Risk Management Strategy

If you have difficulty with sight or hearing, or if you require a translated copy of this document, we would be pleased to provide this information in a form that suits your needs.

Glen Oaks HOUSING ASSOCIATION	**Policy number:**	**G07**
	Policy approved on:	26 February 2025
	Due for review:	February 2028

Our Vision, Mission Statement and Values

Glen Oaks' vision statement '**Where Communities Thrive**' and our mission statement '**Our aim is to provide good quality affordable housing and an excellent service. We will encourage resident participation and work with other agencies to regenerate our community**' provide the foundation for Glen Oaks Housing Association's commitment to its residents and the communities they live in.

This commitment is also demonstrated in the Association's values which were agreed following discussions with the Board and staff. Glen Oaks' values are fundamental to how we carry out our day-to-day activities.

Our values are:

respectful
we trust and respect our customers and each other

dedicated
we will give 100% commitment to our work

transparent
we will be open and honest about what we do

aspirational
we will strive to achieve the best we can for our communities

Equality & Diversity Statement

The Association is intent on ensuring people or communities do not face discrimination or social exclusion due to any of the following protected characteristics: age; disability; sex; marriage & civil partnership; race; religion or belief; sexual orientation; gender reassignment; pregnancy & maternity.

This document complies with the Association's equality & diversity policy.

The Association will regularly review this document for equal opportunities implications and take the necessary action to address any inequalities that result from the implementation of the policy.

Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Risk Management is a rapidly developing discipline and there are many and varied views and descriptions of what Risk Management involves, how it should be conducted, and what it is for. This policy details how the subject of Risk Assessment and Management will be carried out in relation to Glen Oaks Housing Association.

2.0 Aims and Objectives

2.1 The Association must ensure that it mitigates potential risks which would affect its ability to achieve objectives, meet targets or result in losses. In order to achieve this, a consistent approach should be applied by all staff and the Board in assessing and controlling risks.

3.0 Regulatory and Good Practice Requirements

3.1 This policy has been influenced and informed by regulation and good practice, and is designed to comply with these requirements.

4.0 Definition and Description

4.1 Risk

4.1.1 Risk is any event or action that prevents the Association from maintaining good performance; and/or meeting pre-set targets, goals and plans; and/or results in loss being incurred by the Association.

4.2 Risk Management

4.2.1 Risk Management is the responsibility of staff at all levels and should be embedded into the culture of the Association. Risk Management is a continuous process whereby current and potential risks which will, or may, affect the Association are identified and assessed, and control procedures put in place to mitigate such risks.

5.0 Responsibility Allocation

5.1 Board and Chief Executive

5.1.1 The Board and Chief Executive have overall responsibility for the adequacy of the Risk Management framework and processes and should review and monitor the most significant risks that face the Association.

5.2 Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee

5.2.1 The Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee has responsibility for:

- Setting the Risk Management framework, including the Risk Management Strategy and risk appetites;
- Ensuring that all significant risks have been identified, assessed and adequately mitigated;
- Obtaining adequate assurance that the Risk Management process is working effectively;
- Ensuring that there are appropriate levels of Risk Management awareness and embedding of Risk Management throughout the organisation;
- Reporting to the Board on the adequacy of the system of Risk Management and Internal Controls.

5.3 Finance Director

5.3.1 The Finance Director has primary responsibility for ensuring the requirements of the Risk Management Strategy are being effectively carried out, including identifying, assessing, responding to, and reporting of, risks.

5.4 Directors

5.4.1 The Directors are responsible for ensuring that risks within their departments are identified, and that these (or any other risks assigned to them) are adequately controlled and managed.

5.5 Departments

5.5.1 Each department should be aware of risks which fall into their area of responsibility, and the possible impacts these may have on other areas.

The subject of Risk Management should be considered at team meetings at least on a quarterly basis.

5.6 Individuals

5.6.1 Individuals should understand that risk awareness and Risk Management are a key part of the Association's culture and should be aware of their own responsibility in this regard.

5.7 Risks identified by individuals and departments that cannot be managed by that department, or have an impact on other areas, should be advised to the appropriate department Director. Once the risk has been discussed by the Corporate Management Team, a response should be given to the individual or department concerned as to how the risk will be managed.

6.0 Classification of Risks

6.1 The Association's objectives are contained in its Business Plan. On an annual basis, the Association will identify any areas of risk which have prevented, or may prevent, the achievement of these objectives. The Risk Map will be adjusted accordingly.

6.2 Any potential risk will be allocated into one of the following categories:

- Internal
- External

However, it is quite possible that the risks involved might not be exclusive to one group.

6.3 Assessment and Evaluation of Identified Risks

6.3.1 The principal criteria used to assess risks will be:

(a) Likelihood; and
(b) Impact

6.3.2 (a) ***Likelihood*** - the scale used to assess likelihood will be:

1. Rare
2. Unlikely

3. Moderate
4. Likely
5. Common

6.3.3 (b) ***Impact*** - the scale used to assess impact will be:

1. Insignificant
2. Minor
3. Moderate
4. Major
5. Catastrophic

6.3.4 From these criteria, an overall risk rating will be calculated:
Low, Medium or High (further guidance is provided in Appendix 1).

6.4 Identification and Categorisation of Controls

6.4.1 The next stage in the assessment and evaluation of potential risks will be to identify controls to manage the risk. The controls can be categorised by:

- ***Outsourcing controls***, e.g. by insurance policies
- ***Preventative controls***, e.g. cost limit authorisation levels
- ***Detective controls***, e.g. monitoring and assurance reports
- ***Corrective controls***, e.g. disaster recovery and business continuity

These four categories of controls are not mutually exclusive, and a risk area may have a combination of a number of these control categories. The identified controls must be specific, clearly defined, and measurable in terms of their effectiveness.

6.5 Ability to Manage

6.5.1 As part of the process of identifying and categorising controls, an assessment will be made of the Association's ability to manage risk on the following scale:

1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

6.6 Responsibility

6.6.1 Following the identification of controls and manage risk, etc. specific responsibility will be assigned to a person or to a Sub-Committee, e.g. the Technical and Health & Safety Sub-Committee, or the Finance Director.

6.7 Risk Maps and Summary

6.7.1 This is a spreadsheet of all potential identified risks that the Association faces, with prioritisation of such risks and the relevant responses and controls should such risks emerge.

6.7.2 When potential new risks are identified, the Corporate Management Team will assess the impact on the Association and, if necessary, control procedures will be created and put in place.

6.7.3 The summary and maps will be updated as required by the Corporate Management Team, at a minimum, quarterly. The summary report, together with individual maps of newly-assessed risks, will be presented to the Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee at their next meeting.

6.8 Risk Management Assurance Report

6.8.1 This report, by the Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee to the Board, will be a section within the Annual Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee Report and will provide assurance on the Risk Management framework and operation, as well as compliance with regulatory requirements. It will contain:

- The Statement of Internal Control, along with whatever evidence has been received to support the information/opinion in the statement.
- Review of training on the risk framework and current issues over the preceding year.
- Statement of Compliance to funding and regulatory requirements.

6.8.2 The Finance, Audit and Corporate Services Sub-Committee will also consider whether the controls in place to manage risks are adequate, and what actions should be taken (if any), and by whom. This information will be inserted into the Risk Maps. Progress against proposed actions will be reported by the Officers responsible at each meeting of the Corporate Management Team.

6.8.3 It is for individual Directors to confirm that controls in place are being operated. Internal Audits will also undertake a range of reviews which will provide independent assurance over whether controls in place are adequate and are working effectively.

7.0 Risk Appetite

7.1 The Board will use the framework set out in the HM Treasury document - managing your risk appetite to review and update the risk appetite. This should take place as part of the business planning process annually.

The key objectives of the Association should be allocated to one of the following risk categories:

- Strategic Risks
- Governance Risks
- Operations Risks
- Legal Risks
- Property Risks
- Financial Risks
- People Risks
- Technology Risks
- Information Risks
- Security Risks
- Project Programme Risks
- Reputational Risks

The Board should then consider the risk appetite for each of the above risk categories (using the framework in Appendix 3 as a guide). The levels of risk appetite are as follows:

1. Averse
2. Minimalist
3. Cautious
4. Open
5. Eager

8.0 Monitoring and Reporting

8.1 The Association recognises that regular review of the outcomes of this policy is essential to assess if the system is operating effectively and delivering value.

9.0 Training

9.1 Training will be provided to staff and the Board on the content of this policy, the Risk Management processes, and the need to develop a consistent approach to assessing, minimising and monitoring risks.

9.2 Training will be repeated on a regular basis as required, or when changes to policy and procedure require it.

9.3. Induction training for new staff will include an overview of this policy.

10.0 Policy Review

10.1 This policy will be reviewed every 3 years, or sooner if the monitoring and reporting framework identifies processes that need to be amended.

Assessing Likelihood and Impact

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Association's Risk Management policy and procedures set out a 5 point scale for assessing both the likelihood and impact of risks. From this, a risk rating is derived by multiplying the likelihood and impact scores.

1.2 The policy defines the points on each scale by a single word. This may lead to inconsistency in risk rating as a result of the subjectivity involved in interpreting these words. To address this, a matrix has been produced which defines the points on the impact scales in terms of different types of impact, and the points on the likelihood scale have also been defined in more detail.

1.3 Appendix 2 sets out the 3 key tables to be used in assessing likelihood and impact, and assigning an overall risk rating (high, medium or low).

- ***Table 1*** shows the types of impact which should be considered and defines points 1 to 5 on the scale in respect of each.
- ***Table 2*** defines points 1 to 5 on the likelihood scale in terms of both frequency and chance of occurrence.
- ***Table 3*** shows how the overall high, medium or low score is derived by multiplying the two scores.

Further guidance on applying the scales is set out below.

2.0 Process

2.1 The process for applying the scales is as follows:

2.1.1 For each new risk that is identified, consider which type of impact applies (there may be more than one).

2.1.2 Decide which point on the scale most closely matches the potential impact. Where more than one impact type applies, select the highest scoring one. Your assessment should take into account mitigating action currently in place. Where further mitigating action is planned, the score should represent the current position and should be re-assessed once the action has been implemented.

2.1.3 Decide which point on the likelihood scale most closely matches the chance of frequency of this level of impact occurring. Again, the assessment should be based on the current situation, and revisited following the implementation of any new mitigating action.

2.1.4 Multiply the resulting impact and likelihood scores to arrive at the overall high, medium or low rating.

2.1.5 It is important that the same parameters are used for both the impact and likelihood scoring, i.e. if impact is scored on a worst case basis, the likelihood score should reflect the chance of that scenario occurring. It is a matter of judgement whether to consider the worst case or the most likely scenario. It may be useful to look at both, and if the overall rating differs, select the higher one. What is not acceptable is to take an impact score based on worst case and a likelihood score based on a lesser level of impact and multiply these two - this will result in overstating the risk level.

3.0 Guidance on Applying the Impact Scale

3.1 The following points should be noted in applying the impact scale:

3.1.1 For financial loss or cost increase the percentage of the budget for that particular activity is the guiding factor. It may be useful to write in the actual figures that represent the relevant percentages.

3.1.2 For performance impacts, 'targets' refers to the Association's agreed performance targets. Again, it may be useful to write in the relevant actual figures.

4.0 Guidance on Applying the Likelihood Scale

4.1 Likelihood is expressed in terms of either frequency or percentage chance of occurrence. For risks relating to open-ended activities/situations either the frequency or the chance of occurrence in the next year should be used, whichever appears more appropriate. For risks related to projects or initiatives with a defined timeframe of more than a year, the percentage chance can be applied in relation to the lifespan of the project/initiative.

Table 1: Risk Impact Matrix

Appendix 2

Type of Impact	Financial Loss / Cost Increase	Performance	Disruption	Strategy	Reputation
Insignificant	Loss or cost increase <5% of budget	Failure to achieve <5% of targets or abandonment of low priority project	Low level disruption to business of <1 month	Minor distractions from or disagreement over strategic priorities	Isolated complaints
Minor	Loss or cost increase of 5%-9% of budget	Failure to achieve 5%-9% of targets or abandonment / failure of medium priority project	Low level disruption to business of 1-3 months	Conflicts over strategic priorities with non-key partners / stakeholders	Dissatisfaction of particular individuals or group with limited influence or short duration / low key criticism which can be readily rebutted
Moderate	Loss or increase of 10%-19% of budget	Failure to achieve 10%-19% of targets or significant shortfall in benefits from a major initiative or abandonment / failure of high priority local initiative or more than one	Delay of <3 months in significant activity / initiative or significant disruption to business of up to 1 month	Conflicts over strategic priorities with key partners, or tactical opportunity misses or diversion of limited amount of resources away from strategic priorities	Short duration or low-key criticism where there is some substance, or longer term / higher profile criticism which can be readily rebutted or dissatisfaction of key client or influencer group

Type of Impact	Financial Loss / Cost Increase	Performance	Disruption	Strategy	Reputation
Major	Loss or cost increase of 20%-49% of budget	Failure to achieve 20%-49% of published targets, or failure of a major initiative to achieve any significant benefit, or significant shortfall in benefits on more than one major initiative	Partial shutdown of operations, or delay of >3 months to key activity / initiative or significant disruption of >1 month	Failure to have appropriate influence over policy in key area, or significant strategic opportunity missed or diversion of significant resources away from strategic priorities	Sustained, high profile criticism of the Association by media / politicians / dissatisfied customers where there is some substance and/or the critics have significant influence
Catastrophic	Loss or cost increase of 50% or more of budget	Failure to achieve 50% or more of published targets, or failure of more than one major initiative to achieve any significant benefit	Total shutdown of operations	Failure to make any discernible contribution to strategic priorities	Loss of The Scottish Housing Regulator's and/or appropriate Local Authority confidence

Table 2: Likelihood Scale

Likelihood	Frequency	Chance of Occurrence in Next Year / Project Lifespan
1. Rare	Less than once in 10 years	<10%
2. Unlikely	Up to 4 times in 10 years	10% - 39%
3. Moderate	Around once every 2 years	40% - 49%
4. Likely	Around once a year	50% - 79%
5. Common	More than once a year	= or >80%

Table 3: Overall Rating

		LIKELIHOOD				
		Rare (1)	Unlikely (2)	Moderate (3)	Likely (4)	Common (5)
IMPACT	Insignificant (1)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Minor (2)	**2**	**4**	**6**	**8**	**10**
	Moderate (3)	**3**	**6**	**9**	**12**	**15**
	Major (4)	**4**	**8**	**12**	**16**	**20**
	Catastrophic (5)	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**

Low
Medium
High

Risk Appetite Appendix 3

Risk Categories

Strategy risks	Risks arising from identifying and pursuing a strategy, which is poorly defined, is based on flawed or inaccurate data or fails to support the delivery of commitments, plans or objectives due to a changing macro-environment (e.g., political, economic, social, technological, environment and legislative change).
Governance risks	Risks arising from unclear plans, priorities, authorities and accountabilities, and/or ineffective or disproportionate oversight of decision-making and/or performance.
Operations risks	Risks arising from inadequate, poorly designed or ineffective/inefficient internal processes resulting in fraud, error, impaired customer service (quality and/or quantity of service), non-compliance and/or poor value for money.
Legal risks	Risks arising from a defective transaction, a claim being made (including a defence to a claim or a counterclaim) or some other legal event occurring that results in a liability or other loss, or a failure to take appropriate measures to meet legal or regulatory requirements or to protect assets (for example, intellectual property).
Property risks	Risks arising from property deficiencies or poorly designed or ineffective/ inefficient safety management resulting in non- compliance and/or harm and suffering to employees, contractors, service users or the public.
Financial risks	Risks arising from not managing finances in accordance with requirements and financial constraints resulting in poor returns from investments, failure to manage assets/liabilities or to obtain value for money from the resources deployed, and/or non- compliant financial reporting.
Commercial risks	Risks arising from weaknesses in the management of commercial partnerships, supply chains and contractual requirements, resulting in poor performance, inefficiency, poor value for money, fraud, and /or failure to meet business requirements/objectives.
People risks	Risks arising from ineffective leadership and engagement, suboptimal culture, inappropriate behaviours, the unavailability of sufficient capacity and capability, industrial action and/or non- compliance with relevant employment legislation/HR policies resulting in negative impact on performance.
Technology risks	Risks arising from technology not delivering the expected services due to inadequate or deficient system/process development and performance or inadequate resilience.
Information risks	Risks arising from a failure to produce robust, suitable and appropriate data/information and to exploit data/information to its full potential.
Security risks	Risks arising from a failure to prevent unauthorised and/or inappropriate access to key government systems and assets, including people, platforms, information and resources. This encompasses the subset of cyber security.

Project/Programme risks	Risks that change programmes and projects are not aligned with strategic priorities and do not successfully and safely deliver requirements and intended benefits to time, cost and quality.
Reputational risks	Risks arising from adverse events, including ethical violations, a lack of sustainability, systemic or repeated failures or poor quality or a lack of innovation, leading to damages to reputation and or destruction of trust and relations.

Risk Appetite Scale

Risk Appetite	Description
Averse	Avoidance of risk and uncertainty in achievement of key deliverables or initiatives is key objective. Activities undertaken will only be those considered to carry virtually no inherent risk.
Minimalist	Preference for very safe business delivery options that have a low degree of inherent risk with the potential for benefit/return not a key driver. Activities will only be undertaken where they have a low degree of inherent risk.
Cautious	Preference for safe options that have low degree of inherent risk and only limited potential for benefit. Willing to tolerate a degree of risk in selecting which activities to undertake to achieve key deliverables or initiatives, where we have identified scope to achieve significant benefit and/or realise an opportunity. Activities undertaken may carry a high degree of inherent risk that is deemed controllable to a large extent.
Open	Willing to consider all options and choose one most likely to result in successful delivery while providing an acceptable level of benefit. Seek to achieve a balance between a high likelihood of successful delivery and a high degree of benefit and value for money. Activities themselves may potentially carry, or contribute to, a high degree of residual risk.
Eager	Eager to be innovative and to choose options based on maximising opportunities and potential higher benefit even if those activities carry a very high residual risk.

Risk Appetite Table

Risk appetite level definition				
Averse	**Minimal**	**Cautious**	**Open**	**Eager**
Guiding principles or rules in place that limit risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities. Organisational strategy is refreshed at 5+ year intervals	Guiding principles or rules in place that minimise risk in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities. Organisational strategy is refreshed at 4-5 year intervals	Guiding principles or rules in place that allow considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities. Organisational strategy is refreshed at 3-4 year intervals	Guiding principles or rules in place that are receptive to considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities. Organisational strategy is refreshed at 2-3 year intervals	Guiding principles or rules in place that welcome considered risk taking in organisational actions and the pursuit of priorities. Organisational strategy is refreshed at 1-2 year intervals
Avoid actions with associated risk. No decisions are taken outside of processes and oversight / monitoring arrangements. Organisational controls minimise risk of fraud, with significant levels of resource focused on detection and prevention.	Willing to consider low risk actions which support delivery of priorities and objectives. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable limited risk taking. Organisational controls maximise fraud prevention, detection and deterrence through robust controls and sanctions.	Willing to consider actions where benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable cautious risk taking. Controls enable fraud prevention, detection and deterrence by maintaining appropriate controls and sanctions.	Receptive to taking difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements enable considered risk taking. Levels of fraud controls are varied to reflect scale of risks with costs.	Ready to take difficult decisions when benefits outweigh risks. Processes, and oversight / monitoring arrangements support informed risk taking. Levels of fraud controls are varied to reflect scale of risk with costs.
Defensive approach to operational delivery - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate. Priority for close management controls and oversight with limited devolved authority.	Innovations largely avoided unless essential. Decision making authority held by senior management.	Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided unless necessary. Decision making authority generally held by senior management. Management through leading indicators.	Innovation supported, with clear demonstration of benefit / improvement in management control. Responsibility for non-critical decisions may be devolved.	Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority – management by trust / lagging indicators rather than close control.
Play safe and avoid anything which could be challenged, even unsuccessfully.	Want to be very sure we would win any challenge.	Want to be reasonably sure we would win any challenge.	Challenge will be problematic; we are likely to win, and the gain will outweigh the adverse impact.	Chances of losing are high but exceptional benefits could be realised.
Obligation to comply with strict policies for purchase, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money.	Recommendation to follow strict policies for purchase, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money.	Requirement to adopt arrange of agreed solutions for purchase, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures producing good value for money.	Consider benefits of agreed solutions for purchase, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that meeting organisational requirements.	Application of dynamic solutions for purchase, rental, disposal, construction, and refurbishment that ensures meeting organisational requirements.
Avoidance of any financial impact or loss, is a key objective.	Only prepared to accept the possibility of very limited financial impact if essential to delivery.	Seek safe delivery options with little residual financial loss only if it could yield upside opportunities.	Prepared to invest for benefit and to minimise the possibility of financial loss by managing the risks to tolerable levels.	Prepared to invest for best possible benefit and accept possibility of financial loss (controls must be in place).
Zero appetite for untested commercial agreements. Priority for close management controls and oversight with limited devolved authority.	Appetite for risk taking limited to low scale procurement activity. Decision making authority held by senior management.	Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided unless necessary. Decision making authority generally held by senior management. Management through leading indicators.	Innovation supported, with demonstration of benefit / improvement in service delivery. Responsibility for non-critical decisions may be devolved.	Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority – management by trust / lagging indicators rather than close control.
Priority to maintain close management control & oversight. Limited devolved authority. Limited flexibility in relation to working practices. Development investment in standard practices only	Decision making authority held by senior management. Development investment generally in standard practices.	Seek safe and standard people policy. Decision making authority generally held by senior management.	Prepared to invest in our people to create innovative mix of skills environment. Responsibility for noncritical decisions may be devolved.	Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority – management by trust rather than close control.

Risk appetite level definitions					
	Averse	**Minimal**	**Cautious**	**Open**	**Eager**
Technology	General avoidance of systems / technology developments.	Only essential systems / technology developments to protect current operations.	Consideration given to adoption of established / mature systems and technology improvements. Agile principles are considered.	Systems / technology developments considered to enable improved delivery. Agile principles may be followed.	New technologies viewed as a key enabler of operational delivery. Agile principles are embraced.
Data & Info	Lock down data & information. Access tightly controlled, high levels of monitoring.	Minimise level of risk due to potential damage from disclosure.	Accept need for operational effectiveness with risk mitigated through careful management limiting distribution.	Accept need for operational effectiveness in distribution and information sharing.	Level of controls minimised with data and information openly shared.
Security	No tolerance for security risks causing loss or damage to HMG property, assets, information or people. Stringent measures in place, including: • Adherence to FCDO travel restrictions • Staff vetting maintained at highest appropriate level. • Controls limiting staff and visitor access to information, assets and estate. • Access to staff personal devices restricted in official sites	Risk of loss or damage to HMG property, assets, information or people minimised through stringent security measures, including: • Adherence to FCDO travel restrictions • All staff vetted levels defined by role requirements. • Controls limiting staff and visitor access to information, assets and estate. • Staff personal devices permitted, but may not be used for official tasks.	Limited security risks accepted to support business need, with appropriate checks and balances in place: • Adherence to FCDO travel restrictions • Vetting levels may flex within teams, as required • Controls managing staff and limiting visitor access to information, assets and estate. • Staff personal devices may be used for limited official tasks with appropriate permissions.	Considered security risk accepted to support business need, with appropriate checks and balances in place: • New starters may commence employment at risk, following partial completion of vetting processes • Permission may be sought for travel within FCDO restricted areas. • Controls limiting visitor access to information, assets and estate. • Staff personal devices may be used for official tasks with appropriate permissions.	Organisational willing to accept security risk to support business need, with appropriate checks and balances in place: • New starters may commence employment at risk, following partial completion of vetting processes • Travel permitted within FCDO restricted areas. • Controls limiting visitor access to information, assets and estate. • Staff personal devices permitted for official tasks
Project/Programme	Defensive approach to transformational activity - aim to maintain/protect, rather than create or innovate. Priority for close management controls and oversight with limited devolved authority. Benefits led plans fully aligned with strategic priorities, functional standards.	Innovations avoided unless essential. Decision making authority held by senior management. Benefits led plans aligned with strategic priorities, functional standards.	Tendency to stick to the status quo, innovations generally avoided unless necessary. Decision making authority generally held by senior management. Plans aligned with strategic priorities, functional standards.	Innovation supported, with demonstration of commensurate improvements in management control. Responsibility for noncritical decisions may be devolved. Plans aligned with functional standards and organisational governance.	Innovation pursued – desire to 'break the mould' and challenge current working practices. High levels of devolved authority – management by trust rather than close control. Plans aligned with organisational governance.
Reputational	Zero appetite for any decisions with high chance of repercussion for organisations' reputation.	Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is no chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation.	Appetite for risk taking limited to those events where there is little chance of any significant repercussion for the organisation.	Appetite to take decisions with potential to expose organisation to additional scrutiny, but only where appropriate steps are taken to minimise exposure.	Appetite to take decisions which are likely to bring additional Governmental / organisational scrutiny only where potential benefits outweigh risks.