

**Central Durham Crematorium  
Joint Committee**

**28 September 2011**

**Risk Register Update 2011/12**



---

**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 Risk Register for the Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee, in accordance with the arrangements established for the routine reporting of risk issues.

**Background**

2. A Risk Assessment report was presented to members at the 26<sup>th</sup> January 2011 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 and 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 2011**

3. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee in January 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. Full details of the Durham County Risk Management Methodology are set out at Appendix 2.
4. In line with the previous report, two risk registers have been prepared, separately identifying Service (Strategic) and Operational risks.
5. Both sections of the Risk Register have been reviewed by the Risk Officer responsible for Neighbourhood Services and the Superintendent and Registrar. 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 in Appendix 3, together with the individual risk assessments for each of these. The risk matrix plots the risk to a grid based upon the assessment of likelihood and impact scores. The higher a risk is towards the top right corner of the matrix the more significant the risk is to the service.
7. All Strategic risks have low Net Scores and there have been no changes to the scores following the review. These risks are all considered to be at tolerable levels.
8. Risk 12 “Adverse inspection/ audit report” and Risk 19 “Lack of evidence for Employers Liability claims” have been closed as it was considered that these are management issues rather than specific risks to the Joint Committee.
9. There are no outstanding actions at this time with regards to the service risks that have been identified.
10. 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 4 together with individual risk assessments for each of these.
11. There have been no changes to Operational Net Risk Scores following the review and all risks are considered to be at a tolerable level. There are no outstanding actions with regards to the operational risks that have been identified.
12. The assessment of both the service and operational risks confirm that these are being well managed and it can be demonstrated that there is a risk culture embedded within the service.
13. There is one emerging risk to monitor and that relates to the Local Authority becoming responsible for implementing the changes required under the reform of Health & Social Care bill regarding Death Registration and that by December 2011 each Local Authority should have appointed someone to oversee these responsibilities. Further details will be provided to the Joint Committee at a future meeting.

### **Embedding Risk Management**

- 14 In order to ensure that risk management continues to be embedded and that the risk register is kept up to date, regular reviews will need to 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**

- 15 The original risk register has been revised and updated and rescored, where appropriate, in accordance with Durham County Council criteria.

## Recommendations and Reasons

16 It is recommended that :-

- Members of the Central Durham Joint Crematorium Committee note the content of this report and the updated position following the January review.
- The Risk Registers are kept up to date and continue to be reviewed by the Joint Committee on a half yearly basis.

## Background Papers

- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 26 January 2011
- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 29 September 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 27 January 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 12 June 2009
- External Audit Report – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 30 October 2009

---

**Contact:**

**Paul Darby**

**Tel: 0191 383 6594**

**Marian Shanks**

**Tel: 0191 372 7639**

---

---

## **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**

None

### **Risk**

The report and associated appendices sets out in detail the strategic and operational risks, control measures in place to mitigate these and improvement actions associated with these. Each risk has been scored and against the Durham County Council risk management methodology. Maintaining and continually reviewing the risk register is a key component of the control and governance framework for the Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee.

### **Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty**

None

### **Accommodation**

None

### **Crime and Disorder**

None

### **Human Rights**

None

### **Consultation**

Officers of Spennymoor Town Council were consulted on the contents of this report.

### **Procurement**

None

### **Disability Issues**

None

### **Legal Implications**

None

---

## Appendix 2: Durham County Council Risk Management Process

---

The risk management process at Durham County Council is based upon a cycle:-



Once a Risk has been identified it is analysed and evaluated as follows:-

- Likelihood X Impact (taking into account Financial + Service Delivery + Stakeholder impacts)

Initially the **Gross Risk** is assessed by scoring the impact and likelihood of the risk **without** taking account of any controls that the Council may already have in place. It is essential to determine this Gross risk, as it is the key baseline against which to evaluate this risk on an ongoing basis.

The **Net Risk** is then determined **after** taking account of any controls that the Council may already have in place, and the likelihood that the risk event may occur over a given period.

In order to calculate the scores for Likelihood and Impact the Risk Assessment criteria is used as outlined below.

After scoring the risk a decision is made whether to Tolerate, Transfer, Treat or Terminate the risk. If any control improvements or actions have been identified as a result of reviewing the risk these are allocated to a responsible officer with timescales to ensure they are carried out before the next review.

## DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL – IMPACT FACTORS

Factor	Severity	Financial	Service Delivery/ Performance	Stakeholder and Reputation
5	Critical	> / = £15M  > 5% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inability to meet statutory duties</li> <li>• Key services can no longer be delivered – emergency actions needed, which need Cabinet approval.</li> <li>• Significant Legal Action / Challenge</li> <li>• Intervention or sanctions by regulatory body / prosecution or litigation (including corporate manslaughter)</li> <li>• Strike action which is Council-wide or service-wide in a critical Service for a long period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perception of the majority of potential partners and stakeholders that the Council is not 'fit to deal with'.</li> <li>• Loss of life</li> </ul>
4	Major	£5M - £15M  3% - 5% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major disruption to some statutory and / or non statutory services i.e. key service delivery adversely affected – crisis management implemented, which needs Cabinet approval.</li> <li>• Strike action which is Council-wide or service-wide in a critical Service for a short period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious reputational damage to the Council regionally, nationally and internationally</li> <li>• Damage to relationships with central government or other public bodies e.g. One North-East, Environment Agency, other Councils</li> <li>• Perception of small number of potential partners and stakeholders that the Council is not 'fit to deal with'.</li> <li>• Serious injury to individual</li> </ul>
3	Moderate	£1M - £5M  1% - 3% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate disruption to statutory and / or non statutory services i.e. some disruption to service delivery – action plans to rectify</li> <li>• Failure of Service to maintain existing status under other Inspection regimes e.g. Ofsted</li> <li>• Resolution requires approval at CMT level</li> <li>• Limited strike action within a Service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results in negative Regional or National press / media coverage</li> <li>• Minor reputational damage to the County Council</li> <li>• Major criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government</li> </ul>
2	Minor	£0.5M - £1M  0.2% - 1% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor service disruption / customer dissatisfaction i.e. little disruption to service delivery – no long term or permanent impact on key services</li> <li>• Capable of resolution by Service Management Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results in negative press coverage within County Durham</li> <li>• Minor criticism by Community</li> <li>• Minor criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government</li> <li>• Significant number of complaints from service users</li> <li>• Serious Reputational damage to own Service area</li> </ul>
1	Insignificant	< £0.5M  < 0.2% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insignificant service disruption e.g. very little or no disruption to services</li> <li>• Impairment of quality of service</li> <li>• Capable of resolution by Head of Service and their management team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results in negative press coverage within the locality / ward</li> <li>• Insignificant criticism by Community</li> <li>• Insignificant criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government</li> <li>• Insignificant number of complaints from service users</li> <li>• Minor Reputational damage to own Service area</li> </ul>

## DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL - LIKELIHOOD FACTORS

Factor	Description	Expected Frequency
5	Highly Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>More than once a year</b></li> <li>• Something that is already occurring or is likely to be a regular occurrence throughout a one year period</li> <li>• Inevitable i.e. the event is expected to occur in most circumstances</li> <li>• &gt;80% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
4	Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Once a year</b></li> <li>• Something that has occurred in the last year, or is likely to occur at least once throughout a one-year period.</li> <li>• Probable or where the conditions of the loss occur on a regular basis i.e. the event will probably occur in most circumstances</li> <li>• 61% to 80% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
3	Possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Every 1-3 years</b></li> <li>• Likely only to happen at some point over the next 1 to 3 years.</li> <li>• Possible but responding to well understood situations i.e. the event might occur at some time</li> <li>• 31% to 60% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
2	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Every 3-5 years</b></li> <li>• Likely only to happen at some point over the next 3 to 5 years or likely to continue to occur i.e. the event is not expected to occur</li> <li>• 11% to 30% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
1	Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Over 5 years</b></li> <li>• Rare activity or is unlikely based on current intelligence i.e. the event may only occur in exceptional circumstances</li> <li>• &lt; 10% chance of occurring</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3: Service Risk Register**

RISK MATRIX							
5	Highly Probable						LIKELIHOOD
4	Probable						
3	Possible		11				
2	Unlikely	4,20	7,10,16	3, 15			
1	Remote	13,14, 18	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					

<b>Risk. No.</b>	<b>Risk – Ranked by Risk Number</b>	<b>Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
3	Impact of staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	14	1
4	Sickness absence of key staff	6	8
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal / maintenance of information	5	13
6	Failure of Cremators / Specialist Equipment	6	8
7	ICT and Power Failure	10	4
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	13
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	Adverse inspection / Audit report (CLOSED SEPT 2011)	5	13
13	Financial Losses due to reputation	3	16
14	Contractual failure in relation to future planned projects or maintenance leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e.g. Replacement of Cremators	3	16
15	Inability to meet 2012 legislation changes	14	1
16	Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	10	4
17	Administrative duties (CLOSED September 2010)		
18	Lack of awareness of the Impact of Equalities, DDA, Access to Services and Age Legislation	3	16
19	Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims (CLOSED SEPT 2011)	3	16
20	Damage to Public or Vehicles due to tree branches falling	6	8

<b>Risk. No.</b>	<b>Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
3	Impact of staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	14	1
15	Inability to meet 2012 legislation changes	14	1
11	Managing excess deaths	12	3
7	ICT and Power Failure	10	4
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	10	4
16	Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	10	4
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	7
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
4	Sickness absence of key staff	6	8
6	Failure of Cremators / Specialist Equipment	6	8
20	Damage to Public or Vehicles due to tree branches falling	6	8
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal / maintenance of information	5	13
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	13
12	Adverse inspection / Audit report (CLOSED SEPT 2011)	5	13
13	Financial Losses due to reputation	3	16
14	Contractual failure in relation to future planned projects or maintenance leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e.g. Replacement of Cremators	3	16
17	Administrative duties CLOSED September 2010		
18	Lack of awareness of the Impact of Equalities, DDA, Access to Services and Age Legislation	3	16
19	Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims (CLOSED SEPT 2011)	3	16

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	5	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> Disclosure of confidential information through the incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of data</li> <li>Data disclosed to persons not authorised</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breach of confidentiality</li> <li>Breach of Data Protection</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal procedures and policies are in place for document retention and disposal</li> <li>Secure environment for storage of information</li> <li>Passwords in place for electronic data storage</li> <li>Document retention and disposal policy in place</li> <li>Contract with Securishred</li> <li>Book of Remembrance and Registers are scanned annually and held on external hard drive</li> <li>Improved filing/folder referencing system on the server</li> <li>Register is kept in a fire resistant safe and associated papers are kept in a separate location within the crematorium overnight.</li> <li>All records over 5 years old are stored at County Hall.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE</b> after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
A fire resistant room has been built into the design of the new extension for the crematorium.	A Jose	31/07/2012
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	09/09/11	

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

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Injury to staff and visitors	7	2
2	Exterior Pathways, Steps and Grounds	5	3
3	Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening on site, driveway and car park	5	3
4	Cleaning, Maintenance and Gardening Duties	5	3
5	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken	10	1
6	Violent or other Assault on officer whilst lone working	5	3
7	Limited Space in Office Area	3	7
8	Slips, trips and falls	3	7

<b>Risk. No.</b>	<b>Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Injury to staff and visitors</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Exterior Pathways, Steps and Grounds</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening on site, driveway and car park</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Cleaning, Maintenance and Gardening Duties</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Violent or other Assault on officer whilst lone working</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Limited Space in Office Area</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Slips, trips and falls</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	7	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Limited space in office area	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sufficient space for staff using office area</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Furniture moved to provide maximum space around desks</li> <li>Shelves checked to ensure they are secure and sturdy</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE</b> after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Accommodation issues have been addressed in the plans for the new extension proposed for the crematorium.	A Jose	31/07/12
Completed by		Date
T Maddison/A Jose		09/09/11