

For Publication

**Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority
Service Delivery Policy and Challenge
Group
15 March 2018
Item No. 17**

REPORT AUTHOR: HEAD OF ORGANISATIONAL ASSURANCE

SUBJECT: CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

For further information on this Report contact: Area Commander Darren Cook
Head of Organisational Assurance
Tel No: 01234 845061

Background Papers: None

Implications (tick ✓):

LEGAL			FINANCIAL	
HUMAN RESOURCES			EQUALITY IMPACT	
ENVIRONMENTAL			POLICY	
CORPORATE RISK	Known	✓	OTHER (please specify)	
	New			

Any implications affecting this report are noted at the end of the report.

PURPOSE:

To consider the Service's Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Members note and approve the review by the Service of the Corporate Risk Register in relation to Service Delivery.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Members have requested a standing item to be placed on the Agenda of the Policy and Challenge Groups for the consideration of risks relating to the remit of each Group. In addition, the Fire and Rescue Authority's (FRA) Audit and Standards Committee receives regular reports on the full Corporate Risk Register.
- 1.2 An extract of the Corporate Risk Register showing the risks appropriate to the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group together with explanatory notes regarding the risk ratings applied is appended to this report.

2. Current Revisions

- 2.1 The register is reviewed on a monthly basis during the Service's Corporate Management Team (CMT) meetings and by CMT members between these meetings if required. A copy of the risks relevant to the Service Delivery Policy and Challenge Group are attached for your information and approval.
- 2.2 Changes to individual risk ratings in the Corporate Risk Register: None. Individual risk ratings have been reviewed and are unchanged.
- 2.3 Updates to individual risks in the Corporate Risk Register:
- **CRR00002: If we cannot recruit or retain adequate numbers of part time fire fighters, particularly in relation to day cover, then we will not be able to fully crew our fire appliances and thus have a detrimental impact on our service delivery due to the unavailability of our fire appliances:** The RDS project is investigating a number of areas such as contracts and leave to fully implement a more efficient and effective recruitment and retention process for the RDS. This will improve the services overall availability of the RDS appliances with a flexible approach to crewing arrangements. The Inherent risk remains at 9 with the Residual risk score of 6.
 - **CRR00022: If we have inadequate or incomplete operational pre planning policies, procedures or information available to us then we can potentially risk injury or even death to our fire-fighters and staff:** National Operational Guidance Programme have now issued training specifications in a number of areas (9 in total), one of which is BA. The Service is waiting for specific gap analysis toolkits to be developed to enable an analysis to be completed. The Inherent risk remains at 8 with the Residual risk score of 4.
 - **CRR00044: If the Service does not have a reliable accurate system for continuously monitoring and updating the availability and skills of Retained Duty System (RDS) operational personnel and RDS appliances then there could be delays in mobilising the nearest available appliance to emergency incidents. This could significantly impact upon the effectiveness and mobilising of our emergency response, increase risks to firefighters and the community, reduce our ability to monitor performance, undermine RDS employees confidence in the Service and could result in negative media coverage:** BFRS have been in contact with Essex FRS to understand to requirements for integration of Gartan with 4i. Detailed information has been requested on the Application Process Interface (API's) to enable both systems to be developed to undertake the task of automatic updates on crewing availability. The Inherent risk remains at 8 with the Residual risk score of 4.

**AREA COMMANDER DARREN COOK
HEAD OF ORGANISATIONAL ASSURANCE**

Explanatory tables in regard to the risk impact scores, the risk rating and the risk strategy.

Risk Rating

Risk Rating/Colour	Risk Rating Considerations/Action
Very High	<p>High risks which require urgent management attention and action. Where appropriate, practical and proportionate to do so, new risk controls must be implemented as soon as possible, to reduce the risk rating. New controls aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? reduce the likelihood of a disruption ? shorten the period of a disruption if it occurs ? limit the impact of a disruption if it occurs <p>These risks are monitored by CMT risk owner on a regular basis and reviewed quarterly and annually by CMT.</p>
High	<p>These are high risks which require management attention and action. Where practical and proportionate to do so, new risk controls <i>should</i> be implemented to reduce the risk rating as the aim above. These risks are monitored by CMT risk owner on a regular basis and reviewed quarterly and annually by CMT.</p>
Moderate	<p>These are moderate risks. New risk controls should be considered and scoped. Where practical and proportionate, selected controls should be prioritised for implementation. These risks are monitored and reviewed by CMT.</p>
Low	<p>These risks are unlikely to occur and are not significant in their impact. They are managed within CMT management framework and reviewed by CMT.</p>

Risk Strategy

Risk Strategy	Description
Treat	<p>Implement and monitor the effectiveness of new controls to reduce the risk rating. This may involve significant resource to achieve (IT infrastructure for data replication/storage, cross-training of specialist staff, providing standby-premises etc) or may comprise a number of low cost, or cost neutral, mitigating measures which cumulatively reduce the risk rating (a validated Business Continuity plan, documented and regularly rehearsed building evacuation procedures etc).</p>
Tolerate	<p>A risk may be acceptable without any further action being taken depending on the risk appetite of the organisation. Also, while there may clearly be additional new controls which could be implemented to 'treat' a risk, if the cost of treating the risk is greater than the anticipated impact and loss should the risk occur, then it may be decided to tolerate the risk maintaining existing risk controls only.</p>
Transfer	<p>It may be possible to transfer the risk to a third party (conventional insurance or service provision (outsourcing)), however it is not possible to transfer the responsibility for the risk which remains with BLFRS.</p>
Terminate	<p>In some circumstances it may be appropriate or possible to terminate or remove the risk altogether by changing policy, process, procedure or function.</p>