

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



C5 - The Council fails to comply with the regulatory framework within which it must operate.

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| Category: Legal & Regulatory | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: James Deane | Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 4 Very Likely | 4 Severe | 16 Red | 3 Likely | 2 Medium | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| <p>As a public sector organisation, there a number of regulatory frameworks which govern the way in which the Council must operate both on a day-to-day basis and in the discharging of one-off duties or actions.</p> <p>Generally, compliance with these frameworks is considered an operational risk and is monitored and managed through a combination of the Operational Risk Register and Performance Indicators which are reported to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committees.</p> <p>However, there is a risk that in some circumstances failure to comply with regulations could result in a number of consequences for the Council that are sufficiently negative and high profile in nature to become, for a short time, strategic in nature.</p> <p>For example, failure to follow the correct protocols prescribed under the data protection legislation could result in the following consequences for the Council:</p> | | <p>The Council has a number of strategies and policies in place which aim to provide clarity in the way Council Members and staff should operate.</p> <p>These documents are reviewed and updated periodically by Officers who are experts in the field and are frequently the subject of Internal Audit reviews in order to provide Members with independent, third-party assurance.</p> <p>These processes mitigate the likelihood of this risk crystallising and have resulted in my reducing the inherent risk score from '4', Very Likely, to '2', Unlikely.</p> <p>Data Protection policy & procedures Health & Safety policy & procedures Risk Management framework Safeguarding policy & procedures Financial Regulations Procurement Standing Orders Constitution</p> | | <p>The Financial Regulations (Main Accounting) and Emergency Plan were audited by Mazars, the Council's Internal Auditors in 2014/15 and achieved a FULL level of assurance.</p> <p>The Risk Management framework and Procurement Standing Orders were audited in 2014/15 and achieved a SUBSTANTIAL level of assurance.</p> <p>Data Protection, Health and Safety, the Constitution (Corporate Governance) and the Financial Regulations (Main Accounting) are in the Internal Audit plan for review in 2015/16.</p> | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



1. Disclosure of personal information causing harm to a resident
 2. High profile negative publicity regarding the way the Council operates
 3. Significant financial penalty imposed by the Information Commissioner

This risk has been included on the Strategic Risk Register to ensure that there is scope to escalate an operational risk for Cabinet consideration and Audit Committee scrutiny should there be a period of intensified risk in a specific regulatory area.

Emergency Plan
 Human Resources terms & conditions

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The Health and Safety Executive's investigation into the Council's management of exposure to Hand Arm Vibration at Cupid Green remains ongoing. However, there are no material developments on which to update Members or to warrant changing the current risk score.

A meeting has been scheduled for relevant officers to meet with counsel in early December for them to give a view on the Council's position. Members will be updated once further information becomes available.

C6 - The Council does not attract and retain the skill sets within its workforce that will enable it to maximise opportunities for delivering its services more efficiently through increased partnership working.

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Category: People/Employees | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: Sally Marshall | Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 4 Very Likely | 4 Severe | 16 Red | 2 Unlikely | 4 Severe | 8 Amber |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| Consequences | Current Controls | Assurance |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of service delivery is likely to be adversely affected due to a lack of resources and/or skills to effectively deliver services through increased partnership working. • There is likely to be a reduction in efficiency savings due to inability to create more effective partnerships. • There is also likely to be a negative impact on any proposals for devolved powers. • A failure to create more examples of effective partnership working will result in a higher likelihood of back office and front line services being reduced as the financial constraints on the Council's budget continue to tighten. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leading in Dacorum continues to be delivered (all courses stated in risk register) - People strategy to be implemented autumn 2016 which will cover issues including graduate scheme, apprenticeship scheme, succession planning, reviewing T&Cs etc. - Continuation of sharing services with other LAs, with policy development and transactional/operational Hr activities - The new approach for service planning for 2016/2017 focusses heavily on service innovation, service efficiencies and workforce planning. - All leadership appointments are subject to behaviour tests which will assist with assessing their understanding and approach to partnership working. This control will reduce the risk as it will ensure that candidates who are appointed to leadership positions within the Council will have demonstrated that they display a positive approach to partnership working. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across 2015/16 the Council had a voluntary annual turnover rate of 10.6% (76 staff). This compares positively to the public sector average (18%) and it is below the level within local government (11.9%). It is also lower than average for district councils (11%). • Opportunities for collaboration and shared services are being actively considered across Hertfordshire in relation to Legal, HR, Information Management, Insurance and Payroll Services. • Recruitment for leadership posts is generally competitive with a good number of applications being received from suitably qualified candidates for vacant posts. |
| Sign Off and Comments | | |
| Sign Off Complete | | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Recruitment and Retention:

We have a well-established process for recruiting staff which includes be-spoke training for managers, job adverts in modern media and up-to-date recruitment policies. We also continue to make use of behaviour based assessments as part of the recruitment process to ensure that staff joining the organisation have the right values as well as having the right skills and experience. We are also in the process of appointing a new specialist recruitment agency.

Nevertheless we recognise that some roles continue to be difficult to fill, which in turn is leading to agency overspend and budgetary cost pressures. This includes building control, planning and environmental health. Therefore, as part of our new People Strategy, we have commissioned a review (by our Innovation and Improvement Team) to look at additional ways to make us more attractive. It is also important that we continue to work closely with other local authorities to consider how we can jointly address national recruitment problems.

Development and Training:

Our dedicated management training programme (Leading in Dacorum) continues to be delivered and our service planning model focuses on service innovation, service efficiencies and workforce planning. We have also recently appointed a new HR & OD Officer who will be driving our OD plan through our people strategy.

Conclusion and Next Steps:

Given the controls in place, it is not necessary to change the risk rating.

C7 - Controls do not develop at a sufficient pace to keep track with the continually emerging data protection risks

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Category: Corporate | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | | Risk Owner: Sally Marshall | Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden | Tolerance: Treating |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Cause of Risk - The Council is reliant on vast amounts of | | Information Security Officer appointed responsibilities | | - Information Security Officer appointed | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



good quality data and information to determine sound decisions and plans, conduct operations and deliver services.

It is also required by the Data Protection Act and Government's Public Sector Network (PSN) Code of Connection (CoCo) to maintain confidentiality, integrity, availability and appropriately authorised use of the data.

With the Government's 'Open' agenda, increased flexible working patterns of staff, and increased partnership working and use of multiple information storage sources, controls on data management and security have become complex and important.

Consequences of Risk –

1. Poor decision making due to ineffective use of or insufficient availability of data and information sharing.
2. Loss, misrepresentation or unauthorised disclosure of sensitive data, DBC has the potential to be susceptible to cyber-attacks or sabotage.
3. Under performance. Breach of Data Protection Act leading to legal actions, fines, adverse publicity, and additional remedial and data protection costs.
4. Significant interruption of vital services leading to failure to meet duties and to protect people, finances and assets.
5. Potential damage to DBC's reputation.

include:

- the Council's Corporate Information Assurance specialist
 - the custodian, owner and updater of ICT Security and Information Governance strategy, policy and procedure ensuring that the Council complies with the latest legislation in terms of ICT Security standards and compliance.
 - To ensure that the Council's policies and procedures regarding ICT Security and Information governance are adhered to across all the Council's services.
 - To keep informed of relevant technical innovation and changes to technological, infrastructure, telecom and software systems in relation to Information Security.
 - To be the custodian and owner of Information Security and Governance Standards.
 - To manage Information Security and Governance strategies and to support the Council in the future development of Information Security, Governance and Business Continuity.
 - To train Council Staff, Members on Information Security, Data Protection Act and Freedom of Information Acts.
- Compulsory training for staff on Data Security
- PSN Compliance
 - Audit of data protection approach

- Various ICT policies and procedures in place
- Compulsory training for staff on Data Security
- PSN Compliance

Sign Off and Comments

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Sign Off Complete

As an organisation we have in place a number of technical and procedural controls to ensure that we effectively manage our data protection responsibilities (and risks).

We are currently undergoing our annual PSN compliance assessment, which will ensure that our processes and network & security controls meet the Cabinet Office's exacting requirements. The controls we have in place include anti-virus software, corporate firewalls, various authentication processes and end point security solutions. These controls are reviewed regularly and opportunities taken to extend them, for example through the planned introduction of a new remote working solution which will require all remote web browsing on Council laptops to happen through DBC's network. We also have a robust procedure for the disposal of equipment, which ensures that we receive certifiable assurance that any data is removed.

We continue to run quarterly training courses on the Data Protection Act, Information Security Management and the Freedom of Information Act, and our guidance requires staff to attend a refresher course at least once every four years. Staff are also required to review, understand and sign a number of policies including Data Protection Policy, Corporate Information Technology Security Policy and Home and Remote working policy. All suppliers working with our data are also required to complete an 'accreditation form' which assures us that they have robust data protection policies and security controls in place.

As we move to the Forum we also recognise the increased data protection risks and we have put in place a series of detailed processes and checks to ensure that any physical data is properly removed.

Given the range of measures and controls we do not consider it necessary to change the ratings for this strategic risk.

F6 - Changes to legislation could negatively affect the medium to long term viability of the HRA Business Plan.

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| Category: Financial | Corporate Priority: Affordable Housing | Risk Owner: Mark Gaynor | Portfolio Holder: Margaret Patricia Griffiths | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 4 Very Likely | 4 Severe | 16 Red | 4 Very Likely | 3 High | 12 Red |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Since the 'once and for all' settlement with government | | Elements of the changes are yet to apply (the rent | | A remodelling of the HRA Business Plan has been made | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



on the self financing of the HRA there have been major legislative and policy changes which, overall, have impacted detrimentally on the HRA Business Plan:

- The re-invigoration of the RTB which has increased sales from around 15-20 per year to well over 100
- The parallel introduction of the RTB 'one for one' replacement scheme where the Council can use receipts to build new homes but only to pay for 30% of costs (leaving the other 70% to be sourced)
- A change to national rent policy which moved from RPI + 0.5% to CPI + 1% and ending the process of reaching target rents (leaving 60% of DBC properties below target)

The government now propose two further changes which, if enacted, will further constrain the capacity of the HRA Business Plan viability:

- A rent reduction of 1% per year for four years and a complete inability to make any progress towards convergence to target rents (a reduction of income of £30M over the first four years and over £500M over the lifetime of the HRA Business Plan)
- Enforced sales of 'high value' council homes as they become vacant to fund Housing Association RTB

The first of these changes is already in draft legislation and the assumption must be that it will happen. The consequences are very significant, and even with mitigation will continue to be so:

The financial viability of the HRA to meet its current business plan objectives in full cannot be made due to loss of income and economies of scale as stock numbers

changes start from April 2016) and the current controls – proper business planning, the disciplines of the MTFs, project and programme management arrangements, effective contract management, annual efficiency programmes and so on – reflect on the existing position and could provide sufficient mitigation to the long term business plan. The controls proposed for the new changes – if the proposed legislation is enacted – will only mitigate the impact to an extent as the scale of change, compounded with previous changes, are so significant. The controls are as follows:

A complete review of the HRA Business Plan to spread the impacts over activities and over time. Initially, in order to deliver the current new build programme, this will be focused on a slowing down of the investment into current stock.

Reducing the costs of running the service through efficiency and service redesign (in partnership with tenants and leaseholders).

Improved procurement of services and renegotiation of existing contracts (though these have been procured within the last year or so and will restrict potential). This would include seeking shared services with other partners and models of operation which reduce the overheads of the HRA.

Maximising the income to the HRA by altering use of parts of the stock (increased use of HRA stock for temporary accommodation and provision of low level care as part of a tenancy where rent controls do not apply).

to take account of the impact of the changes which will be considered by Cabinet (initially in November 2015 and periodically thereafter). This has demonstrated that the current new build programme can be completed. The ability to extend this further will depend on the success of the mitigations above.

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



diminish.
Services to tenants will have to reduce, including proposed investment in the existing stock, to deal with the scale of resource reduction.
The new build programme at its proposed scale will have to reduce, and possibly cease, in order to provide services to tenants and balance the books.
That resources provided through RTB one for one replacement will be unused and lost to the Borough as it is returned to the Treasury as a result of the Council's inability to provide the 70% match funding and as Housing Associations reduce their supply of new affordable homes (as a result of the same legislative changes impacting on the Council).
The Council's housing stock will progressively reduce through RTB, enforced sales and reduction in new build which will reduce its ability to meet the housing needs in the Borough and achieving the strategic objective of increasing the supply of affordable homes.

Altering the tenure mix of the current new build programme to include shared ownership and market sale in order to cross subsidise new rented provision. This could incorporate an element of affordable rent to increase revenue.
Development of a partnership approach to use of RTB one for one replacement funding with local Housing Associations in order to minimise losses of resource to the Borough and to increase supply of new homes.
Fully exploring the potential of a Local Housing Company to improve the cost of delivery of new homes alongside the benefits to the General Fund.
Lobbying of government regarding the disproportionately severe impacts of the changes, though historical reasons, on DBC seeking some local amelioration.
Ensuring that our intelligence on the changing position and on developments within the sector are fully up to date through membership of ARCH, liaison with CIH and other key bodies.
The following controls are in place already with regard to the financial and strategic management of the HRA Business Plan:

- An annual refresh of the HRA Business Plan reported both to CMT and to Cabinet
- Monthly meeting between budget holders and accountants monitoring progress against original timeframes and costs
- Regular meetings of the Corporate New Build Group considering performance and new schemes

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMT receive a fortnightly update on the new build programme • Performance Board comprising Chief Officers and cabinet members receive a report on progress before each cabinet meeting • Reports on HRA performance go the Overview and Scrutiny every quarter • The HRA is reported as part of the overall corporate financial reporting process | |
|--|--|--|

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Further work on the potential of the de-pooling of service charges is underway and will be considered in the budget process for 2017/18

F7 - Funding and income is not sufficient to deliver the Council's corporate objectives

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| Category: Financial | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: James Deane | Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 4 Very Likely | 4 Severe | 16 Red | 3 Likely | 3 High | 9 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| The government's austerity programme has led to reduced Local Authority funding over the last five years, resulting in the Council's need to find savings of £5m since 2010/11. Further funding reductions in excess of £3m are forecast over the next four years, which increase the risk of the Council being unable to deliver its vision for the borough, as detailed in the Corporate | | The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and the HRA Business Plan are controls that mitigate the likelihood of this risk crystallising through the effective modelling of the future financial environment, which allows for more effective forward planning. These controls are detailed below, and have resulted in my reducing the inherent risk score from '4', Very Likely, to | | There were three internal audit reviews undertaken by Mazars during 2014/15, which provide an external view of the effectiveness of the controls implemented by the Council to manage the financial risks to delivering its priorities. The audits on 'Efficiency Savings' and 'Main Accounting' | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Plan. (http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/dacorum_corporateplan_web.pdf?sfvrsn=2)</p> <p>Sustained funding reductions of this magnitude are not only a risk to the Council's capacity to grow and enhance the community, but more fundamentally they are a risk to the continued provision of high quality frontline services to residents.</p> <p>If the Council is unable to deliver its vision or to protect its frontline service provision, it risks the following consequences: Increased community hardship as the services provided to the most vulnerable residents in the borough are impacted, leading to delays in their accessing financial and residential help.</p> <p>The impact of reducing standards of environmental services across the borough could lead to a less attractive environment and a loss of community identity and civic pride for residents.</p> <p>Reputational damage as residents become dissatisfied with their experience of interacting with the Council. This risk is exacerbated by the growth of social media and the ability of residents to share their experiences with large numbers of people instantaneously.</p> | <p>'3', 'Likely'.</p> <p>The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) details the financial implications of the Corporate Plan over a five-year period. It ensures that the Council is able to forecast likely income pressures in the medium-term, and optimise the balance between its financial resources and the delivery of its priorities. The MTFS is reviewed at least annually and is approved by Full Council, thereby providing the opportunity for Members to make informed amendments to the Corporate Plan on the basis of likely funding constraints. The current version is accessible via the following link:</p> <p>http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/mtfs-july-cabinet-2015.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>The Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan maps planned income and expenditure over a thirty-year period. Government legislation that can affect the Council's delivery of social housing is incorporated within the plan and forms the basis for informed strategic decision-making.</p> <p>The Council's reviewing of its Corporate Plan together with its Communications Strategy mitigate the impact of this risk, should it occur, by keeping residents informed of the pressures faced by the Council, and consequently by managing aspiration and expectation (detail below).</p> | <p>received a Full level of assurance (the highest available), and the audit on 'Budgetary Control' received a Substantial level of assurance (the second highest available).</p> <p>These internal audit opinions provide assurance that the Council is effectively controlling the processes that will enable it to derive value for money from its available resources, and therefore to maximise the opportunity for delivering its corporate objectives.</p> |
|--|---|---|

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>On this basis, I have reduced the Impact score from '4', Severe, to '3', 'High.</p> <p>The Council reviews its Corporate Plan periodically to ensure that the vision for the borough remains relevant and realistic within the financial constraints outlined within the MTFS and the HRA plan. The aspirations of the Council and the community are managed through the Council's Communications Strategy both through social media, the local press and Digest.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Since the last update of the Strategic Risk Register at the end of Quarter 1, there have been no formal updates to the MTFS position reported to Cabinet in July 2017.

However, in early November confirmation was received from DCLG that the Council has been granted the four-year funding settlement for which it applied. Whilst this does not increase the funding available to the Council in the medium-term, it does mean that the funding assumptions within the MTFS have now been confirmed as correct as far as they can be (the funding settlement, even though agreed by Government until 20/21, could be subject to further change by Government, if necessary).

Work has continued on balancing the budget for 2017/18, and the first draft will be reported to Members for consideration at the Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting scheduled for 6 December.

I3 - The Borough does not secure sufficient investment in infrastructure to ensure that housing delivery and economic and community growth is sustainable in the longer term.

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Affordable Housing | Risk Owner: Mark Gaynor | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| 4 Very Likely | 4 Severe | 16 Red | 3 Likely | 3 High | 9 Amber |
|--|-------------|--|-------------|--|------------|
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| <p>The provision of infrastructure such as schools, health, transport and other facilities is crucial to sustainability of the local community and economy. Its funding, however, is increasingly complex and difficult as central government moves away from direct provision and expects the development process and local partnerships to deliver it. Failure to provide this infrastructure will have a number of damaging consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction in the quality of life and opportunities for people in the Borough A serious constraint to economic growth with the impact on the contribution to service provision through Business Rates growth Increased community opposition to new developments, particularly housing, on the grounds that existing infrastructure will not cope Damage to the image of the area, worsening of community pride and social cohesion and reputational damage to the Council | | <p>Infrastructure is provided through the development process (s106 and Community Infrastructure Levy) and elements of funding which comes from central government (increasingly through the LEP, bidding and HCC). The responsibility for some infrastructure elements is through privatised arrangements (utilities) or arms-length government agencies such as Network Rail. The ability of the Council to control these processes is limited.</p> <p>The Council is able to promote the quantum, nature and timing of growth making it more likely that the infrastructure will be delivered. It is also able to promote partnerships and use its asset base and influence to stimulate desired development. Current controls include:</p> <p>Ensuring that the Local Plan (and its component elements such as the Core Strategy, site allocations, supporting policies and so on) is up to date and sets out very clearly the requirements of proposed development. This promotes sustainable development by design, access and movement, materials. Use of masterplanning supports what is required to be delivered to produce sustainability on larger sites.</p> <p>The approved Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Policy and schedule (CIL) provides for the levels of contributions that must be made by developers and the purpose for which they will be spent. This also includes</p> | | <p>The process for setting out development delivered is through the Annual Monitoring Report. The agreed process for CIL will see an annual report setting out income due, achieved and expenditure made on agreed infrastructure.</p> <p>Regular reports are made as set out above in controls.</p> | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



an element of CIL which can be spent by local communities and act to link growth directly with infrastructure provision local people want.

Operating a 'open for business' approach to how the Council deals with potential development with a presumption of making acceptable development easier to deliver by proactive advice through the planning process. Allied to this is ensuring that the development management service is capable of achieving decision making within required time limits.

Stimulating required growth through the Council's own regeneration activity, including Hemel Evolution, Gade Zone and Heart of Maylands resulting in inward investment being more likely.

Increasing inward investment through initiatives such as Dacorum Look no Further, Ambassadors, direct provision of business advice and a supportive approach to new development.

Good market intelligence through regular liaison with local employers, landowners, developers, institutional investors and land agents regarding demand and expected assistance.

Partnership with the LEP as the main route for additional funding for infrastructure through influencing the Strategic Growth Plan (in which Hemel Hempstead and the M1 corridor is a priority) and bidding for resources for infrastructure (such as the £5M achieved for West Herts College)

Working to create key partnerships to bring forward development capable of funding major infrastructure

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | (such as Gorhambury) These controls are exercised within the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly reporting to Hemel Evolution Board and Corporate Regeneration Group • Fortnightly reporting on key projects to CMT • Reporting to Performance Board before each Cabinet Meeting • A clear programme for the Local Development Framework and CIL • Quarterly reporting to Overview and Scrutiny • Regular reporting to Cabinet • Adherence to the agreed performance and project management processes | |
|--|---|--|

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Mo major changes to report.

R5 - The Council does not embrace the increased use of social media as a tool for social engagement and increased community engagement.

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| Category: Reputational | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: Sally Marshall | Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 3 High | 9 Amber | 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| The risk of not using social media - This will mean that our approach to engagement (i.e. | | In order to mitigate these risks we have put in place a number of controls: | | o Corporate Information Security Management Policy o Corporate Information Technology Security Policy o Data Protection Act Policy | |

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>letters, workshops, printed magazines) is likely to exclude key demographic groups including younger residents and those who are more technologically minded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We will not be able to respond to negative posts or views which could cause significant reputational damage or risk. - We will have less opportunity to influence Government and media through the use of targeted campaigns and communications. - The organisation may not be viewed as 'technologically forward thinking' which could lead to reputational risks. This includes more difficulty in attracting hi-tech investment or exclusion from innovation pilots. <p>Managing the risk of social media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the public can use DBC's profile to raise negative or incorrect statements that damage the reputation of DBC. - Employees may breach data security rules regarding the management of private or confidential information. - Inappropriate or unacceptable content posted by employees | <p>The risk of not using social media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our social media strategy sets out how we will proactively engage with residents through Twitter, Facebook, Linked In, Instagram and using online videos. - We have 18 social media accounts covering corporate and operational services including from the CSU. - We regularly use social media to actively promote campaigns, events and messages. - We interact with partners and other third parties (eg HCC) to promote joint initiatives via social media - We generate reports and analysis on scale and content of Facebook and Twitter posts. <p>Managing the risk of social media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We employ the Crowd Control system to enable the Communications team to manage and authorise services posts and tweets. - The Crowd Control system also enables the Communications team to monitor and respond to any negative posts. - Our system provides automatic moderation of abusive messages. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Freedom of Information Policy o PSN/Government Connect (GSx) Acceptable Usage Policy o Information Security Incident Procedure o Social Media Strategy o Facebook and Twitter accounts o Social Media Management System |
|--|---|--|

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



- Our social media accounts are 'identity jacked' which occurs when fake accounts are set up to look like those of DBC. This is a risk because the fake accounts can post incorrect or inappropriate information which is then associated with DBC.

- Weak authentication in the use of social media accounts can lead to them being hacked. The hacked accounts are then used to post inappropriate, derogatory or libellous comments.

- The use of social media can make it easier for 'pressure groups' to generate support behind negative campaigns.

- We provide in-house training for all staff posting on DBC social media accounts.

- We use a subscription service that manages and secures accounts.

- All staff are required to read and sign-up to a range of policies including:

Corporate Information Security Management Policy
Corporate Information Technology Security Policy
Data Protection Act Policy
Freedom of Information Policy
PSN/Government Connect (GSx) Acceptable Usage Policy
Information Security Incident Procedure

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

September 2016



In the last quarter we have continued to deliver a strong social media presence. We posted over 1,460 outbound messages, received over 319 direct messages which were responded to in accordance with our social media policy and guidance, and had a total twitter reach of 3.06 million viewers across our 18 social media accounts and networks. Some of the campaigns we have run include Community Champion Awards 2016, Hemel Evolution (Water Gardens), London Road Apsley, (36 new Council homes) and communication campaigns including the Olympics (Max Whitlock and Jessica Stretton), e-newsletter (Digital Digest) and Tring Memorial Gardens entry award for Green Flag People's Choice Award.

In terms of management and security, we have continued to manage our social media profile through a range of measures including the enforcement and implementation of our social media and ICT policies and our dedicated social media management system (Crowd Control) which is the leading risk management software in the UK. As far as is possible (and accepting freedoms of speech and communications) we manage the risk of negative social media responses through our social media management system and by having a monitoring system in place which ensures we always have staff available to respond to any issues. We have also agreed to routinely remove posts from individuals who have been restricted in the way they communicate with the Council, and all vexatious or inappropriate language is automatically deleted from our accounts as part of the risk management software.

Social media is an important tool to communicate and engage. However it also has challenges and risks and it's important that we continue to manage that as much as is possible. Given the controls we have in place, we do not consider that any changes need to be made to the risk or the likelihood of it occurring.