Risk Register

	Risk Area	Analysis of Risk "Which will result in"		Assessment of Risk (original score in brackets)			Management Actions Implemented or Planned (in bold)	Assessment of Risk after mitigations (original score in brackets)			Responsible Officer
_	"There is a risk that"	·		Impact	Probability	Rating			Probability		
	Brexit will bring turbulence and unanticipated change to UK waste management.	Increased cost, lack of treatment capacity in UK, waste stockpiling, reduced haulage options. HRRC closure, increased landfill.	Economic	5	3	15	PPP contract with rail haulage for most of the Authorities waste provides significant protection. Bidders will consider Brexit during MRF procurement and Authority will take cost and benefit of price fluctuations. Lack of waste processing capacity on shore UK for materials currently shipped abroad can only be mitigated UK wide by Govt planning and EA flexibility. Additional reserves for increased costs of haulage and treatment of smaller waste streams.	4	3	12	Managing Director
	Authority decisions may be based on inaccurate or incomplete information	Inappropriate actions or decision making, unnecessary costs, challenge from an interested party, failure to meet objectives and impact on reputation	Political	5	2	10	Manage in accordance with policies and proceedures, review P&Ps to ensure they are up to date and robust. Scrutiny processes in place for reporting, reviewing and checking of any financial data by Officers. Policy for handling conflicts of interest involving Members and/or Officers. Internal management team meetings, Chief Officer's meetings, Borough Partnership meetings review Authority papers. Audit Committee established with internal and external audit governance framework. Key performance indicators are reported to the Authority.	5	1	5	Managing Director
	One or more of the waste treatment and disposal contracts will perform poorly or a single event will result in a need for business continuity planning.	Poor service to the Boroughs using the sites or needing material to be removed from site. Complaints about nuisance e.g. odour or pests. Increased cost of handling materials	Political	5	2	10	Ongoing review of contingency arrangements on each contract quarterly / annually as required. PPP contract used contingency arrangements during commissioning. Holding regular meetings with contractors and monitor KPIs as appropriate. Regular communication with Boroughs about service issues. Service monitoring and market information, reports on credit changes monitored. Credit checks and a review of accounts are routinely undertaken for new contracts and considered for contract extensions.	5	1	5	Senior Contracts Manager
	WLWA financial processes are not robust	Internal fraud by an employee or contractor, bad information resulting in wrong decisions	Economic	5 (4)	2	10 (8)	Internal audit plan in place. Policies and procedures in place including arrangements for checking contracts and invoices. Segregation of duties between authorisation and checking of payments. Robust arrangements in place to control payments. Register of assets maintained. Processes in place for the monitoring of ad hoc contracts, contract management and negotiations. Whistle blowing policy. Standing Orders. Procurement fraud training rolled out in 2016 and declarations of interest extended to all staff. Cash facilities removed completely and card procedures reviewed.	4	1	4	Head of Finance and Performance
	There will be unforeseen financial costs not covered by balances	An in-year levy to the Boroughs	Economic	4	3	12	Budget processes reviewed and monthly reporting demonstrating consistent performance. Budgets built from the bottom up with input and validation of data from boroughs. Boroughs nominate number of tonnes for PAYT budget for collected tonnes. Prudent levels of reserves are maintained to act as a buffer against any unforeseen risks and financial costs. Budget plan takes into account quantifiable risks. Where appropriate budgets are set with contingencies for identified risks. This includes any implications resulting from Brexit.	3	1	3	Head of Finance and Performance
	WLWA insurance cover will be insufficient	Inadequate cover to meet the costs of future claims, increasing difficulty in obtaining competitive quotes for waste industry facilities	Economic	5	3	15	There is an annual review with brokers and insurers to review adequacy of policies, claims history and premiums and options. Regular updates from insurer and broker advising of new policies. Recent insurance procurement has shown that it is increasingly difficult to attract insurers to bid for the provision of cover. Therefore reserves will be built up to deal with loss of any insurance cover in coming years.	5	1 (2)	5 (10)	Head of Finance and Performance
	Funds (cash) are not managed effectively	Insufficient readily accessible cash to meet spending commitments resulting in financial penalties, legal claims and poor reputation. Poor rate of return on investments.	Economic	4	4	16	Cash planning in place. Processes in place to make payments swiftly, within minutes if necessary. Cash balances maintained to cover delays in borough transactions. 3 day turnaround time for calling down funding from investments. Placement facility to deliver better returns. Opportunities to improve returns are reported to Chief Officers/Authority e.g. office procurement, transfer station purchase	3	1	3	Head of Finance and Performance
	The contract payment mechanisms are not properly understood or ambiguous	Payment delays, under or overpayments or disputes	Economic	5 (4)	3	15 (12)	In-house checks of invoices by both operational and financial managers in place. Independent audit of contractor's payment model. In depth contract knowledge of Sharpe Pritchard solicitors and PwC financial advisers and key Authority managers. Monthly contract meetings, training and familiarisation with payment mechanisms. Periodic billing file audits	4 (5)	3 (1)	12 (5)	Head of Finance and Performance
	IT systems are insecure or suffer a major failure	Loss of data which we are obliged to report, or without which we cannot invoice or operate effectively	Economic	4 (5)	4	16 (20)	ICT service is out sourced and subject to a wide range of back-up and security measures including remote storage and performance to an agreed service level standards. An IT strategy is in place and IT requirements are regularly reviewed.	4	1	4	Head of Finance and Performance
	WLWA Borough data is not being viewed holistically	A disjointed approach. Failure to capitalise on opportunity. Additional cost. A continuing disjointed approach. The Boroughs will fail to meet the 50% recycling composting target by 2020	Technological	5	3	15	Data is viewed from an Authority perspective and ensures operations are effective for the Authority. However a more holistic view of data across all boroughs will facilitate better partnership working. Projects identified in the Business plan aim to provide a fuller picture.	4	2	8	Head of Finance and Performance
	There will be a change in law relevant to our contracts	Unanticipated cost for the Authority	Legislative	4	4	16	Legislative changes are identified i.e. which affect EfW or transfer station operations, an incineration tax or change in classification to hazardous waste and are prepared for accordingly. Networking with contractors and public sector bodies on expected changes to follow the Resources and Waste Strategy. Nawdo, Lednet and Widp meetings. Where possible costs will be built into the budgeting process or reported through budget monitoring and dealt with through reserves.	4	2	8	Senior Contracts Manager
	Environmental damage will be caused by Authority or Contractor Activities	Increased cost of repair, potential fines, reputational damage	Environmental	5	2		Range of processes including internal daily and weekly monitoring. Review operations risks. Review procurement policy. Monitor contractor's environmental performance and reporting.	5	1	5	Operations Manager

Risk Register

Risk Area "There is a risk that"	Analysis of Risk "Which will result in"	Туре	(origin	sessment al score in b	orackets)	Management Actions Implemented or Planned (in bold)	Assessmen: after mitig (original score in to limpact Probability	ations orackets)	Responsible Officer
There will be a breach in Health & Safety at an Authority or Contractor site	Risk of injury to staff or public visitors to Authority sites	Environmental	5	2	10	Specialist Health and Safety Advice contracted in. Periodic internal audit assurance. Annual Action Plans are considered and agreed with GMB. Monitor contractor's health and safety performance and reporting. A range of fire prevention/precaution measures are in place at site including fire risk assessments. Losses are also covered by insurance policies.	5 1	5	Operations Manager

Risk/ Impact Rating

1/19W 1	πιρασι παιπιξ	1						
Rating	Status	Service disruption	Financial Loss	Reputation	Failure to provide statutory service / meet legal obligations	People		
5	Extreme	Total failure or service	Over £5m	National publicity > than 3 days Resignation of leading member or chief officer	Multiple civil or criminal suits. Litigation, claim or fine of above £5m	Fatality or one or more clients/staff		
4	Very high	Serious disruption to service	£500k-£5m	National public or press interest	Litigation claim or fine £500k-£5m	Serious injury. Permanent disablement of one or more clients / staff		
3	Medium	Disruption to service	£50k-£500k	Local public /press interest	Litigation claim or fine £50k-£500k	Major injuries to individual		
2	Low	Some minor impact on service	£5k-£50k	Contained within department	Litigation claim or fine £5k-£50k	Minor injuries to several people		
1	Negligible	Annoyance but does not disrupt service	< £5k	Contained within unit/section	Litigation claim or fine less than £5k	Minor injuries to an individual		

Likelihood Classification

- 1. Rare May occur only in exceptional circumstances (0-5%)
- 2. Unlikely- Could occur at some time (6%-20%)
- 3. Possible likely to occur (21%-50%)
- 4. Likely-Will probably occur in most circumstances (51%-80%)
- 5. Almost Certain Expected to occur in most circumstances >80%)

Risk Rating/Scoring = Impact x likelihood. Prioritisation of Risks

20-25 (Red)	Those risks requiring immediate management and monitoring
9-19 (Amber)	Those risks requiring management and monitoring but less time critical
1-8 (Green)	Those risks which require ongoing monitoring