

# Risk Management: Statement, policy and risk register

Updated: 20.09.24

### **Risk policy purpose**

We recognise that the trustees of Fences & Frontiers have responsibility for any risks and their potential outcomes. The aim of this risk management policy is to ensure that the charity makes every effort to manage risk appropriately by maximising potential opportunities whilst minimising the adverse effects of risks.

#### **Risk policy objectives**

- To confirm and communicate the charity's commitment to risk management.
- To establish a consistent framework and protocol for determining appetite for and tolerance of risk and for managing risk.
- To assign accountability to management and staff for risks within their control and provide a structured process for risk to be considered, reported and acted upon throughout the organisation.

#### **Risk policy statement**

The trustees and executive management of Fences & Frontiers believe that sound risk management is integral to both good management and good governance practice. Risk management forms an integral part of our decision–making and is incorporated within our strategic and operational planning. Risk assessment will be conducted on all new activities and projects to ensure they are in line with the charity's objectives and mission. Any risks or opportunities arising will be identified, analysed and reported at an appropriate level. A risk register covering key strategic risks (later in this document) will be maintained and updated annually and more frequently where risks are known to be volatile.

The risks are identified, reviewed and assessed by the board of Fences & Frontiers.



## **Risk Register**

Risks:

- Governance
- Operational
- Financial
- Environmental
- Law and regulation compliance
- Reputational

The table below outlines the key risk we have identified for Fences & Frontiers, and lays out our plans to mitigate these risk. This table will be updated on an annual basis (or sooner as risk arise).

Potential risk	Potential impact	Severity /Likelihood score score *(see appendix 1)	Actions to mitigate risk
Governance - making	the best strategic dec	isions	
The charity lacks direction, strategy and forward planning	the charity has no clear objectives, priorities or plans issues are addressed piecemeal with no strategic reference needs of beneficiaries not fully addressed	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	create a strategic plan which sets out key aims, objectives and policies create financial plans and budgets use job plans and targets monitor financial and operational performance

	financial management difficulties loss of reputation		get feedback from beneficiaries and funders
Trustee body lacks relevant skills or commitment	charity becomes moribund or fails to achieve its purpose decisions are made bypassing the trustees resentment or apathy among trustees, volunteers or staff poor decision making reflected in poor value for money on service delivery	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	review and agree skills required draw up competence framework and job descriptions implement trustee training and induction review and agree recruitment processes
Trustee body dominated by one or two individuals, or by connected individuals	trustee body cannot operate effectively as strategic body decisions made outside of trustee body conflicts of interest pursuit of personal agenda culture of secrecy or deference arbitrary over-riding of control mechanisms	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	consider the structure of the trustee body and its independence agree mechanisms to manage potential conflicts of interest review and agree recruitment and appointment processes in line with governing document agree procedural framework for meetings and recording decisions Consult with service users and volunteers on decisions when appropriate.

	1	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Conflicts of interest	charity unable to pursue its own interests and agenda decisions may not be based on relevant considerations impact on reputation private benefit	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	agree protocol for disclosure of potential conflicts of interest put in place procedures for standing down on certain decisions ask that people stand back from certain activities where conflicts exist review recruitment and selection processes
Loss of key staff, volunteers and trustees)	experience or skills lost operational impact on key projects and priorities	Impact 4, Likelihood 3	succession planning document systems, plans and projects Implement training programmes Agree handover process review and agree recruitment processes Ongoing recruitment of new trustees and volunteers as required
Ineffective organisational structure	lack of information flow and poor decision making procedures	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	create an organisation chart for clear understanding of roles and duties
	remoteness from operational activities		delegation and monitoring should be consistent with good

			,
	uncertainty as to roles and duties		practice and constitutional or legal requirements review structure and the need for constitutional change Avoid hierarchical decision making where appropriate.
Reporting to trustees (accuracy, timeliness and relevance)	inadequate information resulting in poor quality decision making failure of trustees to fulfil their control functions trustee body becomes remote and ill informed	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	put in place proper strategic planning, objective setting and budgeting processes timely and accurate project reporting timely and accurate financial reporting assess and review projects and authorisation procedures have regular contact between trustees and staff (if hired) Provide training opportunities when necessary
Operational - day to o	day operations of the c	harity	
Contract risk	onerous terms and conditions liabilities for non performance	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	create cost/project appraisal procedures agree authorisation procedures
	non-compliance with charity's objects		get professional advice on terms and conditions

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			put in place performance monitoring arrangements consider insurable risks cover
Service provision - customer satisfaction	beneficiary complaints loss of fee income loss of significant contracts or claims under contract negligence claims	Impact 2, Likelihood 1	agree quality control procedures benchmark services Agree and implement complaints and review procedures
	reputational risks		
Safeguarding	Risks to safety and wellbeing of beneficiaries Risks to safety and wellbeing of staff, trustees, and volunteers Ability to operate Reputational risks Legal risks Insurance and funding implications.	Impact 5, Likelihood 1	All volunteers, staff and trustees have criminal records /DBS checks All representatives read and sign core safeguarding documents and understand safeguarding procedures Designated safeguarding lead appointed Safeguarding lead appointed Safeguarding documents are updated annually or when required (whenever is sooner) All complaints or incidents fully investigated and

		-	
			dealt with by multiple trustees. All complaints and incidents reported to the full board of trustees. Any complaints or incidents directly involving a trustee, staff member, or volunteer will not be investigated by said person
Project or service development	Loss of contract income reduced fund-raising potential reduced public profile profitability of trading activities	Impact 2, Likelihood 1	monitor and assess performance and quality of service Review market and methods of service delivery agree fund-raising strategy ensure regular contact with funders monitor public awareness and profile of charity
Fundraising	unsatisfactory returns reputational risks of campaign or methods used compliance with law and regulation	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	implement appraisal, budgeting and authorisation procedures review regulatory compliance monitor the adequacy of financial returns achieved (benchmarking comparisons)

Fences & Frontiers

			,
			stewardship reporting in annual report Utilise a diverse fundraising strategy and avoid dependency on one stream of income.
Employment and staff turnover	Not currently relevant but here as recognition to be added if/when required	Impact NA, Likelihood NA	
Volunteers	lack of competences, training and support poor service for beneficiaries inadequate vetting and reference procedures recruitment and dependency	Impact 3, Likelihood 3	review and agree role, competencies review and agree vetting procedures review and agree training and supervision procedures
Health, safety and environment	injury to beneficiaries, staff, volunteers and the public product or service liability ability to operate	Impact 4, Likelihood 3	comply with law and regulation train staff and compliance officer put in place monitoring and reporting procedures Insurance cover Utilise a health and safety plan and procedures during all activities Fill in accident book and consider means to prevent

			reoccurance
Procedural and systems documentation	lack of awareness of procedures and policies actions taken without proper authority	Impact 3, Likelihood 3	properly document policies and procedures audit and review of systems
Information technology	systems fail to meet operational need failure to innovate or update systems loss/corruption of data eg donor base lack of technical support breach of data protection law	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	appraise system needs and options appraise security and authorisation procedures implement measures to secure and protect data agree implementation and development procedures use service and support contracts create disaster recovery procedures review insurance cover for any insurable loss
Financial			
Budgetary control and financial reporting	budget does not match key objectives and priorities decisions made on inaccurate financial projections or reporting	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	link budgets to business planning and objectives monitor and report in a timely and accurate way
	decisions made based on unreliable costing data or		use proper costing procedures for product or service delivery

	income projections inability to meet commitments or key objectives poor credit control poor cash flow and treasury management ability to function as going concern		ensure adequate skills base to produce and interpret budgetary and financial reports agree procedures to review and action budget/cash flow variances and monitor and control costs regularly review reserves and investments
Reserves policies	lack of funds or liquidity to respond to new needs or requirements inability to meet commitments or planned objectives reputational risks if policy cannot be justified	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	link reserves policy to business plans, activities and identified financial and operating risk regularly review reserves policy and reserve levels
Cash flow	inability to meet commitments lack of liquidity to cover variance in costs impact on operational activities	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	ensure adequate cash flow projections (prudence of assumptions) identify major sensitivities ensure adequate information flow from operational managers monitor arrangements and reporting Diversify fundraising strategy and open

		i	
			new channels of income
Dependency on income sources	cash flow and budget impact of loss of	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	identify major dependencies
	income source		implement adequate reserves policy
			consider diversification plans and put into operation
Compliance with donor imposed restrictions	funds applied outside restriction	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	implement systems to identify restricted receipts
	repayment of grant		
	future relationship with donor and beneficiaries		agree budget control, monitoring and reporting arrangements
	regulatory action		
Fraud or error	financial loss	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	review financial control procedures
	reputational risk regulatory action		segregate duties
	impact on funding		set authorisation limits
			whistle-blowing policy
			review security of assets
			identify insurable risks
Counterparty risk	financial loss disruption to activities or operations	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	research counter party's financial sustainability
			contractual agreement
			consider staged

	i		·
			payments
			agree performance measures
			monitor and review investments
			establish monitoring and review arrangements
Environmental and ex	cternal		
Public perception	impact on voluntary income	Impact 4, Likelihood 1	communicate with supporters and beneficiaries
	impact on use of services by beneficiaries ability to access grants or		ensure good quality reporting of the charity's activities and financial situation
	contract funding		implement public relations
			training/procedures
			Ensure key communications are approved by multiple trustees and volunteers
Adverse publicity	loss of donor confidence or funding	Impact 3, Likelihood 1	implement complaints procedures
	loss of influence		agree proper review procedures for complaints
	confidence		agree a crisis management strategy for handling - including consistency of key messages and a nominated spokesperson

Relationship with funders	deterioration in relationship may impact on funding and support available	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	ensure regular contact and briefings to major funders report fully on projects meet funders' terms and conditions
Demographic consideration	Increase or decrease in donors or beneficiaries	Impact 2, Likelihood 1	profile donor base profile and understand beneficiary needs
Government policy	availability of contract and grant funding impact of tax on voluntary giving impact of general legislation or regulation on activities undertaken role of voluntary sector	Impact 2, Likelihood 3	monitor proposed legal and regulatory changes consider membership of appropriate umbrella bodies (NCVO, Locality, NAVCA, Localgiving, FSI, SCC, etc.)
Law and regulation c	ompliance		
Compliance with legislation and regulations appropriate to the activities, size and structure of the charity	fines, penalties or censure from licensing or activity regulators employee or consumer action for negligence reputational risks	Impact 3, Likelihood 2	identify key legal and regulatory requirements allocate responsibility for key compliance procedures put in place compliance monitoring and reporting prepare for compliance checks and visits

			obtain compliance reports from regulators (where appropriate) - auditors and staff to consider and action at appropriate level	
Regulatory reporting requirements	regulatory action reputational risks impact on funding	Impact 2, Likelihood 2	review and agree compliance procedures and allocation of staff responsibilities	

Fences & Frontiers

Risk Assessment Methodology

 Impact

 Descriptor
 Score

 Impact on service and reputation

Fences & Frontiers

Insignificant	1	<ul> <li>no impact on service</li> <li>no impact on reputation</li> <li>complaint unlikely</li> <li>litigation risk remote</li> </ul>
Minor	2	<ul> <li>slight impact on service</li> <li>slight impact on reputation</li> <li>complaint possible</li> <li>litigation possible</li> </ul>
Moderate	3	<ul> <li>some service disruption</li> <li>potential for adverse publicity - avoidable with careful handling</li> <li>complaint probable</li> <li>litigation probable</li> </ul>
Major	4	<ul> <li>service disrupted e.g. long term sickness</li> <li>adverse publicity not avoidable (local media)</li> <li>complaint probable</li> <li>litigation probable</li> <li>Sudden loss of funding</li> </ul>
Extreme	5	<ul> <li>service interrupted for significant time</li> <li>major adverse publicity not avoidable (national media)</li> <li>major litigation expected</li> <li>resignation of senior management</li> <li>resignation of board</li> <li>major premises related issue e.g. burglary</li> <li>loss of beneficiary confidence</li> </ul>



#### Likelihood

-

Descriptor	Score	Example
Remote	1	may only occur in exceptional circumstances
Unlikely	2	expected to occur in a few circumstances
Possible	3	expected to occur in some circumstances
Probable	4	expected to occur in many circumstances