



CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Impact - 1: Insignificant, 2: Low, 3: Medium, 4: High, 5; Almost certain critical

Likelihood - 1: Extremely unlikely, 2: Possible, 3: Likely, 4: Most likely, 5: Certain

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
10	Failure of Waste Contractors to deliver the contracted level of service	Disruption to services and loss to reputation	5	3	15	15	↔	Manage / Transfer	Contract Management Systems (WMRC, RRC, Interim), Contracts Risk Register, Comments and Complaints System, Business Continuity Planning inc. contingency planning, Permit Scheme. As the Authority moves to update its landfill contingency arrangements the risk is likely to reduce.
3	Failure to recognise impact of legal changes, economic and political environment.	Inability to make provision for future development, risks to effectiveness of contracts / levy implications in relation to district council budgets / waste arising predictions outdated	4	3	12	12	↔	Manage	Performance management framework including long term corporate planning and budget process, financial and legal advice, Partnership working, Development of levy strategy with district treasurers, Contract Management Review, JWDA Group

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
8	Failure to engage partners and stakeholders	Unable to identify and deliver waste services which meet the needs of the Merseyside Partnership and its stakeholders / Lack of clear understanding of commitment by each partner	4	3	12	12	↔	Manage	District Action Plans, IAA with Halton and MoU with Districts, Communications Strategy, partnership working, Education and Awareness, Treasurers Group, SOWG, Liverpool City Region & working with new CX's, MRWA CX offer to attend Council scrutiny Committees, taken up by some (but not all) Councils.
12	Failure to implement the Joint Recycling and Waste Management Strategy.	Unable to translate plans into action and therefore fail to improve performance to an acceptable level, and appropriate timescales	4	3	12	8	↑	Manage	Sustainable Development Action Plan, District Action Plans and Procurement Project, Annual Report, Memorandum of Understanding, Strategy Refresh starting 2015. Awaiting significant measures following the Strategic Review. On hold to be updated Government Government statement from Secretary of State in Autumn 2018.

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
24	Failure or weakness of ICT infrastructure	Loss of access to knowledge resources	4	3	12	6	↑	Manage	Mersey Travel SLA including data backup and security, ICT Strategy, maintenance contracts, Contract Information System Development, transition to new servers with Mersey Travel
38	Authority policy and procedures fail to provide strong enough governance framework to ensure the Authority meets the highest standards	Risk of poor and inconsistent decision making.	4	3	12	N/A	↑	Manage	Review all of the Authority's policy and procedures regularly to ensure they provide a consistent and clear framework for effective decision making. Ensure key policies and procedures are approved by Members at Authority meetings
21	Failure to retain sufficient and appropriate staff or capitalise in full on their potential	Loss of skills and experience to deliver performance improvements.	5	2	10	10	↔	Manage	Retention and Recruitment Policy, Family Friendly Policy, staff training and development, Equality and Diversity training, Redundancy Policy, shared services, review of resources & succession planning
32	Failure to provide appropriate or sufficient information in decision-making processes	Members unable to take well informed decisions to secure the best interests of the Authority	5	2	10	10	↔	Manage	Performance Management Framework, Member Training and Development Plan / Provision of information, workshops and briefings and study tour

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
6	Failure to identify current strengths and weaknesses in performance and plan for future needs.	Unable to develop and implement key projects to deliver performance improvement.	5	2	10	10	↔	Manage	Performance Management Framework, lead officer on Governance and Performance
36	Failure to meet Health and Safety obligations	Failure to avoid or reduce risk of harm to staff and the public in relation to the Authority's activities.	5	2	10	10	↔	Manage	Health and Safety Policy, SLA with St Helens for support, Review of Health and Safety Procedures and Processes, Health and Safety management system in place; to review at year end. Job description of responsible officers to be updated.
27	Failure to manage the health, safety and environmental impact of the Authority's activities	Environmental pollution, damage to health, loss of reputation, damage to assets, cost of carbon.	5	2	10	10	↔	Manage	Environmental Monitoring System (ISO14001), planned maintenance and technical improvements, Capital Programme, Strategic Environmental Assessments, security measures at sites
5	Failure to manage joint working relationships with Halton BC	Risk to the delivery of the Resource Recovery Contract, risk to the delivery of WMRC contract	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Inter Authority Agreement / Ongoing dialogue with Halton BC. Halton DC dialogue with Veolia over proposed changes to services in Halton under WMRC, with MRWA as close observer.

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
33	Failure to plan response to disruption of service due to external factors	Disrupted delivery of services and damage to reputation	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Business Continuity Plan and testing and auditing (Authority & contractors), staff awareness, ongoing monitoring and review, partnership working. Date for testing to be agreed.
31	Failure to manage assets	Poor service delivery, avoidable costs	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage / Transfer	Capital Strategy, review of assets and valuations, maintenance programme, lease compliance monitoring, insurance cover, environmental monitoring, contractor asset management.
13	Failure to direct and control the Authority and its services effectively and relate these to the community	Poor or ineffective corporate governance leading to lack of transparency and confidence	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Code of Corporate Governance, Governance Review, Corporate Social Responsibility, Procedural Rules and Scheme of Delegation, Member Training and Development, lead officers for Governance and Performance
23	Failure to secure appropriate attendance levels	Financial / reputational loss	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Sickness Absence monitoring included in PMF, management and corporate training, Family Friendly Policy, Stress Management Training, Health and Wellbeing Programme

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
22	Failure to manage resources to ensure Value for Money	Inefficiencies and damage to reputation	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Budget Management, Audit Process, Performance Management Framework, Contract Management, Forward Planning Panel
28	Failure to manage performance strategically and control data quality	Unable to respond to performance information due to poor reporting or reliability of data.	4	2	8	8	↔	Manage	Performance Management Framework, Data Quality Strategy, Contract Control Measures, lead officer for GDPR and for Data and Performance
11	Failure to develop Bidston Methane Ltd Business Succession Strategy	Unable to secure value for money and manage environmental liability effectively	2	3	6	8	↓	Manage	Environmental Monitoring, Development of Management Strategy with Infinis Energy Ltd (previously Novera)
17	Failure to minimise the Authority's exposure to litigation claims	Lengthy and costly litigation process	3	2	6	6	↔	Manage	Early legal advice. Strategy agreed with MWHL re company risks. Insurance and Indemnities.
18	Failure to procure goods and services which are sustainable.	Negative impact on sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) and our reputation with stakeholders.	3	2	6	6	↔	Manage	Sustainable Procurement Policy, Sustainability Appraisal procedures, EMS includes requirement of key suppliers to have an environmental policy, Social Value included in Corporate Plan

Item Ref	Risk	Implication	Level of Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Previous Rating	Direction of Risk	Strategy	Mitigating Actions
34	Failure to adapt to and mitigate the effects of Climate Change on the services provided by the Authority	Disruption to services and effects on service requirements	3	2	6	6	↔	Manage	Climate Change Strategy, Sustainable Development Policies, Business Continuity Plan, Environmental Targets, Carbon Savings via contracts
29	Failure to prevent fraud / loss / misuse	Financial / reputational loss	3	2	6	6	↔	Manage / Transfer	Anti-Fraud Policy, Procedural Rules, Audit Plans, Insurance, Data Interrogation, Contractual arrangements
35	Failure to secure the Authority's approval of a sustainable financial position and budget.	Unsustainable use of General Funds and potential to set an illegal budget	5	1	5	20	↓	Mitigate	Levy and financial position of the Authority to be part of wider Strategic Review led by CX/Leaders of constituent councils. Infrastructure Review following strategic review implementation to identify potential budget savings.
7	Failure of Treasury Management arrangements	Financial / reputational loss	5	1	5	5	↔	Transfer	Internal Audit verification of St Helens systems
30	Failure to manage Capital Programme	Operational delays, loss of funding, loss of revenue	2	2	4	6	↓	Manage	Annual planning, Capital Strategy, Forward Planning Panel, Infrastructure Review
26	Failure to capitalise on appropriate funding opportunities.	Loss of potential source of income and opportunity for further development.	2	2	4	4	↔	Manage	Researcher tasks allocated within waste strategy section