| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence (score 1 - 5) | exposure occurs | Score | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | | let core | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|---|---|--|-----------------|----------|---------------------------|---|------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| | | (555.5 : 5) | (000.0 1 0) | (2 // 1) | | | OK x 0.8 | | | | | | |
| Oramont Biolog | | | | | | | Poor x 1.5 | | | | | | |
| Current Risks | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. SAFEGUARDING PEOPLE & PROPERTY | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1a Workforce Health & Safety exposure in a varied | Staff injury assault: low morale stress: | Λ | 3 | 12 | MOD | Risk Assessment | good | 6 | TOL | GMO | Response to Audit in progress. PPE | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| sometimes hazardous environment; lone working, seasonal climate, violence & aggression | sickness absence; litigation and insurance claim; backlogs and overtime cost; bad publicity; criminal prosecution | | Ç | | | Programme - Technical + Office + Field activities; Recognised reporting protocols; Issue of Personal Protective Equipment, where appropriate; External advice on control | 900 | | | | review completed. Risk assessments to be reviewed. Lone working policy required. | • | • |
| | | | | | | measures; Employee induction. Call in/out procedures documented. Mobile phones in use. Lone working devices in use. CV19 Site visit protocol established. | | | | | | | |
| 1b Fraudulent activity by employee (Valuation Roll, Council Tax and Electoral Registration) | Adverse publicity; Elected Member concern; senior staff reprimand; systems replacement; internal inquiry uses valuable resource. Removal of IER Accreditation. | 3 | 3 | 9 | | Audit staff records; Staff training/awareness e.g. conflict of interest; Stringent checks on Valuation Roll and Valuation List amendments improved reporting from 2012/13; Audit reconciliations. ER postal vote number threshold check in place. ER duplicate name check procedure in place. Disclosure Scotland checks carried out on existing staff and new employees. Information protection course has been completed by all staff and now part of new start induction process. Disclosure refreshed every 4 years. Register of interests for all staff implemented December 2020. | good 4 | 4.5 | TOL | IHM | Access to ER/VR/CT on operational grounds. Review procedures to account for the ongoing changes systems including IER. | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 1c Fraudulent activity by employee (Financial) | Misappropriation of funds; adverse publicity; Elected Member concern; senior staff reprimand; systems replacement; internal inquiry uses valuable resource | 2 | 2 | 4 | | Financial controls, Banking reviewed; Staff training/awareness; External check by Finance staff + audit reconciliations. Purchase card transaction logging and approval system | good | 2 | TOL | IHM LHS | IHM to continue close liaison with Treasurer and Accountant. | 01/02/2021 | 4 monthly |
| 1f Elgin office accommodation may be unfit for current demands of service. Concern regarding DDA. | Health & Safety of staff compromised; poor security; inadequate storage; failure to comply with legislation e.g. DDA; poor image, operational inefficiency; morale damage | 4 | 2 | 8 | | Service responsiveness to assessed risks. Replacement windows installed, maintenance and refurbishment programme underway. Disabled access arrangements with ground floor accommodation | ok 6 | 6.4 | TOL | JAB | Alternative options to be considered as part of a wider review of estate requirements | 01/02/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 1g Environmental controls for IT Server accommodation inadequate | IT outages due to inadequate environmental controls | 4 | 4 | 16 | HIGH | Mechanical ventilation installed, remote monitoring and alerts. | Poor 2 | 24 | HIGH | DGY | Monitor conditions following the installation of mechanical ventilation. Estimates to be obtained for improvements | 01/11/2020 | 2 monthly |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence (score 1 - 5) | Impact if exposure occurs (score 1- 5) | | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls Good x 0.5 OK x 0.8 | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|--|---|--|---|----|---------------------------|--|---|--------------|---------------------------|------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| 2. QUALITY, SECURITY, INTEGRITY & COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION | | | | | | | Poor x 1.5 | | | | | | |
| 2a Inadequate engagement with the Board on Governance matters in general and risk management in particular | Adverse audit report; failure to achieve service improvements; No overall organisational recognition of strategic direction | 2 | 3 | 6 | | Financial and operational performance information reported to the Board at all meetings. The Board review the operational performance thresholds periodically. Risk analysis is presented to the Board annually. Member Workshop August 2019 | | 3 | TOL | IHM | Monitor risk. | 01/08/2020 | Annually |
| 2b The service is heavily reliant upon ICT systems; loss or serious interruption of data or service e.g. fire, hacking, virus, patching, employee misuse - intentional or accidental | Loss of data and essential records; disclosure of confidential records; cost of recovering systems and data reinstatement; loss of data integrity; Elected Member concern; Partner councils' concern; adverse publicity. Increased issue of ransomware. | 4 | 4 | 16 | | Rigid protocols for data back-up; Disaster Recovery Server; Data share with councils; Strategy of outsourcing systems and support to maximise resilience. Periodic IT health checks programmed in accordance with PSNA requirements. Membership of Scoittish Gov Cyber resilience network. | good | 8 | LOW | | Staff training and testing required to raise awareness and reduce risk from ransomware. PSN and Cyber Essentials plus accreditation renewal to be progressed following upgrading | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 2c Inadequate corporate policy documents | Errors and omissions; avoidable accidents and loss; employee dispute and claims; adverse audit report; fraud; low morale; breach of legislation; inability to change or improve; failure to meet Corporate Governance obligations | 4 | 2 | 8 | | HR and governance policies review programme in place. IT policy documents reviewed to comply with PSN requirements. Records Management Plan approved by Keeper. MT to monitor policies and HR to progress review programme. | | 6.4 | TOL | MT | Policy review programme to continue | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 2d Inadequate procedure documents | Errors and omissions; avoidable accidents and loss; employee dispute and claims; adverse audit report; fraud; low morale; breach of legislation; inability to change or improve; failure to meet Corporate Governance obligations | 4 | 2 | 8 | LOW | IT, CT and VR manuals and procedures constantly reviewed. CT and VR last updated 6/2018. | ok | 6.4 | TOL | LHS | Ongoing review. Documentation for manuals and procedures for new electoral registration system. | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence | exposure occurs | | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------------|--|---|--------------|---------------------------|------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| | | (score 1 - 5) | (score 1- 5) | (L x I) | | | Good x 0.5 OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | | | | | | |
| 3.SPECIFIC BUSINESS RISKS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3a Referencing of our Valuation Roll, Council Tax and Electoral Registration data may be inefficient | Regular duplication of work; confusion in use of multiple references for same property | 4 | 2 | 8 | LOW | Staff training, Shared Directories | ok | 6.4 | TOL | MJA DGY | Work practices under constant review. CT & ER Manuals. File naming convention in hand as part of our records management procedure. Rationalisation of data storage. Review of security settings on access to network folders is underway as part of records management procedure. | 01/03/2020 | 6 monthly |
| 4.SPECIFIC GOVERNANCE RISKS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4a Data protection | There is an unauthorised release of information. | 4 | 3 | 12 | | Working with colleagues on SAA Governance Committee. Fol group formed at SAA. GDPR training undertaken in Spring 2018. Privacy notices have been updated. DPO has been appointed. Suppliers contracts incliude data processing agreements. Data breach procedure and log in place. | ok | 9.6 | LOW | MJA | Working with SAA Governance Committee and stakeholders on data agreements. | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 5. BUSINESS PLANNING & MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5e A strategic shift in the taxation ethos | GVJB may cease to exist; function may be contracted, regionalised; staff redundancies; low morale, staff required to run down existing systems whilst preparing for replacement procedures; Errors, loss of data | 3 | 4 | 12 | | Largely a political issue outwith specific control of the service; the SAA is actively engaged in the new devolved taxation bodies which include Revenue Scotland, the Devolved Tax Collaborative and the Tax Consultation Forum. NDR(S)Act in place SAA Project Plan in place. Grampian NDR reform project plan in development. | OK | 9.6 | LOW | IHM | Monitor situation which might be subject to policy changes. Non-domestic taxation position is now settled with the NDR reforms being implemented. | | 6 monthly |
| 5f Inadequate funding | Essential equipment and Systems upgrade/replacement placed on hold; inability to recruit, retrain or develop staff; poor morale; service improvement opportunities lost; staff leakage | 3 | 4 | 12 | | Board can requisition at their required level. We currently have cross discipline working practices in place. | good | 6 | TOL | IHM | Monitor performance closely for early detection of service degradation. Keep staff informed and involved, encourage innovation and flexible working. | Monthly | Monthly |
| 5g Board fails to make adequate requistions | 100% service failure due to lack of funds resulting in default on property and equipment rentals, insurances, software licencing and salaries. | 3 | 4 | 12 | | Workshop session for Board members August 2019. Budget scenarios presented to Board 1 November 2019. Onging advice of Board Officers. | ok | 9.6 | LOW | IHM | Board Officers to liaise with constituent authorities to seek to ensure that Board requisitions are made timeously. | Weekly | Weekly |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence | exposure | 1 | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------------------------|---|---|--------------|---------------------------|------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| | | (score 1 - 5) | (score 1- 5) | (L x I) | | | Good x 0.5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | | | | | | |
| 5h Inadequate business continuity planning | Inability to maintain or restore essential business functions within required timescale. Failure to meet statutory deadline; audit censure, intervention; dispute with partner councils; Member concern, adverse publicity; loss of records; financial penalties; waste of time and essential resource through inability to control crisis situation | 3 | 5 | 15 | MOD | Plan approved and implemented. Breach notification procedure in place. | good | 7.5 | LOW | ІНМ | Contingency plan under constant review | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 5i Introduction of Registration policy changes | Degradation of Register completeness and accuracy | 5 | 3 | 15 | | Risk and issues register in place. Active voter engagement strategy in place. Active monitoring of progress of 3 electoral bills in Holyrood Parliament. SAA ERC and Scottish Government working with EMS supplier to specify and test required system amendments | | 12 | MOD | | Risk and issues regsiter to be standing item on Admin Group agenda. Continue to seek to strengthen degree of engagement with Cabinet Office, IER DS and Scottish Government. | Monthly | Monthly |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence (score 1 - 5) | exposure occurs | Gross Score (L x I) | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls Good x 0.5 OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|---|---|--|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--------------|---------------------------|------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| 6. SERVICE, PROCESS & DELIVERY | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6a Inadequate numbers of trained / skilled staff to fulfil statutory functions | Failure to meet statutory deadline; errors, omissions; stress, sickness absence; audit censure; public, media concern | 4 | 5 | 20 | | Our internal recruitment policy and RICS training scheme assists retention/recruitment of trained staff. Individual training plans for graduates/trainee valuers prepared and maintained. Skills audit of administrative personnel. Absence Management Policy applied across all offices and staff groups. | ok | 16 | HIGH | | Arrange external opportunities for experience. Monitor vacancies. Widen training across disciplines. Progress training of all Admin staff in CT, VR & ER work. Planning for introduction of 3YR - wide ranging procedure review required to determine precise requirements - systems and personnel. Training plan for all new members of staff. Fresh approach to universities after poor response to undergraduate training opportunities and consideration of apprenticeships | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 6b Inadequate staff development | Inability to retain staff | 4 | 3 | 12 | MOD | SRDS has been implemented. HR advice on revision to SRDS obtained. | ok | 9.6 | LOW | | Review SRDS provisions in place in comparable organisations | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 6c Over-reliance upon a small number of key Information Technology & Systems specialists. | Backlogs, error and omission; stress; inability to recruit, unattractive prospect; staff leakage, stress; insurance claims; quality deficit, deadlines missed; low morale; inability to plan and schedule | 3 | 5 | 15 | | Advance planning - with the exception of snap elections demands are programmed. Outsourcing of services with Service Level Agreements in place. Electoral registration system outsourced to increase long-term resilience. Password management arrangements in place. | ok | 12 | MOD | | Moves to broaden skill-base of IT personnel and improve support/resilience provided by third parties. | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| 6d Inconsistency of approach to tasks due to geographical spread of offices and different councils involved | Imbalance in standards and levels of performance arising out of the differing "capabilities" of our constituent councils; friction with partner councils; audit censure; loss of flexibility | 5 | 2 | 10 | | Regular management administrative and technical group meetings, Operational manuals and Statutory requirements. Since implementation of remote working in March 2020 management has been focussed around broad process disciplines and demand with less emphasis on local office and divisional | good | 5 | TOL | | Wholesale review current procedures required and to be informed by SAA NDR reform workstreams. At a national level the SAA Action Plan first published October 2017 includes an issues log, a local issues log implementtion scheduled for 2020 as part of an overall process review. | 01/02/2021 | Annually |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence | exposure occurs | | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------|--------------|
| | | (score 1 - 5) | (score 1- 5) | (L x I) | | | Good x 0.5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | | | | | | |
| 6e Failure of external contractor at crucial point in | Missed deadline; contractual dispute; | | 1 4 | 12 | MOD | Revised procurement | | 6 | TOL | LHS | Regular monitoring. | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| service cycle. (ER) | GVJB blamed for contractor failure; additional expense; re-tendering exercise; audit censure; media comment; friction with partner councils; | | 7 | 12 | | procedures implemented and supported by Moray Council Procurement team. A procurement action plan is in place. Canvass Risk Register maintained. Canvass Plan & Performance Evaluation | good | J | IOL | LIIO | Regular monitoring. | 01/03/2021 | o monuny |
| | | | | | | submitted to Electoral Commission. Additional infrastructure has been procured to increase resilience. | | | | | | | |
| 6f Failure of external contractor at crucial point in | Missed deadline; contractual dispute; | 3 | 4 | 12 | MOD | Revised procurement | good | 6 | TOL | DGY | Regular monitoring. | 01/03/2021 | 6 monthly |
| service cycle. (IT) | GVJB blamed for contractor failure; additional expense; re-tendering exercise; audit censure; media comment; friction with partner councils; | | | | | procedures implemented and supported by Moray Council Procurement team. A procurement action plan is in place. Requirement for contingency planning by contractors. Backup network in place. Out of hours monitoring and support contract in place. | | | | | | | |
| 6h Out of hours working for statutory events | Staff not available to process last minute | 3 | 3 | 9 | LOW | Overtime payments or | good | 4.5 | TOL | IHM | | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| | registration or absent vote applications | J | | | | time off in lieu is granted for out of hours working. Employment contracts amended from March 2013 to provide out-of-hours availability. | good | | | | | | , |
| 6i Industrial action by Employees | Reduce capability | 3 | 3 | 9 | | Local Level - close liaison | ok | 7.2 | LOW | IHM | Active monitoring | 01/04/2021 | 6 monthly |
| | | | | | | with union reps. National level - negotiations & | | | | | | | |
| | | •—— | | | | dialogue via COSLA. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | dialogue via COSLA. | | | | | | | |
| Votes | | | | Kov | | dialogue via COSLA. | | | | MT | Management Team | | |
| | to provide an initial score. | | | Key CT | | | | | | | Management Team David Yeaman | | |
| ikelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied | | | | СТ | Council T | ax | | | | DGY | Management Team David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie | | |
| ikelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied | | | | CT ER | Council T | | | | | DGY FMIM | David Yeaman | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1 The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks v | = Low, 5 = High. without regard to any controls | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a ground statement. | = Low, 5 = High. without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks very procedures that may be in place. This provides a groupotential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT | = Low, 5 = High. without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks very procedures that may be in place. This provides a gropotential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT | = Low, 5 = High. without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1 The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks very procedures that may be in place. This provides a group protential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAN INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks we can be procedured that may be in place. This provides a group otential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various | IS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1 The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks we procedures that may be in place. This provides a group otential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAN INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors | IS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks we be procedured that may be in place. This provides a group otential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT IS ESSENTIAL THAT IS ESSENTIAL THAT IS ENGLY OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors | IS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks very procedures that may be in place. This provides a group operation of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risks. | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors | IS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group operation of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. | JS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group otential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THA INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONTROLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATION AS A CONT | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. TE = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 | JS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group potential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAINFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATE Should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should have risks as the risks are risks as the risks are risks as the ri | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. TE = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 d be programmed for corrective | JS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group potential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAINFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATE Any risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should action. This should be agreed with the risk owner who s | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. E = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 d be programmed for corrective should assign responsibility for taking | JS | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks very procedures that may be in place. This provides a group operation of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATE Any risks still assessed as HIGH or MODERATE should action. This should be agreed with the risk owner who section and the appropriate timescales. e.g. High = com | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. TE = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 d be programmed for corrective should assign responsibility for taking mence within 4 weeks; | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Notes Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1 The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group potential scale of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATE Should action. This should be agreed with the risk owner who saction and the appropriate timescales. e.g. High = commoderate = commence within 4 months; Low = commence | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. TE = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 d be programmed for corrective should assign responsibility for taking mence within 4 weeks; | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |
| Likelihood & Impact of each incident are first multiplied. Both Likelihood & Impact are measured on a scale of 1. The initial assessment is a consideration of the risks vor procedures that may be in place. This provides a group operation of any problems. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT INFLUENCED BY CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING OF The manager or group then review the CONTROLS that exposures (with reality testing as appropriate) and adjust (good = 0.5, OK = 0.8, poor = 1.5) to provide a net risk scores are graded - TOLERABLE = < 6.5; LOW = 6.5 up to 10; MODERATE Should action. This should be agreed with the risk owner who saction and the appropriate timescales. e.g. High = com | without regard to any controls oss score which is an indication of the AT GROSS SCORE IS NOT BENEFICIALLY R INTENDED CONTROLS. at are or should be in place to reduce the various the gross score by weighting factors isk score. TE = > 10 up to 15; HIGH = > 15 d be programmed for corrective should assign responsibility for taking mence within 4 weeks; | | | CT ER KPI IT | Council T Electoral Key Perfo | ax Registration rmance Indicator on Technology | | | | DGY FMIM GMO IHM JAB LHS MJA | David Yeaman Fiona McKelvie Gavin Oag Ian Milton Jim Barron Linda Smith Mark Adam | | |

| | ASSESSOR ERO | | | | | | | • | RISK REGIS | | | | | | | | APPE |
|------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------------|--|------|-------------------|---|-------------------|--|--------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Risk Description | | Wors | Case Outcome Scenari | 0(| actual | Impact if exposure occurs score 1- 5) | | 1 | Current Contro | ls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls Good x 0.5 OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
| Risk Matrix | x - Likelihood | | | | | | | | | | 1 001 X 1.5 | | | | | | |
| Likelihood | | | | De | scription | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Almost certaiı | Will undou possibl | btedly happen, y frequently | 0 | ver 90% | | | Annua | al | lmmi | nent/near mi | ss | | | | | |
| 4 | Likely | | oly happen, but rsistent issue | Ul | p to 90% | | | 3 yea | r | Has hap | pened in the | past | | | | | |
| 3 | Possible | May happ | en occasionally | Uį | p to 65% | | | 10 yea | ar | Has hap | pened elsew | here | | | | | |
| 2 | Unlikely | | ted to happen, s possible | Ul | p to 20% | | | 25 yea | ar | Not kno | own in this ac | tivity | | | | | |
| 1 | Remote | Very unlike h | ely this will ever appen | Les | ss than 5% | | | 100 ye | ar | Fo | rce majeure | | | | | | |
| Risk Matrix | x - Impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Impact | | | | De | escription | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Score | | Impact on Servi Objectives | ce Financial I | | | t on Peo | ple | Durati | on of Impact | : | Impact on Reputation | - | | | | | |
| 5 | Catastrophic | Unable to functio inability to fulfil obligations | | cial loss | [| Death | | (days) | ess of 2 years to recover pre nt position | s Hi e sev | ghly damagir ere loss of pu confidence | na. | | | | | |
| 4 | Major | Significant impact sevice provision | on Major financ | al loss | Extensive perma | e injury, i anent hai | | year recov | en 1 year - 2 rs (days) to er pre event position | publi | Major adverse city, major lo confidence | e ss of | | | | | |
| 3 | Moderate | Service objective partially achievab | | nancial | requi permane | al treatme ired, sement harm 1 year | ni | 1 year (recov | n 6 months to 1½ to 1 day) to er pre event position | 0 8 | Some adverse oublicity, lega implications | ıl 📑 | | | | | |
| 2 | Minor | Minor impact or service objective | | ancial | non peri | d treatmo manent h | narm | | nonths (hours recover | ' ⁾ em | Some public barrassment, age to reputa | no | | | | | |
| 1 | Negligible | Minimal impact, r service disruptio | | cial loss | | obvious rm/injury | | month | nal - up to 2 ns (hours) to recover | | o interest to the | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | | | | | , | | | | | | | |

| Risk Description | Worst Case Outcome Scenario | Likelihood of actual occurrence (score 1 - 5) | exposure occurs | Score | Initial Risk Rating | Current Controls | Quality & Effectiveness of Controls Good x 0.5 OK x 0.8 Poor x 1.5 | Net Score | Revised Risk Rating | Risk Owner | Action Proposed | Review Date | Review Cycle |
|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|---------------------------|---|---|--------------|---------------------------|------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| Obsolete Risks | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1d Storage accommodation (on and off site) may be unfit for current demands of service. Concerns regarding amount of storage space. | e Inadequate storage; operational inefficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | TOL | Service responsiveness to assessed risks. | good | 0 | TOL | MT | No longer a current risk. | | |
| 1e Banff office accommodation may be unfit for current demands of service | Health & Safety of staff compromised; cost of running repairs; poor security; inadequate storage; failure to comply with legislation e.g. DDA; poor image, | 0 | 0 | 0 | TOL | Regular building surveys; Patch & mend repairs as necessary; Fire and security protections and | good | 0 | TOL | | Building now vacated and staff have moved to new purpose built office. No longer a current risk. | | |
| 4a Lack of certainty regarding duty of disclosure under Freedom of Information | No longer considered to be an issue and likelihood minimal. | 1 | 1 | 1 | TOL | Scottish Assessors Association - pooled expertise; Register created on types of information request received to provide guidance; Controls untested, but increasing level of staff understanding obtained from practical experience | good | 0.5 | TOL | IHM | Revised publication scheme implemented. | | |
| 5a Relocation of Banff office | Loss of records; interruption to service and missed deadline; contractor failure; inadequacies in facilities at new site; staff injury, complaint, claim; dispute with contractor; additional, unbudgeted costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | TOL | Tight project plan; Close monitoring of plan. Selective timing; Appointment + monitoring of reputable contractors | good | 0 | TOL | GMO | Move completed successfully. No longer a current risk. | | |
| 5b Relocation of main HQ at future date. | Uncertainty over final location; partner timeframe does not recognise essential GVJB service or Statutory deadlines; damage to staff morale; disruption to service; systems failure and related "snagging" problems at new site; staff injury, complaint; loss or damage to equipment; failure by removal contractor unforeseen costs. | 0 | 0 | 0 | GOOD | Move completed successfully | good | 0 | TOL | AWH DGY | Move completed in June 2007, new 10 year lease. | | |
| 5c Outstanding matters in connection with new lease of HQ accommodation | Uncertainty over final location; partner timeframe does not recognise essential GVJB service or Statutory deadlines; damage to staff morale; disruption to service; systems failure and related "snagging" problems at new site; staff injury, complaint; loss or damage to equipment; unforeseen costs. | 5 | 3 | 15 | MOD | | good | 12 | MOD | IHM | Lease finalised. | | |
| 5d We may be required to carry out a Council Tax revaluation | Inadequate staff resource - competencies and number; Media management; Member agendas; quality or deadline slip in ongoing service; public resistance and volume of appeals; increased staff costs | , | 2 | 2 | TOL | Records are currently maintained up to date in readiness for a Revaluation at any time | good | 1 | TOL | МТ | Revaluation now unlikely. | | |
| 5g We may have difficulty managing the outcome of the staffing review; (equal pay legislation). Staffing review completed and Career Grade Scheme approved but not yet fully implemented. | Industrial action; poor staff morale; staff leakage; inability to replace, recruit; increased financial cost. | 0 | 0 | 0 | TOL | Career grade scheme to be implemented. | good | 0 | TOL | IHM | Review successfully completed and Career Grade Scheme implemented. | | |
| 6g Risk of Solar Flare | There is a heightened risk of increased solar flare activity peaking in 2013. Any magnetic media (disk or tape) could be wiped by such an occurrence. | 1 | 5 | 5 | TOL | Data in Woodhill House is located in basement, this may offer some protection. Banff and Elgin data vulnerable. Elgin archived data stored at Woodhill House. | ok | 4 | TOL | DGY | Industry standard precautions taken | 01/03/2016 | 6 monthly |

Risk Matrix - Likelihood

| Likelihood | | | Description | | |
|------------|----------------|--|--------------|----------|----------------------------|
| 5 | Almost certain | Will undoubtedly happen, possibly frequently | Over 90% | Annual | Imminent/near miss |
| 4 | Likely | Will probably happen, but not a persistent issue | Up to 90% | 3 year | Has happened in the past |
| 3 | Possible | May happen occasionally | Up to 65% | 10 year | Has happened elsewhere |
| 2 | Unlikely | Not expected to happen, but is possible | Up to 20% | 25 year | Not known in this activity |
| 1 | Remote | Very unlikely this will ever happen | Less than 5% | 100 year | Force majeure |

Risk Matrix - Impact

| Impact Score | | | De | scription | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Impact on Service Objectives | Financial Impact | Impact on People | Duration of Impact | Impact on Reputation |
| 5 | Catastrophic | Unable to function, inability to fulfil obligations | Severe financial loss (> £) | Death | In excess of 2 years (days) to recover pre event position | Highly damaging, severe loss of public confidence |
| 4 | Major | Significant impact on sevice provision | Major financial loss | Extensive injury, major permanent harm | Between 1 year - 2 years (days) to recover pre event position | Major adverse publicity, major loss of confidence |
| 3 | Moderate | Service objectives partially achievable | Significant financial loss | Medical treatment required, semi permanent harm up to 1 year | Between 6 months to 1 year (½ to 1 day) to recover pre event position | Some adverse publicity, legal implications |
| 2 | Minor | Minor impact on service objectives | Moderate financial loss | First aid treatment, non permanent harm up to 1 month | 2 to 6 months (hours) to recover | Some public embarrassment, no damage to reputation |
| 1 | Negligible | Minimal impact, no service disruption | Minimal financial loss (< £) | No obvious harm/injury | Minimal - up to 2 months (hours) to recover | No interest to the press, internal only |