



## ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RISK REGISTER

Financial Year:	2009/10
Directorate:	Organisational Development
Executive Director:	George Pashley
Service Area Risk Register:	N/A
Relevant SIPs:	HS, HR SIPs 2009-10
Risk Register Owner (RRO)*:	Ian Rabett

	QR1	QR2	QR3	QR4
Date of Update and Review:		28 September 2009	30 December 2009	
RRO Signature:				
Date of Review and Approval:				
Executive Director Signature***:				

**KEY: -**

- \* - see Guidance worksheet item **xviii)** for definitions
- \*\* - only required for Service Area Risk Registers.
- \*\*\* - only required for Directorate Registers (on 6 monthly basis).

**Risk Register Colour Key:-**

- = Corporate
- = Directorate
- = Service Area
- = Project/Partnership

**RISK REGISTER**

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	Inherent / Prevailing Risk			Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual Risk		
						LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score				Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
<b>Objective: Deliver excellent customer focused services.</b>														
	Failure to understand diversity and customer excellence in our workforce.	No sustained culture change. Inconsistent customer service.	Level of mandatory awareness training for new starters. Level of effective induction procedures and learning evaluation process.	M Mayes and Carol Aaron	Aug-08	4	4	16	Mandatory customer care and equality and diversity training for new starters. Active monitoring of complaints to identify any patterns or trends. Refresher training every year. Maximising use of Diversity Champions Group to drive home key messages. Longer term introduction of e learning E&D modules.	Lou Beardsley and Carol Aaron	All actions effective from 01/08/08	2	4	8
	Failure to successfully implement the new HR structure and full staffing compliment.	Lack of capacity and capability to deliver the company's aims and development plans. Higher risk of poor customer service and loss of reputation as an employer in the market place. Negative affect on Company staff recruitment and retention.	Timeliness of decision making. Reputation of Company in the market place. Changing work environment/context.	M Mayes	Nov-08	3	4	12	New Director of OD reviewing existing proposals. Produce a new structure. Consult with HR staff/TU and implement. Consideration of a career graded structure to 'grow our own' HR advisers. Admin structure in place and currently recruiting. HR Advisor roles to be finalised before advertising vacancies.	George Pashley	New structure to be implemented by 11/01/2010	2	3	6
	Under representative workforce.	Impact on Human Resources capabilities, service delivery and company reputation.	Level of appropriate and accessible recruitment advertising. Level of positive action. Capacity and level of training of managers. Ability to work and engage with partnership organisation and stakeholders.	M Mayes	Aug-08	3	4	12	An effective recruitment and selection procedure. Recruitment monitoring. R&S procedure currently being reviewed. E Recruitment enables effective monitoring at all stages of the recruitment process. Interview training currently being organised. Representative panels where appropriate. Work experience targeting high BME populated inner city schools and all girl schools along with outreach work for apprenticeship schemes. EME representation on these recruitment panels. HR in attendance on selection panels.	Lou B/Carol Aaron/	All actions effective from 31/03/09	2	4	8
	High levels of sickness absence across the Company and failure to embed the Sickness Management Procedure.	Insufficient human resources of the right quality and quantity. Low staff morale caused by increased workload of existing staff covering sickness absence. Managers distracted from service delivery when staff off sick. The cost of covering sickness absence, through the use of additional agency or temporary staff, exceeds available budget resource.	Ability to establish adequate sickness absence procedures. Communication of policy and procedure to Managers. Communication of policy and procedure to absent staff and adherence. Adequacy and consistency of procedures to dealing with absenteeism. Level of adequate Occupational Health service support. Level of ownership of the responsibility for dealing with issues by Managers.	M Mayes	Aug-08	3	4	12	Implement a robust procedure consistently across the company. Train managers in systems and application of managing absence. Set targets for Directorates to achieve. Engage new Occupational Health provider. Pilot new ways of dealing with sickness. Policy development completed. Pilots inclusive with regards to supporting the reduction in sickness absence. New OH provider on board. HR Advisors working very closely with managers on all case work.		New procedure and targets in place by the end of March 2010 following the evaluation of the pilots. New occupational health provider in place from March 09	2	3	6
	Failure to provide ongoing diversity training, especially legislative, to new and existing employees.	Potential litigation due to claims of racism, sexism etc, and the associated cost and resource pressure of such litigation. Reputational damage e.g. bad press coverage.	Inconsistency in the induction of new employees. Dissolution of Equality Steering Group and no alternative to strategic decision making - specifically on diversity. Extent of training budget provision to facilitate training needs.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	3	4	12	Mandatory content for all new starters. Mandatory training for new starters. Active monitoring of complaints to identify any patterns or trends. Refresher training every year. Maximising use of Diversity Champions Group to drive home key messages. Longer term introduction of e-learning of E&D modules.	C Aaron	Mar 2010	2	3	6
<b>Objective: Engage customers in influencing the shape and quality of housing services that we provide.</b>														
<b>Objective: Be a key partner in the delivery of safe and sustainable neighbourhoods.</b>														
	Fire Safety arrangements in high rise / sheltered scheme buildings below standard	Multiple deaths of residents in fire, prosecution with fines and reputational damage	Enforcement notice served by FRS, risk assessments provided by external consultant.	Ian Rabett	04/09/2009	4	5	20	Develop Fire Safety Policy. Develop and implement procedures for fire safety inspections. Set up working group to ensure fire precautions are up to standard.	C. Hall C. Hall I. Rabett	Nov 2009 Nov 2009 Nov 2009	2	4	8
	Failure to extend the 'Tackling Worklessness' project beyond NCH and to engage with city partner agencies.	Disjointed approach to a City wide agenda leading to inefficient use of resources and potential duplication of effort. Damage to Company reputation of being a lead partner in City wide agendas.	Capacity of Organisational Development Directorate to deliver on a major city wide project. Level of buy-in from workforce to tackle worklessness in the community.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	3	4	12	Develop Company wide strategy. Links with city partners established via recent sustainable employment conference. NCH Director championing initiative. Future Jobs Fund Scheme and Mentoring in the Community programme being established.	C Aaron	Feb 2010	2	4	8
	Failure to sufficiently manage the increased number of Apprentices and co-ordinate 1 in a Million Scheme. Alternative ways of managing schme being explored.	Increases in turnover, sickness absence levels and disciplines and grievances linked to apprentices. Also failures to complete on time.	Increase in numbers from the Future Jobs Fund means additional funding to increase number of trainees beyond manageable level.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	4	4	16	Team have agreed to take on extra responsibilities linked to apprentice management with a proposal to recruit additional administration staff and review in three months.	C Aaron	Jan 2010	3	2	6
<b>Objective: Be a key partner in the transformation of Nottingham's neighbourhoods.</b>														

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
	Poor Health & Safety performance by Decent Homes contractors.	Enforcement action resulting in programme delays, compensation claims by tenants / leaseholders and poor press.	Existing claims and complaints evolving from improvement works; experience of similar organisations.	Ian Rabett	2008	4	3	12	Review arrangements for tender evaluations, H&S performance reviews and contractor competence validation. Simplify tender evaluation arrangements and ensure all involved in procurement process understand them. Review process for H&S inspections of contractor on site work.	J. Whitehead C. Beckwith C. Beckwith	Jun 2009 Jun 2010 Dec 2009	3	2	6
<b>Objective: Be an excellent organisation.</b>														
	H&S training or information not understood by all.	Successful personal injury litigation against Company, > £250k.	Personal injury claims are regularly made - at present around 50% are successful. H&S training or information may be relied upon to form a defence, but it can be alleged that the training or information provided was not presented in a way that could be understood by the individual.	Ian Rabett	2008	3	3	9	Develop E-Learning (initial target will be to develop and implement one e-learning module). Roll out e-learning for manager safety course, DSE assessment, office induction and fire safety. Develop H&S Training strategy.	R. Worrall C. Aaron R. Worrall	Nov 2008 Dec 2009 Dec 2009	2	3	6
	Risk assessment process does not meet needs of individual employees.	Successful personal injury litigation against Company, > £250k.	Personal injury claims are regularly made - at present around 50% are successful. Risk assessments are usually relied upon to form a defence, but it can be alleged that the risk assessment did not meet the needs of the individual.	Ian Rabett	2008	4	3	12	Prepare 3 year H&S strategy including review of entire risk assessment process, including process to meet individual needs. Develop & implement new risk assessment process.	I. Rabett I. Rabett	Aug 2008 Jun 2010	2	3	6
	H&S performance of NCH services not regularly audited / verified.	Non-conformances not identified resulting in high profile failures. Impact on Company reputation and loss of revenue to claims / fire damage.	No clear inspection / audit programme in place.	Ian Rabett	2008	4	3	12	Prepare 3 year H&S strategy including review of inspection and audit procedures. Implement inspection schedule. Develop & implement audit process.	I. Rabett I. Rabett G. Langham	Aug 2008 Jun 2009 Jun 2011	2	3	6
	No business continuity plan exists for organisation	Organisation unprepared for impact of an emergency or loss of facility or personnel	No corporate plans or process in place (some services have existing plans)	Ian Rabett	04/09/2009	4	4	16	Prepare Business Continuity Plan for critical services Prepare BCP for organisation	I. Rabett I. Rabett	Dec 2009 Jun 2011	4	2	8
	Poor employee and industrial relations.	Low morale. Increased number of grievances and disciplinary. Above average turnover. Discriminatory practices. Increase in the number of Employment Tribunals.	Level of manager capability and capacity. The provision of effective advice and support from HR. The existence of modern and effective policies and procedures. Level of Trade Union capability. The existence of modern and effective negotiation and consultation processes.	M Mayes	Nov-08	3	4	12	Effective procedures and support. Training of managers and trade unions. Review of the Framework Agreement. Encouraging all parties to deal with potential grievances at the earliest opportunity. Review of the Framework agreement on hold due to the implementation of the modernisation programme	Mary Mayes	Jul 2010	3	3	9
	High levels of Employment Tribunal Claims	Significant cost implications. Low Morale. Significantly resource intensive. Adverse publicity. Poor reputation in the market place	Ineffective communication with trade unions. Managers competency in dealing with employee relations issues. Unclear and ambiguous Agreements. Unclear/unfit policies and procedures	M Mayes	Nov-08	4	4	16	Reviewing historic Agreements. Consulting and negotiating with trade unions on new methods of working. Training managers in how to deal with conflict. Review of associated policies and guidelines. Regular meetings at all levels with the trade unions. Quality advice, support and guidance from HR in the execution of all the prevailing processes. Training of Managers in Investigation skills currently underway. Board Member training for Appeals against dismissal.	Mary Mayes/Carol Aaron/HR Advisors	Ongoing	3	4	12
	Single Status/Job Evaluation	Equal Pay Claims. 2 tier workforce. Affordability. Equality Level III status unachievable	Robust and fair JE scheme.	George Pashley / Mary Mayes	Sep-09	4	4	16	Resource to be sourced. JE scheme to be reviewed for fit for purpose. Analysis of differentials to be completed for NJC employees	George P/Mary Mayes	June 2010?	3	4	12
	Failure to respond to Audit Commission recommendation on developing the competency and capability of managers.	Non-delivery of service improvements and effective performance management. Bad press and poor Company image due to not achieving 2 stars. Failure of the Company to retain and attract high calibre employees.	Prioritisation of development by line managers. Level of effective provision from Organisational Development.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	3	3	9	Comprehensive management development programme being implemented including coaching/mentoring, accredited programmes and training in performance mgt systems e.g. appraisal and managing sickness absence. One to one support to be provided by team.	C Aaron	Jan 2010	2	3	6
	Failure to deliver agreed NCH workforce development plan 2009.	Workforce not developed to continuously improve services. Employee dissatisfaction with lack of training leading to low morale, higher employee turnover. Customer dissatisfaction with services, poor image of service. Outsourcing of services. Loss of IIP status	Capacity issues in implementing the plan.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	2	3	6	Programme outlined and well underway for delivery - in line with budget.	C Aaron	Sep 2009	2	3	6

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
	Failure to embed new People Performance Appraisal Scheme.	Workforce not set annual targets or poor quality review meetings with managers. Failure to achieve NCH targets thus impacting upon star rating and external reputation. Low morale.	Managers not taking ownership for performance management. Managers not having the capacity.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	3	4	12	Robust training programme in place. Coaching support to be provided to all managers. Targets for completion of appraisals to be monitored by EMT. Simplified scheme to support manager buy in, developed in partnership with mgrs.	C Aaron	Feb 2010	2	3	6
	Failure to maintain Investors In People accreditation.	Company loses image as an employer of choice. Harder to attract high calibre job applicants. Employee morale affected by loss of prestigious award, leading to low morale and motivation affecting service delivery.	IIP standards not maintained due to management capacity.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	3	4	12	Use of IIP assessors to advise and support continuous maintenance of accreditation. Name officer to undertake project management role of annual health check.	C Aaron	Spring 2012	2	3	6
	Failure to introduce Housing Management Traineeships	Succession planning, representation of females and BME at managerial is not transparent.	Timescales for recruitment linked to academic year - need to embed processes and format of Graduate Training scheme linked to academic year is highly challenging given resources and timescales	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	4	3	12	Benchmarking in place along with proposal to introduce professional qualifications across the organisation to develop from within initially. Timescale linked to academic year has been missed this will not be achieved this financial year.	C Aaron	Sep 2009	5	2	10
	Failure to embed E-learning across the company - phase 2 E&D	Opportunity missed to continue a value for money learning method to cover legislative and core training and refresher training	The launch of H&S e-learning last November has proven a slow process with many people taking too long to access and complete training modules.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	2	2	4	Phase 1 H&S Delivery underway so E&D will be second phase -	C Aaron	Jan 2010	2	3	6
	Failure to support Property Services on fully implementing hand held technology in specified timescales.	Operational problems resulting in customer and staff complaints.	Partnership with Project Team being established but resources will be required to deliver the training to standard.	C Aaron	01-Apr-09	4	5	20	Continually in contact with Project Leader and awaiting instruc	C Aaron	Jan 2010	3	4	12
	Failure to ensure all operatives in Property Services have CSCS cards	Failure to keep the Repairs and Maintenance Contract or win additional contacts through lack of proof of competency of operatives.	A small % of operatives failing to engage will delay this but ultimately everyone will achieve a card.	C Aaron	29-Jun-09	4	2	8	Project Manager working closely with all parties. Service Level Agreement in place with provider.	C Aaron	Mar 2010	3	2	6
<b>Off-Plan Objectives - Other duties, responsibilities &amp; challenges</b>														
	Fit for Purpose Payment Systems	Equal Pay Claims. Low Morale. Affordability. High level of grievances. Resource implications	Poor relations with the trade unions. Equitable and transparent payment system. Managing realistic salary levels.	M Mayes	01/08/2009	4	4	16	Reviewing Payment systems in consultation with Tusk. Benchmarking with the Housing Sector. Discussing with the City Council possibilities in changes of how NCH is paid for work done. External resources recruited to support the review	M Mayes	Apr 2010	3	3	9

## Risk Matrix

<b>Likelihood Rating</b>	Almost Certain	5	5	10	15	20	25
	Likely	4	4	8	12	16	20
	Unlikely	3	3	6	9	12	15
	Improbable	2	2	4	6	8	10
	Remote	1	1	2	3	4	5
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			<b>Impact Rating</b>				

Numbers in the boxes are the "Risk Scores" which are equal to the product of the Impact and Likelihood "Risk Ratings".

## Likelihood

HOW TO MEASURE LIKELIHOOD (Vertical Axis)		
LIKELIHOOD RATING	DESCRIPTION	CRITERIA
5. ALMOST CERTAIN	Almost certain to occur	81+% chance
4. LIKELY	More likely to occur than not	51-80% chance
3. UNLIKELY	Less likely to occur than to not	31-50% chance
2. IMPROBABLE	Low but not impossible	11-30% chance
1. REMOTE	Virtually impossible	0 to 10% chance

## Impact

HOW TO MEASURE IMPACT (Horizontal Axis)		
IMPACT RATING	COST IMPACT	SCHEDULE IMPACT
5. CATASTROPHIC	Major increase (75+%)	Major delay (>50%)
4. MAJOR	Large increase (31-75%)	Large delay (31-50%)
3. MODERATE	Significant increase (11-30%)	Significant slip (11-30%)
2. MINOR	Small increase (4-10%)	Small schedule slip (4-10%)
1. NEGLIGIBLE	Negligible effect on projected cost (0-3%)	Negligible effect on projected schedule (0-3%)

**ACTIONS REQUIRED AFTER ASSESSING INHERENT RISK**

INHERENT RISK SCORES	CONCLUSION AND ACTION REQUIRED	RESIDUAL RISK SCORES	MONITORED BY (Timeliness)
<b>1 to 4</b>	<p><u>Acceptable level of risk.</u>                      No further action(s) required to reduce risk, but Action Owners shall ensure that the relevant controls are operating effectively. Existing controls for low risk areas shall be carefully reviewed to ensure that there are not too many controls in place i.e. lack of efficient use of resources.</p>	<b>1 to 4</b>	SERVICE AREA MANAGERS / RROs (Quarterly)
<b>5 to 11</b>	<p><u>Implementation of additional controls may be required.</u>                      The costs and benefits associated with implementing additional systems, controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate individual risks shall be considered and implemented as deemed required.                      The relevant Director/RRRO/RRO or CRO may agree that no further action(s) should be taken, but this decision must be recorded on the risk register.</p>	<b>5 to 11</b>	
<b>12 to 25</b>	<p><u>Implementation of additional controls is required.</u>                      Directors/RRROs/RROs (and their teams) or the CRO (and the RMP) shall discuss, establish and implement additional systems, controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate individual risks.                       If the decision is taken not to introduce additional controls or other measures to mitigate high level risks, approval must be sort from the Board. Any such agreement from should be recorded on the risk register.</p>	<b>1 to 4</b>	DIRECTORS* ( 6 Monthly Basis) & THE RISK MANAGEMENT PANEL (Bi-Monthly Basis)
		<b>5 to 11</b>	
		<b>12 to 25</b>	

\* - Directors are ultimately responsible for deciding which risks are included on their Directorate Risk Registers and explaining any such omissions from SARRs.

### **Risk Register Construction Steps (for more detailed guidance see the Risk Management Cycle - Appendix 6 of the RMF)**

- 1) Risk registers should be completed, reviewed and updated as per the requirements of Company's Risk Management Framework (available on the Company's internet site - see link towards the bottom of the following linked page):  
[http://www.nottinghamcityhomes.org.uk/customer\\_care/more\\_strategies.aspx](http://www.nottinghamcityhomes.org.uk/customer_care/more_strategies.aspx)
- 2) Risk Register Owners (RROs)/Responsible Officers (RRROs) should identify the individual risks associated with each corporate plan objective specified on the
- 3) "Risk Register" worksheet RROs/RRROs should identify any additional risks associated with their risk area under "Other duties, responsibilities & concerns" at the bottom of the "Risk Register" worksheet.
- 4) Each risk should be assigned a 'Risk Owner' (defined below) and a date when the risk was raised.
- 5) Where the risk register is aligned with a Service Improvement Plan (SIP) (see Summary worksheet) the SIP should be reviewed alongside the register to ensure that all risks associated with achieving SIP objectives are identified and included as necessary and cross referenced.
- 6) Value for Money, the Reputation of the Company & Financial Cost should be considered by all RROs/RRROs in relation to the risks in their areas.
- 7) RROs/RRROs should provide each risk with an impact and likelihood rating according to the "rules" set out on the "Risk Matrix" worksheet. The "Inherent/Prevailing Risk Score" will be calculated automatically. This is the initial score before Counter Measures or Controls in place to manage the Risk have been considered and is sometimes called the "natural" risk rank. Risks that have scores of 12,15,16,20 or 25 are serious risks with **HIGH** Risk Scores that require a bespoke management response.
- 8) RROs/RRROs should identify existing counter measures for each risk and assess whether they are adequate.
- 9) RROs/RRROs should identify additional actions to be taken (e.g. Controls / Mitigations / Countermeasure Actions or a Management Plan) if the existing counter measures are considered to be insufficient to manage each risk down to an acceptable level.
- 10) Each action identified as required to control risk should be assigned an 'Action Owner' (defined below). There will often be more than one Action Owner for each risk and Action Owners may be the peer of, or more senior to, the Risk Owner.
- 11) The key existing Counter Measures (step 7) and any new action(s) identified during step 8) should be summarised in the related column of the "Risk Register" worksheet, together with specific "In Operation Target Dates".
- 12) RROs/RRROs should then re-rank each risk with a "Residual" impact & likelihood rating according to the "rules" on the "Risk Matrix" worksheet. The final "Residual Risk Score" will be calculated automatically.
- 13) Directorate Risk Registers should only include risks with **HIGH** and **MEDIUM** Risk Scores.

### **Risk Register Validation (actions required of the RRRO, RRO and Company Secretary)**

- a) Risk Registers should be reviewed & updated as per the requirements of the Risk Management Framework & evidenced as such through completion of the 'Summary' worksheet.
- b) Registers should be reviewed against all relevant Internal Audit reports to highlight any controls identified by IA as not being in place or not working effectively.
- c) The Risk Register review process should include the testing of a selection of counter measures/controls to ensure they are in place and working effectively.
- d) Evaluation Forms (included as Appendix D in the Risk Management Framework) should be used by Executive Directors, RRROs and RROs to evaluate the content of their risk registers against the Company's Risk Management Framework.

### **Definitions (for further definitions see the Company's Risk Management Framework - Appendix A)**

- i) **Risk**: combination of the **probability** of an **event** & its **consequence**. The term **risk** is generally used only when there is at least the possibility of negative consequences. In some situations, risk arises from the possibility of deviation from expected outcomes or **events**.
- ii) **Consequence**: outcome of an **event**. There may be more than one consequence from an event. Consequences can range from positive to negative and can be expressed qualitatively and quantitatively.
- iii) **Probability**: extent to which an **event** is likely to occur. Degrees of belief about probability can be chosen as ranks, such as rare/unlikely/moderate/likely/almost certain.
- iv) **Event**: occurrence of a particular set of circumstances. The event can be certain or uncertain, with a single occurrence or a series of occurrences. The probability associated with the event can be estimated for a given period of time.
- v) **Risk management**: the process of controlling **risks** to ensure that they are reduced to an acceptable level.
- vi) **Likelihood** – an assessment is made of how likely the risk is to occur in practice.
- vii) **Impact** – an assessment is made on if the risk did occur, what would be the impact on the Company.
- viii) **Risk control**: actions implementing **risk management** decisions. Risk control may involve monitoring, re-evaluation and compliance with decisions.
- ix) **Risk response**: actions taken to mitigate a **risk**.
- x) **Risk reduction (mitigation)**: actions taken to lessen the **probability**, negative **consequences** or both, associated with a **risk**, through specific controls.
- xi) **Risk treatment**: process of selection and implementation of measures to modify **risk**. Risk treatment measures can include avoiding, optimising, transferring or retaining **risk**.
- xii) **Inherent (gross) risk**: the **exposure** arising from a **risk** before any action has been taken to manage it. Recurrent **risks** that arise through an organisations existence in an environment i.e. not necessarily through its actions or choices, are often referred to as inherent risks.
- xiii) **Residual risk**: the **exposure** arising from a specific **risk** after action has been taken to manage it (making the assumption that the action has been effective) i.e. **risk** remaining after **risk** treatment. Residual risk should be lower than the **inherent risk**.
- xiv) **Risk rating**: derived from the scoring mechanism and designed to allow the organisation to prioritise its **risk management** activities.
- xv) **Risk score**: each risk is assessed for **impact** and **likelihood** before considering what **controls** are in place to manage it. The resulting score is called the risk score and is derived from the factor of the individual **likelihood** and **impact** risk ratings.
- xvi) **Risk matrix**: the mechanism used to display the **risk scores** produced as a result of the various **risk ratings**.
- xvii) **In operation target date**: the target date by which all 'Additional Controls, Mitigations and Countermeasure Actions', adopted to address specific **risks**, have been established and implemented.
- xviii) **Risk Register Owners (RROs)**: responsible for reviewing, updating and managing (primarily) Service Area Risk Registers, (but also) the Corporate Register and project or programme risk registers.
- xix) **Risk Register Responsible Officers (RRROs)**: responsible for reviewing, updating and managing Directorate Risk Registers.
- xx) **Risk Owners**: responsible for individual risks assigned.
- xxi) **Action Owners**: responsible for taking the actions needed to control the risk, as authorised by the Risk Owner.