

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: 29 JULY 2010
title: RISK MANAGEMENT – UPDATE ON RED RISKS
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
principal author: MICK AINSCOW

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide members with additional information on the current areas of high risk for the Council as identified on the risk register.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At your last meeting on 29 June a report was presented showing the current areas of high risk for the Council. There were at that time five risks that were highlighted as red on the risk register:

Community Safety Partnership (2 red risks)
Forward Planning (1 red risk)
Three Stream Waste Collection (1 red risk)
Town Centre Management (1 red risk)

- 2.2 A number of questions were raised by members regarding the report and they resolved that further information/explanation was required from individual service managers responsible for the red risks which had been identified. Members requested a special meeting of this committee be arranged where the relevant officers should attend to provide further details regarding the red risks.

3 RED RISKS

- 3.1 A template was drawn up and sent to relevant officers asking for more information regarding the red risks within their respective service areas, and to the potential impact on the authority should those risks actually materialise. Attached as Annex A are the completed templates from the relevant risk owners.
- 3.2 All risk owners will be attending the next meeting to provide members with any relevant information/explanation on the risks.

PRINCIPAL AUDITOR

20 July 2010
AA18-10/MA/AC

Forward Planning

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
Land is not available to meet employment needs.	8	<p>1. Policies and procedures: there are documented policies and procedures and all employees involved in the planning application process are aware of, and have access to, the legislation governing the process.</p> <p>2. Land usage monitored: The Council maintains detailed maps to monitor land usage.</p> <p>3. Land use policies reviewed: Policies on land usage are periodically reviewed.</p> <p>4. Local plan: The LDF and Regeneration Strategy are prepared and approved by the Council. The LDF system will put measures in place to tackle land shortages and provide up to date planning policies.</p>	<p>Now amber as a result of change to RSS and the ability for requirements to be set locally.</p> <p>Our monitoring identifies opportunity to bring land forward is likely to meet demands over the next 10 years.</p> <p>Planning Policy in LDF being formulated to enable land to come forward to meet local economic health.</p> <p>This is being presented to Committee 15/7 and has been published 9/7/10.</p>	<p>Risk for authority is probably most related to operational reputation. We could also be losing job creation opportunities which supports image and economic wellbeing of the area.</p>	<p>Process/controls are within our statutory functions, that is, we could grant applications and allocate land.</p> <p>The Council could acquire land and bring it forward.</p>	<p>No real need for additional measures.</p> <p>Financial constraints are a factor in bringing forward land.</p>

Town Centre Management

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
Services cannot be undertaken due to funding problems. No partnership arrangement funding.	7	1. Partnership arrangements: Regeneration Strategy and work of LSP will undertake a review of town centres in the absence of a formally funded Town Centre Partnership. Consultants appointed to provide baseline information.	This is now amber as the Council has now adopted action plans and proposals for the Town Centres. The risks are reduced because partnership arrangements are being put in place to secure funding opportunities.	Reputation/image as decline in Town Centre wellbeing will be apparent. Potential loss of revenue from commercial services, car parking if footfall/business numbers decline.	By taking the action on Town Centres there are probably few controls needed. Targeting spending on Town Centre projects may be applied to promote growth – but availability of resources will be an issue.	No real need for further controls but again measures would need finance <u>or</u> in some instances may require different approach to some areas of service delivery.

Community Safety Partnership

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
The partnership receives insufficient funding, resulting in less prevention initiatives being carried out.	7	None	RVCSP currently has a budget of £72,500 of which £43,500 comes from the Area Based Grant, administered by LCC. This fund is not ring fenced and could be withdrawn at any time especially at a time when the Government is clawing back on grant funding. Indeed, we are already aware that the Govt is asking for 10% back from this year's budget!	If funding is reduced all elements of our budget will have to be reviewed. The budget currently funds one post and part funds a second shared post. We also have a number of projects which have a proven track record in relation to reducing crime and improving people's lives. These include the Mentoring Project; Parents in Partnership; Ribble Valley Sports Club.	Funding for Community Safety has traditionally come from GONW or recently from LCC. Whilst one or two agencies have made a contribution to our budget, there has never been a large element of the funding.	Now is probably the worst possible time to be asking other agencies for contributions towards the CSP budget. Councils, Police, Primary Care Trusts and others are all being told to make significant savings in their budgets.
Merger of the RVCSP with other districts to form a Police Footprint CSP (ie Ribble Valley, Hyndburn & Blackburn Councils). This would reduce the funding of local problems, autonomy and recognition of the partnership.	9	None	There has been an ongoing discussion at the Safer Lancashire Board about the possible merger of all Lancashire CSP's along 'police footprints' This has clearly been a concern both in terms of staffing and budgets	If this CSP were to be merged with Hyndburn and Blackburn-with-Darwen, this could affect our future funding and our reputation as one of the safest places in England, simply because we are not seen as a high priority for crime. This could then impact on the desirability of RV as a place to live and affect the economy of the area.	This matter is out of our control although we will continue to argue against any forced mergers as not being in the best interests of the residents of Ribble Valley.	Same comments as column four.

Three Stream Waste Collection

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
Statutory legislation is not complied with.	8	<p>1. Improvement notice issued by the HSE.</p> <p>2. Policies and procedures: Documented policies and procedures exist, which are reviewed and updated on an annual basis. All staff receive training relating to policies and procedures.</p> <p>3. Training: Refuse collection staff have undergone training - this includes agency staff (part of agency contract requirement).</p>	<p>The waste management industry has the worst record for deaths and serious injuries than any other area of employment and is therefore highly regulated by the Health and Safety Executive. The requirements of the Health and Safety Executive for us to deliver services in a safe manner are on the increase and to respond to these demanding expectations is both resource intensive in staffing terms and could add additional costs to the operation at a time when budgets are being constrained or potentially cut.</p> <p>On the job supervision of staff is difficult due to the limited and maybe reducing resources the Council makes available regarding this work.</p>	<p>The requirements for the service as set out in legislation may be breached. An employee or member of the public could be killed or seriously injured. The Authority may face prosecution by the Health and Safety Executive and a case of Corporate Manslaughter could result.</p>	<p>Ensure that services are only delivered in a manner which is safe and effective. The requirement to do something out of the ordinary to satisfy a resident should be resisted if it means that a risk of injury or accident may arise as a result of those changes.</p> <p>Make adequate staff resources available to deliver, supervise and manage the services in a safe and effective manner.</p> <p>Ensure all equipment provided (vehicles, PPE, etc) is fit for purpose and properly maintained by making the necessary financial resources available to do so.</p> <p>Make adequate funding</p>	<p>The amount of financial resources needed to ensure full compliance at all times and under any circumstances may not be available in the present financial climate.</p> <p>The recruitment of suitably qualified and experienced staff may prove difficult if the salary levels offered are not competitive.</p>

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
			<p>Without records of supervision and inspection then in the event of a serious incident taking place then this could lead to the authority and key staff being prosecuted. Any future reductions in management and supervision resources and funding for training is likely to lead to failure in compliance with statutory requirements and action being taken by the HSE as well as injury to either staff or the public or both.</p> <p>The carrying out of risk assessments for this service is an onerous and resource intensive task. If not done by efficient, competent and trained staff could lead to serious consequences arising.</p> <p>The training of staff to be able to meet the safety standards expected of us when delivering the</p>		<p>available for training to ensure all staff are competent to carry out their respective management and manual tasks.</p> <p>Make changes to the level and type of service provided to meet the available resources. This will require a fundamental change to the service itself which the residents may well find unacceptable.</p>	

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <u>AUTHORITY</u> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
			<p>service has been on going for some time now, but due to the type and nature of the training needed it can affect service delivery as we only have the absolute minimum of staff to deliver the daily service in the first place. Taking time out to train staff is extremely difficult under the circumstances.</p> <p>The provision of appropriate personnel protective equipment is essential in this case and budgetary constraints affect our ability to comply with this statutory requirement.</p> <p>The Council has a duty of care to its staff and must take this seriously and invest in their health and well being. So far this matter has not been fully addressed.</p>			