



**RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**2 May 2016**

**Minute**

**Present:** Mr Hugh Edmiston, Director of Corporate Services (Convener)  
Professor Tina Harrison  
Dr Bruce Nelson, College Registrar, CSE  
Dr Catherine Martin, College Registrar, CHSS  
Dr Catherine Elliott, College Registrar, CMVM  
Mr Tony Weir, Director of IT Infrastructure  
Ms Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning  
Mr Phil McNaul, Director of Finance

**In attendance:** Mr Noel Lawlor, Chief Internal Auditor  
Ms Pat Tomlin, Programme Development Director  
Ms Kirstie Graham, Deputy Head of Court Services

**Apologies:** Professor Jake Ansell  
Mr Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience

**1 Minute**

**Paper A**

The Minute of the meeting held on 21 March 2016 was approved as a correct record.

**2 Convener's Business**

**Verbal**

The Convener welcomed Noel Lawlor, Chief Internal Auditor, to his first meeting of the Committee and informed members he had invited Pat Tomlin, recently appointed Programme Development Director in Corporate Services to attend for this meeting.

**SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS**

**3 Enterprise Risk Management Review**

**Paper B**

The Convener introduced the report, noting that over the period he had been responsible for risk management, he had introduced a number of incremental changes to streamline the existing process and had considered it timely to invite external consultant to undertake a more thorough review. PwC's report noted that the University was in the upper quartile in the HE sector with many areas of established good practice. Consideration had been given to enterprise risk management in the corporate world to identify areas where the University may wish to strengthen its processes.

The recommendations included reducing the number of risks on the risk register and tightening the wording to a 'cause/event/consequence' model of describing risk; introducing a more standard approach to definitions and terminology; introducing graphics and diagrammes to illustrate risk; increased support and training to embed a risk culture across the University; and increased resource for implementing the recommended changes.

Members discussed the report, noting the importance of ensuring that the process adopted was appropriate in resource requirements and scale and that it was important to be clear which recommendations were essential and which were longer terms aspirations. There was agreement that use of an off the shelf software system would be beneficial in simplifying processes.

The outcome of the review would be considered by Central Management Group and forwarded to Audit and Risk Committee for endorsement. It was suggested that a half day workshop for committee members over the summer could be useful to take forward the implementation of recommendations agreed by the Audit and Risk Committee.

#### 4 Review of University's Risks 2015/16

Paper C

The Committee considered the University's Risk Register and the following risk reviews:

**Risk 12: Insufficient investment and weak coordination of investment across the University in ICT infrastructure, systems development and information systems**

Mr Tony Weir, Director of IT Infrastructure, reported that the risk had been slightly reworded as 'Underinvestment, constraints or weak coordination/standardisation in IT and Library so that the critical services required by the University fail to be maintained and fail to scale with the University's key objectives' to follow a cause/event/consequence model. The likelihood had been reduced, due to significant infrastructure funding alongside the Digital Transformation and Service Excellence programmes.

**Risk 13: Loss of sensitive data due to systems being compromised or weak security practices**

The newly appointed Chief Information Security Officer had reworded this risk as 'Compromise of University systems and/or data due to missing, ineffective or inappropriate controls' and it was noted that it remained a challenging landscape in relation to information security.

**Risk 15: Inadequate implementation of major change projects both individually and as a combined programme of activity.**

Members welcomed the list of current projects included in this risk and noted that the Service Excellence programme was intended to be

a repository for major projects to feed up through. The number of projects and the capacity to resource these was noted as a risk and there was discussion of the definition of a 'major change' project, project interdependencies and the need for clearer metrics in defining project risks.

**Risk 15b: Alan Turing Institute**

Members noted the Alan Turing institute was progressing well and was no longer a University level risk for the next iteration of the University Risk Register.

**Risk 20: Significant academic collaborations fail to be effectively managed and do not deliver benefits**

The three Colleges each provided a risk review for this risk. There was discussion of the need to differentiate between College and School level partnerships, to ensure that opportunities to develop deeper partnerships were not overlooked and to understand the different types of collaboration in order that these are considered proportionately. It was noted that long standing collaborations that have developed organically may require revisited to ensure robust arrangements are in place.

**5 Updates to College and Support Group risk registers**

**Paper D**

Each College and Support Group maintains a risk register which is formally reviewed annually. The Committee considered the updated risks registers and brief summaries were given of the changes.

Through general discussion it was noted that it was important to consider the Risk Registers overall to identify any common themes or trends and to ensure there was alignment between the College and Support Group Risk Registers and the University Risk Register.

**6 Movement of Risks 2013/14 to 2015/16**

**Paper E**

The Committee noted that the University's risk profile appears to be increasing. It was agreed that new presentations including dashboard formats to give a broader oversight of risk trends would be a useful development as part of the revision of risk processes.

**7 Update of University Risk Register 2016/17**

**Paper F**

The Committee considered the summary draft University Risk Register 2016/17 and noted the proposed changes. It was noted that Principal's Strategy Group had requested that a risk specific to Brexit was added. The Committee noted the revised draft would be forwarded to Central Management Group for further discussion prior to consideration by Audit and Risk Committee for recommendation to Court for approval.

**8 Annual Year End Questionnaire**

**Paper G**

The questionnaire was agreed, with minor revisions, for circulation to the Colleges and Support Groups over the summer.

**ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL**

**9 Risk Register update - Subsidiary Company**

**Paper H**

The Risk Register received from Edinburgh University Press was noted and it was agreed that subsidiary companies should adopt the standard University risk register template.

**10 Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 13 October 2016 at 10.30 pm in the Elder Room, Old College.

There will be a joint meeting with Audit & Risk Committee on Thursday, 15 September 2016 at 1.00pm in the Raeburn Room, Old College.