

Committee	Dated:
Open Spaces & City Gardens	11 October 2017
Subject: Open Spaces Departmental Risk Register	Public
Report of: Director of Open Spaces	For Decision
Report author: Esther Sumner, Business Manager, Open Spaces	

Summary

Members have previously expressed dissatisfaction with the way that risks are presented using the departmental summary risk register alongside the divisional risk registers. Officers believe this is because the current departmental summary risk register does not provide sufficient detail. This report outlines alternative options for the presentation of departmental risks. Members are asked to consider the options, and select one which can then be trialled.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Note the current departmental summary risk register (Appendix 1)
- Approve one of the options outlined in this report for a trial.
- Note that it is recommended that the chosen option be trialled for a year and then reviewed.

Main Report

Background

1. The Open Spaces Department manages risk in accordance with the Risk Management Strategy 2014, and all of our departmental and divisional risks are registered on the Covalent Risk Management System. However, neither the Risk Management Strategy nor the Covalent system anticipated a department spread over six divisions (Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood, Queen's Park & Keats House; Parks & Gardens; Epping Forest; The Commons; Cemetery & Crematorium; and Tower Bridge & Monument) and reporting to six Committees (Open Spaces & City Gardens; West Ham Park; Epping Forest & Commons; Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood & Queen's Park; Culture Heritage & Libraries and Port Health & Environmental Services). This has made the concept of a "departmental risk register" challenging.
2. The Open Spaces Department manages risk through a number of processes including: Departmental and Divisional risk registers, the departmental health and safety improvement group, divisional health and safety groups and risk

assessments. Departmental risks are reviewed by the Department's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) on a regular basis.

3. The department also responds to the Charity Commission requirement that Trustees confirm in the charity's annual report that any major risks to which the charity is exposed have been identified and reviewed and that systems are established to mitigate those risks. These risks are to be reviewed annually. Each Open Spaces Committee is presented with relevant risk registers to fulfil this requirement. Although the Charity Commission requires an annual consideration of risks as a minimum, the City's internal policies recommend a quarterly consideration. The Open Spaces Department presents full risk registers to committee twice a year and provides interim updates as part of the Business Plan progress report.

Current Position

4. The Open Spaces Department currently reports on risk using a summary departmental risk register and divisional risk registers for each division. The summary risk register represents the top 5 or 6 cross cutting or most serious issues facing the department. These summary entries point to the detail contained within the divisional risk registers. This approach has not been popular with Members and so alternative presentations of risk are now presented for Members to consider.
5. Recent discussions have identified two further risks which should be included on our risk registers: historic landscapes and safeguarding. It has been identified that a number of our historic landscapes and features could be at a risk of decline or of further decline in their condition. Members will be aware that capital projects are being considered to mitigate this risk. Safeguarding was not previously included on the departmental risk register as it is reflected on the corporate register. This is not felt to be a sufficient so it will be now added to the departmental risk register. The Director is confident that the department is managing this risk well having undertaken "train the trainer" session to prepare staff in the Learning Team to deliver safeguarding training across the department. This is in addition the online training available corporately. These risks will be added to the revised risk register once the new format has been agreed by Members. Members may also like to note that the impact of terrorism at Tower Bridge has now been incorporated into the departmental risk register.

Options

One 1: Departmental summary risk register and detailed divisional risk registers

6. This is the current position. This allows each service committee to monitor its own risks and provides the Open Spaces & City Gardens Committee and the other Committees with the overarching summary position. Members have previously been dissatisfied with the extent of the "summary" provided.

Option 2: Detailed divisional risk registers only

7. This option would do away with the summary departmental risk register and just present the divisional risk registers. This could increase Committee focus on the risks as impacting on the individual divisions. The Open Spaces & City Gardens Committee would only receive the Parks & Gardens risk register, which it is jointly

responsible for with the West Ham Park Committee. The Committee could, if it wished, receive copies of all divisional risk registers annually to satisfy itself of the Committee's strategic role, that risk is well managed across the department.

Option 3: Departmental risk register which reflects actions from divisional risk registers and divisional risk registers

8. This option retains a summary risk register reflecting the top 5 or 6 key departmental issues, but populates the actions with the actions from each of the relevant divisional risks entries. This option has been trailed and is presented at Appendix 2. This approach has the advantage of drawing Members of this Committee's attention to the key strategic issues, whilst allowing Members to "drill down" and see what actions are being taken at each division.

Option 4: Departmental wide risk register

9. This option would see a single risk register produced for all of the Open Spaces, but separate registers would probably be retained for the Cemetery, Tower Bridge & Monument and Keats House. This option would include a risk entry for each risk identified across the department with divisional actions populated as appropriate for each risk. This option has not been trialled due to the amount of work involved, but an analysis of the existing risks across the divisions has suggested that the resulting risk register would be extremely lengthy as the following risks would need to be reflected:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Asset Condition | • Major incident and resulting 'access denial' |
| • Pests and diseases / pathogens | • Public Behaviour |
| • Invasive non-native species | • Severe weather event |
| • Development close to open space land | • Bathing ponds |
| • Loss of open space land / granting of prescriptive rights | • Zoo licensing / animal husbandry |
| • Financial management / loss of income | • Delivering divisional projects and programmes |
| • Decline of SSSI / SAC condition | • Fire |
| • H&S | • Rural Payment Agency grants |
| • Water bodies / raised reservoirs | • Gilder operations – Kenley Airfield |
| • Wanstead Park – Heritage at Risk Register | • Safeguarding |
| • Skills shortages and succession planning | • Decline in condition of historic landscapes |

10. While this approach would give the Committee an impression of the breadth of issues facing the department, it may also make it difficult to pick out the actions that each division is taking to address the specific issues they are facing at their site. Members may also find that this level of detail is difficult to digest. It is also possible that Members of the Open Spaces Committees may find it frustrating to identify the particular actions identified for their division.

Proposals

11. Members are asked to select a preferred option, Officers recommend options 2 or 3. Unless option 4 is selected, officers will continue to prepare divisional risk registers for presentation to the relevant Committees.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

12. Effective risk management supports the delivery of the departmental business plan and the Corporate Plan.

Implications

13. There are no implications (HR, legal, financial, health, equalities etc) arising from this report. It is hoped that an alternative approach to presenting risks will support Members in their challenge and support of officers on risk.

Conclusion

14. Members' views are sought on a more effective way to present risk.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Departmental Risk register (current)
- Appendix 2 – Revised departmental risk register (option 3)

Esther Sumner, Business Manager, Open Spaces Department

T: 020 7332 3517

E: esther.sumner@cityoflondon.gov.uk