

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

DECISION
----------

Agenda Item No 8

meeting date: 15 SEPTEMBER 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 an update on the current areas of high risk for the Council as identified on the risk register.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council's risk management approach is designed to form an integral part of the performance management approach of the Council.

2.2 Risks are scored based on their gross and net likelihood and impact levels, gross being the likelihood and impact level if no controls were in place and net being the level once controls have been considered. Risks are then allocated an overall risk score based on these levels. The scores are assigned using the matrix as shown below.

#### Risk Matrix

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Amber 6</b>	<b>Red 8</b>	<b>Red 9</b>
	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Green 3</b>	<b>Amber 5</b>	<b>Red 7</b>
	<b>Low</b>	<b>Green 1</b>	<b>Green 2</b>	<b>Amber 4</b>
		<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
	<b>LIKELIHOOD</b>			

### 3 RED RISKS

3.1 At a previous meeting it was resolved that members be provided with detailed information regarding any red risks highlighted in the register. Templates were drawn up and sent to the relevant officers asking for more detail regarding 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.

### 4 CONCLUSION

4.1 There are currently only 4 red risks to report, however due to the changing nature of risk it is important that staff keep a regular review of known risks and look for evolving new risks.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 5.1 Review, acknowledge and refer any comments regarding the attached red risks at Annex 1 to the appropriate Service Committee.

PRINCIPAL AUDITOR

AA20-10/MA/AC  
2 September 2010

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
<p>The partnership receives insufficient funding, resulting in less prevention initiatives being carried out.</p>	7	None	<p>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!</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Merger of the RVCSP with other districts to form a Police Footprint CSP (ie Ribble Valley, Hyndburn &amp; Blackburn Councils). This would reduce the funding of local problems, autonomy and recognition of the partnership.</p>	9	None	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Same comments as column four.</p>

**Extreme/ Severe Weather Red Risks**

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 controls can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
<p><b>Prolonged/ Severe Drought.</b> Reduction in ability to supply water, either public water supply or other forms of abstractions. The impact of a drought could be localised due to specific supply problems or countrywide in extreme circumstances.</p>	7	<p>Multi-Agency Major Accident Procedures. Multi-Agency Command &amp; Control Procedures. Annual Briefings. Multi-Agency Contingency Plan. Business Continuity Plan. Disaster/ Emergency Advice Publications. Public Information Points. Website/ Internet. Local Radio Bulletins/ Updates. District Response Forum. Co-ordinated Training Programme. District Emergency Plan. Accident/ Disaster Warnings/ Notifications. Simulations/ Exercises. Vulnerable Persons Identified. Communication Devices. 24/ 7 Emergency Contact/ Communication. Mutual Aid Agreements. Agreed/ Signed Protocol.</p>	<p>Gross Likelihood – Because a drought has occurred in the past year this must be scored as high.</p> <p>Net Likelihood – As above, no controls can be implemented to reduce the likelihood of a drought occurring.</p> <p>Gross Impact – Serious service failure that would impact on vulnerable groups. High.</p> <p>Net Impact – Service failure would impact on non-vulnerable groups. Medium.</p> <p>The resulting score on the Grace Risk Management System is Net 7.</p>	<p>The impact of a reduction in water supply could be localised due to specific supply problems.</p>	<p>Contingencies are in place with United Utilities to supply bottled water to the Ribble Valley in the short-term, for example in the event of mechanical failure.</p> <p>However, there is no support contingency that is sufficient to provide water over the longer-term as would be required in the event of a national drought.</p>	<p>As a result of last year’s drought, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) is currently carrying out an investigation to determine how water shortage contingencies can be improved. The findings are expected to be published in a report next year. Once greater external controls have been introduced that protect Ribble Valley residents from the possibility of a severe water shortage it is likely that the net risk level can be reduced.</p>

Risk	Net Risk Level	Current Identified Controls	Justification why the risk is currently red	What will be the impact on the <b>AUTHORITY</b> if this risk materialises?	What (if any) further controls can be implemented to reduce the risk level?	If no additional controls can be implemented – why not? Eg financial constraints/timing etc
<p><b>Localised, Extremely Hazardous Flash Flooding.</b> Heavy localised rainfall in steep valley catchments leading to extremely hazardous flash flooding e.g. high velocities and depths. Likely that no flood defences in place. Probably no flood warning service available/ or suddenness of event means timely flood warnings are not possible. Flooding of up to 200 properties.</p>	<b>8</b>	<p>Multi-Agency Command &amp; Control Procedures. Multi-Agency Contingency Plan. Business Continuity Plan. Disaster/ Emergency Advice Publications. Public Information Points. Advertising Campaign. Website/ Internet. Website Maintenance. Local Radio Bulletins/ Updates. District Response Forum. Co-ordinated Training Programme. District Emergency Plan. Accident/ Disaster Warnings/ Notifications. Simulations/ Exercises. Communication Devices. 24/ 7 Emergency Contact/ Communication. Mutual Aid Agreements. Agreed/ Signed Protocol.</p>	<p>Gross Likelihood – Heavy localised rainfall has occurred in the past 2 – 5 years. Medium.</p> <p>Net Likelihood – As above, no controls can be implemented to reduce the likelihood of heavy localised rainfall occurring.</p> <p>Gross Impact – If the Council fails to respond rapidly to flash flooding this could lead to negative national publicity or widespread adverse local publicity. High.</p> <p>Net Impact – As above, controls in place may not be sufficient to deal with an unexpected flood.</p> <p>The resulting score on the Grace Risk Management System is Net 8.</p>	<p>The Council has a responsibility to evacuate residents that are at risk following flooding and as such its response is open to media scrutiny.</p>	<p>Controls are in place to deal with flooding, for example flood watch, flood warnings and flood action. However, these controls assume that a flood is anticipated. The risk with ‘localised, extremely hazardous flash flooding’ is that the Council may not receive any warning in advance of the event in order to co-ordinate a timely response.</p>	<p>Because of the immediacy of flash flood events there are no practical solutions that can be put in place to reduce the net risk.</p>