

Appendix A Suggestion, Comments and Queries from Members

| <i>Suggestions / Comments / Queries</i> | <i>Management responses</i> | <i>Proposed changes in Strategy</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Amend 1.1 to read, “South Cambridgeshire District Council’s primary role is to fulfil its statutory obligations.” (i.e. remove wording that related to the previous Council vision and 3 A’s)</p> | <p>The purpose of paragraph 1.1 is to set the strategy in the context of the Council not only fulfilling its statutory obligations, but also achieving its strategic objectives, i.e. the 3 A's. The strategy and risk registers have to relate to this wider context - I'll amend the paragraph by adding your wording at the beginning and explaining the strategic objectives more, including updating as necessary for the 2012/13 3 A's.</p> | <p>The suggested wording has been added at the beginning of paragraph 1.1 and the rest of the paragraph has been amended to refer to the Council’s Long Term Vision.</p> <p>A new paragraph 1.2 has been added which refers to the three Strategic Aims, with associated Approaches and Actions.</p> <p>The first sentence of paragraph 1.3 (previously paragraph 1.2) has been amended to, “The Council has a responsibility to consider risks involved in providing or enabling service delivery, both in fulfilment of its statutory obligations and in achieving its strategic aims.”</p> |
| <p>1.1 My primary concern here is that the Council cannot alone achieve this objective: to make South Cambridgeshire the best place to live and work in the country ... The Council is dependent on others and must work with them to achieve this. By stating this as an objective the Council is setting itself up to fail. It will certainly mean that 2.2 (e) ' ... <i>enhance the Council's reputation and public image.</i>' is at risk.</p> <p>I would also question the validity of some of the language used: 'where residents have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment' would</p> | <p>Paragraph 1.1 is an opening statement, intended to mirror the Council’s 3A’s and set the overall context for the strategy. This ensures that we don’t treat risk management as a bureaucratic exercise, but as an essential element of strategic and service planning and performance management. As part of this, risks in risk registers are linked to relevant 3A’s and we’re in the process of linking performance indicators to risks to show that control measures over the risks are effective.</p> <p>We’re not saying that this strategy alone has to achieve this objective, nor that we can</p> | <p>Paragraph 1.1 has been amended to refer to the Council’s Long Term Vision.</p> <p>New paragraph 1.2 has been added which refers to the three Strategic Aims, with associated Approaches and Actions.</p> <p>The first sentence of paragraph 1.3 (previously 1.2) has been amended as, “The Council has a responsibility to consider risks involved in providing or enabling service delivery, both in fulfilment of its statutory obligations and in achieving its strategic aims.”</p> |

| Suggestions / Comments / Queries | Management responses | Proposed changes in Strategy |
|---|---|--|
| <p>probably not enhance the Council's reputation for equality when read by many of our less affluent residents on the housing waiting list or living in locations where planning matters and the enforcement thereof present what they view as a constant battle. Such a description will only serve to emphasise the division that exists between the 'haves' and the 'have nots' and will not encourage the engagement of the latter.</p> | <p>achieve it alone – as you say, we depend on other authorities, agencies and partners to help us do so, as I think some of the Approaches and Actions under each Aim also suggest. I'll update the wording of 1.1 to make sure it reflects the current 3A's and explain the role of risk management more in 1.2.</p> <p>What we're saying in 2.2 (e) is that risk management includes consideration of risks to the Council's reputation and image – again, I'll make sure that the wording of 2.2 explains this more.</p> | <p>Paragraph 2.2 (e) has been amended as "Seek to improve the delivery of Council services and ensure that risks to the Council's reputation and public image are considered."</p> |
| <p>Amend 2.2 (d) to read, "... by in managers responsible for the Council's delivery of services."</p> | <p>2.2 (d) is setting out that risk management needs to be undertaken by managers - I'll amend the wording to more accurately reflect this.</p> | <p>The wording has been amended to more accurately reflect that risk management needs to be undertaken by managers.</p> |
| <p>Amend the bullet points under 3.1 (b) to read,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the executive role ... will be led by the Finance & Staffing Portfolio Holder Corporate Governance Committee; • the governance role ... will be undertaken by the Corporate Governance Committee Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder. | <p>Risk management best practice is that the executive role should be undertaken by the Council's Executive - in our case Cabinet led by the relevant portfolio holder - and that the governance role should be undertaken by the Council's committee responsible for overseeing governance arrangements - in our case Corporate Governance Committee. This was agreed by Corporate Governance Committee in February 2010. I'm not sure why you are suggesting that it should be the reverse - please could you explain ? (In passing, I'll be updating the strategy where necessary for changes to portfolio holders and officer post titles.)</p> | <p>Strategy updated where necessary for changes to portfolio holder and officer post titles.</p> <p>No other changes are proposed.</p> |

| Suggestions / Comments / Queries | Management responses | Proposed changes in Strategy |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Enhance 3.1 (c) (d) and (e) as follows:</p> <p>(c) Adopt agreed [by whom?] standards of risk management that are monitored at corporate and service level and ensure that further action is taken where necessary.</p> <p>(d) Ensure [how?] that regular identification, assessment and management of significant risks is integral to all corporate and service planning.</p> <p>(e) Ensure [how?] that effective processes are in place to facilitate prompt remedial action on adverse events and their identification and reporting and to enable near misses to inform future action.</p> | <p>3.1 (c) (d) and (e) set out the principles; the details of "by whom" and "how" are given in the sections that follow.</p> | <p>No changes are necessary.</p> |
| <p>In 5.2.2 what does the text shading mean? It makes the text hard to read; even harder printed b/w.</p> <p>I don't see how a dotted line (- - - - -) showing the Council's risk tolerance line can be the case for each risk?</p> | <p>The shading was explained in the covering reports that went to Corporate Governance Committee and Council, that it highlights text where updates were proposed - I'll see if I can find a different way of doing this. Your point about the tolerance line not being possible for each risk is well made - it shows that the person drafting the document is sometimes too close to it and can miss the obvious - I'll remove the bullet point (and also under 5.2.7).</p> | <p>The shading was introduced to assist management and Members in seeing where proposed changes would be applied in the strategy. The Committee will be invited to comment on whether it wishes to retain the shading.</p> <p>The bullet points about the risk tolerance line have been removed.</p> |
| <p>In 5.2.2, replace the Red / Amber / Green colour coding with an Increased / Unchanged / Improved notation (and so for all RAG comments below).</p> | <p>The Strategic Risk Register is held in the Council's performance management system, CorVu. CorVu uses Red/Amber/Green for performance measures and therefore for risks, where the R/A/G shows where risks have worsened, stayed the same or</p> | <p>Having reviewed the display of risk scores against colour coding, no improvements were identified and no changes are proposed.</p> |

| Suggestions / Comments / Queries | Management responses | Proposed changes in Strategy |
|---|--|---|
| | improved. Corporate Governance Committee "agreed that wherever possible agendas should not be printed in colour ... for reasons of cost" and I wholeheartedly concur with that, but here is a case where colour is important - I'll see if there is a better way of displaying the risk scores against colour coding so that they are clearly visible. | |
| Correct 8.4.2 as follows, "...if the risk is significant (e.g. i.e. has a score of 12 or more, and especially if it is a new risk) | I'll change the e.g. to i.e. | e.g. has been changed to i.e. |
| Add the following wording at the end of the third sentence in 10.1, " ... to their line managers and/or through the relevant form. " | Thank you for your suggested additional wording - I'll include it in the document that goes to Corporate Governance Committee. | The additional wording has been added as suggested. |
| In Annex A, all the colours could be dropped with no loss of information, particularly since the areas of the wedges do not appear to be meaningful, so a simple list would probably be better and clearer. | A simple list is what it shall be. | Annex A now comprises a simple list. |
| In Annex B, under 'Strategic technological risks', I assume a specific <i>type</i> of "Breach of confidentiality" is intended here. Breaches in general are not 'technological'. Update ' Global warming ' to ' Climate change ' | Yes, we were thinking of potential breaches of confidentiality associated with technology (e.g. information sent to the wrong people, databases etc made available publicly, etc) - I'll make the wording more specific. I'll also update "Global warming" to "Climate change". | "Breach of confidentiality" has been amended to "Breach of confidentiality associated with technology / systems". "Breach of confidentiality" has been added under 'Strategic customer/citizen risks'. "Global warming" has been changed to "Climate change". |
| In Annex E, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> with regard to the new guideline, 'Could happen in the next year', with what probability? with regard to the guideline, 'More than 90% likely to occur in the next 12 | What the guidelines are trying to do is give risk managers a variety of frameworks within which to assess Likelihood: probability of occurrence within circumstances; probability of occurrence within a timeframe of the next 12 months; and the new shaded one of | No changes are proposed. |

| <i>Suggestions / Comments / Queries</i> | <i>Management responses</i> | <i>Proposed changes in Strategy</i> |
|---|---|---|
| months', how does this differ from the other stated guideline of 'Is expected to occur in most circumstances (more than 90%)' ? | proximity of occurrence (within one year, 2 years, 3 years etc). Risk managers find different frameworks useful, according to the risks they are considering. | |
| In Annex F, remove the colours. | I'll remove the colours. | Colours have been removed. |
| <p>In Annex H, amend the roles of Corporate Governance Committee and the Finance & Staffing Portfolio Holder as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Corporate Governance Committee) Reviews and approves the risk management strategy and process annually at each meeting, updating them if necessary. • An This annual review will include considering the adequacy of the quarterly reviews of the strategic risk register by the Finance & Staffing Portfolio Holder. • The Finance & Staffing Portfolio Holder reviews and approves the strategic risk register quarterly. | <p>Following on from 3.1 (b), the separate executive and governance roles mean that Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for reviewing the risk management strategy and process to ensure that it remains effective (I'll add your wording about approving the strategy), but this only needs to be done annually not at each meeting; the relevant portfolio holder is responsible for reviewing and approving the strategic risk register quarterly (and since the separation of roles in February 2010 as mentioned above, Corporate Governance Committee has moved away from monitoring the portfolio holder's reviews quarterly, to now doing so as part of the annual review of the risk management strategy and process - agreed at Corporate Governance Committee on 30 September 2011).</p> | <p>The phrase "and approves" has been added as suggested.</p> <p>No other changes are proposed.</p> |