

Agenda Item 20
Report PR20/21-10

Report to	Policy & Resources Committee
Date	16 July 2020
By	Head of Governance and Support Services
Title of Report (Note)	Corporate Risk Register

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

1) Note the Corporate Risk Register as at July 2020

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Policy and Resources Committee has terms of reference which include "... to ensure the robustness of risk management and performance management arrangements; and to agree the Internal Audit Plan and Annual Report and receive progress and other relevant internal audit reports."
- 1.2 The Corporate Risk Register is reported to each meeting of the Committee. From June 2016 the corporate risk register has been monitored by the organisation's Operational Management Team on a monthly basis and issues escalated to SMT as required.
- 1.3 At its meeting in September 2019 the Committee approved a new Risk Management Policy and Guidance document which has since been communicated across the Authority

2. Policy Context.

- 2.1 Corporate Governance comprises the arrangements put in place to ensure that the intended outcomes for stakeholders are defined and achieved. It includes the systems and processes, and cultures and values, by which public bodies are directed and controlled and through which they account to and engage with their partners, communities and citizens.
- 2.2 Risk management is a key aspect of corporate governance and is one of the 7 principles in the 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government Framework (2016)' developed by Cipfa and SOLACE¹ to help public bodies make open, transparent and better informed decisions that take full account of risk and opportunities.

3. Issues for consideration

- 3.1 **Appendix 2** shows the risk register in a graphical way which allows Members to see, at a glance, the likelihood and impact of risks. Explanatory information is provided at **Appendix I** to this report.
- 3.2 There have been no significant changes to the Risk Register since it was last considered by the committee. Updates have been applied across the register, particularly in relation to the Authority's response to the Covid 19 Pandemic, which has affected processes and ways of working

¹ Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy and Society of Local Authority Chief Executives & Senior Managers

3.3 Updates to mitigations and actions, where identified, across all risks are documented in **Appendix 2** to this report.

4. Issues raised by members in advance of the meeting

4.1 A number of questions were raised by Members in advance of the meeting. These questions and answers are set out below for Members information:

- **Is the annual DEFRA grant intact for this year? What is likely financial impact of reduced planning income in 1st quarter?**

Yes, the National Park Grant is unchanged this year. There has been a downturn in planning income over the first two months of the year and we are forecasting a drop in income over the year of £189k. This is offset to some extent by a reduction in the delegated planning payments we make to District Councils, and our current estimates show a projected overspend of £127k for the year. The budget is, however, still firmly under control and expenditure will be retained within budget

- **How well did the Business Continuity Plan hold up to the sudden necessity of home working etc due to Covid-19?**

The Business Continuity Plan held up well to the sudden implementation of lockdown, and contributed to ensuring that flexible working continued during this period. The plan has informed discussions by OMT and SMT about how the South Downs Centre is reopened and the prioritisation of work space. The plan will be reviewed in the Autumn to ensure all lessons learnt from the new ways of working are incorporated in it.

- **How robust does SMT feel the Partnership Management Plan's deliverability is going to be given that some partners may well struggle for a while to recover from impact of Covid-19?**

We are expecting that delivery of the PMP will change quite significantly for two reasons. The first is that many of our delivery partners may take a long time to recover from the impacts of COVID-19 on their businesses or organisations. The second is the world is going to look different and there will be upsides (for example the chance to engage more people with nature, encourage local services or walking and cycling) as well as downsides to this, therefore we may want to change the priorities.

Further discussions, involving all Members, on this topic are scheduled for September 2020.

- **When is Secretary of State approval (for the acquisition of Seven Sisters Country Park) thought to be forthcoming?**

East Sussex County Council have been told to allow two months for Secretary of State approval – they are currently awaiting advice from Defra as to whether approval is needed from Defra as well as Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). It is expected however that the request will be with the Secretary of State(s) by the end of June, so September might be a reasonable expectation.

5. Options & cost implications

5.1 Members are asked to consider and comment upon the Corporate Risk Register.

5.2 Management of risk is a key aspect of the organisation's governance and is undertaken within existing corporate budgets.

6. Next steps

6.1 Further updates on the Corporate Risk Register will be brought to future meetings of the Committee.

7. Other Implications

Implication	Yes/No
Will further decisions be required by another	No

committee/full authority?	
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	There are no additional resource requirements arising directly from this report. Any additional resources required for the delivery of identified mitigations will be subject to the Authority's usual decision making requirements.
How does the proposal represent Value for Money?	Effective risk management contributes to the efficient running of the organisation.
Are there any Social Value implications arising from the proposal?	No
Has due regard been taken of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	There are no equalities implications arising from this report. Actions and mitigations are subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment where this is appropriate.
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	There are no implications arising from this report.
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	There are no implications arising from this report.
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	There are no implications arising from this report.
Are there any Data Protection implications?	There are none
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy?	Effective risk management contributes to the principle of promoting good governance

8. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

8.1 There are no direct risks arising from this report. The report outlines the current major risks facing the Authority and how they will be mitigated.

ROBIN PARR

Head of Governance

South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: Robin Parr, Head of Governance

Tel: 01730 819207

email: robin.parr@southdowns.gov.uk

Appendices: 1. Explanatory Information

2. Corporate Risk Register

SDNPA Consultees: Chief Executive Officer, Director of Countryside Policy & Management, Director of Planning, Chief Finance Officer, Monitoring Officer

Background Documents: Previous Committee reports

Explanatory Information for Risk Register:

Description	Likelihood of Occurrence
Almost Certain (5)	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances.
Likely (4)	There is a strong possibility the event will occur.
Possible (3)	The event might occur at some time
Unlikely (2)	Not expected, but a slight possibility
Rare (1)	Highly unlikely. It could happen but probably never will

Category	Example Descriptor of Impact
Insignificant (1)	Basic first aid required, less than £100 financial impact, reputation remains intact.
Minor (2)	Short term injury to 1 or 2 people, minor localised disruption lasting less than 24 hours, between £100-£1000, minimal reputation impact.
Moderate (3)	Semi-permanent disability, affects between 3-50 people, high potential for complaints, financial burden between £1,000 and £10,000, litigation possible.
Major (4)	Causing death serious injury or permanent disability. Service closure for up to 1 week, significant financial burden, national adverse publicity, litigation expected.
Catastrophic (5)	Multiple deaths, Financial burden over £100,000, international adverse publicity, widespread displacement of people (over 500), complaints and litigation certain.

SDNPA Risk Appetite Statement:

The Authority seeks to operate within a limited overall risk range. The Authority's lowest risk appetite relates to safety including employee health and safety, with a higher risk appetite towards those activities directly connected with the Authority's Purposes and Duty. The Authority accepts that risk is ever present and is generally only willing to accept low levels of risk as part of its day to day business and in relation to its reputation. The Authority will normally only consider options where the level of risk can be managed to a low degree. However, the Authority may be willing to consider a higher level risk where it has the opportunity to be innovative in relation to its service delivery.