

Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee

4 October 2013

Risk Register 2013/14



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 January 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 – September 2013

3. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee in 31st January 2013 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 Bereavement Services 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. Risk 4 “Sickness absence of staff” has been removed and the Crematorium Manager has now left Authority. Risk 12 “Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees.” has been removed as the project is not going forward.

8. Risk 10 “Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through staff loss” remains a significant risk due the inability to recruit a replacement following the departure of the Crematorium Manager.
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. 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.
11. 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, we are still awaiting clarification from the Government as to how these requirements are to be met.

Embedding Risk Management - Monitoring and Review

12. 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

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

Recommendations

14. 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 – 31/01/13
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – Sept 12
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 27/01/12
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 30/09/12
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 04/02/11
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 23/09/10
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 29/01/10
- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 12/06/09
- External Audit Report – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 30/10/09

Contact:	Paul Darby, Head of Finance – Financial Services
Tel:	03000 261 930
Contact:	Teresa Morgan, Strategic Insurance & Risk Officer
Tel:	0191 383 3518

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 2 and 3.

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		4	10			
3	Possible		11	3			
2	Unlikely		7				
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	7
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	7
3	Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	21	2
4	Sickness absence of staff	20	3
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	5	10
6	Failure of Cremators	6	7
7	Power Failure	10	5
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	10
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	6
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	28	1
11	Managing Excess Deaths	12	4
12	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees. (CLOSED SEPTEMBER 2013)		

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score	Net Risk Score	Ranking
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	28	1
3	Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	21	2
4	Sickness absence of staff	20	3
12	Pre-payment of bond premium is not sufficient to cover fees. (CLOSED SEPTEMBER 2013)		
11	Managing Excess Deaths	12	4
7	Power Failure	10	5
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	6
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	7
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	7
6	Failure of Cremators	6	7
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	5	10
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	10

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Mountsett Crematorium	
Risk	4	
Risk Owner	Graham Harrison	
Detail of Risk	Sickness absence of key staff	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unexpected sickness absence by key staff • Prolonged Sickness Absences 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to deliver service • Reputational damage • Loss of confidence • Loss of income due to invoices not being raised. 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		1
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)		5
Likelihood (1 to 5)		5
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		25
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal procedures and policies are in place. • Back to Work interviews are undertaken • Sickness Monitoring is undertaken • Family friendly policies in place with HR advice available • Internal recruits have been recruited and trained as volunteer cremator technicians. • Reciprocal arrangement with Durham Crematorium for staff to cover in place 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		1
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)		5
Likelihood (1 to 5)		4
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		20
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Cover provided by Bereavement Services Manager to arranged as and when required.	G Harrison	31/06/13
Completed by		Date
T Maddison / G Harrison		09/01/13

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Mountsett Crematorium	
Risk	10	
Risk Owner	Graham Harrison	
Detail of Risk	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through staff loss.	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff leaving for alternative employment Sudden departure of staff 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure in service delivery Increase work load for remaining staff. Adverse impact on staff morale. 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		3
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)		5
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		35
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reciprocal agreement in place with Durham Crematorium to provide emergency cover Close communication with small team 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		3
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)		4
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		28
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Report to joint committee to agree a how to address this issue.	G Harrison	31/12/13
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison / G Harrison	06/09/13	

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