
Joint Report of Terry Collins – Corporate Director: Neighbourhood Services; Don McLure – Corporate Director: Resources and Treasurer to the Joint Committee

Purpose of the Report

1. To provide an update on the current position with regards to the Risk Register of the Mountsett Crematorium Committee.

Background

2. A Risk Assessment report was presented to members at the February meeting which included a comprehensive risk register that identified all known risks of a Service and Operational nature, with all risks scored using the Durham County Council methodology approach to Risk Management. In approving the report, the Committee committed to regular monitoring and reporting of both strategic and operation risks.

Risk Assessment – January 2012

3. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee on 30 September 2011 has been reviewed, reassessed and updated in accordance with the Durham County Council methodology/approach to Risk Management. This entails an assessment of both the gross and net risk from each area, the difference between the gross and net risk score being that the net risk result is after taking into account existing control measures.
4. In line with the previous report, two risk registers have been prepared, separately identifying Service and Operational risks.
5. Both sections of the Risk Register have been reviewed by the Risk Officer responsible for Neighbourhood Services and the Crematorium Manager. Net risk ratings have been agreed by consensus and actions to mitigate and/or tackle issues arising from the individual risks have been agreed for the forthcoming year.
6. The Service Risks (i.e. those that are key to the service achieving its strategic objectives and priorities for improvement, linked to service improvement plans and the budget setting cycle) have been plotted onto a risk matrix, based on Net Risk Scores. This is set out at Appendix 2. The risk matrix plots the risk to a grid based upon the assessment of likelihood and impact scores. The higher a risk is in the top right corner of the matrix the bigger a risk it is to the service.
7. One new risk has been added to the Service Risk Register; Risk 18: “Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees”. The detailed assessment regarding the financial implications is included in Appendix 2. There is the possibility of minor

reputational damage and / or financial regulation compliance issues attached to this risk but this will be managed by registering and complying with the Financial Services Authority requirements.

8. All other strategic risks have low Net Scores and there have been no changes to the scores following the review. These risks are at tolerable levels.
9. As with Service Risks, the Operational Risks (i.e. those that are key to the operational areas of the service which relate to individual tasks carried out on a routine basis) have also been plotted onto a risk matrix and these are set out at Appendix 3.
10. Only one operational risk has an outstanding action Risk 8 "Slips, trips and falls". As reported previously, the action to carry out training in risk assessments for ladder duties had been arranged but the course cancelled. Training has been re-arranged to take place in February 2012 which will see this risk reduce to a tolerable level once completed. The detailed assessment of this risk is included in appendix 3.
11. There have been no changes to the remaining Operational Net Risk Scores following the review and all risks are considered to be at a tolerable level.
12. The emerging risk reported last quarter regarding the Local Authority becoming responsible for implementing the changes required under the reform of Health & Social Care bill regarding Death Registration where each Local Authority will have to appoint someone to oversee these responsibilities is still on the horizon. However, the Government has moved the implementation date for this to August 2013. A full risk assessment will be carried out nearer the time and details included in future reports.

Embedding Risk Management - Monitoring and Review

13. In order to ensure that risk management is embedded and that the risk register is kept up to date, regular reviews will continue to be carried out to ensure any new and emerging risks are identified, existing risks are removed if no longer appropriate and existing risks are reviewed taking into account current issues.

Conclusions

14. The original risk register has been revised and updated and rescored in accordance with Durham County Council criteria.

Recommendations

15. It is recommended that:-
 - Members of the Mountsett Joint Crematorium Committee note the content of this report and the updated position.
 - The Risk Registers be kept up to date and reviewed by the Joint Committee on a half yearly basis.

Background Papers

- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint committee – 30th September 2011
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint committee – 4th February 2011
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 23 September 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 29 January 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 12 June 2009
- External Audit Report – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 30 October 2009

Contact(s): Paul Darby, 03000 260930

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance

There are no financial implications associated with this report. Exposure to financial risk is integral to the gross and net risk assessments undertaken and included in the Risk Registers attached at Appendix 3 and 4.

Staffing

There are no staffing implications associated with this report.

Risk

There are no implications in this report

Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty

There are no implications in this report

Accommodation

There are no implications in this report

Crime and Disorder

There are no implications in this report

Human Rights

None

Consultation

Officers of Gateshead Council were consulted on the contents of this report.

Procurement

None

Disability Issues

None

Legal Implications

None

Appendix 2: Service Risk Register

RISK MATRIX							
5	Highly Probable						LIKELIHOOD
4	Probable						
3	Possible		11	3			
2	Unlikely	4	7, 10	12			
1	Remote		1, 2, 5, 6, 8,	9			
		Insignificant (Score 1-3)	Minor (Score 4-6)	Moderate (Score 7-9)	Major (Score 10-12)	Critical (Score 13-15)	
IMPACT							

Risk. No.	Risk – By Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
3	Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	21	1
4	Sickness absence of staff	8	6
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	5	11
6	Failure of Cremators	6	8
7	Power Failure	10	4
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	11
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	7
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	10	4
11	Managing Excess Deaths	12	3
12	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees	16	2

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score	Net Risk Score	Ranking
3	Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	21	1
12	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees	16	2
11	Managing Excess Deaths	12	3
7	Power Failure	10	4
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	10	4
4	Sickness absence of staff	8	6
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	7
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
6	Failure of Cremators	6	8
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	5	11
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	11

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Mountsett Crematorium	
Priority Theme	11/07-Alttogether Better Council	
High level objective	Improving efficiency and value for money	
Risk 18	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees.	
Risk Owner	Ian Staplin	
Detail of Risk	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees.	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	1. The fixed fee paid up front is not sufficient to cover future costs due to increases in inflation. 2. Take up is rate not as high as anticipated. 3. Insufficient Investment return on income.	
Potential Impact	1. Loss of future profits. 2. Adverse impact on Service Budget.	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	4	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	8 (Moderate)	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	4 (Probable)	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	32	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front load with a premium approximate (20%) payment to start. • Draw down on prepayments. • Review of premiums at least annually, and premium increased where necessary. • Income invested not spent. • Accounts and investments will be monitored by the FSA. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	4	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	8 (Moderate)	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2 (Unlikely)	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	16	
CONCLUSION		
TOLERATE; TRANSFER; TREAT ; TERMINATE		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
0001 – Review take up and age profile of plans sold to monitor premium.	I Staplin	30/06/12
0002 – Register with FSA.	I Staplin	31/03/12
Completed by	Date	
I Staplin/ T Maddison	10/01/12	

Appendix 3: Operational Risk Register

RISK MATRIX							
5	Highly Probable						LIKELIHOOD
4	Probable						
3	Possible		7				
2	Unlikely						
1	Remote	8	2,3,4,5	1,6			
		Insignificant (Score 1-3)	Minor (Score 4-6)	Moderate (Score 7-9)	Major (Score 10-12)	Critical (Score 13-15)	
		IMPACT					

Risk. No.	Risk – By Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Injury to staff and visitors	7	2
2	Exterior Pathways and Steps	5	5
3	Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening	5	5
4	Cleaning Duties	5	5
5	Violence/Assault from Member of the Public	6	4
6	Fire	7	2
7	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken	10	1
8	Slips, trips and falls	3	8

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score	Net Risk Score	Ranking
7	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken	10	1
1	Injury to staff and visitors	7	2
6	Fire	7	2
2	Exterior Pathways and Steps	5	5
3	Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening	5	5
4	Cleaning Duties	5	5
5	Violence/Assault from Member of the Public	6	4
8	Slips, trips and falls	3	8

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC)	
Risk	8	
Risk Owner	Ian Staplin	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk - Slips, Trips and Falls	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manual handling Tripping hazards Step ladders 2 rung 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular inspections of office and work areas carried out. Ensure training is kept up to date Manual handling training provided where appropriate Staff issued with Manual Handling Risk Assessment Good Housekeeping – walkways kept clear at all times. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Risk Assessments training to be carried out for ladder duties	G Harrison	31/03/12
Completed by		Date
T Maddison/ Ian Staplin		05/09/11