

## Criteria for risks within London Councils

(Extract from London Councils Risk Management Strategy & Framework, approved March 2012)

### Types of risks

The main types of risk that London Councils is likely to encounter are:

Risk	Definition
Compliance	Risk of failing to comply with statutory requirements.
External	Risks from changing public or government attitudes.
Financial	Risks arising from insufficient funding, losing monetary resources, spending, fraud or impropriety, or incurring unacceptable liabilities
Operational	Risks associated with the delivery of services to the public and boroughs arising, for example, from recruitment difficulties, diversion of staff to other duties, or IT failures, loss or inaccuracy of data systems or reported information
Project	Risks of specific projects missing deadlines or failing to meet stakeholder expectations.
Reputation	Risks from damage to the organisation's credibility and reputation.
London	Risks to our stakeholders that need to be taken into account in our planning and service provision
Strategic	Risks arising from policy decisions or major decisions affecting organisational priorities; risks arising from senior-level decisions on priorities.
Contractual Risks	Risks related to the management of service contracts
Internal	Risks that relate to HR/People risks associated with employees, management and organisational development

### Assessing and scoring risks

To assess risks adequately London Councils will identify the *consequences* of a risk occurring and give each risk a score or *risk rating*.

A means of comparing risks is needed so that efforts can be concentrated on addressing those that are most important. Each risk will be given a score, depending on its likelihood and its impact, as shown below. A risk may meet some, or all, of a description of likelihood or impact. These descriptions provide guidance rather than a prescriptive formula for determining risk ratings. Scoring a risk is a judgement call based on knowledge, understanding and informed guesswork.

Any risks which are both very likely to occur and will have a high impact are the ones that demand immediate attention.

Risk assessment			
Rating	Likelihood	Impact	Rating
<i>Very High</i> 4	<b>70% chance of occurrence</b> Almost certain (the risk is likely to occur within 6 months or at a frequent intervals). The event is expected to occur as there is a history of regular occurrence.	Huge financial loss; key deadlines missed or priorities unmet; very serious legal concerns (e.g. high risk of successful legal challenge, with substantial implications for London Councils); major impact on Boroughs or Londoners; loss of stakeholder public confidence.	<i>Very High</i> 4
<i>High</i> 3	<b>40% - 70% chance of occurrence</b> Probable, the risk is likely to occur more than once in the next 12 months. A reasonable possibility the event will occur as there is a history of frequent occurrence.	Major financial loss; need to renegotiate business plan priorities; changes to some organisational practices due to legislative amendments; potentially serious legal implications (e.g. risk of successful legal challenge); significant impact on the Boroughs or Londoners; longer-term damage to reputation.	<i>High</i> 3
<i>Medium</i> 2	<b>20% - 39% chance of occurrence</b> Possible, the risk may occur in the next 18 months. Not expected but there's a possibility it may occur as there is a history of casual occurrence.	Medium financial losses; reprioritising of services required; minor legal concerns raised; minor impact on the Boroughs or Londoners; short-term reputation damage.	<i>Medium</i> 2
<i>Low</i> 1	<b>&lt;20% chance of occurrence</b> Rare, the risk may occur in exceptional circumstances.	Minimal financial losses; service delivery unaffected; no legal implications; unlikely to affect the Boroughs or Londoners; unlikely to damage reputation.	<i>Low</i> 1

### Risk scores

Risk Assessment				
<b>Very High (4)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>High (3)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Medium (2)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>Medium (2)</b>	<b>High (3)</b>	<b>Very High (4)</b>
<b>Impact</b>				

It is recognised that the scores at different levels of the register (project/team, directorate/ divisional, corporate) will reflect the importance of the risk in the context of

the level of the register. For example, an individual officer's project register may reflect a high impact score on the project if an element is delivered late, but this will not necessarily correspond to a high impact on the organisation as a whole. This incremental approach to impact allows risks to be appropriately scored at each level to enable effective prioritisation of management and mitigation actions.

### **Mitigating risks**

In addressing risks, a proportionate response will be adopted – reducing risks to 'As Low a Level as is Reasonably Practicable' in the particular circumstances (known as the ALARP approach).

In identifying actions to address a risk, at least one of the 4 T's; treat, transfer, tolerate or terminate should apply.

**Treat** – treating the risk is the most common response, taking action to lessen the likelihood of the risk occurring. Treatment can also mean planning what you will do if the risk occurs, therefore minimising the impact. The purpose of 'treatment' is not necessarily to terminate the risk but, more likely, to establish a planned series of mitigating actions to contain the risk to an acceptable level.

**Transfer** – transferring the risk might include paying a third party to take it on or having an insurance policy in place. Contracting out a service might mitigate the risk but create new risks to be managed.

**Tolerate** – the ability to take effective action against some risks may be limited, or the cost of taking action may be disproportionate to the potential benefit gained. In this instance, the only management action required is to 'watch' the risk to ensure that its likelihood or impact does not change. This is an acceptable response as long as the risk has been properly identified and toleration is agreed to be the best option. If new management options arise, it may become appropriate to treat this risk in the future. London Councils may choose to tolerate a high residual risk if the activity involves presents a significant, yet risky, opportunity for the organisation. This should be explained in the description of the countermeasures.

**Terminate** – by doing things differently, you remove the risk.