Organisation - ADC - Risk Management

		AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS			MANAGEMENT RESPONSES		
Rec No.	Risk Rating	Summary of Weakness (Issue)	Issue Accepted	Suggested Action (Recommendation)	Action Details Inc. alternative solution (If no action please state reasons)	Officer Responsible (email address only)	Implementation Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
1	Low Risk	The coversheet for the Risk Management and Process document contained blank sign off and distribution fields.	YES/NO	We suggest that the Risk Management Strategy and Process document coversheet is fully completed, or the sponsor and distribution fields are removed if they are surplus to requirements.	Noted and accepted	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
2	Low Risk	The officer with overall responsibility for risk management was not identified.	YES/NO	We recommend that the Chief Executive is identified as the responsible officer within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document, which would bring the risk management framework in line with recognised good practice.	Identified as CEO in revised strategy document	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
3	Low Risk	There were several contradictions and inconsistencies within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document.	YES/NO	We recommend that the Risk Management Strategy and Process document is reviewed and revised to ensure that it is clear in its message and intention.	Risk strategy reviewed and all suggestions considered and implemented where noted	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
4	Low Risk	Accountabilities were not sufficiently defined within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document.	YES/NO	We recommend that the Risk Management Strategy and Process document, in addition to setting out responsibilities, details how assurance will be obtained to ensure responsibilities are being met. E.g. Regular meetings (to stay aligned) Process write-ups (to gauge what is working and what is not) Project plans (to outline future goals).	Accountabilities reviewed and additional wording added to the strategy. The major gateways are identified e.g. Audit Committee and CLT reviews however the flexibility for Service Directors and Service Managers should remain and I don't think there should be prescribed dates in the strategy at those levels. The process write up to gauge what is working and what is not is largely up to the Risk Sponsor (AD Corporate Services and Transformation) to evaluate and manage. Project plans relating to risk in projects should be managed by PM Sponsors and PM's and in line with the PM Framework.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
5	Low Risk	The Risk Management Strategy and Process document did not contain an organisational chart showing the relationships between all the boards and committees established for risk management.	YES/NO	We recommend that an organisational chart be drawn up and documented within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document depicting the relationships between the Council and all the committees and boards established for risk management.	An organisational chart is now included	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
6	Low Risk	Key staff with specific and specialist risk management responsibilities were not identified within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document.	YES/NO	We suggest that staff that may have skills, knowledge and experience or specific responsibilities that could be utilised for effective risk management are identified and documented within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document to ensure that knowledge is fully utilised.	"Other key officers" have been identified and included. The overall responsibility of corporate risk and driving best practice rests with the AD Corporate Services and Transformation and other officers key to the risk management process such as Service Manager - Risk & Emergency Planning who will manage H&S as well as business continuity and will report direct as the service manager to the Director Legal and Governance, a similar arrangement exists with the reporting of insurance related risks by the Principal Accountant, Financial Management to the Corporate Finance Manager. In both examples any risk that is considered outside of the risk appetite tolerance and cannot be managed and poses a risk to the delivery of the Council's services will be elevated to the corporate risk register. The roles are now included in the strategy however as described the process exists for these "experts" to elevate risks to a corporate level.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22

central midlands audit partnership

Organisation - ADC - Risk Management

		AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS			MANAGEMENT RESPONSES		
Rec No.	Risk Rating	Summary of Weakness (Issue)	Issue Accepted	Suggested Action (Recommendation)	Action Details Inc. alternative solution (If no action please state reasons)	Officer Responsible (email address only)	Implementation Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
7	Low Risk	The risk management framework was not subjected to full ongoing regular review by the Audit Committee as set out within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document.	YES/NO	We recommend that the entire framework (strategy, procedure, and people) should be subject to a clearly defined and regular review by key stakeholders including the Audit Committee.	Noted	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
8	Low Risk	Risk registers did not contain the most appropriate information for review, such as the key fields recording inherent and residual risk scores as suggested by good practice.	YES/NO	We recommend that the risk register template is revised in line with good practice and requirements of the Risk Management Strategy.	Noted. The design of the risk register can be managed through the Performance Management software "Pentana" and the design of the risk registers can be such so that uniformity exists across the Council.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
9	Low Risk	The Risk Management Strategy and Process document contained insufficient and contradictory guidance on risk identification techniques.	YES/NO	We recommend consideration be given to expanding the guidance contained within Appendix 1 of the Risk Management Strategy and Process document to include other risk identification techniques, such as brain storming, interviewing, reviewing complaint logs or claims history etc. Inconsistences in the document should be rectified.	Risk strategy revised and changes made.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
10	Moderate Risk	The corporate risk definition contained within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document was too broad to accurately differentiate between corporate risk and service level risk.	YES/NO	We recommend that the corporate risk definition is more tightly defined to minimise the number of corporate risks and allow for appropriate proportionality of response.	Corporate risk definition has been further defined to remove any ambiguity.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
11	Low Risk	It was unclear what review periods were in effect for the review of risks and if they were being met.	YES/NO	We recommend that review periods are considered and clearly documented within the Risk Management Strategy and Process document and that all risk records contain a target date field to show when it is required to be looked at next.	Review periods are pre-set in Pentana. As an example, where corporate risks exist then they are scheduled for a 3 monthly review. Where there is a service risk they are set as a minimum for every 3 months. The review date can be set by the risk owner if a more frequent review is required. It might benefit directorates if a brief session was held to explain how to manage the scheduling in Pentana. List of review dates by types included in page 24 of the revised strategy.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22
12	Moderate Risk	Controls listed on the corporate risk register may not have been adequately evaluated in order to mitigate against the identified risk.	YES/NO	We recommend that controls are reviewed as often as the risk and periodically tested to ensure they can respond as intended.	The control should be reviewed by the risk owner and subject to examination by CLT in their reviews of the corporate risk register.	Chris.clarke@ashfield.gov.uk	28/01/22

central midlands audit partnership