Reference	BOT21/DEC/08
Date	1st December 2021

RTPI
Royal Town Planning Institute

Board of Trustees

RTPI RISK REGISTER

Report from Director of Wales, Northern Ireland and Planning Aid England

FOR DECISION

The Board is asked to agree the amendments to Risks R13: Financial Loss Resulting From Inadequate Insurance Cover.

1. Summary

There is a rolling review timetable for each Risk within the Register to ensure every risk is reviewed at least once a year, although any risk can be reviewed at any time if circumstances require it. This report provides the latest Risks reviewed by SET for agreement by the Board.

Work continues by SET on other Risks and a further set will be brought for the Board to consider at its next meeting.

2. Amended Risks

One Risk has been considered by SET since the last BOT meeting and this is set out below for the Board to consider.

2.1. R13: Financial Loss Resulting From Inadequate Insurance Cover

This Risk has been updated to clarify all areas of the Risk and to update it with new actions which are underway or planned. It is considered by SET that the score should remain as previously set.

	IMPACT (IM)	**LIKELIHOOD (LK)**
Prior to risk control	4	3
Mitigated score	3	1

Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM	**6**

3. Recommendation

The Board is recommended to agree the amendment of Risk R13: Financial Loss Resulting From Inadequate Insurance Cover.

4. Health and safety implications

There are no direct health and safety implications, although the Risk Register covers health and safety factors.

5. Equality and diversity implications

In respect of R04 relationships with governments: if these relationships do not work effectively we may not be able to influence planning policy and practice on EDI factors, for the ability to impact planning policy in relation to gender mainstreaming, designing for neurodiversity or other disabilities.

6. Financial implications

The Risk Register is a corporate responsibility and resources are allocated as appropriate for each risk to the relevant budget. The majority of mitigation measures will have a cost implication and these have been built into budgets. In making decisions on budget implications the cost of not acting is taken into account.

In particular for the reviewed risk it is noted that we retendered our insurance this year and reduced the cost and ensured that the insurance we have in place is relevant.

7. Communications Implications

The revised Risk Register is communicated to colleagues to ensure there is knowledge of the mitigation and actions required and to embed ownership.

8. Governance and Compliance implications

Charities that are required by law to have their accounts audited must make a risk management statement in their trustees' annual report confirming that '...the charity trustees have given consideration to the major risks to which the charity is exposed and satisfied themselves that systems or procedures are established in order to manage those risks.' (Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008). Where there are risks relating to a particular jurisdiction these are taken into account. The Risk Register includes a risk which relates to compliance with operating legislation, for example data protection.

9. Jurisdiction and devolution implications

Where there are any differences in regulations / law within the devolved Nations or Ireland, these are built into the relevant Risk.

10. Corporate Strategy - Climate action

Given the RTPI's commitment to climate action, it is essential that our reputation on this topic is not damaged through inappropriate action.

11. Corporate Strategy - GROWPLAN (Corporate Strategy)

Reputational damage could lead to an impact on membership levels and could have serious implications for GROWPLAN.

12. Corporate Strategy - Digital Transformation

The Digital Transformation Strategy addresses a number of Risks in the Register including R15 and R18, although it does not directly relate to the Risk reviewed in this report.

Risk Register Scoring

The scoring process adopted for the RTPI Register is a standard model used and is recommended by the Charity Commission.

The methodology considers how likely the risk is to occur (Likelihood) and how severe its impact would be on the RTPI if it did occur (Impact). It enables a focus on those risks that would have a more significant impact on the RTPI; however lower impacts must not be ignored because they can trigger other risks leading to a compound of effects. Risk scoring often involves a degree of judgement or subjectivity, but wherever possible evidenced-based judgements are made.

The score is generated by (Likelihood x Impact) + Impact. This formula multiplies impact with likelihood then adds a weighting again for impact. The effect is to give extra emphasis to impact when assessing risk. However this can mean that whilst actions to reduce the Likelihood of a risk occurring are in place, there may be little change to the score, because there is an emphasis on the Impact grade.

The heat map below illustrates the grading for Impact and Likelihood and the range of scores.

Risk Assessment - Heat Map

Impact					
5 = Extreme /Catastrophic	10	15	20	25	30
4 = Major	8	12	16	20	24
3 = Moderate	6	9	12	15	18
2 = Minor	4	6	8	10	12
1 = Insignificant	2	3	4	5	6
	1 = Remote	2 = Unlikely	3 = Possible	4 = Probable	5 = Highly Probable
	Likelihood				

Annex 2

Revised Risk

RTPI Corporate Risk Register

R13	Financial Loss Resulting From Inadequate Insurance Cover

Category	Financial
CSIP Ref	Foundation
Service Plan	Finance
Owner	COO
Dependencies	

	IMPACT (IM)	LIKELIHOOD (LK)
Prior to risk control	4	3
Mitigated score	3	1
Net Risk (IM x LK) + IM		6

Cause(s) and potential impact of risk event

- Failure to meet insurers conditions invalidates cover
- Insufficient insurance to cover the value of claims
- Insufficient insurance to cover all risks
- Insufficient funds to cover premiums for appropriate cover

Description of controls to mitigate risk

- Annual insurance review with broker to ensure approriate risks are covered
- Evaluation of all new risks checked against policies
- Horizon scanning for new risks for future cover
- Review of insurance brokers every three years in line with RTPI Procurement Guidelines
- Changes in operating status constantly reviewed aganst existing cover
- Brokers selected against experience and expertise in the charity / NFP sectors

	Actions	Who	Target Date
1	Inform brokers of intended work on BL and take on associated additional cover that may be required.	COO	Sep-21
2	Conduct cover review following the completion of any work on BL	COO / CTO	Apr-22
3	Quarterley review of cover against changes in operational status.	COO	Nov-21
4	Review of cyber cover against changing risks.	COO / CTO	Dec-21

Notes

Broker review in 2021 with full procurement exercise resulting in change to new broker. Review removed some insurances and added new cover like cyber security.

Date last reviewed:	Sep-21
Review date:	Sep-22