.5. The Bi Borough Procurement Board is apprised of key risks and issues as part of the new reporting format to the Board. Cabinet reports include a provision for comment on risk management. Key risks identified include;
- Separate Governance Decision Making Processes
  - Separate Contract Standing Orders
  - Differing approach to procurement
  - Optimum timing of contracts extensions to co-ordinate three borough procurement exercises

## 6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 6.1. *Not applicable as the report is a representation of the business risks and opportunities to H&F council.*

## **7. CONSULTATION**

7.1. *Not applicable as the report addresses the business risks to H&F council.*

## **8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

8.1. *The responsibility to complete Equality Impact Assessment in relation to policy decisions is the responsibility of the appropriate departmental officer. The report highlights some of the risks and consequences of risk taking over a broad landscape and as such specific Equality and Diversity issues are referred to in the councils Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register.*

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1. *Failure to manage risk effectively may give risk to increased exposure to litigation, claims and complaints. As such the report contributes to the effective Corporate Governance of the council.*

## **10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

10.1. *Exposure to unplanned risk could be detrimental to the ongoing financial and reputational standing of the Council. Failure to innovate and take positive risks may result in loss of opportunity and reduced Value for Money. There are no direct financial implications with the report content.*

## **11. RISK MANAGEMENT**

11.1. *It is the responsibility of management to mitigate risk to an acceptable level. Appropriate and proportionate mitigating actions to known risks are expressed in the Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance Register and subject to review as part of planned Audit work and the Annual Governance Statement.*

11.2. Implications verified/completed by: Michael Sloniowski, Principal Consultant Risk Management. 020 8753 2587

## **12. PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS**

12.1. *Failure to address risk in procurement may lead to a reduction in the expected benefits ( Value for Money, Efficiency, Resilience, Quality of Service) and leave the council exposed to potential fraud and collusion as identified in the Bribery Act.*



No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	Association of Local Authority Risk Managers & Institute of Risk Management, 2002, A Risk Management Standard	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
2.	The Orange Book, Management of Risk Principles & Concepts – HM Treasury	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
3.	Departmental Risk Registers, Tri borough Portfolio risk logs	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith
4.	TriBorough Programme report updates	Michael Sloniowski 2587	TriBnet
5.	BS 31100 Code of Practice for risk management	Michael Sloniowski 2587	Corporate Finance Division, Internal Audit, Town Hall, Hammersmith


**[Note:** Please list only those that are not already in the public domain, i.e. you do not need to include Government publications, previous public reports etc.] Do not list exempt documents. Background Papers must be retained for public inspection for four years after the date of the meeting.


#### **LIST OF APPENDICES:**

*Appendix 1  
Enterprise Wide Risk and Assurance register*


*Appendix 2  
Information Management incident experience*





No.	Business risk Perspective (Strategic, Change or Operational)	TriBorough BiBorough or Sovereign risk	Risk	Consequence	First line of defence (Management Controls)	Second line of defence (Independent Assurance)	Likelihood (L)	Impact (I)	Exposure = L x I	Risk Rating	Responsible Officer or Group	Review
1.	Strategic	Sovereign	<b>Managing budgets</b> Sub-risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NNDR</b> localisation of Business Rates – taking on financial risk of non-collection of NNDR plus the associated loss of government grant</li> <li>• Underlying performance of the economy is still poor.</li> <li>• Impact of a sluggish national <b>economic recovery</b> and cascade effect on social budgets * link to revenue forecast</li> <li>• <b>Pressure on demand led services</b> may occur mid year resulting in unanticipated additional costs</li> <li>• <b>HMRC VAT claims</b> regarding partnering activities and the partial exemption benefit</li> <li>• <b>Grant application</b> is incorrectly calculated</li> <li>• <b>Unplanned growth</b></li> <li>• Failure to achieve <b>VFM</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement to deliver planned savings</li> <li>• Pressure on the authority to manage overspends</li> <li>• Departments have to manage cost pressures</li> <li>• Loss of financial benefit to the council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High risk &amp; volatile budget areas identified by H &amp; F Finance</li> <li>• E-Learning package for Finance Managers now live</li> <li>• Collaborative Planning system with supported training for budget holders</li> <li>• Medium Term Financial Strategy and Business Planning Processes</li> <li>• MTFS Officer &amp; Member Challenge</li> <li>• Leader's monthly monitoring reports</li> <li>• Financial Strategy Board (FSB) periodically evaluates the effectiveness of the financial management arrangements</li> </ul>	Annual Audit Letter  Select Committees are given the opportunity to fully scrutinise budgets during January.  Internal Audit reviews of National Non Domestic Rates, Financial Accounting System Ledger, Cost reduction Contracts Management, S106 Economic Development and Regeneration Expenditure 2012 2013	3	4	12	Medium 	Jane West lead – All Executive Directors	Review May 2013

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Accruals &amp; reconciliations</b></li> <li>• <b>Planned savings</b> not implemented</li> <li>• <b>Creditworthiness</b> of some contractors may be downgraded as a result of the economic downturn</li> <li>• <b>Contractors may go bust and cost may be incurred putting in new arrangements for service delivery</b></li> <li>• <b>Insufficient budgetary provision</b> and/or budgetary under/overspend *</li> <li>• <b>Incomplete/inaccurate accounting records</b></li> <li>• <b>Overestimation</b> of potential revenue streams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional spend on dealing with contract failure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership activity now includes a VAT trace and has been raised at FSB</li> <li>• Grant Claims &amp; returns record is tracked at FSB</li> <li>• Monthly corporate revenue &amp; capital monitoring to cabinet</li> <li>• Reports to the Leader identify where spend levels exceed a tolerable level during the year</li> <li>• Credit check of contractors is being undertaken through the BiBorough Procurement Strategy Board (RBKC &amp; H&amp;F)</li> <li>• Disposal of Assets</li> <li>• Sponsorship and advertising opportunities risk &amp; reward exercise</li> </ul>	<p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee, External Audit, Financial Strategy Board</p> <p>Overview and Scrutiny Board</p>						
2.	Strategic	Sovereign	<b>Managing the Business Objectives (publics needs and expectations)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Public or section of the public may not receive the service that they need or to the quality they expect</li> <li>• Reputation of the service may be affected</li> <li>• Services are delivered in an unplanned way</li> <li>• Services start to do their own thing - Maverick decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TriBorough Business Plans have been issued for 2013</li> <li>• Implementation of Lean Thinking principles putting the voice of the customer at the heart of service design</li> <li>• Performance monitoring and feedback through local media</li> <li>• Customer experience and</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Members</p> <p>Scrutiny Cttee review performance</p> <p>Ofsted</p> <p>Care Quality Commission</p>	3	3	9	Low 	All Executive Directors	Review May 2013

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistencies in service delivery start to emerge</li> <li>Lack of transparency</li> <li>Duplication of effort</li> <li>Communication of objectives and values is lost</li> <li>Target and Objective setting is diminished reducing the effectiveness of the performance management regime for officers</li> </ul>	satisfaction surveys							
3.	Strategic	Sovereign	<b>Market Testing</b> ( refer to Bi Borough Procurement Board RBKC & H&F )  <b>Sub-risks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tri Borough or Bi Borough <b>procurement risk appetite</b> may vary</li> <li><b>Procurement procedures</b> may become unclear across Tri or Bi Borough services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in threat of legal challenge on contract awards</li> <li>Officers time away from other projects</li> <li>Timescale of project is tight</li> <li>Insufficient numbers of Officers designated to the project</li> <li>Benefits are not realised</li> <li>Data Quality ( Accuracy, timeliness of information ) results in variation to original contract spec.</li> <li>Uncertainty about the most appropriate procurement route, lengthen process due to reporting to 3 Member bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transforming Procurement work with Agilisys procurement processes to make them slicker and more efficient</li> <li>Transforming Procurement Programme with Agilisys undertakes to improve the knowledge base and skills throughout H&amp;F</li> <li>Consultation with other boroughs</li> <li>Project managing the process</li> <li>Separation or joining of projects to maximise benefit potential</li> <li>Realistic timetables agreed and reviewed at BiBorough</li> </ul>	BiBorough Procurement Board (RBKC & H&F)  Transformation Board  HFBB  Audit review conducted for Use of Contractors  Internal Audit Substantial Assurance reports 2011/12 Market Testing H & F News, BTS, Legal Services Full Assurance report 2011/12 Market Testing Out of Hours	4	3	12	Medium 	All Executive Directors	Review  May 2013


					Procurement Board (RBKC & H&F) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Testing progress report to HFBB</li> <li>• Programme &amp; Project Management – Risk Logs being maintained, periodic risk reviews</li> <li>• Revenue estimated from the contract to be included as a risk in the MTFS</li> </ul>	Service							
4.	Change	TriBorough	<b>Managing Programmes, Portfolios and Projects</b>  <b>Sub-risks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Projects do not consider enough time</b> to mobilise in the event services are awarded to the private sector</li> <li>• Project implementation is delayed due to <b>protracted discussions regarding pensions transfers</b></li> <li>• <b>The risk of challenge to contract awards may increase</b> during the harsher economic climate</li> <li>• Large scale high risk high return <b>projects are not led by a qualified or experienced project manager.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers needs and expectations are not fully met when projects are delivered</li> <li>• Benefits of investment in creating toolkit not realised</li> <li>• Threat of overspend on projects</li> <li>• Benefits are not fully realised</li> <li>• Delays in mobilisation of services through revised contracts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Innovation and Managing Change Team brings together programme management skills from H&amp;F and RBKC.</li> <li>• Programme and Project management is supported by a recommended decision-making and governance process.</li> <li>• Projects and programmes are managed through the context of the Transformational portfolios.</li> <li>• A centralised project register is also contributing this to goal by giving visibility of projects</li> </ul>	The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Internal Audit  Departmental Project Management arrangements Audit 2012 2013  Bi Borough Procurement Board  Transformation Board  Internal Audit review of specific contracts HFBB,	3	3	9	Low 	Jane West lead – All Executive Directors  Martin Nottage (Tri Borough Innovation and Change Management Division)	Review  May 2013	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Too many projects are undertaken</b> with unrealistic or unachievable targets</li> <li>• <b>Successful delivery of the Tri-borough Managed Services Programme</b></li> <li>• <b>Successful delivery of the Tri-borough ICT Programme</b></li> <li>• <b>Successful delivery of the Tri-borough Total Facilities Management Programme</b></li> <li>• <b>Housing Regeneration</b>, Borough Investment Plan.</li> </ul>		<p>that are in department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further training and capability is being advanced with RBKC and WCC.</li> <li>• Standard documentation is provided to support project and programme management.</li> <li>• Monthly reporting to Transformation Board (dashboard)</li> <li>• BiBorough Procurement Strategy Board (RBKC &amp; H&amp;F) monitor aspects of project management compliance</li> <li>• Procedures for TUPE transfer have been included in project management instructions</li> </ul>	Audit Pensions and Standards Committee							
5.	Change	Sovereign	<p><b>Public Health Service and NHS Provision</b></p> <p><b>Sub-risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Council remains concerned about the <b>impacts of proposals to change the hospital arrangements in North West London</b></li> <li>• The <b>transfer of the Public Health Service</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Council is remaining active in debate with NHS decision-makers to ensure the best possible deal for residents. The Council could face unexpected spending</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new Director of Public Health will attend Housing, Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee</li> <li>• Dedicated officers implementing the setting up of a Health &amp; Well Being Board</li> <li>• The Council has no obligation to cross subsidise Public Health Tri-borough Public Health</li> </ul>	<p>HFBB</p> <p>Education &amp; Childrens Services Select Committee</p> <p>Cabinet</p>	4	3	12	High		Derek Myers, Director of Public Health (to be appointed)	Review March 2013

			from the NHS to local government may not go well	pressures from new responsibilities	service should be hosted at Westminster as agreed by the Leaders of the three councils								
6.	Operational	Sovereign	<b>Business Resilience</b>  <b>Sub-risks IT resilience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Systems not joined up and connected in the event of a H &amp; F or Tri-Bi Borough event</b></li> <li>• <b>Strategic Information technology framework not implemented effectively</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of top tier response plans</b></li> <li>• <b>ISP version</b> update to the infrastructure of the internet will have to move over to a new system, IPv6 previous versions not being compatible</li> <li>• <b>Electronic information storage capacity</b></li> <li>• <b>Mobile Communications technology provider service failure</b></li> <li>• <b>Openscape as a form of remote communications and working</b></li> </ul>	<b>If an event occurs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers face delays in service provision</li> <li>• Non compliance with statutory duties - indirectly</li> <li>• Threat to life - indirectly</li> <li>• Time to recover power and IT Services could be between 6 &amp; 8 weeks</li> <li>• Loss of information</li> <li>• Loss of productivity</li> <li>• Increased cost of resurrecting services ( only partially insurable)</li> <li>• Wasted resources &amp; staff duplication in recovery phase</li> <li>• Cost of additional data storage capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate Incident Management Procedures incorporate Business Continuity</li> <li>• Training has been delivered to local service plan leaders</li> <li>• A corporate service resilience group has been formed and meet periodically</li> <li>• Directors of Resources have been appointed as Departmental contact leads</li> <li>• Local Service Plans have been compiled, reviewed and refreshed and quality checked by Emergency Services</li> <li>• H &amp; F Bridge Partnership have submitted a Local Service Recovery, a major incident process has been established by HFBB as part of Data recovery is insured under the councils corporate insurance package (</li> </ul>	HFBB  The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Internal Audit  H&F Audit Pensions and Standards Committee  The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Audit Committee  Service Resilience Group  ELRS DMT  Substantial Assurance report 2011/12 Emergency Planning  H&F Substantial Assurance Business Continuity Audit report 2011 2012	4	3	12	Medium 	Lyn Carpenter ( Corporate Business Continuity ) ELRS Bi Borough with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  Jane West ( Insurance & H F Bridge Partnership contract monitoring )  Jackie Hudson Tri Borough Information and Communications Technology Lead Advisor	Review May 2013	




					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>but limited )</li> <li>• the Service Desk Manual</li> <li>• A threat assessment has been compiled</li> <li>• Some ITC service has been moved to East London</li> <li>• The Business Continuity (BC) project now involves provision of IT BC for approximately 30 First Order applications as identified by H&amp;F. The data is replicated from the primary data centre at East London to the secondary site at HTH. Additionally, there is local network switch resilience within HTH; resilience for the infrastructure elements such as profiles, home folders and printing; plus annual tests of parts of the BC solution.</li> </ul>	<p>Data storage &amp; back up audit Audit report 2009/10 ( Substantial assurance )</p>							
			<b>Contractor Liquidity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delays/ interruption to the service as a replacement is found</li> <li>• Cost and time of re-procuring the service</li> <li>• Protection of contributions to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creditsafe Financial checks</li> <li>• Corporate Finance credit checking</li> <li>• Contractor Business Continuity Planning</li> <li>• Pension fund performance bond</li> </ul>	<p>Bi Borough Procurement Board</p> <p>Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p> <p>Cabinet Office</p>							

			<b>Terrorist attack/Civil disturbance</b>	<p>H&amp;F Pension fund as more outsourcing is undertaken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service interruption</li> <li>• Property loss or damage</li> <li>• Injury or harm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrorism insurance cover</li> <li>• Tri Borough councils are working together to prevent terrorism offering free interactive workshops to raise awareness of the Prevent Strategy</li> <li>• Prevent aims to stop people from becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism by focusing on supporting and protecting those who might be vulnerable to radicalisation.</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE</b> Please refer to BCP Risk Assessment for highlighted risks and controls</p>	COBRA								
7.	Operational	Sovereign	<b>Managing statutory duty</b>  <b>Sub-risks</b> <b>Non-compliance with laws and regulations</b>  <b>Breach of duty of care</b>  <b>Breach in standard and delivery of care – caring and care homes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non compliance may result in prosecution or a Corporate Manslaughter charge</li> <li>• Financial compensation may be claimed</li> <li>• Injury or death to a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nigel Pallace is lead Sponsor on HFBB for Health &amp; Safety</li> <li>• Pro-active Health, Safety and Welfare culture across the council</li> <li>• TriBorough - The TotalFM contractor will manage a</li> </ul>	H&F Health & Safety Internal Audit planned Audit in 2012/13  Accommodation Gas Safety Audit 2012/13 Substantial	4	3	12	Medium 	Nigel Pallace  Jane West (Equalities)	Review  May 2013		


				<p>member of the public or employee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A breach of information security protocols may result in fines, harm to reputation and personal liability of Executive Directors</li> <li>• Inadequate level of service</li> <li>• Poor satisfaction with statutory services</li> </ul>	<p>number of statutory and regulatory Health &amp; Safety procedural, record and management processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TriBorough Health &amp; Safety protocols are being discussed and established</li> <li>• Contractors are managed within CHAS regime</li> <li>• Insurance cover is in place in the event of a claim for breach of duty of care and in respect of financial claims</li> <li>• Legislative changes are adopted and reflected in amendment to the council's constitution, budget allocation through MTFS ( Now unified business &amp; financial planning process )</li> <li>• Training and guidance packages and newly agreed performance management indicators</li> <li>• Periodic reporting to HFBB</li> <li>• Health &amp; Safety campaign on slips, trips and falls</li> <li>• Health &amp; Safety guidelines have been reviewed, refreshed and</li> </ul>	<p>Assurance</p> <p>Annual Assurance process</p> <p>Assurance required that actions are being taken to ensure compliance with the law and regulations</p> <p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p> <p>Education &amp; Childrens Services Select Committee</p> <p>H&amp;F Safety Committee</p> <p>TriBorough Safety Committees CHS and ASC</p> <p>Internal Audit 2012 2013 Review of Health &amp; Safety Statutory &amp; Regulatory compliance</p> <p>FSB, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate</p>						
			<b>Departmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Executive, Hammersmith &amp; Fulham Business Board, Executive</li> </ul>								

			<p><b>assurances</b></p> <p><b>Corporate Parenting</b></p> <p><b>Equalities (public sector equality duty or 'PSED') and Human Rights</b> (a budget challenge could be in whole terms or of a single line)</p>	<p>Directors and Management Teams may not have been apprised of significant controls weaknesses that appear in the service area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to reputation, potential harm or injury to individual</li> <li>• Increased complaints, Ombudsman involvement, judicial review which can result in; quashing order, prohibiting order, mandatory order, declaration, injunction, damages, and potential further challenge to a budget.</li> </ul>	<p>communicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of the Occupational Health Service and Workplace Options Employee Assistance Scheme</li> <li>• Housing and Regeneration have rolled out personal safety training to over 130 staff through the Suzy Lamplugh Trust Training</li> <li>• FSB reviewed and approved a process to harmonise the Management Assurance process at Director and Divisional level with that of RBKC.</li> <li>• All child protection cases have remained allocated to a social worker despite of the high demand.</li> <li>• A detailed action plan has been implemented in response to the increased numbers of children with child protection plans, to safely manage the</li> </ul>	<p>Governance, Chief Executive and Leader of the Council</p> <p>Local Safeguarding Childrens Board, Unannounced Safeguarding Inspection, Ofsted , Local and London Child Protection Procedures</p> <p>Limited Assurance report April 2012 H&amp;F Application of the Equality Act 2010</p> <p>Officer Working Group</p>						
--	--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>demand and reduce activity in line with that of our statistical neighbours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of qualified social workers delivering a child protection service has increased by two over the past year.</li> <li>• EIA's or Equality Statement (where applicable) must accompany all Cabinet, Full Council and Key Decision reports, KPI's</li> <li>• EIA's and Equality Statements address Human Rights where applicable</li> <li>• HFBB signed off actions that included a Policy for completion of Service Delivery EIA's (April 2012) and guidance for equality impacts of budget proposals to be drawn up and disseminated.</li> </ul>							
8.	Operational	Sovereign	<p>Successful partnerships &amp; Major Contracts</p> <p><b>Sub-risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnering activity with other boroughs and the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint objectives are not met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance arrangements are in</li> </ul>	H & F Bridge Partnership	4	3	12	Medium 	Derek Myers	Review May 2013

			<p>NHS may blur the lines of responsibility, accountability, governance or liability in the event of service failure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Housing Company</li> <li>Differing procurement processes Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders across TriBorough services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community expectations are not met</li> <li>A business plan may not be concluded</li> <li>Decisions may be made which contradict or challenge the Contract Standing Orders or Financial Regulations of H&amp;F</li> </ul>	<p>place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance monitoring reports reported to Select Cttee's</li> <li>The Cabinet Member will be closely involved in business plan discussions</li> <li>Financial creditworthiness checks at BiBorough Procurement Board (RBKC &amp; H&amp;F)</li> </ul>	<p>Assurance process</p> <p>Internal Audit Substantial Assurance report 2011/12 Partnership Governance</p> <p>BiBorough Procurement Board (RBKC &amp; H&amp;F)</p> <p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p>							
9.	Operational	Sovereign	<p><b>Maintaining reputation and service standards</b></p> <p><b>Sub-risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Multiplicity of external forces and initiatives</b></li> <li><b>Breach of Officer or Member code of conduct</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat to the status of the council</li> <li>Failure to deliver plans &amp; savings.</li> <li>Ability to effectively lead and resource the transformation agenda is diminished</li> <li>Service delivery deteriorates</li> <li>Harm to the council's reputation</li> <li>Potential adverse media reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Annual Residents Survey</li> <li>A review of the corporate governance arrangements has been conducted by Internal Audit</li> <li>Annual Complaints review report April 2010 to March 2011 produced to Committee</li> <li>Combined Finance &amp; Service Planning processes</li> <li>New Standards procedures are in place</li> <li>Standards issues</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Ofsted, Care Quality Commission, Annual Audit letter</p> <p>HFBB, Audit Pensions and Standards Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Board</p>	4	3	12	Medium	Jane West	Review May 2013	


			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Information Management and Governance</b></li> <li>• <b>Inappropriate Data released</b></li> <li>• <b>Poor data quality</b> internally or from third parties, breaches of information protocols, information erroneously sent to third parties.</li> <li>• Auto forwarding of information ( <b>Information control and threat of leakage</b> )</li> <li>• <b>Local information interconnectivity and data storage ( hosting )</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential fines or action from the Information Commissioner</li> <li>• Quality and integrity of data held in support of Performance Management &amp; Financial systems leads to under or over estimation</li> <li>• Data management 'without boundaries' could be more sensitive to local, national or geographical service interruption, theft, loss or duplication</li> </ul>	<p>now covered under the Audit Pensions and Standards Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information governance forms part of the TriBorough ICT Programme</li> <li>• New Information Management Security Protocols published on the Intranet</li> <li>• Regular reporting on Security Incidents by the Information Management Team</li> <li>• Performance statistics are scrutinised by Select Committees, HFBB &amp; DMT's</li> <li>• Corvu Performance Management System is able to pick up anomalies</li> <li>• Data Quality E-Learning module has been released</li> <li>• From Wednesday 1st August 2012, the Council is introducing a new contractor ( industry specialists) for the collection and destruction of confidential waste from all Council offices in the H&amp;F.</li> <li>• Webmail has now been banned across</li> </ul>	<p>TriBorough Information Management Project Board</p> <p>ITSOG</p> <p>Management Letter has been issued (based on comparison to requirements under the Data Protection Act )</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--


					H&F								
10.	Operational	Sovereign (TriBorough) (from April 2013)	<b>Managing fraud ( Internal &amp; External)</b>  <b>Sub-risks</b> <b>Misappropriation of assets</b> <b>Appointee ship/custodian or guardian</b>  <b>Contracting</b> Gifts & Benefits Manipulation of performance data, collusion, billing, non-compliance with Financial and or Contract Standing Orders  <b>Misrepresentation of Personal or Commercial Circumstances</b>  <b>NNDR</b>  <b>Payroll</b>  <b>Cheque</b>  <b>Grant award</b>  <b>Treasury</b>  <b>Housing Tenancy or Benefit Fraud</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of reputation</li> <li>• Financial loss</li> <li>• Loss of asset</li> <li>• Loss of revenue</li> <li>• Adverse regulatory /audit report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Egress system introduced to protect confidential e-mails going outside of Tri-borough</li> <li>• Corporate Services review includes the Corporate Fraud Service. The aim of the project is to develop an adaptable Bi-Borough corporate fraud function which responds through a single professional and effective team to the challenging and changing range of fraud, both internally and externally executed.</li> <li>• Corporate Anti Fraud Service has been established</li> <li>• CAFS team now use a risk assessment to assist in targeting and workload prioritisation</li> <li>• New model being piloted to collate information from fraud cases and disseminate the recommendations through risk &amp; assurance registers</li> <li>• Literature and training has been delivered to all levels of the authority</li> <li>• Information and</li> </ul>	HFBB receive quarterly summary information on anti-fraud activity  Audit Pensions and Standards Committee receive quarterly reports on Fraud	4	3	12	Medium 	<b>TriBorough</b> Nicholas Holgate RBKC Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance and Business Lead, Internal Audit  <b>H&amp;F</b> Jane West lead – All Executive Directors  <b>WCC</b> Barbara Moorhouse	Review  May 2013	



					<p>guidance has been published on the corporate intranet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of fraud is being tracked through FSB</li> <li>• Close working relationship is established with the Police</li> <li>• Bribery Act Policy and Risk Register</li> <li>• Money laundering policies recently reviewed and amended.</li> </ul>						
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

OPPORTUNITY RISKS ( Where the is in excess of £3Million Benefit to H&F )

1.	Change	TriBorough	<p><b>Merging of education services</b> (with Westminster Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea)</p>	<p>Savings due to removal of duplication across the councils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IT opportunities such as access and sharing of files and connecting to networks when at other sites.</li> <li>• HR workshops regarding specific topics such as Sick Leave, Pay etc. are currently being planned and more information will be available soon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Reviews, Looked after Children, Leaving Care</li> <li>• TriBorough Managers Induction</li> <li>• Tri Borough Mandate approved for Childrens Services at Cabinet 05-12-11</li> <li>• Combined Senior Management Team</li> <li>• A single education commissioning function responsible for raising standards</li> <li>• A single commissioning function responsible for arranging services for early years, children, young people, social care, health, disability and</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet</p> <p>Transformation Board</p> <p>Education &amp; Childrens Services Select Committee</p> <p>External Audit (review 2012)</p> <p>Ofsted</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Kensington &amp; Chelsea Internal Audit</p> <p>TriBorough Childrens Services Portfolio Board</p>	2	4	8	Low		Andrew Christie	Review May 2013
----	--------	------------	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	-----	---	-----------------	--------------------

					<p>workforce development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three Borough-based delivery units with responsibility for protecting children, supporting families and delivering early help in the most efficient manner possible.</li> </ul>	<p>TriBorough Headteachers Executive Board</p> <p>Local Safeguarding Childrens Board</p> <p>BiBorough Procurement Strategy Board (RBKC &amp; H&amp;F)</p>							
3.	Change	Sovereign	<p>Regeneration of King Street and Civic Offices</p> <p><b>Sub-risks</b></p> <p><b>GLA do not approve the proposals</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Hall extension has come to the end of its life and needs to either be demolished or refurbished. An estimated cost of around £18m in temporarily accommodating staff through a relocation to facilitate repairs</li> <li>• New office accommodation at no cost is being provided in exchange for land</li> <li>• A new modern building is also expected to save around £150,000 in energy costs</li> <li>• Jobs will be created in King Street</li> <li>• A new community-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Leader of the Council has announced revised proposals regarding the height of buildings in the residential blocks.</li> <li>• King Street Development will be reviewing the scheme over the coming months and a further consultation with residents' and amenity groups will follow later in the year.</li> <li>• Hammersmith &amp; Fulham Council has agreed to work with the GLA on a further independent rigorous assessment on viability</li> <li>• Exhibition of 3 bid schemes 2007</li> <li>• Statement of</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet</p> <p>Planning Applications Committee</p> <p>Mayor of London</p> <p>Greater London Authority</p> <p>Port of London Authority</p> <p>English Heritage</p>	3	4	12	<p>Medium</p> 	Nigel Pallace	<p>Review</p> <p>May 2013</p>	

				<p>sized supermarket and a range of new restaurants and other retailers, alongside a council 'One Stop Shop', will draw more people down King Street and encourage more investment in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful redevelopment would enable the council to terminate contracts for various costly leased buildings around the borough savings around £2 million a year.</li> </ul>	<p>Community Involvement – Two public consultation exercises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private meetings with residents</li> <li>• Stakeholder Forums</li> <li>• Flyer to 15,000 homes</li> <li>• Pre application meetings with GLA and local amenity groups</li> <li>• 1800 letters sent to individual properties in the wider area.</li> <li>• Consultation with statutory groups; GLA, HAFAD, Port of London Authority, LFEPA, Metropolitan Police, English Heritage &amp; Archaeology, Natural England,CAA, BAA Airports, Thames Water, Environment Agency, Tf</li> <li>• Residents Groups &amp; Landowners; Thomas Pocklington Trust, Tesco, Quakers, Amenity Groups, Brackenbury Residents Assoc. The Georgian Group, HAMRA, the Hammersmith Soc. H &amp; F Historic Buildings Group, Ravenscourt Action Group, Ashcurch</li> </ul>							
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Residents Assoc. Old Chiswick Protection Soc. Digby Mansions 39-58a Residents Assoc. For further detail please refer to Planning Applications Committee Agenda 30-11-11</p> <p>Submitted by the Planning Applicant;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Statement, Energy Statement, Flood Risk Assessment,</li> <li>• Air Quality Assessment, Environmental Noise Assessment, Lighting Strategy</li> <li>• Phase 1 Habitat Survey &amp; ecological database search</li> <li>• Telecommunications assessment</li> </ul>							
4.	Change	Sovereign	Earls Court regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive redevelopment allows existing housing stock to be replaced on a "new for old" basis and 16% of existing tenants who are overcrowded can be re-housed in homes with enough bedrooms to meet their need.</li> <li>• Proposed guarantees for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earls Court Regeneration Team supported by high quality advisory team comprising Jones Lang LaSalle, SNR Denton and PWC.</li> <li>• All major decision reports reviewed by Tim Kerr QC in relation to Judicial Review challenge risk.</li> <li>• Workshops in</li> </ul>	<p>Project Group chaired by Executive Director</p> <p>HFBB</p> <p>Cabinet</p> <p>Housing, Health And Adult Social Care Select Committee</p> <p>Planning</p>	3	4	12	Medium	Mel Barrett	<p>Review</p> <p>May 2013</p>

				<p>tenants and leaseholders include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brand new replacement homes, one move only within the local area.</li> <li>- Tenants remain secure Council tenants and continue to pay Council rents – there is no stock transfer and therefore no requirement for a ballot.</li> <li>- Phased approach allows communities to be moved together.</li> </ul> <p>Comprehensive regeneration offers opportunity to secure major estate renewal across the West Kensington and Gibbs Green estates as well as offering major regeneration benefits including 7,500 new homes, 36,000 construction jobs, 9,500 permanent jobs and £99.5 million per annum of additional local expenditure, together with additional community facilities comprising</p>	<p>August 2012 to cover procurement, risk, finance, housing redevelopment, planning, legal and communications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive report submitted to and approved by Cabinet 3rd September 2012.</li> <li>• The council received £15m from Capital and Counties (CapCo) for signing an exclusivity agreement relating to the Earl's Court Regeneration site. Of this receipt, £10m is refundable should completion of the CLSA not occur, the remaining £5m is not refundable under any circumstances</li> </ul>	<p>Applications Committee</p> <p>The Royal Borough Major Planning Development Committee</p> <p>The Royal Borough Planning Applications Committee</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				new schools, leisure and health facilities, new open and play space and a significant increase in job opportunities.										
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note 1. All key risks have been extracted from( but not limited to) a number of sources for analysis by the Hammersmith & Fulham Business Board . The sources include;

- i. Previous Corporate Risk & Assurance Register
- ii. World Economic Forum Global risks 2012
- iii. Information identified from Tri Borough Programme, Departmental Risk & Assurance Registers
- iv. Officers Knowledge and experience
- v. Tri-Borough & H&F Portfolio Summary reports
- vi. Procurement exercises
- vii. Significant Weaknesses established from the Annual Assurance process
- viii. Audit & Fraud Reports
- ix. Knowledge and experience of public sector risks from the Principal Risk Consultant
- x. Data Quality and Integrity
- xi. Cabinet, Scrutiny and Public Domain reports.
- xii. WCC and RBKC Risk knowledge pooled information
- xiii. Zurich Municipal, Grant Thornton and Price Waterhouse Coopers reports

Note 2. Categorised under the PESTLE methodology as published in the Hammersmith & Fulham Risk Standard. Compliant with BS31100/ ALARM/IRM/CIPFA best practice.

Score	Key
16-25	RED - High and very high risk - immediate management action required
11-15	AMBER - Medium risk - review of controls
6-10	GREEN - Low risk - monitor and if escalates quickly check controls
1-5	YELLOW - Very low risk - monitor periodically

**Information Management incident experience****(Appendix 2)****Statistical summary of incidents****Total Incidents per year (by incident type)**

Department	2010			2011			2012			2013		
	Incident	Loss	Dept Total	Incident	Loss	Dept Total	Incident	Loss	Dept Total	Incident	Loss	Dept Total
CHS	6	12	18	3	2	5	6	9	15	4	3	7
ASC	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	5	1	2	3
T&TS	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	1
FCS	7	1	8	4	0	4	6	1	7	1	0	1
HRD	0	0	0	5	2	7	1	0	1	1	1	2
HFBP	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0
ELRS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Cross Dept	4	0	4	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	2
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Yearly Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>

**Note:**

- The figures above indicate the number of incidents logged in each year by type and department.
- Incidents are only counted once, therefore if an incident was a 'Cross Department' incident it will only be counted in this row and will not also appear against the individual department's totals.
- **Cross Department** = This includes incidents which occurred across all departments (e.g. a malware attack on the H&F network) or where an incident occurred across more than one department (e.g. incident occurred in CSD and CHS).
- **Loss** = This includes incidents which occurred as a result of a loss or a theft
- **Incident** = This includes all incidents which have not occurred as a result of a loss or theft. This would include for example confidentiality breaches, personal data leaks, Information Security Policy breaches, Government Connect breaches.



### Incidents Monitored in 2013

Department	Closed	Contained	Live	Total
CHS	3	4	8	15
ASC	1	3	3	7
T&TS	2	0	0	2
FCS	1	4	1	6
HRD	1	2	0	3
HFBP	0	0	1	1
ELRS	0	1	0	1
Cross Dept	0	1	1	2
<b>Total (to date)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>37</b>