

**Risk Analysis**  
Report by Chief Executive

**Summary:** This report updates Members on risk analysis and reporting.

**Recommendations:**

- (i) That the revised timescale for the review of the Strategic Risk Register set out in paragraph 2.1 is adopted.
- (ii) That a risk analysis is incorporated in future reports to the Broads Authority where a significant financial or reputational risk has been identified.
- (iii) That the risk analysis for the Authority's Strategic Priorities is noted.

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 At its last meeting the Committee reviewed and updated the Strategic Risk Register having considered whether all risks had been identified. One of the missing items identified by Members was the risk posed by an outdated governance regime and it was suggested that the Code of Conduct for Members needed to be reviewed. Internal Audit examined the relevant documents and gave advice on specific areas to focus on. The task of reviewing the Code of Conduct has been given a high priority and the Authority's recently appointed Solicitor and Monitoring Officer has drafted a new document in line with the latest best practice and advice for the Committee to consider (see elsewhere on the agenda).
- 1.2 This report follows up on the issues of the timescale for the review of the Strategic Risk Register, consideration of risk analysis in reports and examines the risks associated with the Authority's strategic priorities.

**2 Strategic Risk Register**

- 2.1 At its last meeting the Committee looked at the need for a more regular review of the Authority's Strategic Risk Register. It is suggested that the following timescale be adopted, such that the Committee formally examines the risks twice a year.

### ***Review Timescale***

December:	Six monthly review of Strategic Risk Register by Risk Owners
January:	Formal review of Strategic Risk Register by Management Forum
February:	Review of the Strategic Risk Register by the FSAC
June:	Six monthly review of Strategic Risk Register by Risk Owners
July:	Formal review of Strategic Risk Register and Risk Management Policy by Management Forum
September:	Review of the Strategic Risk Register by the FSAC

## **3 Risk Analysis in Key Reports**

- 3.1 In recent Broads Authority reports an analysis of risk has been included where it has been thought to be appropriate, for example: the High Level Review of Flood Risk Management for the Broads where there is the scope for considerable public concern; the update on the negotiations with Network Rail where there is also financial risk and the establishment of National Park Partnerships. It is proposed to continue this practice on reports where the author identifies significant reputational or financial risk.

## **4 Strategic Priorities – Risk Analysis**

- 4.1 One of the items identified by Internal Audit was the identification of risks for the Authority's Strategic Priorities. This work has been completed and a copy of the analysis is attached for information.

Background papers: None

Author: John Packman

Date of report: 24 June 2016

Broads Plan Objectives: None

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Strategic Priorities 2016/17 – Risk Analysis

Strategic Priorities – 2016/17 – Risk Analysis (P = Probability 1-3; S = Severity 1-3)

	Broads Plan Review	Broads Landscape Partnership Scheme	Hickling Broad Lake Restoration Project	Promoting the Broads	Stakeholder Action Plan	Integrated flood risk management and climate smart communities
<b>Availability of Key Staff</b>	2 (P1xS2) - Dependent on a few key staff	3 (P1xS3) - Very dependent on Project Manager	2 (P1xS2) – Dependent on a few staff	2 (P1xS2) – Dependent on Staff	1 (P1xS1) – Involves a wide number of staff	2 (P1xS2) – Dependent on key staff
<b>Financial Management</b>	1 (P1xS1) – Cost fully funded from Planning Delivery Grant	2 (P1xS2) – Stage 1 relatively modest financial exposure	2 (P1xS2) – Current activity of £60,000 in budget – bidding for external funding	1 (P1xS1) – Only allocated £5,000 to date. Largely about rebadging.	1 (P1xS1) – No budget and costs mainly staff time	1 (P1xS1) – Allocated £5,000 in the budget. No financial exposure beyond that.
<b>Project Management</b>	1 (P1xS1) – Published timetable and established process.	1 (P1xS1) – Process and timetable for Stage 1 set out by HLF	4 (P2xS2) – Complicated process but experienced staff	1 (P1xS1) – Dependent on JR and cooperation of partners	1 (P1xS1) – Tried and tested process for Parish Forums etc.	1 (P1xS1) – Environment Agency in the Lead for most contentious area.
<b>Engagement with Partners</b>	2 (P1xS2) – Established process for engagement – Broads Forum etc.	2 (P1xS2) – Excellent engagement so far but highly dependent on partners	4 (P2xS2) – Involvement with Upper Thurne Working Group working well to date.	2 (P2xS1) – Needs partners to come on board with the branding initiative.	2 (P1xS2) – Needs the buy in from communities and stakeholders	4 (P2xS2) – Contentious issue and needs engagement for it to really succeed
<b>Legal Risks</b>	2 (P1xS1) – Clear process	2 (P1xS1) – Using HLF processes	3 (P1xS3) – Involves complications such as Habitats Regs.	4 (P2xS2) – Depends on JR outcome	1 (P1xS1) - None	1 (P1xS1) - None
<b>Reputational Risks</b>	2 (P1xS2) – Dependent on Stakeholder engagement for success	2 (P1xS2) – While Stakeholders supportive little risk	3 (P1xS3) – Progress of the project closely scrutinised by stakeholders	4 (P2xS2) - Progress of the project closely scrutinised by stakeholders and involves Defra and National Parks	2 (P1xS2) – If engagement at Parish Forums failed then clearly would have some impact on reputation.	4 (P2xS2) – Our involvement in this high profile area poses some risks