

**RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS
ANNUAL UPDATE 2025/26**

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This paper updates Members of the Audit and Governance Committee on the ongoing development and maintenance of the Council's risk management processes during 2025/26.

Attached to this report is the current Corporate Risk Management Policy, as presented to Cabinet for approval on 25th November 2025.

AGC Members are asked to note this report and comment on the adequacy of the Council's risk management arrangements, particularly in respect of the key updates made to the risk management policy as highlighted within the report.

1. Background

- 1.1 The role of the Audit and Governance Committee (CGAS) is to *"provide independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework"*. Specifically in relation to risk management, the Constitution states that the AGC should *"monitor the effective development of risk management in the Council"*.
- 1.2 This report provides an update to AGC Members on the risk management activity that has taken place and is planned for the remainder of 2025/26 in line with arrangements set out in the Council's updated Risk Management Policy, which is attached as Appendix A.
- 1.3 As was reported in previous years, 2025 has continued to be a period of significant uncertainty across a broad range of economic, social and political matters. Circumstances such as high interest rates and slow growth in the economy continue to have an impact on the Council's financial position, operations and capital projects. The wider implications for the Council have meant a continued focus on mitigation plans adapting to meet the ongoing challenges presented. Alongside these challenges the commencement of work on LGR and CGR have meant that new risks have arisen.
- 1.4 It is important to recognise the role that the Council's risk management process has played in recognising the potential impacts of the risks the Council faces, and ensuring that the Senior Leadership Team and Cabinet Members are regularly updated. Risks continue to be routinely reviewed and discussed at both a service level and amongst senior management.

- 1.5** The risk management process will continue to play an important role in the Council meeting its key objectives as existing risks continue to develop during 2025/26 and beyond. For context, the most recent public version of the Corporate Risk Register, taken to Cabinet on 25th November 2025, is attached as appendix B.

2.0 Development of Risk Management

- 2.1** The Council has continued its work to embed risk management within the organisation and streamline the processes in place. The MS Lists based system introduced in July 2022 continues to promote efficiency and allows for easy interrogation in a live format at any time by key personnel.
- 2.2** The Council's risk management policy and arrangements continue to be reviewed and developed in order to remain effective and to provide continual improvement.
- 2.3** Work to develop a strategic risk appetite/policy using the facilitation services of an external advisor was concluded during Q2 2025/26. This work took place with SLT, Committee Chairs and Cabinet Members. As a result, the wider risk management policy and arrangements have themselves been reviewed to reflect this and the changes in organisational structure.
- 2.4** The renewed policy was presented to Cabinet on 25th November 2026 for approval and is attached as appendix A. The major updates incorporated are:
- The inclusion of the risk appetite statement/policy – and procedures to ensure each risk is measured against the corporate appetite. The purpose is to ensure mitigation is appropriate and is applied in a consistent way across what is a diverse risk profile.
 - The introduction of and cross reference with an appropriate issue management system, for recognition and management of risks that become issues.
- 2.5** During Q3 work will take place to update the structure/template of the risk registers themselves to reflect the policy changes. An officer briefing programme will then follow this during Q4 to embed the new processes throughout the organisation.
- 2.6** An internal audit of the Council's risk management arrangements by SIAP commenced in October 2025 and is expected to conclude during Q3 2025/26.

3.0 Risk Management Reporting during 2025/26

- 3.1** As set out in the risk management policy, reports on risk have been presented to the Council's Senior Leadership Team on a quarterly basis and presented to Cabinet, incorporated into the quarterly performance report. In addition, risk is discussed with greater frequency outside these meetings, with regular discussions and risk register reviews taking place across projects and programmes.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1** CGAS is asked to note this report which summarises how risk has been managed across the Council in 2025/26.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Appendix A – Risk Management Policy

Appendix B – Corporate Risk Register v21.1

CONTACT DETAILS:

Report Author –

Roger Sanders, Corporate Risk Manager – 01252 398809

roger.sanders@rushmoor.gov.uk

Head of Service –

Karen Edwards, Executive Director

karen.edwards@rushmoor.gov.uk

Rushmoor Borough Council - Corporate Risk Register v21.1 04/11/25 (PUBLIC)

Risk Title	Risk Owner	Risk Type	Risk Description & Potential Outcomes	Inherent Risk Score	Inherent Risk Rating	Inherent Risk Trend	Existing Controls / Mitigation	Residual Risk Score	Residual Risk Rating	Residual Risk Trend	Additional Mitigation Planned	Target Risk Score	Target Risk Rating	Traget Risk Trend
Strategic Risks (ST) - Total 10 (No change)														
Securing infrastructure investment	Karen Edwards	ST	Inability to attract infrastructure investment through the public and private sector to support priorities and projects identified in the Council Business Plan. In particular, failure to secure investment in the area could lead to a decrease in Rushmoor's competitiveness and attractiveness and put at risk the stated aim for a thriving Rushmoor economy, vibrant town centres and strong communities who are proud of the area.	16	High	↔	Work with public and private sector infrastructure providers and funders. Utilising UK Shared Prosperity Fund to assist with public realm improvements in Farnborough town centre. Horizon scanning in relation to the levelling up agenda and its implications for Rushmoor. Horizon scanning by Policy Team for future funding opportunities.	12	High	↔	Explore Regeneration and Growth Partnership arrangement with Hampshire County Council. Engage effectively with other opportunities to access Government funding. Continue to secure support from local stakeholders for projects - including residents, HCC and MP. Engage with utility providers with a view to understanding lead in times for additional capacity. NB - progress likely to be effected by LGR.	6	Medium	↔
Financial sustainability of public sector partners	Ian Harrison	ST	The financial sustainability of a wide group of public sector partners is negatively impacted, resulting in reduced service provision by all. In this scenario, the range and quality of services available to residents could be impacted. This could have negative repercussions for health, education, community outcomes and economic outcomes identified in the Council Business Plan/Delivery Plan It is possible that the Council would be expected to meet some of this 'gap' in provision thus exposing the Council to potential financial and reputational risk.	12	High	↔	Close partnership working at a senior officer and political level with the Council's public sector partners. Members and Officers are well briefed on potential implications/risks arising from decisions taken by other public sector partners. Responses to relevant consultation documents (HCC budget consultations) and undertake further planning activity in light of proposals. Proposals for a future sustainable Local Government Model across Hampshire submitted on 26th September 2025.	8	High	↔	Continued horizon scanning/monitoring of the broader policy context. Further development of joint working with partner agencies in 2025/26. Consideration of financial sustainability and financial impacts resulting from Local Government Reorganisation. Statutory consultation on proposals submitted for LGR expected to commence by end Nov 25. Government decision on future LGR configuration expected Spring 26.	6	Medium	↔
Poor Educational Attainment	Karen Edwards	ST	Educational attainment continues to present challenges. This may have an impact on deprivation, unemployment etc. Impact on the area's local reputation. May impact on service demand.	9	High	↔	HCC responsible for Education, RBC supporting role. Priorities set out in the Rushmoor Together Plan and the Young People Plan - with a focus on aspirations. Joint work on supporting families with Hampshire Children's Services.	9	High	↔	Ongoing dialogue with headteachers. Engaging with young people relating to skills, development and opportunities, in line with the Rushmoor Together plan and the Young Peoples Plan - including a structured work experience programme.	4	Medium	↔
Changing external policy context	Karen Edwards	ST	Significant fast track change which can have significant impact on services, levels of available resources or the Council's financial position all of which could adversely impact on the Council's ability to deliver its priorities. Government White Paper bringing forward Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation. Hampshire included in the Priority Programme requiring Unitary Councils from April 2028 resulting in Rushmoor BC not continuing. Reputational risk if the Council is unable to sufficiently adapt to the changing environment.	12	High	↔	Service level risk assessments to consider impacts of potential policy changes on individual Council services. Policy, Strategy, and Transformation team to support SLT with 'horizon scanning' which will assist the Council in identifying and where possible responding to some changes. Ongoing analysis of policy and budget announcements. Council working with other Hampshire authorities to produce local government reorganisation proposals by September 2025 deadline.	8	High	↔	Continued engagement with Government officials and other partners. Retained capacity on PPAB work plan. Work on devolution and reorganisation to be prioritised in 2025/26 so impacts and next steps are clearly understood. Council has a reserve available in order to put in / pay for support and relevant pieces of work in line with deadlines laid down by the Government.	6	Medium	↔
Risk to the health outcomes of Rushmoor Residents due to proposed changes in local NHS healthcare arrangements.	Karen Edwards	ST	Risk to health outcomes of Rushmoor residents if proposed changes to ICB arrangements continue as planned. The quality of services overseen by HIOW ICB is in a number of cases lower than that provided through the Frimley system. In addition, accountable care body arrangements are not yet clear for functions not transferring to new ICBs, posing a local risk to ongoing local service delivery and transformation work necessary to enable the new hospital programme.	8	High	↔	Working with Frimley and HIOW ICBs to ensure safe transfer of services and obtain assurance on transformation and future service quality.	8	High	↔	Increase level of engagement with accountable care organisation arrangements, once established. This is likely to include FHFT and local PCNs.	2	Low	↔
Poor Health Outcomes within Borough (e.g. obesity, mental health etc)	Karen Edwards	ST	Rushmoor has areas where there are health inequalities and health deprivation. Areas of deprivation have poorer health outcomes and higher demands associated. Diabetes, highest smoking rate in Hampshire, high instance of obesity and inactive adults. Mental Health and wellbeing – lack of funding available at local level ICB restructure and loss of NHS Place team has reduced capacity and support at place level to deliver local intervention programmes. HCC savings will also services that provide support for health and well being of vulnerable residents.	12	High	↔	Rushmoor Together - Revised partner plan approved in July. Joint working with partners, particularly with the ICS, HCC and the PCNs with a range of initiatives and plans in place or being developed. Targeted school Projects to include increased physical activity and reducing obesity in targeted schools. Identified as a priority for the Council. Executive Director is a member of the ICS Board. Reintroduction of Health place meeting with key ICB colleagues focusing on deprived areas. Monthly meetings arranged with Public Health Team to review data Focused Projects incorporated within the service Plan include increasing physical activity, promotion of oral health projects and wider family support with food and fuel poverty.	6	Medium	↔	Review approach to resourcing (in conjunction with partners, in particular the ICS and HCC). Targeted projects in service plan to address inactivity and increase physical activity support. Working with Energise me and Public Health to identify additional resource opportunities Rushmoor Together Plan includes latest health data and reflects PCN's/health inequalities priorities Monthly public health/RBC meetings arranged - and HCC update meeting with RBC Exec Director and PH took place in June.	6	Medium	↔
Negative economic and social trends undermine Council Delivery Plan priorities for town centres including the development of Rushmoor's towns to meet the needs of businesses and residents	Tim Mills	ST	Economic and social changes have a significant negative impact on Farnborough and Aldershot town centres, and other district centres and therefore reduce the ability to meet Delivery Plan priorities. This could result in a significant number of empty retail units, a loss of facilities and amenities (e.g. high street banking) for residents and a possible increase in crime and anti-social behavior. A decline in the retail sector will also have an impact on business rates income for the Council. Store closures e.g. Wilko, and chains such as Cneworld in financial difficulty, demonstrate the potential further retrenchment of the retail and hospitality sector. The increase in Employers NI, reduction in Business Rate Relief coupled with the wider economic uncertainty could see businesses that have been holding on go to the wall causing increased vacancies in the town centre.	12	High	↔	Programmes of town centre regeneration in both Aldershot and Farnborough which give consideration to future economic and social trends. Dedicated resource within EPSH, working with retail sector and other partners to support town centre businesses. Activity in both town centres to maintain/increase footfall e.g. town centre events, environmental enhancements.	6	Medium	↓	Close engagement with and ongoing provision of business support to town centre businesses. Work with Community Safety Team to tackle increased or perceived increase in ASB/ crime in the town centres. Town centre events and additional markets/craft fayres planned. Union Yard completion provides opportunity for new lettings which can draw additional footfall and residential once let will also assist.	6	Medium	↔

Risk of negative impact on Rushmoor's current service operations as a result of diverting resources to LGR preparations	Ian Harrison	ST	Diversion of significant unplanned resources to the LGR programme could potentially lead to impacts on the delivery of the Council's priorities and business as usual activities.	12	High	↔	Full participation in LGR programme important to ensure delivery of best outcome for local residents. Budget was assigned to this for 2025/26 to cover additional costs and expenses. Programme delivery structure developed - for engagement of Officers and Members. Plans being developed to adjust resourcing/structure in order to meet the demands of the programme whilst maintaining the Council's current delivery plans. Regular comms with staff and members.	6	Medium	↔	Programme delivery structure kept under review as demands change through process	4	Medium	↔
Deteriorating economic conditions	Tim Mills	ST	Adverse changes to the economy could result in the loss of major employers within the borough and/or impacts on particular sectors of the economy. This could result in increasing levels of unemployment and higher levels of deprivation and inequality. Economic uncertainty is likely to depress economic growth. Impact of rising inflation on the cost of living and consumer confidence. Low business confidence impacting on investment decisions inc. business lettings. Changes of this nature have potential implications for the council in terms of increased demand for services and adverse financial impact. There is also a reputational risk if the council is not seen to be adequately responding to economic changes or supporting residents.	9	High	↔	Partnership working with other organisations on support for the economy and local businesses. Engagement with businesses and business networks. Maintaining an understanding of local economic conditions – tracking economic indicators at a local level. Ensuring that key issues/ events are escalated to SLT at the appropriate time. Close working with business rates team on hardship and growth incentive reliefs to retain businesses and secure investment.	6	Medium	↓	Inclusive 1-1 business advice and support SeedL - training hub Signpost business support via dedicated business support channels.	6	Medium	↔
Demographic change	Karen Edwards	ST	Changes in Rushmoor's demography could impact on services required or expected by residents as well as how they engage with the economy or society more generally. Any sudden shifts in demography may not be visible to the Council for a period of time which could result in services not being delivered effectively or efficiently and could impact on the Council's ability to deliver its aim of having strong communities who are proud of their area. A strong understanding of the area's demography will also be important as devolution and reorganisation proposals are developed.	6	Medium	↔	Community engagement work may identify some changes ahead of them being reported in data sets. Review and analyse publicly available datasets, alongside those held by the Council. Work with partners to understand trends that exist at a larger geography and potential implications (e.g. aging populations). Census information reviewed and shared widely across the Council and with partners so that trends and their implications are understood. Rushmoor Together Plan to cabinet for approval in July	4	Medium	↔	Additional community engagement work planned in 2025/26 which might help to identify any key trends. The Belong Network commissioned to deliver further engagement with a view to adopting a new approach to be delivered from November 25	2	Low	↔

Standing Corporate Risks (SC) - Total 12 (-1) 1 Not suitable for Public Register/Removed, 3 Redacted

Threat of Cybercrime & Data Loss	Peter Vickers	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	16	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔
Major Data Breach – non-technical (human and physical)	Peter Vickers	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	8	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	6	Medium	↔
Insufficient funding to proceed with projects	Karen Edwards	SC	The Council cannot commit to fund the programme of projects, within the regeneration and property programme. Failure to deliver the schemes as a result of a lack of funding and team resources will not meet the overarching strategy objective as stated in the Council Business Plan to deliver additional income or capital and regenerate our town centres. The recent increases in interest rates makes affordability of funding more challenging. In addition, build costs remain high and there are little to no incentives in the buyer's market e.g. help to buy to generate interest in development.	16	High	↔	Secured some external grant funding to assist with bridging funding gaps. A Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) has been developed to ensure that the Council can be on a sustainable footing over the medium term. A target for capital receipts has been established to assist with reducing the level of external borrowing and associated revenue implications. There will need to be sufficient headroom created to allow for further borrowing in the absence of external grant funding.	12	High	↔	Seek additional grant funding to mitigate the risk to the Council. Obtain detailed expert advice and carry out due diligence on major projects and capital commitments. Consider joint ventures and other methods of delivery in order to share the risk/reward. Continue to review financial position in order to determine capacity to support regeneration and property projects. Review opportunities for receipts in the context of income received from these assets. Expedite actions to enable disposal of identified assets. Work with members to establish priorities for commitment of available funding against regeneration programme Consider the further prioritisation, slowing and reprofiling of the programme.	4	Medium	↔
Lack of employee alignment, engagement and development will reduce organisational performance	Belinda Tam	SC	A high performing organisation requires employees to be engaged, aligned and developed – significant risk of performance targets not being achieved if these areas are not developed. Increased risk of inability to recruit and retain. Due to the age profile there is a risk of losing knowledge and experience in coming years.	12	High	↔	Developmental activities: •Annual Development Reviews May-Aug, with learning needs feeding into the corporate Learning and Development plan, and individual service L&D needs/CPD identified •eLearning platform for compliance and self-developmental training, with reminders when training due •Bespoke leadership development & leadership development with partners, ongoing internal communications via Staff Live, Viva Engage, People Portal, email, team meetings, 121s •Regular and ongoing engagement activities e.g. around savings/transformation and other priority areas. Regular review of people engagement opportunities and attract, recruit and retention policies.	12	High	↔	Review development review process and leadership development in 2025. Increased people engagement initiatives and learning and development conversations and opportunities.	4	Medium	↔
Financial Sustainability	Peter Vickers	SC	Cost of borrowing does not track within the assumptions built into the MTFS. Resulting in additional unplanned financial pressure that will require additional mitigation to be identified.	12	High	↔	MTFS planning process identifies strategy to manage the impact of such an occurrence built into future spending plans. Updates to keep February 2024 approved MTFS have been reported to July Full Council with an update on the action plan to bring costs back to a sustainable level, including use of reserves. A mid-year review of MTFS was brought to Cabinet in November. Financial Recovery Plan has been put in place as per October 2024. MTFS has been updated as at February 2025 alongside budget. Savings of £1m for 2025/26 have been identified and due to be presented to Cabinet in July. CIPFA have provided an independent review and due diligence on the capacity for the Council to deliver the required actions. Key findings are the actions taken by the Council are sound and further governance adjustments have been recommended for adoption.	12	High	↔	Update to MTFS as agreed in February 2025 to be presented in September 2025. If additional mitigation strategy is required, permissions will be sought through committees as appropriate.	6	Medium	↔

Civic Quarter, Farnborough - Major Project	Karen Edwards	SC	High levels of public and political interest in scheme. Lack of deliverable / viable masterplan proposal in current economic context. Publicly, politically and financially RBC's regeneration intervention is deemed a failure negatively impacting the Council.	12	High	↔	Regular Cabinet and Member reporting. Outline Planning application approved (subject to s106) in February 2023. OPE funding of £1.75m secured to assist with early enabling works - demolition/utilities diversions. No commitment to further expenditure at this stage. Exploring the potential to dispose of land interests to Homes England. Leisure Centre phase being progressed through detailed design utilising Levelling Up funding from MHCLG.	12	High	↔	Programme / scheme viability to be reviewed regularly. Seek further external grant funding to reduce RBC exposure - Homes England / One Public Estate Undertake a Strategic Delivery Review of the current masterplan to ensure the Council has a viable development proposal.	4	Medium	↔
Union Yard, Aldershot - Major Project	Karen Edwards	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	4	Medium	↔
Regeneration of town centres does not deliver economic, community and financial benefits - see major projects	Karen Edwards	SC	Attracting the right level of investment to the Borough remains challenging in the current economic environment. High levels of public and political interest in both town centre major projects. Reputation for delivery will be tested. High intensity of resource required across a range of Council teams, with many interdependent parts - leisure, civic, public realm, retail, hotel, highways etc Publicly, politically and financially RBC's regeneration interventions are deemed a failure negatively impacting the Council and the local economy.	9	High	↓	Regeneration strategy / approach currently under review, with existing projects being managed through ELT. Cabinet and Member reporting as required. Limited external grant funding secured for site de-risking in Farnborough. Wider Town Centre Strategy for Farnborough completed and adopted by Cabinet in Summer 2022.	9	High	↓	Options for Civic Quarter and Farnborough Town Centre Regeneration being explored, including working with Homes England and exploring potential partnerships with Housing Assc / local landowner / major funders or market disposal. Undertake a Strategic Delivery Review to ensure a deliverable / viable masterplan. Seek further external grant funding to reduce Council financial exposure - Homes England / One Public Estate etc. In Aldershot, the completion of Union Yard and disposal of housing units means the Council's role is now focused on enabling other significant developments with the responsibility for increasing footfall and vibrancy etc as BAU with town centre management and responsibility for letting vacant units with the Property Service.	6	Medium	↔
Reduced Income from Property Portfolio	Tim Mills	SC	Significant loss of income from the Council's property portfolio arising from a variety of reasons including deteriorating economic conditions, downturn in the property market and changing consumer or business habits. Feed through of reduced retail rents at lease renewal	9	High	↔	Appointment of LSH Investment Management (LSHIM) to asset manage part of the portfolio and support current in-house skill, knowledge and capacity. Prudent budgeting on Meads and Property Budget and early securing of key rents allows room for level of deterioration	9	High	↔	28 point plan to ensure transparency, accuracy and put property management ahead of the curve to be funded through £200K reserves subject to 8/7/25 Cabinet Managing income through payment plans, where necessary. Increased emphasis by the service in managing debts. Working with tenants directly and with LSHIM to identify issues and actions and reporting to CPPAG. Utilisation of asset management system to enable more targeted action. Identifying additional resource to underpin this important source of income by working on options to re-occupy vacant properties and identifying funds for improving the properties for quicker lettings and reducing the rent-free periods. Evaluating opportunities to create additional income to support the Council's financial position and bring forward where possible. This includes repurposing existing assets and adopting an agreed commercial approach to new ground leases. Updating of Asset Management Forecast for MTSF period including ensuring all reviews etc. are undertaken pro-actively and increased focus on debt management. Option to look at reserve funding on income profile, i.e. forecast income and budget income are different. Using reasonable assumptions to achieve a realistic but prudent estimate. To be included in February 2025 Budget report. Increased monthly monitoring on Asset Portfolio between Property and Finance	6	Medium	↔
Climate Change – Failure to deliver ambition for a carbon neutral Council by 2030.	Karen Edwards	SC	Risk of not delivering high profile organisational objective due to insufficient resources or lack of support because of other priorities	9	High	↔	Allocation of UKSPF resource to deliver climate related projects Projects incorporated within Service Business Plans as part of the Review of the Climate Change. Development of Rushmoor Climate Community Group to engage residents in climate and environmental issues. Group is very engaged and well attended. Next meeting in October. Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan refresh agreed March 2025. Climate change EIA in progress. Eco Festival planned for Sept 2025 Actions being reviewed in light of devolution plans and the Councils financial position. Climate Impact Assessments being developed for internal use. Climate Change officer funded until July 2026	6	Medium	↔	On going Discussions with the portfolio holder on ambitions and plans for delivery Reviewing opportunities for funding to support officer costs beyond 2026 Use of £20k UKSPF to support delivery of CC strategy and action plan agreed by Cabinet. Eco Festival delivered September 25 with over 100% more stallholders from 2024.	6	Medium	↔

Governance and Decision Making – Not meeting statutory deadlines. Legal challenge to a high profile, or regeneration related, or high value decision made by the Cabinet, Committees or under delegated powers.	Amanda Bancroft	SC	Risk of non-compliance with legal requirements. Financial loss from costs of defending, or costs of halting development works. Reputational risk. Risk of delay in delivering key organisational objectives.	9	High	↔	Governance Group meets weekly to consider more complex decision-making matters including Interests and Member engagement. Delegated decision making is monitored by the Governance Group. Strengthening of the governance arrangements with improvements to understanding, learning and development for Members on the CGAS committee - ongoing training programme refreshed annually. Members receive initial induction training by end of July in each civic year. Independent Person recruited as a member of CGAS, offering independent oversight, particularly from an audit perspective. Constitution kept under review in liaison with a subgroup of CGAS (the Constitution working group). Training on decision making provided to CMT/Service Managers. There is a guidance note for Executive Decision Making. Timetables and reminders for deadlines provided by meeting administrators. Senior Managers deliver Corporate Induction on Constitution for staff. Governance arrangements reviewed during CIPFA and Peer Review Q2 2024/25. Independent review of arrangements commissioned early Q3 2024/25 from the Centre for Governance & Scrutiny, final draft received, workshop held with members and now being formally considered with Constitution working group. Further member engagement planned during spring 2025 with changes adopted to be effective from civic year 2025/26.	6	Medium	↔	Continue to integrate risk management in corporate governance arrangements - continual improvement. Review of Risk Management Policy and arrangements took place during Q3 2024/25, including exploration of a Risk Appetite Policy. Work to create a risk appetite policy expected to conclude during Q2 2025/26. Ensure horizon scanning continues within sector. Noted continued relevance/importance in light of ongoing s114 activity in Local Government and White Paper on Devolution.	6	Medium	↔
Escalated Service Risks (ES) - Total 6 (-1) 2 Redacted														
Major Planning Appeal (Airport)	Tim Mills	ES	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔
UKSPF Programme - end of funding	Karen Edwards	ES	The Spending Review 2025 announced that an investment in up to 350 deprived communities in the UK. This seems to be in place of the UKSPF. None of the top 350 areas of high deprivation are in the borough. This means it is likely the Council will receive no UKSPF grant next year. Community, Economic Development, Town Centre, Housing, and Pride in Place grants, events and activities may have to be significantly scaled back or stopped if alternative funding sources cannot be found.	16	High	↔	Funding allocations avoid long term commitments Temporary use to cover existing budgets Investment approach that prioritises 'seed' funding of initiatives that won't require long term financial support to continue.	8	High	↔	Policy team to monitor government announcements for further funding information. Services that currently use UKSPF grant to prepare transition/mitigation activity	6	Medium	↔
Failure to reprovide temporary accommodation	Tim Mills	ES	Failure to reprovide temporary accommodation leads to increased street homelessness with significant impact on Town Centres, much poorer outcomes for homeless people, increased costs for the Council through use of Bed and Breakfast and reputational damage due to impacts on individuals and towns. The economic climate causes increased demand and potential losses of landlords. North Lane Lodge has now been re provided and the council now needs to prioritise the re provision of Clayton Court by the end of 2025. In addition to the lease ending, the building is of poor quality. We also now have the challenge of other boroughs securing good quality temp in the borough therefore reputational risk of RBC not providing to meet its own demand in good quality accommodation.	12	High	↔	Temporary Accommodation project seeking to identify, purchase and repurpose accommodation to replace Clayton Court by end 2025	9	High	↔	Review of previous options and potential ways forward with Cabinet Oct 24 had agreement on approach and potential opportunities. April 25 Cabinet Report sets out way forward together with extension to Clayton removes some risk. Engagement with HCC on Grosvenor Rd to understand ongoing costs to them from closure and potential to retain or find alternative solution are critical and this closure now presents greatest risk to RBC. Identification of potential way forward has reduced risk but remains until agreement secured	4	Medium	↔
Resettlement schemes and asylum seeker accommodation in the borough	Karen Edwards	ES	Resettlement of refugees and accommodation of asylum seekers in the borough may result in reduced levels of community cohesion and increased service demand including housing and other local public services. Homes for Ukraine Thank you payments to host families is ending. This may lead to local hosts not being able to continue support which will mean an increase in people being made homeless. These people may be destitute and have complex needs. The associated funding position is complex, uncertain, and may not meet demand. The associated funding position is complex, uncertain, and may not meet demand. Changes can happen swiftly and may cause short term pressure on resources.	12	High	↔	All Member briefing on 3rd Sept with Police to discuss issues and Council processes. Cohesion and integration officer in post from Sept. Continued work with Belong to develop community engagement events across the borough. Community conversations being planned for November - focusing on community meetings about how to improve local places.	12	High	↔	Reactive and proactive communications with public and local residents. Community Engagement/Rushmoor Voices pages on the website established provide more information and increased transparency on schemes the Council is involved in. Belong report and recommendations also added to the website. Belong commissioned to deliver further work for 6-9 months until early 2026. Community events being developed with Belong to facilitate. RBC need to consider options to support H4U families who are no longer supported by Host families. This may include providing support to Ukraine families moving to private rented accommodation. Options being developed. Thank you Event to thank hosts being planned for December 2025	4	Medium	↔
Inaccurate reporting of financial position	Peter Vickers	ES	Financial reports to Cabinet provide inaccurate financial information leading to poor decision making. Budget holders unaware of budget and spend position Decisions are made on incorrect assumptions. Decisions are taken on an ad-hoc basis without understanding or consideration of wider financial position.	8	High	↔	Budget management process is now completed monthly by services supported by service accountants. A new budget management finance system module has been implemented to support the process. Training and support provided to all budget managers. Financial forecast is reviewed by Head of Finance prior to publication. Business Partnering training provided to finance team to develop skills and awareness.	6	Medium	↔	Finance team capacity and skills are currently under review. Prioritisation of financial management focus based upon risk assessment and materiality of numbers i.e. focus on high value aspects and most likely to go off track. Clarity and transparency of reporting being improved. Integrity of forecasts being reviewed ensuring correlation to assumptions in the budget, history of variances and experience in the current external environment. Further service manager training to ensure skills or organisation support financial management.	4	Medium	↔
Rushmoor Development Partnership	Karen Edwards	ES	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	6	Medium	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	1	Low	↔

Rushmoor Borough Council Corporate Risk Management Policy and Procedures v3.0 25/11/25

Table of Contents	Page
Section 1: Introduction and Overview	2
Section 2: Policy and Management Approach	3
Section 3: Operational Procedures	6
Appendix 1: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite by Theme	16
Appendix 2: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite Policy Statement	19

Section 1: Introduction and Overview

1.1 Overview

This document describes the Council's policy and procedures for the assessment and management of corporate risk.

Section 2 sets out the policy and management approach. Section 3 sets out the operational procedures used to manage risk.

1.2 What is Risk

There are many definitions of risk and risk management. In the context of this document it considers the effect of uncertainty on the delivery of the Council's objectives. Risk can be further defined as the combination of the probability of an adverse event occurring and its potential consequences. It is used to define a matter/incident/potential issue that may prevent the Council from meeting its core objectives or that may result in the critical failure of all or part of the Council or its functions.

Risk can also present as an opportunity for benefit as well as threat to success. The objective of risk management will not always be to eliminate risk. For example the Council may seek out risk in order to receive benefit e.g. investment in the development of a digital application in order to seek future service efficiency.

1.3 Why does the Council need to formally manage risk

The Council's employees manage risk every day without describing it as 'risk management'. Employees consider what might go wrong and take steps to reduce the likelihood or impact if it does. However, the Council cannot rely entirely on informal processes. As a public body, the Council must provide assurance to elected members and the public that it is recognising and managing risk effectively.

1.4 Responsibilities for managing risk within the Council

Everyone at the Council is responsible to some degree in the management of risk in their day-to-day activities, from front line staff to Service Managers, Heads of Service (HoS), Directors and the Head of the Paid Service.

Significant risks must be formally identified, assessed and appropriately managed in order to mitigate their likelihood and/or their adverse impacts. This could be on the continued operation of the Council, compliance with legal obligations or achieving strategic objectives.

The responsibility to ensure that the Council's risk management process is effective lies with the Head of Paid Service, Senior Leadership and elected members. The responsibility to manage this process is delegated to the Senior Risk Officer (SRO) (Currently the Executive Director), with day-to-day management provided by the Service Manager for Risk, Performance and Procurement (referred to as the risk manager in this document – RM).

Section 2: Policy and Management Approach

2.1 Summary of Approach

Senior employees with overall managerial responsibility for the majority of risks, are referred to in this process as 'risk owners' (Predominantly members of the Senior Leadership Team - SLT). They act a single point of contact responsible for taking the lead in ensuring that risks and any mitigations are managed appropriately, including compliance with this policy.

The Council oversees the management of risk collaboratively through the work of SLT and all significant risks are periodically reviewed by them. The determination as to whether a risk is deemed 'significant' is set out later in this policy using a common risk management procedure, to ensure consistency in approach.

The Council will record and assess its work to manage risk through the use of risk registers, held centrally in digital format. These are split into individual Service Risk Registers (SRR) with a single central Corporate Risk Register (CRR) that highlights the most significant risks. Corporate risks are categorised as 'strategic (ST)', 'standing corporate (SC)' or 'escalated service (ES)'.

These risk registers are not intended to be used as a means of recording and managing **all** risk to the Council, or the management of its day-to-day business activities, but to summarise and record the mitigations in place for its significant risks to ensure that they are being effectively managed.

Given its nature, the risk management process will provide a regular periodic snapshot of the current level of risk to the Council in each case and any additional mitigation planned for those risks.

The Council will ensure that its arrangements follow the general principles of good practice as laid out by risk industry guidance, such as the Orange Book published by the UK Government.

The risk management process is cyclical, running on an annual cycle linked to the business planning process and preparation of the Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

2.2 Leadership and Management

The risk management process is overseen by the Senior Risk Officer (SRO). The day-to-day management and maintenance of the risk management system is the responsibility of the RM. To ensure that the RM role itself does not become a single point of failure, the SRO and the RM will ensure that the process can be temporarily administered by other Officers in the RM's absence, with an appropriate level of training, understanding and security access to deliver this function.

Risk owners are responsible for the management of risks and the maintenance of associated processes such as Service Risk Registers. Service Managers may however be delegated the role of 'risk manager', with the responsibility of managing risks and updating registers.

Risk will be considered by SLT every quarter to ensure collective oversight is given to risk at a senior level on a regular basis. The purpose of this collective oversight is to;

- Ensure consistency of approach
- Review risk levels and ensure all significant risks are included in the appropriate register
- Ensure the risk levels are in line with the Council's overall risk appetite
- Assist the identification of interdependencies between risks
- Maintain momentum on progress in relation to risk mitigation and resolution of issues arising from risks being realised

2.3 Training & Guidance

The RM and risk officers will be appropriately experienced and provided with information, instruction/training and guidance to ensure that they are able to effectively fulfil their roles.

Appropriate training, guidance and advice will be provided to all staff that routinely carry out risk management activities in line with this policy, including HoS and Service Managers. All staff requiring training will be identified to the RM by the relevant HoS/Member of SLT.

Training will be undertaken approximately every two years, and on any significant change to the policy or risk register template(s)/methodology, or upon the identification of any significant concerns in competence.

An overview of risk management is provided to all new starters to the Council during their induction.

In addition, the RM will provide advice, support and guidance on the Council's risk management process to any employees and contractors on request.

2.4 Documentation

The Council's risk registers are held centrally in digital format. Currently MS lists located on Sharepoint.

HoS will be responsible for ensuring that their Service Risk Register is updated at least monthly and that risk is a standing agenda item on their service meetings. New risks should be added to the appropriate risk register as soon as they are identified.

2.5 Governance

2.5.1 Senior Leadership Team (SLT)

The Senior Risk Officer (SRO) will ensure risk is reported to SLT at least every 3 months using the CRR to ensure SLT remain aware of the key risks to the Council and the measures being put in place. The risk owners may be required to present their risk entries to SLT for wider discussion.

Minutes and actions arising from the quarterly SLT consideration will be circulated and stored for future reference.

2.5.2 Elected Members

It is the responsibility of Elected members to maintain oversight on the management processes in place at the Council and to ensure that the risk treatment plan for each risk in the CRR is effective.

Risk Management is a function of the Council's Audit and Governance Committee (AGC) and will also be reported to the Executive members via Cabinet as follows.

- Cabinet – quarterly through the quarterly performance report
- AGC – annually, to provide independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework, arrangements and the associated control environment

Section 3 Operational Procedures

3.1 Risk Identification

Risks will be identified by a number of methods, for example (but not limited to):

3.1.1 Strategic and Corporate Level

Strategic analysis tools can be used to identify and analyse the current status and position of an organisation and the environment in which it operates. Tools such as this are used to provide a context for the organisation's role in relation to the external environment and the impact of external issues.

As the Corporate Risk Register and Service Risk registers are updated quarterly and identify the most important risks to the Council they will be used strategically in the overall corporate planning process for the Council. To facilitate this the Council's Performance Management and Policy teams will have full access to all Service Risk Registers and the Corporate Risk Register.

3.1.2 Service Level

Heads of Service will identify any significant risks to their service during the business planning process, including ongoing matters and new and emerging threats foreseen for the year ahead.

3.1.3 Audit

Risk identification and analysis work takes place routinely within the Councils' Internal Audit team. Any new/emerging or increased risks will be brought to the attention of the appropriate risk owner and the SRO/RM. Where appropriate, these risks/updates must be included in the Service risk register by the risk owner.

Audit will routinely share reports that highlight or assess the management of risk in the Organisation in order that any gaps or inaccuracies are identified and resolved – in conjunction with the risk owner.

The Council's Audit team will have full access to all Service risk registers and the Corporate risk register.

3.1.4 Horizon Scanning

Service Managers, HoS and SLT should routinely be horizon scanning to identify future risks.

In addition, the RM will ensure that industry publications and other sources of best practice guidance are periodically reviewed, to identify any new and emerging risks that may affect the Council.

Such publications/sources of information will include:

- Allianz Risk Barometer: Top Business Risks (annual)
- Hampshire County Council: Community Risk Register
- Cabinet Office: National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies
- World Economic Forum: The Global Risks Report (annual)
- Government and public body publications
- Third party journals and publications
- ALARM risk association membership – conferences and publications.

The Council's Policy Team will routinely monitor Government publications and other sources of information in order to identify new and emerging risks as early as possible.

3.1.5 New and Emerging Risks

New and emerging risks will be identified via a number of routes. It is important to recognise not all risks can be predicted and some may be identified during the day-to-day operation of Services, where new (and sometimes unexpected) risks can arise/become apparent during the course of the Council's work or arise in the community or as a result of unexpected events (e.g. recent riots). Once identified, risks must be documented and mitigated where possible, shared and incorporated into the Council's risk management processes.

In order to both highlight and seek awareness of new and emerging risks, the RM will also be a standing member of the Corporate Governance Group.

3.1.6 Capturing Opportunities Identified

During the process of risk identification and horizon scanning, opportunities may also be identified, such as those to apply for funding or grants. Opportunities and threats can also arise when there are local/national policy changes and associated consultations. These are also tracked by the wider Policy team.

In general terms, opportunities will be recorded and tracked on the Council's Policy & Funding tracker, administered by the Policy team. Threats will predominately be recorded through the risk register process described in this policy. It is recognised that there may be some crossover in this process, where for instance there are risks to the Council associated with pursuing an opportunity. Any duplication will be minimised by the Policy team and RM to ensure end users are clear as to what is required of them and that they are not unnecessarily burdened.

Once an opportunity has been identified by the Policy team and added to the tracker, the appropriate Service(s) will be notified. The decision then as to whether to take any action lies with the Service(s), including keeping the tracker up to date.

3.2 Strategic Risk Appetite

The Council has developed a corporate risk appetite at a strategic level. Its purpose is to ensure that the priorities of the Council and appetite towards risk taking is agreed at a Senior level across officers and elected members and appropriately considered when making decisions and throughout the risk management process. Those responsible for strategic direction/policy setting at The Council will be responsible for deciding the risk appetite, including SLT, Cabinet and AGC.

Defining a Corporate risk appetite at a strategic level, whilst ensuring it remains applicable to all activities of the Council, can be complex. Whilst some Services are actively engaging in higher risk activities for reward or the delivery of innovation, others main role is to undertake services where risk needs to be minimised.

The development and revision of the risk appetite is carried out using a collaborative approach (such as a workshop), including members of SLT, Cabinet and other key Elected Members (e.g. the Chairs of AGC and PPAB). The strategic risk appetite is included as an Appendix to this policy. It will be reviewed at least every two years, or whenever the strategic priorities of the Council are updated.

The Council will need to take measured risks to achieve the priority objectives included in the Council Delivery Plan. There will likely be opportunities for the Council to be innovative or work differently and any identified risks will need to be considered against the anticipated cost and efficiency benefits. However, accepting a higher level of risk in one area of business does not mean the Council has a 'high' appetite for risk overall.

To set the appetite towards risk at a more granular level, and to allow each risk to be considered in its own right, risk appetite will be considered over a number of themes or areas. These will evolve over time and those used in the development of the 2025 risk appetite are recorded in Appendix 1, Part 1.

There will be some common themes in the Council's acceptance of risk. These will vary over time, but it is implicit in the role of SLT and risk owners to recognise and apply them. An example is the Council's financial position. If the Council is in a position where savings must be made – the appetite for any risk where there will be significant costs outside of agreed budgets may be very low. It is expected that this form of cross-cutting broader attitude towards risk will be captured within a single risk appetite policy statement, Appendix 1, Part 2.

The council's risk appetite should be considered in conjunction with the risk section of all committee reports when decisions are made. At a line-by-line risk level, application of the strategic risk appetite will be demonstrated and recorded where appropriate by:

- Services discussing the effect of the strategic risk appetite and line by line target risk with their Portfolio holders for every corporate risk register entry, when first added and when there is a significant change in risk score.
- Discussing the risk appetite (risk gap) for each new risk added to the CRR, at SLT during each risk cycle, to reach a consensus amongst Officers in order to make a recommendation to Cabinet and for these decisions to be recorded in the minutes.
- For existing risks, using any significant increase in the risk gap (the gap between residual and target risk scores) as an indicator of a significant change – discussing and reviewing the position on the risk appetite for that risk at SLT – and again to reach a consensus amongst Officers in order to make a recommendation to Cabinet.
- To recommend to Cabinet during each risk cycle, via the Cabinet report – that they discuss the risk appetite for those risks highlighted above and reach a consensus on the risk appetite for each line item.

3.3 Risk Assessment Methodology

3.3.1 Rating & Categorisation

Each risk managed by this process will be assessed and given a risk category based upon the probability of the risk arising and the impact on the Council if it does arise. The same method of rating/scoring will be used throughout.

A traffic light indicator / RAG rating is used to show the risk category. A Corporate risk matrix, maintained and updated by the RM, is provided to assess the probability and impact of risks. This is provided later within this document.

The process for assessment of the risk for each register entry is as follows:

- **Inherent Risk**

This assessment takes place at the very beginning of the process, it does not take into account any mitigation currently in place or planned in the future. The purpose is to initially assess the significance of the risk to the Council. This risk score is not expected to routinely change unless the risk itself fundamentally changes.

If at this stage risks are assessed as being low and therefore not of significance from a Corporate perspective, Services may still wish to record and monitor them within their Service registers, but it is very unlikely to be appropriate for inclusion in the Corporate Risk Register.

- **Residual Risk**

This assessment takes place once the current mitigation(s) have been identified and recorded. It is an assessment of the current risk to the Council when taking into account any action already taken. It does not take into account the expected effect of any future mitigations planned.

This risk score is likely to change regularly as future mitigation(s) are completed/established and the effects can be assessed.

- **Target Risk**

This assessment of risk is based upon the position that the Council aspires to achieve against each risk. It effectively determines the goal that the Council has for the risk – and so also determines whether the mitigations in place and planned are adequate.

The application of a target risk score is one method by which the Council assesses its risk appetite for each specific risk entry, whereby a decision must be taken as to whether the current level of risk is acceptable.

The Council's strategic risk appetite policy must be considered when setting the target risk to ensure that it is consistent with the strategic approach.

The 'risk gap' between the residual and the target risk are a clear measure of the Council's success or otherwise in the management of its risks to an acceptable level.

Given the breadth of duties and roles that the Council holds, it is foreseeable that some target risks will be higher than others – and that in some cases the target risk will not and will never be low.

Although Council's have historically been seen as being predominantly risk averse given their responsibility for the appropriate spending of public funds, some risks may be accepted with appropriate controls in place.

4. Risk Matrix & RAG (Red/Amber/Green) Rating

The matrix to be used for the assessment of all risks is as follows. The rating consistency guidance accompanying it will have regard to the corporate risk appetite policy and wherever possible use examples sourced from the themes.

Severity of Outcome (S)	4					High Risk		Strongly consider further mitigation, tolerating risk is unlikely to be acceptable
	3							Tolerable if risk/exposure is acceptable at senior level
	2							Additional action may not be necessary to manage risk
	1							
		1	2	3	4			
Likelihood of Occurrence (L)								

Rating Consistency Guidance

	Likelihood of Occurrence (L)	Severity of Outcome (S)
1	Very unlikely Very unlikely to occur, (no history or near misses etc). Less than 5% probability.	Minor Risk to specific role. Legal action unlikely. No significant illness or injury. Negative customer complaint possible. Financial impact negligible. No significant risk to matters highlighted in risk appetite statement.
2	Unlikely Unlikely but may occur (may have happened, but not within past 5 years). Is not expected to happen in next 5 years, less than 25% probability	Moderate May be a risk to normal continuation of service. Legal action possible but defendable. Short term absence/minor injury. Negative customer complaints widespread. Financial impact manageable within existing Service budget. Possibility of impact against matter(s) in risk appetite statement but may be mitigated.
3	Likely Likely to occur (or already happened in the past 2 to 5 years). Is expected to happen in the next 2 to 5 years, 25 - 50% probability	Significant Partial loss of service. Legal action likely and may not be fully confident in defense. Extensive injuries or sickness. Negative local publicity. Significant fine. Financial impact manageable within existing Corporate budget - but not Service. One or more matter within risk appetite statement likely to be significantly impacted.
4	Very likely Very likely to occur (or has already happened in the past year), may occur frequently. Is expected to happen in the next year, more than 50% probability	Major Total loss of a service. Legal action likely & difficult to defend. Death or life threatening. Negative regional or National publicity. Imprisonment. Financial impact not manageable within existing funds. Risk appetite statement will not be adhered to.

5. Risk Control / Mitigation Methods

There are various options for controlling risk, often referred to as the four Ts:

- **Tolerate (retain/accept the risk)** – if the Council cannot reduce a risk (or if doing so is out of proportion to the risk) it can tolerate the risk, i.e. do nothing further to reduce the risk. This option must be taken by informed decision only. It is clear that this option will be more likely in the event of taking risk in order to seek benefit/opportunity.
- **Treat (mitigate the risk)** – if the Council can reduce the risk by identifying mitigating actions and implementing them, it should do so. For many of the risks on the corporate risk register this is the action the Council is most likely to take.
- **Transfer (share the risk)** – risks can be transferred to or shared with other organisations, in whole or in part, for example by use of insurance, shared services with other Authorities or by contracting out an area of work. There will almost always be limitations in this method, it is unlikely to be 100% effective. It is also likely that some risk will be retained, for example to reputation.
- **Terminate (eliminate the risk – stop the work/activity)** – this applies to risks the Council cannot mitigate other than by not doing work in that specific area. For example, if a particular project is very high risk and these risks cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level, particularly with regard to the Corporate risk appetite, the Council may decide to terminate it entirely.

6. Risk Types & Records

6.1 Service Risks

In order to ensure that key risks are identified, assessed, managed appropriately and recorded consistently a risk register will be updated and maintained by every service. These are known as Service Risk Registers (SRR) and will record all significant Service risks.

All SRRs must be reviewed and updated at least monthly by the risk owner or their delegated Service Managers/Risk Managers.

The RM will provide each Service with an appropriate template for carrying out and recording their risk assessments. This will include an appropriate method of version control and the ability to archive risks that are no longer current.

6.2 Service Risk Registers (SRR)

These will contain all significant risks to a service that are key to the organisation in terms of the potential severity of the outcome. It is not the intention to use the SRRs as a means of managing day-to-day work of a service.

It is the responsibility of each HoS to maintain its own SRR and review/update it whenever there is a significant change in circumstances, or at least monthly in their Service meetings.

The SRRs will include a method by which HoS can identify risks to be included in the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) as Strategic, Standing Corporate or Escalated Service risks. These will be identified by virtue of the potential risks to the Council as a whole, or their Council-wide crosscutting nature. They are further described below.

HoS will be expected to have regular update meetings with their respective Portfolio holders, using their risk registers to keep the Portfolio holder aware of the current status of the risks within their service. This update must take place at least quarterly.

Those risks identified as being officially sensitive in nature will be marked to ensure that they can be easily redacted/removed from any publicly available copy of the register.

Services must use the risk register format/template provided by the RM.

6.3 Capital Project Risks & Other Significant Interests

Capital projects, such as large-scale regeneration projects, will be treated in a similar manner to Services. Each Project team will hold and maintain a project risk register and manage the day-to-day risks within their teams. The Project Sponsor will be responsible for ensuring that risk register is reviewed on a regular basis.

SLT receive regular project highlight reports for all significant projects including key project risks

Where the Council is a significant stakeholder in other organisations such as Rushmoor Housing Limited, the Senior Officer of the Council involved in those arrangements will ensure that the risk management processes in place align with this policy, protect the interests of the Council, and that significant risks are appropriately escalated to the CRR.

6.4 Corporate Risks

These are risks that have greater significance for the Council as a whole.

These can be further categorised as being 'Escalated Service risks (ES)', 'Standing Corporate risks (SC)' or 'Strategic Risks (SR)'.

6.5 Escalated Service (ES) risks are likely to be those that by virtue of the severity of the potential outcome and/or inadequate controls may be considered a single point of failure for the Council, rather than a threat to a single Service alone. It could also include those risks that are newly identified and have little or no mitigation or controls in place, that require wider consideration and support.

These risks will tend to be operational in nature and arise, be resolved/adequately mitigated and then removed from the CRR.

There are a number of tests that can be applied in order to determine whether a Service risk should be escalated but given their nature and to ensure consistency of approach, it may be appropriate to discuss these risks with the RM before escalating them. The application of a high-risk rating is not a reason in its own right to escalate a risk. It would also be inappropriate to escalate a risk in order to simply raise awareness with other Services, Senior Management or Elected Members. Other methods of reporting/communication should be considered if this is the main aim of the risk owner.

The Service should consider whether oversight/discussion is required at SLT or if the risk can be wholly managed within the Service itself. If no Corporate oversight/intervention, etc., is required, it is not expected that they will be escalated.

6.6 Standing Corporate (SC) risks may also be considered a single point of failure for the Council, and in most cases, although the Corporate response may be managed by a single Service, they will be cross cutting and longer term in nature. SC risks will tend to remain on the CRR for longer periods of time, if not indefinitely. Examples of these may be the Council's financial position or compliance with data-protection legislation, both of which have a wide impact and involvement from across the Council but are generally overseen or managed by one service.

SC risks, impacting more than one Service, will normally be managed by a single Service with the expertise required, but, if not, they will be assigned to one single risk owner as the lead. This is for practical purposes to avoid duplication and ensure that they are managed overall by a single Officer. Although the day-to-day management of the risk itself may not fall entirely upon that risk owner, they will be responsible for collating and updating SLT and the risk register entry on behalf of the Council.

6.7 Strategic (ST) Risks

Strategic risks will tend to be long term in nature and are more likely to be outside the direct control of the Council, for example the local economy, employment or obesity levels.

As they are longer term in nature, the ST risks will be updated at least every 3 months in order that they can be presented to SLT.

6.8 Corporate Risk Register (CRR)


This register contains the key risks to the Council that are considered to be current issues of corporate significance. This will be made up of all of the current Council's ST, SC and ES risks identified.

With the assistance of HoS, the CRR will be updated by the RM every 3 months in order that it can be presented to SLT by the SRO for review and discussion.

Those risks identified as being officially sensitive/not suitable for the public register will be marked to ensure that they can be easily redacted or removed from any publicly available copy of the register. This will be the responsibility of the risk owner during the assessment process.

An appropriate method of version control will be kept by the RM to ensure that the most up to date register is in use but that older versions of the register remain accessible.

7. Diagram: Rushmoor Borough Council Risk Management Process



8. Issue Identification and Management


An issue in the context of this policy, is a problem or a negative event that has already occurred, is certain to occur, or is a risk that has or has a high probability of materialising.

Inevitably there will be occasion when despite all the mitigation put in place, a risk previously identified will develop into an issue. It is also possible that an issue will arise that had not been previously identified as a risk.

In any case, issues of Corporate significance must be identified, brought to the attention of senior management and/or SLT and managed appropriately, with records kept centrally of the action taken to resolve them or mitigate the impacts.

All issues requiring Senior Corporate oversight will feed into the Corporate Action, Issue & Decision (AID) Tracker for onward management. This issue log will be held and managed by the Corporate Policy Team. The risk register (if applicable) must then be updated as appropriate – following the guidelines below.

Diagram: Issue Management Process



*Consider significance of:

- Public opinion / social impact
- Political outfall
- Budgetary impact
- Service impact
- Negative publicity/ reputational damage
- Environmental impact
- Legal challenge, dispute or enforcement

Appendix 1: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite by Theme

Risk appetite level & definition					
	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager
Governance <i>The way that Rushmoor is managed at the highest level, and the systems for managing/overseeing this.</i>	Averse - Avoid actions with associated risk. No decisions are taken outside of processes and oversight / monitoring arrangements.	Minimal - Willing to consider low risk actions which support delivery of priorities and objectives. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable limited risk taking.	Cautious - Willing to consider actions where benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable cautious risk taking.	Open - Receptive to taking difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable considered risk taking.	Eager - Ready to take difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements support informed risk taking.
Strategy <i>The approach and plans agreed for achieving the Council's priorities.</i>	Averse - Guiding principles or rules in place that limit risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Minimal - Guiding principles or rules in place that minimise risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Cautious - Guiding principles or rules in place that allow considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Open - Guiding principles or rules in place that are receptive to considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Eager - Guiding principles or rules in place that welcome considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.
Operational Service Delivery <i>How we provide services to our customers and residents.</i>	Averse - Defensive approach to operational delivery - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate.	Minimal – Change and innovations largely avoided unless essential. Decision making authority held by senior management	Cautious - Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided change minimised unless necessary. Decision making authority generally held by senior management.	Open – Change and Innovation supported, with clear demonstration of benefit / improvement in management control. Responsibility for non-critical decisions may be devolved.	Eager - Innovation pursued – desire to ‘break the mould’ and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority.
Legal <i>Our general compliance, legal and statutory duties (including matters such as health & safety).</i>	Averse - Play safe and avoid decisions or actions which could be challenged, even unsuccessfully.	Minimal - Want to be very sure we would win any challenge to decisions or actions we take.	Cautious - Want to be reasonably sure we would win any challenge to decisions or actions we take.	Open - Challenge will be problematic; we are likely to win, and the gain will outweigh the adverse impact	Eager - Chances of losing challenges are high but exceptional benefits could be realised.

Property <i>The management of and investment in the Council's land and property assets (including commercial properties, operational and community assets and facilities).</i>	Averse - Obligation to comply with strict policies for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money or return.	Minimal - Recommendation to follow strict policies for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money or return.	Cautious - Requirement to adopt a range of agreed solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that is likely to produce good value for money or return.	Open - Consider benefits of agreed solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that would contribute to meeting wider organisational or place objectives.	Eager - Application of higher risk solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that may contribute to meeting wider organisational or place objectives.
Financial <i>Our overall financial position and its management (budgets, income, investments and savings).</i>	Averse - Avoidance of any adverse financial impact	Minimal – Will only take risk essential to existing service delivery - with consideration of the MTFS Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies and ability to maintain a balanced budget. Likely decision level within ELT delegation, up to adverse £20k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Cautious - Seek delivery of Corporate Plan – with consideration of the MTFS Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies and ability to maintain a balanced budget. Likely decision level within Cabinet delegation, up to adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Open - Seek delivery of Corporate Plan – without consideration of a balanced MTFS and contra to existing Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies. Likely decision level with Full Council delegation, over adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Eager - Open to risk without reference to financial capacity. Likely decision level with Full Council delegation, over adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact
People <i>How we treat our staff (autonomy in decision making, investment in training etc).</i>	Averse - Priority to maintain close management control & oversight. Limited devolved authority. Limited flexibility in relation to working practices.	Minimal - Decision making authority held by senior management. Development investment generally in standard practices.	Cautious - Seek safe and standard people policy. Decision making authority generally held by senior management	Open - Prepared to invest in our people to create innovative mix of skills environment. Responsibility for noncritical decisions may be devolved.	Eager - Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority.

Technology <i>The equipment (physical and digital) we use.</i>	Averse - General avoidance of systems / technology developments. Defensive approach to transformational activity - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate.	Minimal - Only essential systems / technology developments to protect current operations. Innovations avoided unless essential.	Cautious - Consideration given to adoption of established / mature systems and technology improvements. Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided unless necessary.	Open - Systems / technology developments considered to enable improved delivery. Innovation supported, with demonstration of commensurate improvements.	Eager - New technologies viewed as a key enabler of operational delivery. Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices.
Data & Info Management <i>How we hold, share, process and store our information and data (physically and digitally).</i>	Averse - Lock down data & information. Access tightly controlled, high levels of monitoring.	Minimal - Minimise level of risk due to potential damage from disclosure.	Cautious - Accept need for operational effectiveness with risk mitigated through careful management limiting distribution.	Open - Accept need for operational effectiveness in distribution and information sharing.	Eager - Level of controls minimised with data and information openly shared
Council Reputation <i>How we are viewed by others (partners, key stakeholders, the public etc).</i>	Averse - Zero appetite for any decisions with high chance of repercussion for organisations' reputation.	Minimal - Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is no chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation	Cautious - Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation.	Open - Appetite to take decisions with potential to expose organisation to additional scrutiny, but only where appropriate steps are taken to minimise exposure.	Eager - Appetite to take decisions which are likely to bring additional Governmental / organisational scrutiny only where potential benefits outweigh risks.
Environment <i>The surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal, or plant lives or operates</i>	Averse – Zero appetite for any decisions/activity with high chance of repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets take full priority.	Minimal – Appetite for risk taking limited to decisions/activity where there is no chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority area in the decision.	Cautious – Appetite for risk taking limited to decisions/activity where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority.	Open – Open to the possible risks to the environment but only where appropriate steps are taken to minimise harm. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered as a priority but balanced with other priorities.	Eager – Prepared to make decisions that will harm the environment but only when the positives will outweigh the environmental negatives. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered but not prioritised.

Appendix 2: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite Policy Statement

This statement supports members and officers in decision making by setting out where Cabinet is comfortable accepting different levels of risk and where risk is unacceptable. The council's current overall risk appetite is defined below (see table below for definitions and statement).

Risk Appetite	Definitions and Summary Statement
Averse	'Prepared to accept only the very lowest levels of risk, with the preference being for ultra-safe delivery options, while recognising that these will have little or no potential for reward/return.'
Minimal	'Willing to accept some low risks, while maintaining an overall preference for safe delivery options despite the probability of these having mostly restricted potential for reward/return.'
Cautious	<p>'Tending always towards exposure to only modest levels of risk in order to achieve acceptable outcomes.'</p> <div> <p>The council's current overall risk appetite in the context of its Delivery Plan and the current economic climate, is defined as cautious, with an openness to risk in some areas where they directly support the pursuit of the Council's priorities and the impacts have been properly explored and understood.</p> <p>The key risks to the Council have been identified as those that would impact successful delivery of its overall strategy, through the Delivery Plan and the Council's financial stability.</p> <p>The Council will seek to deliver its priorities within agreed timescales – but only with due consideration of the MTFS and the Council's ability to maintain a balanced budget.</p> <p>To enable the work to support the Delivery plan in a timely and efficient manner, the Council is more open to risk with regards to governance, operational service delivery, people and autonomy in decision making. The Council is willing to invest resources into innovation, developing skills and devolving non-critical decisions, where it is considered that the expected benefits to the council's operations and delivery will outweigh the negative impacts of the identified risks.</p> <p>Although the Council seeks to use new technology, given the associated risks both reputationally and financially there is a clear preference for the use of established / mature systems and technology and our appetite here is cautious.</p> <p>In terms of property investment and management the Council will take a cautious approach and will generally only support decisions where good value for money or good certainty of a positive return is achieved.</p> <p>A cautious approach will also be taken to protecting the Council's reputation, where the appetite for risk taking is limited to those events where the chance of any significant repercussions has been minimised. This is also the case for the environment, where the appetite for risk taking is limited to decisions/activity where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority.</p> <p>For general matters of compliance, whether that be legal or data management, the Council takes a minimal to cautious approach, seeking a good level of compliance and wanting to be confident of its ability to defend itself against challenge.</p> </div>
Open	'Prepared to consider all delivery options and select those with the highest probability of productive outcomes, even when there are elevated levels of associated risk.'
Eager	'Eager to seek original/creative/pioneering delivery options and to accept the associated substantial risk levels in order to secure successful outcomes and meaningful reward/return.'

**RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS
ANNUAL UPDATE 2025/26**

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This paper updates Members of the Audit and Governance Committee on the ongoing development and maintenance of the Council's risk management processes during 2025/26.

Attached to this report is the current Corporate Risk Management Policy, as presented to Cabinet for approval on 25th November 2025.

AGC Members are asked to note this report and comment on the adequacy of the Council's risk management arrangements, particularly in respect of the key updates made to the risk management policy as highlighted within the report.

1. Background

- 1.1 The role of the Audit and Governance Committee (CGAS) is to *"provide independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework"*. Specifically in relation to risk management, the Constitution states that the AGC should *"monitor the effective development of risk management in the Council"*.
- 1.2 This report provides an update to AGC Members on the risk management activity that has taken place and is planned for the remainder of 2025/26 in line with arrangements set out in the Council's updated Risk Management Policy, which is attached as Appendix A.
- 1.3 As was reported in previous years, 2025 has continued to be a period of significant uncertainty across a broad range of economic, social and political matters. Circumstances such as high interest rates and slow growth in the economy continue to have an impact on the Council's financial position, operations and capital projects. The wider implications for the Council have meant a continued focus on mitigation plans adapting to meet the ongoing challenges presented. Alongside these challenges the commencement of work on LGR and CGR have meant that new risks have arisen.
- 1.4 It is important to recognise the role that the Council's risk management process has played in recognising the potential impacts of the risks the Council faces, and ensuring that the Senior Leadership Team and Cabinet Members are regularly updated. Risks continue to be routinely reviewed and discussed at both a service level and amongst senior management.

- 1.5** The risk management process will continue to play an important role in the Council meeting its key objectives as existing risks continue to develop during 2025/26 and beyond. For context, the most recent public version of the Corporate Risk Register, taken to Cabinet on 25th November 2025, is attached as appendix B.

2.0 Development of Risk Management

- 2.1** The Council has continued its work to embed risk management within the organisation and streamline the processes in place. The MS Lists based system introduced in July 2022 continues to promote efficiency and allows for easy interrogation in a live format at any time by key personnel.
- 2.2** The Council's risk management policy and arrangements continue to be reviewed and developed in order to remain effective and to provide continual improvement.
- 2.3** Work to develop a strategic risk appetite/policy using the facilitation services of an external advisor was concluded during Q2 2025/26. This work took place with SLT, Committee Chairs and Cabinet Members. As a result, the wider risk management policy and arrangements have themselves been reviewed to reflect this and the changes in organisational structure.
- 2.4** The renewed policy was presented to Cabinet on 25th November 2026 for approval and is attached as appendix A. The major updates incorporated are:
- The inclusion of the risk appetite statement/policy – and procedures to ensure each risk is measured against the corporate appetite. The purpose is to ensure mitigation is appropriate and is applied in a consistent way across what is a diverse risk profile.
 - The introduction of and cross reference with an appropriate issue management system, for recognition and management of risks that become issues.
- 2.5** During Q3 work will take place to update the structure/template of the risk registers themselves to reflect the policy changes. An officer briefing programme will then follow this during Q4 to embed the new processes throughout the organisation.
- 2.6** An internal audit of the Council's risk management arrangements by SIAP commenced in October 2025 and is expected to conclude during Q3 2025/26.

3.0 Risk Management Reporting during 2025/26

- 3.1** As set out in the risk management policy, reports on risk have been presented to the Council's Senior Leadership Team on a quarterly basis and presented to Cabinet, incorporated into the quarterly performance report. In addition, risk is discussed with greater frequency outside these meetings, with regular discussions and risk register reviews taking place across projects and programmes.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1** CGAS is asked to note this report which summarises how risk has been managed across the Council in 2025/26.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Appendix A – Risk Management Policy

Appendix B – Corporate Risk Register v21.1

CONTACT DETAILS:

Report Author –

Roger Sanders, Corporate Risk Manager – 01252 398809

roger.sanders@rushmoor.gov.uk

Head of Service –

Karen Edwards, Executive Director

karen.edwards@rushmoor.gov.uk

Rushmoor Borough Council - Corporate Risk Register v21.1 04/11/25 (PUBLIC)

Risk Title	Risk Owner	Risk Type	Risk Description & Potential Outcomes	Inherent Risk Score	Inherent Risk Rating	Inherent Risk Trend	Existing Controls / Mitigation	Residual Risk Score	Residual Risk Rating	Residual Risk Trend	Additional Mitigation Planned	Target Risk Score	Target Risk Rating	Traget Risk Trend
Strategic Risks (ST) - Total 10 (No change)														
Securing infrastructure investment	Karen Edwards	ST	Inability to attract infrastructure investment through the public and private sector to support priorities and projects identified in the Council Business Plan. In particular, failure to secure investment in the area could lead to a decrease in Rushmoor's competitiveness and attractiveness and put at risk the stated aim for a thriving Rushmoor economy, vibrant town centres and strong communities who are proud of the area.	16	High	↔	Work with public and private sector infrastructure providers and funders. Utilising UK Shared Prosperity Fund to assist with public realm improvements in Farnborough town centre. Horizon scanning in relation to the levelling up agenda and its implications for Rushmoor. Horizon scanning by Policy Team for future funding opportunities.	12	High	↔	Explore Regeneration and Growth Partnership arrangement with Hampshire County Council. Engage effectively with other opportunities to access Government funding. Continue to secure support from local stakeholders for projects - including residents, HCC and MP. Engage with utility providers with a view to understanding lead in times for additional capacity. NB - progress likely to be effected by LGR.	6	Medium	↔
Financial sustainability of public sector partners	Ian Harrison	ST	The financial sustainability of a wide group of public sector partners is negatively impacted, resulting in reduced service provision by all. In this scenario, the range and quality of services available to residents could be impacted. This could have negative repercussions for health, education, community outcomes and economic outcomes identified in the Council Business Plan/Delivery Plan It is possible that the Council would be expected to meet some of this 'gap' in provision thus exposing the Council to potential financial and reputational risk.	12	High	↔	Close partnership working at a senior officer and political level with the Council's public sector partners. Members and Officers are well briefed on potential implications/risks arising from decisions taken by other public sector partners. Responses to relevant consultation documents (HCC budget consultations) and undertake further planning activity in light of proposals. Proposals for a future sustainable Local Government Model across Hampshire submitted on 26th September 2025.	8	High	↔	Continued horizon scanning/monitoring of the broader policy context. Further development of joint working with partner agencies in 2025/26. Consideration of financial sustainability and financial impacts resulting from Local Government Reorganisation. Statutory consultation on proposals submitted for LGR expected to commence by end Nov 25. Government decision on future LGR configuration expected Spring 26.	6	Medium	↔
Poor Educational Attainment	Karen Edwards	ST	Educational attainment continues to present challenges. This may have an impact on deprivation, unemployment etc. Impact on the area's local reputation. May impact on service demand.	9	High	↔	HCC responsible for Education, RBC supporting role. Priorities set out in the Rushmoor Together Plan and the Young People Plan - with a focus on aspirations. Joint work on supporting families with Hampshire Children's Services.	9	High	↔	Ongoing dialogue with headteachers. Engaging with young people relating to skills, development and opportunities, in line with the Rushmoor Together plan and the Young Peoples Plan - including a structured work experience programme.	4	Medium	↔
Changing external policy context	Karen Edwards	ST	Significant fast track change which can have significant impact on services, levels of available resources or the Council's financial position all of which could adversely impact on the Council's ability to deliver its priorities. Government White Paper bringing forward Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation. Hampshire included in the Priority Programme requiring Unitary Councils from April 2028 resulting in Rushmoor BC not continuing. Reputational risk if the Council is unable to sufficiently adapt to the changing environment.	12	High	↔	Service level risk assessments to consider impacts of potential policy changes on individual Council services. Policy, Strategy, and Transformation team to support SLT with 'horizon scanning' which will assist the Council in identifying and where possible responding to some changes. Ongoing analysis of policy and budget announcements. Council working with other Hampshire authorities to produce local government reorganisation proposals by September 2025 deadline.	8	High	↔	Continued engagement with Government officials and other partners. Retained capacity on PPAB work plan. Work on devolution and reorganisation to be prioritised in 2025/26 so impacts and next steps are clearly understood. Council has a reserve available in order to put in / pay for support and relevant pieces of work in line with deadlines laid down by the Government.	6	Medium	↔
Risk to the health outcomes of Rushmoor Residents due to proposed changes in local NHS healthcare arrangements.	Karen Edwards	ST	Risk to health outcomes of Rushmoor residents if proposed changes to ICB arrangements continue as planned. The quality of services overseen by HIOW ICB is in a number of cases lower than that provided through the Frimley system. In addition, accountable care body arrangements are not yet clear for functions not transferring to new ICBs, posing a local risk to ongoing local service delivery and transformation work necessary to enable the new hospital programme.	8	High	↔	Working with Frimley and HIOW ICBs to ensure safe transfer of services and obtain assurance on transformation and future service quality.	8	High	↔	Increase level of engagement with accountable care organisation arrangements, once established. This is likely to include FHFT and local PCNs.	2	Low	↔
Poor Health Outcomes within Borough (e.g. obesity, mental health etc)	Karen Edwards	ST	Rushmoor has areas where there are health inequalities and health deprivation. Areas of deprivation have poorer health outcomes and higher demands associated. Diabetes, highest smoking rate in Hampshire, high instance of obesity and inactive adults. Mental Health and wellbeing – lack of funding available at local level ICB restructure and loss of NHS Place team has reduced capacity and support at place level to deliver local intervention programmes. HCC savings will also services that provide support for health and well being of vulnerable residents.	12	High	↔	Rushmoor Together - Revised partner plan approved in July. Joint working with partners, particularly with the ICS, HCC and the PCNs with a range of initiatives and plans in place or being developed. Targeted school Projects to include increased physical activity and reducing obesity in targeted schools. Identified as a priority for the Council. Executive Director is a member of the ICS Board. Reintroduction of Health place meeting with key ICB colleagues focusing on deprived areas. Monthly meetings arranged with Public Health Team to review data Focused Projects incorporated within the service Plan include increasing physical activity, promotion of oral health projects and wider family support with food and fuel poverty.	6	Medium	↔	Review approach to resourcing (in conjunction with partners, in particular the ICS and HCC). Targeted projects in service plan to address inactivity and increase physical activity support. Working with Energise me and Public Health to identify additional resource opportunities Rushmoor Together Plan includes latest health data and reflects PCN's/health inequalities priorities Monthly public health/RBC meetings arranged - and HCC update meeting with RBC Exec Director and PH took place in June.	6	Medium	↔
Negative economic and social trends undermine Council Delivery Plan priorities for town centres including the development of Rushmoor's towns to meet the needs of businesses and residents	Tim Mills	ST	Economic and social changes have a significant negative impact on Farnborough and Aldershot town centres, and other district centres and therefore reduce the ability to meet Delivery Plan priorities. This could result in a significant number of empty retail units, a loss of facilities and amenities (e.g. high street banking) for residents and a possible increase in crime and anti-social behavior. A decline in the retail sector will also have an impact on business rates income for the Council. Store closures e.g. Wilko, and chains such as Cneworld in financial difficulty, demonstrate the potential further retrenchment of the retail and hospitality sector. The increase in Employers NI, reduction in Business Rate Relief coupled with the wider economic uncertainty could see businesses that have been holding on go to the wall causing increased vacancies in the town centre.	12	High	↔	Programmes of town centre regeneration in both Aldershot and Farnborough which give consideration to future economic and social trends. Dedicated resource within EPSH, working with retail sector and other partners to support town centre businesses. Activity in both town centres to maintain/increase footfall e.g. town centre events, environmental enhancements.	6	Medium	↓	Close engagement with and ongoing provision of business support to town centre businesses. Work with Community Safety Team to tackle increased or perceived increase in ASB/ crime in the town centres. Town centre events and additional markets/craft fayres planned. Union Yard completion provides opportunity for new lettings which can draw additional footfall and residential once let will also assist.	6	Medium	↔

Risk of negative impact on Rushmoor's current service operations as a result of diverting resources to LGR preparations	Ian Harrison	ST	Diversion of significant unplanned resources to the LGR programme could potentially lead to impacts on the delivery of the Council's priorities and business as usual activities.	12	High	↔	Full participation in LGR programme important to ensure delivery of best outcome for local residents. Budget was assigned to this for 2025/26 to cover additional costs and expenses. Programme delivery structure developed - for engagement of Officers and Members. Plans being developed to adjust resourcing/structure in order to meet the demands of the programme whilst maintaining the Council's current delivery plans. Regular comms with staff and members.	6	Medium	↔	Programme delivery structure kept under review as demands change through process	4	Medium	↔
Deteriorating economic conditions	Tim Mills	ST	Adverse changes to the economy could result in the loss of major employers within the borough and/or impacts on particular sectors of the economy. This could result in increasing levels of unemployment and higher levels of deprivation and inequality. Economic uncertainty is likely to depress economic growth. Impact of rising inflation on the cost of living and consumer confidence. Low business confidence impacting on investment decisions inc. business lettings. Changes of this nature have potential implications for the council in terms of increased demand for services and adverse financial impact. There is also a reputational risk if the council is not seen to be adequately responding to economic changes or supporting residents.	9	High	↔	Partnership working with other organisations on support for the economy and local businesses. Engagement with businesses and business networks. Maintaining an understanding of local economic conditions – tracking economic indicators at a local level. Ensuring that key issues/ events are escalated to SLT at the appropriate time. Close working with business rates team on hardship and growth incentive reliefs to retain businesses and secure investment.	6	Medium	↓	Inclusive 1-1 business advice and support SeedL - training hub Signpost business support via dedicated business support channels.	6	Medium	↔
Demographic change	Karen Edwards	ST	Changes in Rushmoor's demography could impact on services required or expected by residents as well as how they engage with the economy or society more generally. Any sudden shifts in demography may not be visible to the Council for a period of time which could result in services not being delivered effectively or efficiently and could impact on the Council's ability to deliver its aim of having strong communities who are proud of their area. A strong understanding of the area's demography will also be important as devolution and reorganisation proposals are developed.	6	Medium	↔	Community engagement work may identify some changes ahead of them being reported in data sets. Review and analyse publicly available datasets, alongside those held by the Council. Work with partners to understand trends that exist at a larger geography and potential implications (e.g. aging populations). Census information reviewed and shared widely across the Council and with partners so that trends and their implications are understood. Rushmoor Together Plan to cabinet for approval in July	4	Medium	↔	Additional community engagement work planned in 2025/26 which might help to identify any key trends. The Belong Network commissioned to deliver further engagement with a view to adopting a new approach to be delivered from November 25	2	Low	↔

Standing Corporate Risks (SC) - Total 12 (-1) 1 Not suitable for Public Register/Removed, 3 Redacted

Threat of Cybercrime & Data Loss	Peter Vickers	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	16	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔
Major Data Breach – non-technical (human and physical)	Peter Vickers	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	8	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	6	Medium	↔
Insufficient funding to proceed with projects	Karen Edwards	SC	The Council cannot commit to fund the programme of projects, within the regeneration and property programme. Failure to deliver the schemes as a result of a lack of funding and team resources will not meet the overarching strategy objective as stated in the Council Business Plan to deliver additional income or capital and regenerate our town centres. The recent increases in interest rates makes affordability of funding more challenging. In addition, build costs remain high and there are little to no incentives in the buyer's market e.g. help to buy to generate interest in development.	16	High	↔	Secured some external grant funding to assist with bridging funding gaps. A Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) has been developed to ensure that the Council can be on a sustainable footing over the medium term. A target for capital receipts has been established to assist with reducing the level of external borrowing and associated revenue implications. There will need to be sufficient headroom created to allow for further borrowing in the absence of external grant funding.	12	High	↔	Seek additional grant funding to mitigate the risk to the Council. Obtain detailed expert advice and carry out due diligence on major projects and capital commitments. Consider joint ventures and other methods of delivery in order to share the risk/reward. Continue to review financial position in order to determine capacity to support regeneration and property projects. Review opportunities for receipts in the context of income received from these assets. Expedite actions to enable disposal of identified assets. Work with members to establish priorities for commitment of available funding against regeneration programme Consider the further prioritisation, slowing and reprofiling of the programme.	4	Medium	↔
Lack of employee alignment, engagement and development will reduce organisational performance	Belinda Tam	SC	A high performing organisation requires employees to be engaged, aligned and developed – significant risk of performance targets not being achieved if these areas are not developed. Increased risk of inability to recruit and retain. Due to the age profile there is a risk of losing knowledge and experience in coming years.	12	High	↔	Developmental activities: •Annual Development Reviews May-Aug, with learning needs feeding into the corporate Learning and Development plan, and individual service L&D needs/CPD identified •eLearning platform for compliance and self-developmental training, with reminders when training due •Bespoke leadership development & leadership development with partners, ongoing internal communications via Staff Live, Viva Engage, People Portal, email, team meetings, 121s •Regular and ongoing engagement activities e.g. around savings/transformation and other priority areas. Regular review of people engagement opportunities and attract, recruit and retention policies.	12	High	↔	Review development review process and leadership development in 2025. Increased people engagement initiatives and learning and development conversations and opportunities.	4	Medium	↔
Financial Sustainability	Peter Vickers	SC	Cost of borrowing does not track within the assumptions built into the MTFS. Resulting in additional unplanned financial pressure that will require additional mitigation to be identified.	12	High	↔	MTFS planning process identifies strategy to manage the impact of such an occurrence built into future spending plans. Updates to keep February 2024 approved MTFS have been reported to July Full Council with an update on the action plan to bring costs back to a sustainable level, including use of reserves. A mid-year review of MTFS was brought to Cabinet in November. Financial Recovery Plan has been put in place as per October 2024. MTFS has been updated as at February 2025 alongside budget. Savings of £1m for 2025/26 have been identified and due to be presented to Cabinet in July. CIPFA have provided an independent review and due diligence on the capacity for the Council to deliver the required actions. Key findings are the actions taken by the Council are sound and further governance adjustments have been recommended for adoption.	12	High	↔	Update to MTFS as agreed in February 2025 to be presented in September 2025. If additional mitigation strategy is required, permissions will be sought through committees as appropriate.	6	Medium	↔

Civic Quarter, Farnborough - Major Project	Karen Edwards	SC	High levels of public and political interest in scheme. Lack of deliverable / viable masterplan proposal in current economic context. Publicly, politically and financially RBC's regeneration intervention is deemed a failure negatively impacting the Council.	12	High	↔	Regular Cabinet and Member reporting. Outline Planning application approved (subject to s106) in February 2023. OPE funding of £1.75m secured to assist with early enabling works - demolition/utilities diversions. No commitment to further expenditure at this stage. Exploring the potential to dispose of land interests to Homes England. Leisure Centre phase being progressed through detailed design utilising Levelling Up funding from MHCLG.	12	High	↔	Programme / scheme viability to be reviewed regularly. Seek further external grant funding to reduce RBC exposure - Homes England / One Public Estate Undertake a Strategic Delivery Review of the current masterplan to ensure the Council has a viable development proposal.	4	Medium	↔
Union Yard, Aldershot - Major Project	Karen Edwards	SC	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	4	Medium	↔
Regeneration of town centres does not deliver economic, community and financial benefits - see major projects	Karen Edwards	SC	Attracting the right level of investment to the Borough remains challenging in the current economic environment. High levels of public and political interest in both town centre major projects. Reputation for delivery will be tested. High intensity of resource required across a range of Council teams, with many interdependent parts - leisure, civic, public realm, retail, hotel, highways etc Publicly, politically and financially RBC's regeneration interventions are deemed a failure negatively impacting the Council and the local economy.	9	High	↓	Regeneration strategy / approach currently under review, with existing projects being managed through ELT. Cabinet and Member reporting as required. Limited external grant funding secured for site de-risking in Farnborough. Wider Town Centre Strategy for Farnborough completed and adopted by Cabinet in Summer 2022.	9	High	↓	Options for Civic Quarter and Farnborough Town Centre Regeneration being explored, including working with Homes England and exploring potential partnerships with Housing Assc / local landowner / major funders or market disposal. Undertake a Strategic Delivery Review to ensure a deliverable / viable masterplan. Seek further external grant funding to reduce Council financial exposure - Homes England / One Public Estate etc. In Aldershot, the completion of Union Yard and disposal of housing units means the Council's role is now focused on enabling other significant developments with the responsibility for increasing footfall and vibrancy etc as BAU with town centre management and responsibility for letting vacant units with the Property Service.	6	Medium	↔
Reduced Income from Property Portfolio	Tim Mills	SC	Significant loss of income from the Council's property portfolio arising from a variety of reasons including deteriorating economic conditions, downturn in the property market and changing consumer or business habits. Feed through of reduced retail rents at lease renewal	9	High	↔	Appointment of LSH Investment Management (LSHIM) to asset manage part of the portfolio and support current in-house skill, knowledge and capacity. Prudent budgeting on Meads and Property Budget and early securing of key rents allows room for level of deterioration	9	High	↔	28 point plan to ensure transparency, accuracy and put property management ahead of the curve to be funded through £200K reserves subject to 8/7/25 Cabinet Managing income through payment plans, where necessary. Increased emphasis by the service in managing debts. Working with tenants directly and with LSHIM to identify issues and actions and reporting to CPPAG. Utilisation of asset management system to enable more targeted action. Identifying additional resource to underpin this important source of income by working on options to re-occupy vacant properties and identifying funds for improving the properties for quicker lettings and reducing the rent-free periods. Evaluating opportunities to create additional income to support the Council's financial position and bring forward where possible. This includes repurposing existing assets and adopting an agreed commercial approach to new ground leases. Updating of Asset Management Forecast for MTSF period including ensuring all reviews etc. are undertaken pro-actively and increased focus on debt management. Option to look at reserve funding on income profile, i.e. forecast income and budget income are different. Using reasonable assumptions to achieve a realistic but prudent estimate. To be included in February 2025 Budget report. Increased monthly monitoring on Asset Portfolio between Property and Finance	6	Medium	↔
Climate Change – Failure to deliver ambition for a carbon neutral Council by 2030.	Karen Edwards	SC	Risk of not delivering high profile organisational objective due to insufficient resources or lack of support because of other priorities	9	High	↔	Allocation of UKSPF resource to deliver climate related projects Projects incorporated within Service Business Plans as part of the Review of the Climate Change. Development of Rushmoor Climate Community Group to engage residents in climate and environmental issues. Group is very engaged and well attended. Next meeting in October. Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan refresh agreed March 2025. Climate change EIA in progress. Eco Festival planned for Sept 2025 Actions being reviewed in light of devolution plans and the Councils financial position. Climate Impact Assessments being developed for internal use. Climate Change officer funded until July 2026	6	Medium	↔	On going Discussions with the portfolio holder on ambitions and plans for delivery Reviewing opportunities for funding to support officer costs beyond 2026 Use of £20k UKSPF to support delivery of CC strategy and action plan agreed by Cabinet. Eco Festival delivered September 25 with over 100% more stallholders from 2024.	6	Medium	↔

Governance and Decision Making – Not meeting statutory deadlines. Legal challenge to a high profile, or regeneration related, or high value decision made by the Cabinet, Committees or under delegated powers.	Amanda Bancroft	SC	Risk of non-compliance with legal requirements. Financial loss from costs of defending, or costs of halting development works. Reputational risk. Risk of delay in delivering key organisational objectives.	9	High	↔	Governance Group meets weekly to consider more complex decision-making matters including Interests and Member engagement. Delegated decision making is monitored by the Governance Group. Strengthening of the governance arrangements with improvements to understanding, learning and development for Members on the CGAS committee - ongoing training programme refreshed annually. Members receive initial induction training by end of July in each civic year. Independent Person recruited as a member of CGAS, offering independent oversight, particularly from an audit perspective. Constitution kept under review in liaison with a subgroup of CGAS (the Constitution working group). Training on decision making provided to CMT/Service Managers. There is a guidance note for Executive Decision Making. Timetables and reminders for deadlines provided by meeting administrators. Senior Managers deliver Corporate Induction on Constitution for staff. Governance arrangements reviewed during CIPFA and Peer Review Q2 2024/25. Independent review of arrangements commissioned early Q3 2024/25 from the Centre for Governance & Scrutiny, final draft received, workshop held with members and now being formally considered with Constitution working group. Further member engagement planned during spring 2025 with changes adopted to be effective from civic year 2025/26.	6	Medium	↔	Continue to integrate risk management in corporate governance arrangements - continual improvement. Review of Risk Management Policy and arrangements took place during Q3 2024/25, including exploration of a Risk Appetite Policy. Work to create a risk appetite policy expected to conclude during Q2 2025/26. Ensure horizon scanning continues within sector. Noted continued relevance/importance in light of ongoing s114 activity in Local Government and White Paper on Devolution.	6	Medium	↔
Escalated Service Risks (ES) - Total 6 (-1) 2 Redacted														
Major Planning Appeal (Airport)	Tim Mills	ES	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	12	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔
UKSPF Programme - end of funding	Karen Edwards	ES	The Spending Review 2025 announced that an investment in up to 350 deprived communities in the UK. This seems to be in place of the UKSPF. None of the top 350 areas of high deprivation are in the borough. This means it is likely the Council will receive no UKSPF grant next year. Community, Economic Development, Town Centre, Housing, and Pride in Place grants, events and activities may have to be significantly scaled back or stopped if alternative funding sources cannot be found.	16	High	↔	Funding allocations avoid long term commitments Temporary use to cover existing budgets Investment approach that prioritises 'seed' funding of initiatives that won't require long term financial support to continue.	8	High	↔	Policy team to monitor government announcements for further funding information. Services that currently use UKSPF grant to prepare transition/mitigation activity	6	Medium	↔
Failure to reprovide temporary accommodation	Tim Mills	ES	Failure to reprovide temporary accommodation leads to increased street homelessness with significant impact on Town Centres, much poorer outcomes for homeless people, increased costs for the Council through use of Bed and Breakfast and reputational damage due to impacts on individuals and towns. The economic climate causes increased demand and potential losses of landlords. North Lane Lodge has now been re provided and the council now needs to prioritise the re provision of Clayton Court by the end of 2025. In addition to the lease ending, the building is of poor quality. We also now have the challenge of other boroughs securing good quality temp in the borough therefore reputational risk of RBC not providing to meet its own demand in good quality accommodation.	12	High	↔	Temporary Accommodation project seeking to identify, purchase and repurpose accommodation to replace Clayton Court by end 2025	9	High	↔	Review of previous options and potential ways forward with Cabinet Oct 24 had agreement on approach and potential opportunities. April 25 Cabinet Report sets out way forward together with extension to Clayton removes some risk. Engagement with HCC on Grosvenor Rd to understand ongoing costs to them from closure and potential to retain or find alternative solution are critical and this closure now presents greatest risk to RBC. Identification of potential way forward has reduced risk but remains until agreement secured	4	Medium	↔
Resettlement schemes and asylum seeker accommodation in the borough	Karen Edwards	ES	Resettlement of refugees and accommodation of asylum seekers in the borough may result in reduced levels of community cohesion and increased service demand including housing and other local public services. Homes for Ukraine Thank you payments to host families is ending. This may lead to local hosts not being able to continue support which will mean an increase in people being made homeless. These people may be destitute and have complex needs. The associated funding position is complex, uncertain, and may not meet demand. The associated funding position is complex, uncertain, and may not meet demand. Changes can happen swiftly and may cause short term pressure on resources.	12	High	↔	All Member briefing on 3rd Sept with Police to discuss issues and Council processes. Cohesion and integration officer in post from Sept. Continued work with Belong to develop community engagement events across the borough. Community conversations being planned for November - focusing on community meetings about how to improve local places.	12	High	↔	Reactive and proactive communications with public and local residents. Community Engagement/Rushmoor Voices pages on the website established provide more information and increased transparency on schemes the Council is involved in. Belong report and recommendations also added to the website. Belong commissioned to deliver further work for 6-9 months until early 2026. Community events being developed with Belong to facilitate. RBC need to consider options to support H4U families who are no longer supported by Host families. This may include providing support to Ukraine families moving to private rented accommodation. Options being developed. Thank you Event to thank hosts being planned for December 2025	4	Medium	↔
Inaccurate reporting of financial position	Peter Vickers	ES	Financial reports to Cabinet provide inaccurate financial information leading to poor decision making. Budget holders unaware of budget and spend position Decisions are made on incorrect assumptions. Decisions are taken on an ad-hoc basis without understanding or consideration of wider financial position.	8	High	↔	Budget management process is now completed monthly by services supported by service accountants. A new budget management finance system module has been implemented to support the process. Training and support provided to all budget managers. Financial forecast is reviewed by Head of Finance prior to publication. Business Partnering training provided to finance team to develop skills and awareness.	6	Medium	↔	Finance team capacity and skills are currently under review. Prioritisation of financial management focus based upon risk assessment and materiality of numbers i.e. focus on high value aspects and most likely to go off track. Clarity and transparency of reporting being improved. Integrity of forecasts being reviewed ensuring correlation to assumptions in the budget, history of variances and experience in the current external environment. Further service manager training to ensure skills or organisation support financial management.	4	Medium	↔
Rushmoor Development Partnership	Karen Edwards	ES	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	9	High	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	6	Medium	↔	Redacted. Full remediation plan in place – details are not included in this register due to their sensitive nature.	1	Low	↔

Rushmoor Borough Council

Corporate Risk Management Policy and Procedures

v3.0 25/11/25

Table of Contents	Page
Section 1: Introduction and Overview	2
Section 2: Policy and Management Approach	3
Section 3: Operational Procedures	6
Appendix 1: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite by Theme	16
Appendix 2: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite Policy Statement	19

Section 1: Introduction and Overview

1.1 Overview

This document describes the Council's policy and procedures for the assessment and management of corporate risk.

Section 2 sets out the policy and management approach. Section 3 sets out the operational procedures used to manage risk.

1.2 What is Risk

There are many definitions of risk and risk management. In the context of this document it considers the effect of uncertainty on the delivery of the Council's objectives. Risk can be further defined as the combination of the probability of an adverse event occurring and its potential consequences. It is used to define a matter/incident/potential issue that may prevent the Council from meeting its core objectives or that may result in the critical failure of all or part of the Council or its functions.

Risk can also present as an opportunity for benefit as well as threat to success. The objective of risk management will not always be to eliminate risk. For example the Council may seek out risk in order to receive benefit e.g. investment in the development of a digital application in order to seek future service efficiency.

1.3 Why does the Council need to formally manage risk

The Council's employees manage risk every day without describing it as 'risk management'. Employees consider what might go wrong and take steps to reduce the likelihood or impact if it does. However, the Council cannot rely entirely on informal processes. As a public body, the Council must provide assurance to elected members and the public that it is recognising and managing risk effectively.

1.4 Responsibilities for managing risk within the Council

Everyone at the Council is responsible to some degree in the management of risk in their day-to-day activities, from front line staff to Service Managers, Heads of Service (HoS), Directors and the Head of the Paid Service.

Significant risks must be formally identified, assessed and appropriately managed in order to mitigate their likelihood and/or their adverse impacts. This could be on the continued operation of the Council, compliance with legal obligations or achieving strategic objectives.

The responsibility to ensure that the Council's risk management process is effective lies with the Head of Paid Service, Senior Leadership and elected members. The responsibility to manage this process is delegated to the Senior Risk Officer (SRO) (Currently the Executive Director), with day-to-day management provided by the Service Manager for Risk, Performance and Procurement (referred to as the risk manager in this document – RM).

Section 2: Policy and Management Approach

2.1 Summary of Approach

Senior employees with overall managerial responsibility for the majority of risks, are referred to in this process as 'risk owners' (Predominantly members of the Senior Leadership Team - SLT). They act a single point of contact responsible for taking the lead in ensuring that risks and any mitigations are managed appropriately, including compliance with this policy.

The Council oversees the management of risk collaboratively through the work of SLT and all significant risks are periodically reviewed by them. The determination as to whether a risk is deemed 'significant' is set out later in this policy using a common risk management procedure, to ensure consistency in approach.

The Council will record and assess its work to manage risk through the use of risk registers, held centrally in digital format. These are split into individual Service Risk Registers (SRR) with a single central Corporate Risk Register (CRR) that highlights the most significant risks. Corporate risks are categorised as 'strategic (ST)', 'standing corporate (SC)' or 'escalated service (ES)'.

These risk registers are not intended to be used as a means of recording and managing **all** risk to the Council, or the management of its day-to-day business activities, but to summarise and record the mitigations in place for its significant risks to ensure that they are being effectively managed.

Given its nature, the risk management process will provide a regular periodic snapshot of the current level of risk to the Council in each case and any additional mitigation planned for those risks.

The Council will ensure that its arrangements follow the general principles of good practice as laid out by risk industry guidance, such as the Orange Book published by the UK Government.

The risk management process is cyclical, running on an annual cycle linked to the business planning process and preparation of the Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

2.2 Leadership and Management

The risk management process is overseen by the Senior Risk Officer (SRO). The day-to-day management and maintenance of the risk management system is the responsibility of the RM. To ensure that the RM role itself does not become a single point of failure, the SRO and the RM will ensure that the process can be temporarily administered by other Officers in the RM's absence, with an appropriate level of training, understanding and security access to deliver this function.

Risk owners are responsible for the management of risks and the maintenance of associated processes such as Service Risk Registers. Service Managers may however be delegated the role of 'risk manager', with the responsibility of managing risks and updating registers.

Risk will be considered by SLT every quarter to ensure collective oversight is given to risk at a senior level on a regular basis. The purpose of this collective oversight is to;

- Ensure consistency of approach
- Review risk levels and ensure all significant risks are included in the appropriate register
- Ensure the risk levels are in line with the Council's overall risk appetite
- Assist the identification of interdependencies between risks
- Maintain momentum on progress in relation to risk mitigation and resolution of issues arising from risks being realised

2.3 Training & Guidance

The RM and risk officers will be appropriately experienced and provided with information, instruction/training and guidance to ensure that they are able to effectively fulfil their roles.

Appropriate training, guidance and advice will be provided to all staff that routinely carry out risk management activities in line with this policy, including HoS and Service Managers. All staff requiring training will be identified to the RM by the relevant HoS/Member of SLT.

Training will be undertaken approximately every two years, and on any significant change to the policy or risk register template(s)/methodology, or upon the identification of any significant concerns in competence.

An overview of risk management is provided to all new starters to the Council during their induction.

In addition, the RM will provide advice, support and guidance on the Council's risk management process to any employees and contractors on request.

2.4 Documentation

The Council's risk registers are held centrally in digital format. Currently MS lists located on Sharepoint.

HoS will be responsible for ensuring that their Service Risk Register is updated at least monthly and that risk is a standing agenda item on their service meetings. New risks should be added to the appropriate risk register as soon as they are identified.

2.5 Governance

2.5.1 Senior Leadership Team (SLT)

The Senior Risk Officer (SRO) will ensure risk is reported to SLT at least every 3 months using the CRR to ensure SLT remain aware of the key risks to the Council and the measures being put in place. The risk owners may be required to present their risk entries to SLT for wider discussion.

Minutes and actions arising from the quarterly SLT consideration will be circulated and stored for future reference.

2.5.2 Elected Members

It is the responsibility of Elected members to maintain oversight on the management processes in place at the Council and to ensure that the risk treatment plan for each risk in the CRR is effective.

Risk Management is a function of the Council's Audit and Governance Committee (AGC) and will also be reported to the Executive members via Cabinet as follows.

- Cabinet – quarterly through the quarterly performance report
- AGC – annually, to provide independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework, arrangements and the associated control environment

Section 3 Operational Procedures

3.1 Risk Identification

Risks will be identified by a number of methods, for example (but not limited to):

3.1.1 Strategic and Corporate Level

Strategic analysis tools can be used to identify and analyse the current status and position of an organisation and the environment in which it operates. Tools such as this are used to provide a context for the organisation's role in relation to the external environment and the impact of external issues.

As the Corporate Risk Register and Service Risk registers are updated quarterly and identify the most important risks to the Council they will be used strategically in the overall corporate planning process for the Council. To facilitate this the Council's Performance Management and Policy teams will have full access to all Service Risk Registers and the Corporate Risk Register.

3.1.2 Service Level

Heads of Service will identify any significant risks to their service during the business planning process, including ongoing matters and new and emerging threats foreseen for the year ahead.

3.1.3 Audit

Risk identification and analysis work takes place routinely within the Councils' Internal Audit team. Any new/emerging or increased risks will be brought to the attention of the appropriate risk owner and the SRO/RM. Where appropriate, these risks/updates must be included in the Service risk register by the risk owner.

Audit will routinely share reports that highlight or assess the management of risk in the Organisation in order that any gaps or inaccuracies are identified and resolved – in conjunction with the risk owner.

The Council's Audit team will have full access to all Service risk registers and the Corporate risk register.

3.1.4 Horizon Scanning

Service Managers, HoS and SLT should routinely be horizon scanning to identify future risks.

In addition, the RM will ensure that industry publications and other sources of best practice guidance are periodically reviewed, to identify any new and emerging risks that may affect the Council.

Such publications/sources of information will include:

- Allianz Risk Barometer: Top Business Risks (annual)
- Hampshire County Council: Community Risk Register
- Cabinet Office: National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies
- World Economic Forum: The Global Risks Report (annual)
- Government and public body publications
- Third party journals and publications
- ALARM risk association membership – conferences and publications.

The Council's Policy Team will routinely monitor Government publications and other sources of information in order to identify new and emerging risks as early as possible.

3.1.5 New and Emerging Risks

New and emerging risks will be identified via a number of routes. It is important to recognise not all risks can be predicted and some may be identified during the day-to-day operation of Services, where new (and sometimes unexpected) risks can arise/become apparent during the course of the Council's work or arise in the community or as a result of unexpected events (e.g. recent riots). Once identified, risks must be documented and mitigated where possible, shared and incorporated into the Council's risk management processes.

In order to both highlight and seek awareness of new and emerging risks, the RM will also be a standing member of the Corporate Governance Group.

3.1.6 Capturing Opportunities Identified

During the process of risk identification and horizon scanning, opportunities may also be identified, such as those to apply for funding or grants. Opportunities and threats can also arise when there are local/national policy changes and associated consultations. These are also tracked by the wider Policy team.

In general terms, opportunities will be recorded and tracked on the Council's Policy & Funding tracker, administered by the Policy team. Threats will predominately be recorded through the risk register process described in this policy. It is recognised that there may be some crossover in this process, where for instance there are risks to the Council associated with pursuing an opportunity. Any duplication will be minimised by the Policy team and RM to ensure end users are clear as to what is required of them and that they are not unnecessarily burdened.

Once an opportunity has been identified by the Policy team and added to the tracker, the appropriate Service(s) will be notified. The decision then as to whether to take any action lies with the Service(s), including keeping the tracker up to date.

3.2 Strategic Risk Appetite

The Council has developed a corporate risk appetite at a strategic level. Its purpose is to ensure that the priorities of the Council and appetite towards risk taking is agreed at a Senior level across officers and elected members and appropriately considered when making decisions and throughout the risk management process. Those responsible for strategic direction/policy setting at The Council will be responsible for deciding the risk appetite, including SLT, Cabinet and AGC.

Defining a Corporate risk appetite at a strategic level, whilst ensuring it remains applicable to all activities of the Council, can be complex. Whilst some Services are actively engaging in higher risk activities for reward or the delivery of innovation, others main role is to undertake services where risk needs to be minimised.

The development and revision of the risk appetite is carried out using a collaborative approach (such as a workshop), including members of SLT, Cabinet and other key Elected Members (e.g. the Chairs of AGC and PPAB). The strategic risk appetite is included as an Appendix to this policy. It will be reviewed at least every two years, or whenever the strategic priorities of the Council are updated.

The Council will need to take measured risks to achieve the priority objectives included in the Council Delivery Plan. There will likely be opportunities for the Council to be innovative or work differently and any identified risks will need to be considered against the anticipated cost and efficiency benefits. However, accepting a higher level of risk in one area of business does not mean the Council has a 'high' appetite for risk overall.

To set the appetite towards risk at a more granular level, and to allow each risk to be considered in its own right, risk appetite will be considered over a number of themes or areas. These will evolve over time and those used in the development of the 2025 risk appetite are recorded in Appendix 1, Part 1.

There will be some common themes in the Council's acceptance of risk. These will vary over time, but it is implicit in the role of SLT and risk owners to recognise and apply them. An example is the Council's financial position. If the Council is in a position where savings must be made – the appetite for any risk where there will be significant costs outside of agreed budgets may be very low. It is expected that this form of cross-cutting broader attitude towards risk will be captured within a single risk appetite policy statement, Appendix 1, Part 2.

The council's risk appetite should be considered in conjunction with the risk section of all committee reports when decisions are made. At a line-by-line risk level, application of the strategic risk appetite will be demonstrated and recorded where appropriate by:

- Services discussing the effect of the strategic risk appetite and line by line target risk with their Portfolio holders for every corporate risk register entry, when first added and when there is a significant change in risk score.
- Discussing the risk appetite (risk gap) for each new risk added to the CRR, at SLT during each risk cycle, to reach a consensus amongst Officers in order to make a recommendation to Cabinet and for these decisions to be recorded in the minutes.
- For existing risks, using any significant increase in the risk gap (the gap between residual and target risk scores) as an indicator of a significant change – discussing and reviewing the position on the risk appetite for that risk at SLT – and again to reach a consensus amongst Officers in order to make a recommendation to Cabinet.
- To recommend to Cabinet during each risk cycle, via the Cabinet report – that they discuss the risk appetite for those risks highlighted above and reach a consensus on the risk appetite for each line item.

3.3 Risk Assessment Methodology

3.3.1 Rating & Categorisation

Each risk managed by this process will be assessed and given a risk category based upon the probability of the risk arising and the impact on the Council if it does arise. The same method of rating/scoring will be used throughout.

A traffic light indicator / RAG rating is used to show the risk category. A Corporate risk matrix, maintained and updated by the RM, is provided to assess the probability and impact of risks. This is provided later within this document.

The process for assessment of the risk for each register entry is as follows:

- **Inherent Risk**

This assessment takes place at the very beginning of the process, it does not take into account any mitigation currently in place or planned in the future. The purpose is to initially assess the significance of the risk to the Council. This risk score is not expected to routinely change unless the risk itself fundamentally changes.

If at this stage risks are assessed as being low and therefore not of significance from a Corporate perspective, Services may still wish to record and monitor them within their Service registers, but it is very unlikely to be appropriate for inclusion in the Corporate Risk Register.

- **Residual Risk**

This assessment takes place once the current mitigation(s) have been identified and recorded. It is an assessment of the current risk to the Council when taking into account any action already taken. It does not take into account the expected effect of any future mitigations planned.

This risk score is likely to change regularly as future mitigation(s) are completed/established and the effects can be assessed.

- **Target Risk**

This assessment of risk is based upon the position that the Council aspires to achieve against each risk. It effectively determines the goal that the Council has for the risk – and so also determines whether the mitigations in place and planned are adequate.

The application of a target risk score is one method by which the Council assesses its risk appetite for each specific risk entry, whereby a decision must be taken as to whether the current level of risk is acceptable.

The Council's strategic risk appetite policy must be considered when setting the target risk to ensure that it is consistent with the strategic approach.

The 'risk gap' between the residual and the target risk are a clear measure of the Council's success or otherwise in the management of its risks to an acceptable level.

Given the breadth of duties and roles that the Council holds, it is foreseeable that some target risks will be higher than others – and that in some cases the target risk will not and will never be low.

Although Council's have historically been seen as being predominantly risk averse given their responsibility for the appropriate spending of public funds, some risks may be accepted with appropriate controls in place.

4. Risk Matrix & RAG (Red/Amber/Green) Rating

The matrix to be used for the assessment of all risks is as follows. The rating consistency guidance accompanying it will have regard to the corporate risk appetite policy and wherever possible use examples sourced from the themes.

Severity of Outcome (S)	4					Likelihood of Occurrence (L)	High Risk		Strongly consider further mitigation, tolerating risk is unlikely to be acceptable
	3						Med. Risk		Tolerable if risk/exposure is acceptable at senior level
	2						Low Risk		Additional action may not be necessary to manage risk
	1								
		1	2	3	4				
	Likelihood of Occurrence (L)								

Rating Consistency Guidance

	Likelihood of Occurrence (L)	Severity of Outcome (S)
1	Very unlikely Very unlikely to occur, (no history or near misses etc). Less than 5% probability.	Minor Risk to specific role. Legal action unlikely. No significant illness or injury. Negative customer complaint possible. Financial impact negligible. No significant risk to matters highlighted in risk appetite statement.
2	Unlikely Unlikely but may occur (may have happened, but not within past 5 years). Is not expected to happen in next 5 years, less than 25% probability	Moderate May be a risk to normal continuation of service. Legal action possible but defensible. Short term absence/minor injury. Negative customer complaints widespread. Financial impact manageable within existing Service budget. Possibility of impact against matter(s) in risk appetite statement but may be mitigated.
3	Likely Likely to occur (or already happened in the past 2 to 5 years). Is expected to happen in the next 2 to 5 years, 25 - 50% probability	Significant Partial loss of service. Legal action likely and may not be fully confident in defense. Extensive injuries or sickness. Negative local publicity. Significant fine. Financial impact manageable within existing Corporate budget - but not Service. One or more matter within risk appetite statement likely to be significantly impacted.
4	Very likely Very likely to occur (or has already happened in the past year), may occur frequently. Is expected to happen in the next year, more than 50% probability	Major Total loss of a service. Legal action likely & difficult to defend. Death or life threatening. Negative regional or National publicity. Imprisonment. Financial impact not manageable within existing funds. Risk appetite statement will not be adhered to.

5. Risk Control / Mitigation Methods

There are various options for controlling risk, often referred to as the four Ts:

- **Tolerate (retain/accept the risk)** – if the Council cannot reduce a risk (or if doing so is out of proportion to the risk) it can tolerate the risk, i.e. do nothing further to reduce the risk. This option must be taken by informed decision only. It is clear that this option will be more likely in the event of taking risk in order to seek benefit/opportunity.
- **Treat (mitigate the risk)** – if the Council can reduce the risk by identifying mitigating actions and implementing them, it should do so. For many of the risks on the corporate risk register this is the action the Council is most likely to take.
- **Transfer (share the risk)** – risks can be transferred to or shared with other organisations, in whole or in part, for example by use of insurance, shared services with other Authorities or by contracting out an area of work. There will almost always be limitations in this method, it is unlikely to be 100% effective. It is also likely that some risk will be retained, for example to reputation.
- **Terminate (eliminate the risk – stop the work/activity)** – this applies to risks the Council cannot mitigate other than by not doing work in that specific area. For example, if a particular project is very high risk and these risks cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level, particularly with regard to the Corporate risk appetite, the Council may decide to terminate it entirely.

6. Risk Types & Records

6.1 Service Risks

In order to ensure that key risks are identified, assessed, managed appropriately and recorded consistently a risk register will be updated and maintained by every service. These are known as Service Risk Registers (SRR) and will record all significant Service risks.

All SRRs must be reviewed and updated at least monthly by the risk owner or their delegated Service Managers/Risk Managers.

The RM will provide each Service with an appropriate template for carrying out and recording their risk assessments. This will include an appropriate method of version control and the ability to archive risks that are no longer current.

6.2 Service Risk Registers (SRR)

These will contain all significant risks to a service that are key to the organisation in terms of the potential severity of the outcome. It is not the intention to use the SRRs as a means of managing day-to-day work of a service.

It is the responsibility of each HoS to maintain its own SRR and review/update it whenever there is a significant change in circumstances, or at least monthly in their Service meetings.

The SRRs will include a method by which HoS can identify risks to be included in the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) as Strategic, Standing Corporate or Escalated Service risks. These will be identified by virtue of the potential risks to the Council as a whole, or their Council-wide crosscutting nature. They are further described below.

HoS will be expected to have regular update meetings with their respective Portfolio holders, using their risk registers to keep the Portfolio holder aware of the current status of the risks within their service. This update must take place at least quarterly.

Those risks identified as being officially sensitive in nature will be marked to ensure that they can be easily redacted/removed from any publicly available copy of the register.

Services must use the risk register format/template provided by the RM.

6.3 Capital Project Risks & Other Significant Interests

Capital projects, such as large-scale regeneration projects, will be treated in a similar manner to Services. Each Project team will hold and maintain a project risk register and manage the day-to-day risks within their teams. The Project Sponsor will be responsible for ensuring that risk register is reviewed on a regular basis.

SLT receive regular project highlight reports for all significant projects including key project risks

Where the Council is a significant stakeholder in other organisations such as Rushmoor Housing Limited, the Senior Officer of the Council involved in those arrangements will ensure that the risk management processes in place align with this policy, protect the interests of the Council, and that significant risks are appropriately escalated to the CRR.

6.4 Corporate Risks

These are risks that have greater significance for the Council as a whole.

These can be further categorised as being 'Escalated Service risks (ES)', 'Standing Corporate risks (SC)' or 'Strategic Risks (SR)'.

6.5 Escalated Service (ES) risks are likely to be those that by virtue of the severity of the potential outcome and/or inadequate controls may be considered a single point of failure for the Council, rather than a threat to a single Service alone. It could also include those risks that are newly identified and have little or no mitigation or controls in place, that require wider consideration and support.

These risks will tend to be operational in nature and arise, be resolved/adequately mitigated and then removed from the CRR.

There are a number of tests that can be applied in order to determine whether a Service risk should be escalated but given their nature and to ensure consistency of approach, it may be appropriate to discuss these risks with the RM before escalating them. The application of a high-risk rating is not a reason in its own right to escalate a risk. It would also be inappropriate to escalate a risk in order to simply raise awareness with other Services, Senior Management or Elected Members. Other methods of reporting/communication should be considered if this is the main aim of the risk owner.

The Service should consider whether oversight/discussion is required at SLT or if the risk can be wholly managed within the Service itself. If no Corporate oversight/intervention, etc., is required, it is not expected that they will be escalated.

6.6 Standing Corporate (SC) risks may also be considered a single point of failure for the Council, and in most cases, although the Corporate response may be managed by a single Service, they will be cross cutting and longer term in nature. SC risks will tend to remain on the CRR for longer periods of time, if not indefinitely. Examples of these may be the Council's financial position or compliance with data-protection legislation, both of which have a wide impact and involvement from across the Council but are generally overseen or managed by one service.

SC risks, impacting more than one Service, will normally be managed by a single Service with the expertise required, but, if not, they will be assigned to one single risk owner as the lead. This is for practical purposes to avoid duplication and ensure that they are managed overall by a single Officer. Although the day-to-day management of the risk itself may not fall entirely upon that risk owner, they will be responsible for collating and updating SLT and the risk register entry on behalf of the Council.

6.7 Strategic (ST) Risks

Strategic risks will tend to be long term in nature and are more likely to be outside the direct control of the Council, for example the local economy, employment or obesity levels.

As they are longer term in nature, the ST risks will be updated at least every 3 months in order that they can be presented to SLT.

6.8 Corporate Risk Register (CRR)


This register contains the key risks to the Council that are considered to be current issues of corporate significance. This will be made up of all of the current Council's ST, SC and ES risks identified.

With the assistance of HoS, the CRR will be updated by the RM every 3 months in order that it can be presented to SLT by the SRO for review and discussion.

Those risks identified as being officially sensitive/not suitable for the public register will be marked to ensure that they can be easily redacted or removed from any publicly available copy of the register. This will be the responsibility of the risk owner during the assessment process.

An appropriate method of version control will be kept by the RM to ensure that the most up to date register is in use but that older versions of the register remain accessible.

7. Diagram: Rushmoor Borough Council Risk Management Process



8. Issue Identification and Management


An issue in the context of this policy, is a problem or a negative event that has already occurred, is certain to occur, or is a risk that has or has a high probability of materialising.

Inevitably there will be occasion when despite all the mitigation put in place, a risk previously identified will develop into an issue. It is also possible that an issue will arise that had not been previously identified as a risk.

In any case, issues of Corporate significance must be identified, brought to the attention of senior management and/or SLT and managed appropriately, with records kept centrally of the action taken to resolve them or mitigate the impacts.

All issues requiring Senior Corporate oversight will feed into the Corporate Action, Issue & Decision (AID) Tracker for onward management. This issue log will be held and managed by the Corporate Policy Team. The risk register (if applicable) must then be updated as appropriate – following the guidelines below.

Diagram: Issue Management Process



*Consider significance of:

- Public opinion / social impact
- Political outfall
- Budgetary impact
- Service impact
- Negative publicity/ reputational damage
- Environmental impact
- Legal challenge, dispute or enforcement

Appendix 1: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite by Theme

Risk appetite level & definition					
	Averse	Minimal	Cautious	Open	Eager
Governance <i>The way that Rushmoor is managed at the highest level, and the systems for managing/overseeing this.</i>	Averse - Avoid actions with associated risk. No decisions are taken outside of processes and oversight / monitoring arrangements.	Minimal - Willing to consider low risk actions which support delivery of priorities and objectives. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable limited risk taking.	Cautious - Willing to consider actions where benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable cautious risk taking.	Open - Receptive to taking difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable considered risk taking.	Eager - Ready to take difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements support informed risk taking.
Strategy <i>The approach and plans agreed for achieving the Council's priorities.</i>	Averse - Guiding principles or rules in place that limit risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Minimal - Guiding principles or rules in place that minimise risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Cautious - Guiding principles or rules in place that allow considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Open - Guiding principles or rules in place that are receptive to considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.	Eager - Guiding principles or rules in place that welcome considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities.
Operational Service Delivery <i>How we provide services to our customers and residents.</i>	Averse - Defensive approach to operational delivery - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate.	Minimal – Change and innovations largely avoided unless essential. Decision making authority held by senior management	Cautious - Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided change minimised unless necessary. Decision making authority generally held by senior management.	Open – Change and Innovation supported, with clear demonstration of benefit / improvement in management control. Responsibility for non-critical decisions may be devolved.	Eager - Innovation pursued – desire to ‘break the mould’ and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority.
Legal <i>Our general compliance, legal and statutory duties (including matters such as health & safety).</i>	Averse - Play safe and avoid decisions or actions which could be challenged, even unsuccessfully.	Minimal - Want to be very sure we would win any challenge to decisions or actions we take.	Cautious - Want to be reasonably sure we would win any challenge to decisions or actions we take.	Open - Challenge will be problematic; we are likely to win, and the gain will outweigh the adverse impact	Eager - Chances of losing challenges are high but exceptional benefits could be realised.

Property <i>The management of and investment in the Council's land and property assets (including commercial properties, operational and community assets and facilities).</i>	Averse - Obligation to comply with strict policies for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money or return.	Minimal - Recommendation to follow strict policies for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money or return.	Cautious - Requirement to adopt a range of agreed solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that is likely to produce good value for money or return.	Open - Consider benefits of agreed solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that would contribute to meeting wider organisational or place objectives.	Eager - Application of higher risk solutions for purchase, investment, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that may contribute to meeting wider organisational or place objectives.
Financial <i>Our overall financial position and its management (budgets, income, investments and savings).</i>	Averse - Avoidance of any adverse financial impact	Minimal – Will only take risk essential to existing service delivery - with consideration of the MTFS Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies and ability to maintain a balanced budget. Likely decision level within ELT delegation, up to adverse £20k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Cautious - Seek delivery of Corporate Plan – with consideration of the MTFS Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies and ability to maintain a balanced budget. Likely decision level within Cabinet delegation, up to adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Open - Seek delivery of Corporate Plan – without consideration of a balanced MTFS and contra to existing Reserve & Capital Receipts Strategies. Likely decision level with Full Council delegation, over adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact.	Eager - Open to risk without reference to financial capacity. Likely decision level with Full Council delegation, over adverse £100k ongoing or one-off NET revenue impact
People <i>How we treat our staff (autonomy in decision making, investment in training etc).</i>	Averse - Priority to maintain close management control & oversight. Limited devolved authority. Limited flexibility in relation to working practices.	Minimal - Decision making authority held by senior management. Development investment generally in standard practices.	Cautious - Seek safe and standard people policy. Decision making authority generally held by senior management	Open - Prepared to invest in our people to create innovative mix of skills environment. Responsibility for noncritical decisions may be devolved.	Eager - Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority.

Technology <i>The equipment (physical and digital) we use.</i>	Averse - General avoidance of systems / technology developments. Defensive approach to transformational activity - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate.	Minimal - Only essential systems / technology developments to protect current operations. Innovations avoided unless essential.	Cautious - Consideration given to adoption of established / mature systems and technology improvements. Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided unless necessary.	Open - Systems / technology developments considered to enable improved delivery. Innovation supported, with demonstration of commensurate improvements.	Eager - New technologies viewed as a key enabler of operational delivery. Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices.
Data & Info Management <i>How we hold, share, process and store our information and data (physically and digitally).</i>	Averse - Lock down data & information. Access tightly controlled, high levels of monitoring.	Minimal - Minimise level of risk due to potential damage from disclosure.	Cautious - Accept need for operational effectiveness with risk mitigated through careful management limiting distribution.	Open - Accept need for operational effectiveness in distribution and information sharing.	Eager - Level of controls minimised with data and information openly shared
Council Reputation <i>How we are viewed by others (partners, key stakeholders, the public etc).</i>	Averse - Zero appetite for any decisions with high chance of repercussion for organisations' reputation.	Minimal - Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is no chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation	Cautious - Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation.	Open - Appetite to take decisions with potential to expose organisation to additional scrutiny, but only where appropriate steps are taken to minimise exposure.	Eager - Appetite to take decisions which are likely to bring additional Governmental / organisational scrutiny only where potential benefits outweigh risks.
Environment <i>The surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal, or plant lives or operates</i>	Averse – Zero appetite for any decisions/activity with high chance of repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets take full priority.	Minimal – Appetite for risk taking limited to decisions/activity where there is no chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority area in the decision.	Cautious – Appetite for risk taking limited to decisions/activity where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority.	Open – Open to the possible risks to the environment but only where appropriate steps are taken to minimise harm. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered as a priority but balanced with other priorities.	Eager – Prepared to make decisions that will harm the environment but only when the positives will outweigh the environmental negatives. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered but not prioritised.

Appendix 2: Strategic Risk Appetite – Risk Appetite Policy Statement

This statement supports members and officers in decision making by setting out where Cabinet is comfortable accepting different levels of risk and where risk is unacceptable. The council's current overall risk appetite is defined below (see table below for definitions and statement).

Risk Appetite	Definitions and Summary Statement
Averse	'Prepared to accept only the very lowest levels of risk, with the preference being for ultra-safe delivery options, while recognising that these will have little or no potential for reward/return.'
Minimal	'Willing to accept some low risks, while maintaining an overall preference for safe delivery options despite the probability of these having mostly restricted potential for reward/return.'
Cautious	<p>'Tending always towards exposure to only modest levels of risk in order to achieve acceptable outcomes.'</p> <div> <p>The council's current overall risk appetite in the context of its Delivery Plan and the current economic climate, is defined as cautious, with an openness to risk in some areas where they directly support the pursuit of the Council's priorities and the impacts have been properly explored and understood.</p> <p>The key risks to the Council have been identified as those that would impact successful delivery of its overall strategy, through the Delivery Plan and the Council's financial stability.</p> <p>The Council will seek to deliver its priorities within agreed timescales – but only with due consideration of the MTFS and the Council's ability to maintain a balanced budget.</p> <p>To enable the work to support the Delivery plan in a timely and efficient manner, the Council is more open to risk with regards to governance, operational service delivery, people and autonomy in decision making. The Council is willing to invest resources into innovation, developing skills and devolving non-critical decisions, where it is considered that the expected benefits to the council's operations and delivery will outweigh the negative impacts of the identified risks.</p> <p>Although the Council seeks to use new technology, given the associated risks both reputationally and financially there is a clear preference for the use of established / mature systems and technology and our appetite here is cautious.</p> <p>In terms of property investment and management the Council will take a cautious approach and will generally only support decisions where good value for money or good certainty of a positive return is achieved.</p> <p>A cautious approach will also be taken to protecting the Council's reputation, where the appetite for risk taking is limited to those events where the chance of any significant repercussions has been minimised. This is also the case for the environment, where the appetite for risk taking is limited to decisions/activity where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the environment. The Council's net zero and sustainability targets are considered a priority.</p> <p>For general matters of compliance, whether that be legal or data management, the Council takes a minimal to cautious approach, seeking a good level of compliance and wanting to be confident of its ability to defend itself against challenge.</p> </div>
Open	'Prepared to consider all delivery options and select those with the highest probability of productive outcomes, even when there are elevated levels of associated risk.'
Eager	'Eager to seek original/creative/pioneering delivery options and to accept the associated substantial risk levels in order to secure successful outcomes and meaningful reward/return.'