

## **RISK REGISTER 2016/17**

Presented by the Director of Finance & Resources

### **SUMMARY**

At each Audit Committee Members review the Risk Register for progress against existing actions and to ensure that the Risk Register remains relevant to deal with the corporate risks facing the organisation.

Following input from Members at the last Audit Committee the Register has been updated for use going forward.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Members Approve: (1) the Authority's Strategic Risk Register (incorporating any agreed changes recommended at this Committee meeting) attached as Appendix B to this report.

### **BACKGROUND**

- 1 Risk management is one of the key internal controls for an organisation. Members need to ensure that a sound system of internal control is maintained and an annual review of the effectiveness of the system of internal control is conducted to provide sufficient, relevant and reliable assurance to enable them to authorise the signing of the Authority's annual governance statement (which is published with the financial statements).
- 2 Regulation 3 of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 requires that:  
"A relevant authority must ensure that it has a sound system of internal control which -  
(a) facilitates the effective exercise of its functions and the achievement of its aims and objectives;  
(b) ensures that the financial and operational management of the authority is effective; and  
(c) includes effective arrangements for the management of risk."




In this context "relevant authority" is referring to Lee Valley Regional Park Authority.

- 3 Each financial year the relevant authority must –
  - (a) conduct a review of the effectiveness of the system of internal control required by regulation 3; and
  - (b) prepare an annual governance statement - This statement must be published together with the statement of accounts and the narrative statement in accordance with Regulation 10.
- 4 Assurance of the Authority's internal control system is derived through the work of the internal audit function (undertaken by Mazars for the Authority); and also through the monitoring of processes put in place by management and other external bodies including those around risk management and health & safety. This provides evidence which allows the Authority to form conclusions on the adequacy and effectiveness of the systems of internal control and also on the efficiency of operations.
- 5 Risk management is not solely a focus on the finances of the Authority. The scope of internal control spans the whole range of the Authority's activities and includes those controls designed to ensure:
  - the Authority's policies are put into practice;
  - the organisation's values are met;
  - laws and regulations are complied with;
  - required processes are adhered to;
  - financial statements and other published information are accurate and reliable; and
  - human, financial and other resources are managed efficiently and effectively.
- 6 The Authority approved a Risk Management Framework in April 2005 (Paper A/3798/05). The Risk Management Framework, and more specifically, the Risk Register, was developed by Members and senior officers under the guidance of the internal auditors through a number of workshops and meetings. Members have regularly reviewed the Register at each Audit Committee, adding in their own comments and improvements.
- 7 Since this time Members have consistently (and in depth) reviewed the Corporate Risk Register and revised the strategy, format, and content. The strategy has been revised and updated twice since 2005 at the Audit Committee (20 May 2010, Paper AUD/06/10 and 28 June 2012 Paper AUD/30/12).

## **REVIEW OF THE STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

- 8 The current Strategic Risk Register is reviewed by officers and Members on an on-going basis. At the meeting in September 2015 (Paper AUD/63/15) Members agreed the corporate Risk Register recognising that many of the previously identified risks had been satisfactorily addressed.
- 9 Members also requested on an ongoing basis that:
  - residual risk scores needed reassessing to ensure that we were not overstating the current position and to indicate the overall direction of travel.

Since the February and June meetings (Paper AUD/66/16 and AUD/70/16) officers have reviewed the scoring against the criteria set out in detail at Appendix A to this report. The table below sets out a comparison of the movement in reducing the residual risk over time and the attached total notional score.

Risk	Inherent Risks	Notional Residual Risks 25 February 2016	Notional Residual Risks 16 June 2016	Notional Residual Risks 22 September 2016
	8	0	0	1
	14	10	9	9
	0	12	13	13
<b>Total Risks</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Notional Score</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>424</b>

There were no further changes requested.

- 10 Development of a new Ice Centre has been identified by officers as a new corporate risk on the Register. Inclusion of this risk could be considered as falling within the 8 main strategic risks already identified within the Register. However in line with the previous risk-management of the Olympic build and Olympic legacy, the potential scale of investment (£30m) and scale of change, leads officers to recommend that this project is identified separately on the Register.

There is currently a Member led working group that has reported to the full Authority (Paper A/4228/16). Authority has approved the preferred site and set aside specific resources to deal with the next phases of the project involving design work and preparing a capital funding model. Members of this Committee will want to ensure the legal, financial, reputational, contractual, environmental, business continuity, planning and project management risks are monitored as part of the organisation's required governance.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11 There are no environmental implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

## EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 12 There are no equality implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 13 Revision of the Strategic Risk Register is a key element of this Authority's system of internal control that contributes to safeguarding the assets of the Authority and its reputation for sound financial management of public funds. This is reflected in the Authority's Annual Governance Statement published within the annual accounts and approved by this Committee.
- 14 Where actions require additional resources these will be identified and

approved through the normal budget setting/service planning and management processes in accordance with Financial Regulations.

### **HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 15 There are no additional human resource implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report. Actions have been set so that they can be met from existing employee resources.

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 16 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 17 These are dealt with through the main body of the report and through the revised Register. The Ice Centre project is now perceived as potentially the highest corporate risk faced by the organisation. The other potential high risk areas identified (now amber) within the corporate Register relate to business continuity and resourcing risks. Continuing mitigation against these identified risks is demonstrated by the proposed actions in the strategic Register, attached as Appendix B to this report, and primarily through implementing and delivering the 2016-19 approved Business Plan.

Author: Simon Sheldon, 01992 709 859, [ssheldon@leevalleypark.org.uk](mailto:ssheldon@leevalleypark.org.uk)

### **BACKGROUND REPORTS**

Lee Valley Regional Park Authority Risk Management Strategy June 2012

### **PREVIOUS COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Audit Committee	AUD/06/10	Risk Register 2009/10	20 May 2010
Audit Committee	AUD/17/11	Risk Register 2010/11	02 March 2011
Audit Committee	AUD/21/11	Risk Register 2011/12	02 June 2011
Audit Committee	AUD/23/11	Risk Register 2011/12	22 September 2011
Audit Committee	AUD/26/12	Risk Register 2011/12	23 February 2012
Audit Committee	AUD/30/12	Risk Register 2012/13	28 June 2012
Audit Committee	AUD/34/12	Risk Register 2012/13	20 September 2012
Audit Committee	AUD/38/13	Risk Register 2012/13	28 February 2013
Audit Committee	AUD/40/13	Risk Register 2013/14	20 June 2014
Audit Committee	AUD/44/13	Risk Register 2013/14	26 September 2014
Audit Committee	AUD/46/14	Risk Register 2013/14	27 February 2014
Audit Committee	AUD/50/14	Risk Register 2014/15	19 June 2014
Audit Committee	AUD/54/14	Risk Register 2014/15	25 September 2014
Audit Committee	AUD/57/15	Risk Register 2014/15	26 February 2015
Audit Committee	AUD/59/15	Risk Register 2015/16	25 June 2015
Audit Committee	AUD/63/15	Risk Register 2015/16	24 September 2015
Audit Committee	AUD/66/16	Risk Register 2015/16	25 February 2016
Audit Committee	AUD/70/16	Risk Register 2016/17	16 June 2016
Authority	A/4228/16	Outcome of the Ice Centre Feasibility	16 June 2016

Exercise and  
Proposed Next Steps

**APPENDICES ATTACHED**

Appendix A	Risk Register Definitions and Scoring Criteria
Appendix B	Corporate Risk Register – Authority

This page is blank

## Definitions

The following key terms are used within the Risk Register:

**Risk** = an event or action which may adversely (or positively e.g. the winning or losing of contracts) affect the Trust's ability to maximise stakeholder value and to achieve its objectives, or limit its ability to exploit opportunities.

Risk is an inevitable part of everyday business and cannot be eliminated, but it can be managed.

**Risk Management** = the planned and systematic approach to the identification, evaluation and economic management of the risks associated with the Trust activities.

**Inherent Risk** = the risk exposure (likelihood x impact), assuming that nothing is done to manage it.

**Likelihood** = the estimated chance of a risk being realised.

**Impact** = the potential consequences if a risk is realised.

**Control** = an action taken to help manage a risk, either reducing the likelihood or the impact, or both.

**Residual Risk** = the risk exposure (likelihood x impact), taking into account the steps already being taken to manage it.

**Dealing with the risk** = treating, transferring, terminating or tolerating.

**Treat** Controls are put in place to help reduce the likelihood of a risk being realised.

**Transfer** Action is taken to transfer the potential impact to another party, e.g. through an insurance arrangement.

**Terminate** A decision is made to end the area of activity with which the activity is associated.

**Tolerate** A decision is made to accept the current level of exposure without taking any further action.

**Further Action** = the further steps to be taken to reduce the residual risk exposure to an acceptable level.

**Deadline for Completion of Actions** = final date when action should be completed by.

**Officer Responsible** = a senior officer responsible for managing the risk indicated by their post title e.g., CEO (Chief Executive Officer), DCS (Director of Corporate Services), DFR (Director of Finance & Resources), HP (Head of Parklands), HC (Head of Communications), HSL (Head of Sport & Leisure) and AMPD (Section Manager Asset Management, Protection & Development).

**Assurance** = information which provides a view on the extent to which a risk is being managed in the way envisaged and hence on whether the actual residual risk exposure is consistent with that which it is believed to be.

**Comments** = Officer comments updating against progress against the action and the deadline.

**Risk Appetite and Scoring Criteria**

Risks are assessed using a 1-9 scale for both impact and likelihood. The Authority's risk appetite is then defined using the scoring matrix below.

Impact	9	9	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81
	8	8	16	24	32	40	48	56	64	72
	7	7	14	21	28	35	42	49	56	63
	6	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48	54
	5	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45
	4	4	8	12	16	20	24	28	32	36
	3	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24	27
	2	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18
	1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Likelihood								

Each risk is scored on the basis of the following criteria for impact and likelihood, both for inherent and residual risk. This provides a visual indicator of the original level of risk and where it stands currently.

Key

Score 45-81 High Risk



Score 9-48 Moderate Risk



Score 1-18 Low Risk





Whilst the assessment remains subjective, the following criteria serve as a guide and are used to help ensure consistency in scoring across each of the risks identified.

	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>
1	No impact	<1% likely to occur in next 12 months
2	Financial loss up to £1,000 or no impact outside single objective or no adverse publicity	1%-5% likely to occur in next 12 months
3	Financial loss between £1,000 and £5,000 or no impact outside single objective or no adverse publicity	5%-10% likely to occur in next 12 months
4	Financial loss between £5,000 and £20,000 or minor regulatory consequence or some impact on other objectives	10%-20% likely to occur in next 12 months
5	Financial loss between £20,000 and £50,000 or impact on other objectives or local adverse publicity or strong regulatory criticism	20%-30% likely to occur in next 12 months
6	Financial loss between £50,000 to £250,000 or impact on many other processes or local adverse publicity or regulatory sanctions (such as intervention, public interest reports)	30%-40% likely to occur in next 12 months
7	Financial loss between £250,000 to £500,000 or impact on strategic level objectives or national adverse publicity or strong regulatory sanctions	40%-60% likely to occur in next 12 months
8	Financial loss between £500,000 to £1 million or impact at strategic level or national adverse publicity or Central Government take over administration	60%-80% likely to occur in next 12 months
9	Financial loss above £1 million or major impact at strategic level or closure/transfer of business	>80% likely to occur in next 12 months

This page is blank

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Impact	Likelihood						
SR 1	<b>Legal</b>												
	Failure to comply with the 1966 Park Act and other statutory requirements.	DCS	8	7	56	6	1	6	Quarterly	DCS	External Audit Internal Audit Senior Management	On-going Monitoring	On-going Monitoring
	Failure to comply with Health & Safety legislation	DFR	9	6	54	7	2	14	31/03/2017	DFR	Senior management Members	2016/17 Work site inspections plus annual audits	Annual Internal Audit Plan Complete. BSC audit Complete & 5* grading retained
SR2	<b>Contractual</b>												
	Agreeing to accept a partners' financial terms and conditions that will place an unacceptable long term contingent liability on the Authority	DFR	9	4	36	8	2	16	Quarterly	DCS/DFR	Internal Audit/ External Audit	No new agreements. Monitor re projects eg Ice Centre Development	No new agreements. Monitor re projects eg Ice Centre Development
	Contractors, Governing Bodies, or Trust not delivering agreed objectives	DFR	7	6	42	6	2	12	Executive Quarterly Monitoring	HSL	Senior Management and Members	1st Quarter Monitoring presented to Executive 21/7/2016 and sent to Scrutiny Members	4th Quarter Monitoring presented to scrutiny Paper S/35/16 and reported to Executive 16/6/2016

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Impact	Likelihood						
	Failure to deliver the LVRPA management contract to the required specification including breach in SE Funding Agreements LVWWC, VeloPark, LV H+TC	DFR	9	4	36	6	2	12	Executive Quarterly Monitoring	HSL	Senior management Internal Audit	1st Quarter Monitoring presented to Executive 21/7/2016 and sent to Scrutiny Members Sport England Q1 report sent to SE	4th Quarter Monitoring presented to scrutiny Paper S/35/16 and reported to Executive 16/6/2016. Sport England Q4 report sent to SE 25.5.16
	Management of Facilities Contracts	DCS	9	4	36	9	3	27	Ongoing Monitoring	AMPD	Internal Audit Senior Management	APMD Undertake annual reviews of MPG's at venues to ensure compliance	APMD Undertake annual reviews of MPG's at venues to ensure compliance.
<b>SR 3</b>	<b>Resources</b>												
	I.T. infrastructure does not meet future business need requirements. Authority reduces or lacks funding for updating or improving I.T infrastructure	DFR	9	4	36	8	3	24	Budget resources review for new projects	DFR	Senior Management Internal Audit/External Audit	Strategy under review and built in as corporate objective in 2016-19 business plan. Report to Members by Dec 2016.	Strategy under review and built in as corporate objective in 2016-19 business plan. Report to Members by Dec 2016.

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Total Score	Likelihood	Impact	Existing Controls	Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officers(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Likelihood	Impact										
	The Authority fails to attract and retain staff at all levels of the appropriate calibre	CEO	8	8	8	8	64	●●●	●●●	●●●	Reward & Recognition Training & development framework Management Away Days Staff presentations Internal/External communications	Implement "learning" strategy Regular adverts and communication. Exit Interview Review Employer of choice Review of benefits	31/03/2017	CEO/ DFR	Senior Management/ Members	Review under-way and built in as corporate objective in 2016-19 business plan. Report to Members by Dec 2016.	Review under-way and built in as corporate objective in 2016-19 business plan. Report to Members by Dec 2016.
<b>SR 4</b>	<b>Financial Management</b>																
	Financial Risks of unresourced legacy costs through non-achievement of income targets by Trust or inaccurate budget forecasting	DFR	9	9	9	81	●●●	●●●	●●●	Budget monitoring reports Authority/Trust monitoring Meetings Joint Chairs Meeting Review 2016/17 complete	Budget Review 2017/18	31/12/2016	DFR	Senior management Members	Member Working Group start Sept 2016	Levy & Budget Strategy 2017-18 onwards	
	Ensure Adequate Funding for Both Organisation	DFR	9	9	9	81	●●●	●●●	●●●	Current Financial Plan 2016/17 Existing Budget Process Mandatory Rate relief achieved	Budget Review 2017/18	19/01/2017	DFR	SMT Members	Member Working Group start Sept 2016	Levy & Budget Strategy 2017-18 onwards	

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score				Residual Risk Score				Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Treat, Transfer/Treat/Terminate (if Treat, further actions needed)						
<b>SR5</b>	<b>Governance &amp; Leadership</b>														
	Lack of a clear corporate direction	CEO	9	9	81	●	●	●	↕	Implement 2016-19 Business Plan	Quarterly Monitoring	CEO	Senior Management Members External Audit	Ongoing Monitoring through Executive & Scrutiny.	Ongoing Monitoring through Executive & Scrutiny.
	Challenge to the Levy resulting in non-payment	CEO	9	9	81	●	●	●	↑	Implement 2016-19 Business Plan. Develop Levy Strategy.	Quarterly Monitoring	CEO	Senior Management Members	Member Working Group start Sept 2016	Monitor & respond to outcomes of Lords amendment to Housing & Planning Bill
<b>SR6</b>	<b>Reputation/Communication</b>														
	Impact on Authority if Trust Venues do not have a strong reputation	HC	7	5	35	●	●	●	↑	Managed via Contract Stakeholder updates Feedback/liaison with Trust	Quarterly Monitoring Report	HC	Senior Management/ Members Stakeholder Perception KPI	New legacy report issued to stakeholders in August	Continual media and stakeholder monitoring
	Reputational Enhancement or Damage due to success or failure of Olympics Legacy	CEO	8	5	40	●	●	●	↑	Business plans Olympic Venues Working Relationship LLDC Third party working relationships across Olympic park	Monthly	HC	Senior management Members	Continued media and stakeholder monitoring, plus close working with LLDC to maintain positive public messages.	Continued media and stakeholder monitoring, plus close working with LLDC to maintain positive public messages.

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016






Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Total Score	Likelihood	Impact	Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Lead	Impact	Likelihood									
	Reputational Enhancement or Damage due to success or failure of stakeholder relationships	HC	9	3	27	6	3	18		(If Treat, further actions needed) Tolerate/Transfer/Treat/Terminate	Ongoing	HC	Senior management Members Stakeholder Perception KPI	Engagement Programme with stakeholders, including council leader and GLA member invites to schools festivals and stakeholders invites to major events	Engagement Programme with stakeholders, including council leader and GLA member invites to schools festivals and stakeholders invites to major events	
	Failure to deliver major events in partnership with Governing Bodies/LVLT	HSL	7	5	35	6	4	24		Partner Working with Trust. Events Strategy	30/11/2016	HSL	Senior management Members Stakeholder Perception KPI	All major NGB NEC events with the exception of the NEC Wheelchair Masters due to be held in November 2016 have been completed for this year.	Major events since Q2; 2015 NEC Wheelchair Masters, 2016 UCI Track Cycling World Champs and Sport Relief. 2016 Men & Womens Champions Trophy in June	
<b>SR7</b>	<b>Business Continuity</b>															
	Inadequate business continuity implementation at any (all) sites	DFR	6	5	30	5	3	15		Audit Recommendations completed. Further training and testing	18/10/2016	HSL	External Audit Internal Audit Senior Management	Authority Training Day completed 14/7/2016. Joint Trust & Authority Emergency Planning Training 18/10/2016. Revision of current procedures underway.	Authority Business Continuity training day scheduled for June 2016. Inclusion in annual audit plan.	

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Impact	Likelihood						
SR8	Environmental Management												
	Failure to manage contamination could be a risk to users, this includes land and/or water contamination (also damage to reputation from failing to manage contamination)	DCS	9	9	81	7	2	14	Consultant Site Investigations work to be completed.	30/09/2016	DCS	Paper E/442/16 summarised actions to date; user guides, supplemental land surveys & additional consultancy work at Holy-field Marsh prior to any remedial works being carried out	Paper E/442/16 summarised actions to date; user guides, supplemental land surveys & additional consultancy actions to date; user guides, supplemental land surveys and additional consultancy work at Holy-field Marsh
	Veterinary Disease outbreak affecting Farms business (e.g. avian flu, Foot and Mouth)	DCS	6	6	36	5	3	15	Annual Insurance Renewal	30/09/2016	HP	Insurance Renewal underway 2016/17	Insurance Renewal 2016/17
	Disease outbreak affecting human health	DFR	9	2	18	8	2	16	Pandemic flu outbreak procedure Proactive monitoring during winter months Formal management of animal movements Quarterly SMT Reports Quarterly e-coli checks	Quarterly inspections	DFR	Quarterly inspections of E. Coli control measures conducted by H&S Officer at the farms.	Quarterly inspections of E. Coli control measures conducted by H&S Officer at the farms.
	Flood risk	DCS	7	5	35	6	5	30	Emergency Action Planning Insurance Funds General Reserves Working with Environment Agency & GIS Mapping of Flood Risk Areas Park Development Framework	30/06/2016	HP	Authority Emergency Planning Training 18/10/2016 Plus linked in to EA plus site evacuation plans.	Authority Business Continuity Training June 2016. Plus linked in to EA plus site evacuation plans.



AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Total Score	Likelihood	Impact	Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments			
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Existing Controls	Impact										Likelihood	Total Score	
17	Environment damage/disaster to buildings/ programme/events	DCS	7	5	35		Existing Controls Emergency Action Planning Insurance Funds Work with Trust Working with QEOP and Agencies	6	5	30		  	Treat	Audit Recommendations completed. Further training and testing	30/06/2016	DFR	H+S Senior management	DRP completion and Audit by 31/6/2016. Joint Trust Authority training day to be actioned by 18/10/2016	DRP completion and Audit by 31/6/2016. Joint Authority training day to be actioned by 30/06/2016

AUTHORITY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AS AT 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Risk ID	Risk Name	Inherent Risk Score			Residual Risk Score			Total Score	Likelihood	Impact	Existing Controls	Tolerate/Transfer/Treat/Terminate (if Treat, further actions needed)	Further Actions Needed to reduce Risk	Deadline for Completion Actions	Officer(s) Responsible	Source of Assurance	22/09/2016 Comments	16/06/2016 Comments
		Lead	Impact	Likelihood	Total Score	Likelihood	Impact											
SR 9	Major Development - Ice Centre	CEO	9	8	72	7	7	49			Treat	Business Plan Tender for Design Team Engagement stakeholders, local community	31/03/2017	HSL	Senior management Members External Consultants	Tenders being assessed re project management & design team.	None	
	Failure in Strategic Risks 1-8 above in the development of the Ice Centre circa £30m project				1128			424										

Score 45-81 High Risk  
 Score 19-48 Moderate risk  
 Score 1- 18 Low risk

Progress in a positive direction ie reducing the risk  
 Progress is negative and risk is getting worse.  
 Progress static subject to actions or as risk is "tolerated"