

Well you know what they say about buses, sometimes the same applies to our NEWSLETTERS, you wait a while for one, then two come together.

Don't worry – it is not too late to reply and comment on the content of the last NEWSLETTER if you wish to and I will incorporate any relevant points in the November issue, which should now be issued after the normal time span.

Feature 1

I am grateful to one of our newer members, Ruth Turner of the Financial Services Agency, for an interesting contribution on training and risk frameworks - to set the scene for this future feature, I set out below an opening extract:

“As a risk-based regulator, the Financial Services Authority (FSA), operates a “non-zero failure” regime. This means risk can never be eliminated entirely, and in this context, some of the risks are “let through”. The belief that regulation should seek to eliminate all firm failures may look appalling on paper, but in practice this would impose significant costs on the industry and consumers.

The framework that the regulator uses to make risk-based regulation operational is called “ARROW” which stands for the Advanced, Risk-Responsive, Operating frame Work. As part of the FSA’s internal business improvement programme, we began a review of ARROW. One of the areas we identified where progress could be made included the amount of information needed to make a decision as an issue escalates through a large and complex organisation. In particular, we found that without a clear articulation of risk appetite, which drives clear decisions, it I difficult to ensure a proportionate and consistent approach to risk management”.

A number of issues arise from this statement – the two most pertinent are firstly, that this matter has been submitted to the *People Risk* SIG as being within our orbit and the second, which partly answers the first, is that a finding of the review related to the amount of information needed to make a decision in a large organisation. I am sure that we all look forward to Ruth’s further input dealing with training and risk frameworks, in the meantime **if any other member wishes to contribute on this topic, please write in.**

Feature 2

I asked for your views on how far *People Risk* should extend, especially in a crisis situation. Another of our newer members, Tracey Hutchinson of Northumbria Police, writes that she feels very strongly that you cannot take people out of the

equation of operational risk and that much work has been done on how an organisation can be affected by people's perception of risk.

Further, I have received an interesting and significant contribution from Ray Williams (a member who has a Metropolitan Police background) with a security consultant viewpoint regarding the role played by the British Red Cross, especially after the London Tube Bombings in providing key support roles in caring for the bereaved and protecting people traumatised by the attacks. A copy of an ASIS Newsletter is available by clicking the red ASIS logo on Ray's website which makes interesting reading. Anyone wishing to study this further should go to www.williamscommunication.co.uk.

In case you are now thinking that only *the boys and girls in blue* think that *People Risk* extends into crisis and other areas, I would also quote a paper from our Chairman, Michael Ocock, who has reviewed the extensive research by the *Open University* into major disasters – I mentioned the "Herald" Ferry case in the last *NEWSLETTER* and there will be more of Michael's work to come as his points become relevant to actual topics.

Another issue arising from the *London Tube Bombings*, which I mention mainly for our student members, is the fact that we must always be professional risk practitioners and not let personal emotions get in the way of judgements. Not only are victims and their families *People*, so are terrorists and their sympathisers. Some problems and conflicts of ideas and beliefs can never be completely resolved, such is human nature. It must be for the politicians and big business prompted by human need to plan changes – but I believe we can bring influence to bear and this must never be forgotten.

Before moving on, I will just throw my own *two penny worth* on disasters into the hat: On 11th/12th June 1955 a major disaster struck the Le Mans 24 hour race in France. 82 people were killed and around 150 injured when a two racing cars collided and one of them summersaulted into the vast crowd. Little is now talked about this catastrophe, it was a long time ago, but maybe also because it happened in a non-English speaking Country (I am prompted to mention this point as it is the week after the FERMA pan European meeting).

The very brave decision was taken by the management at the circuit (in 1955 many of them would have had first hand experience of war and the German occupation). The ruling was, they would carry on running the race as if nothing had happened – this was decided in spite of many objections, mainly on moral grounds of showing respect for the dead, but later the decision was applauded as being absolutely the correct one – the reason was quite simple, if the race had been stopped, half the crowd would have gone and stared at the carnage and got in the way, whilst the other half would have headed for home and their vehicles would have blocked the roads around the circuit for hours to ambulances and other essential traffic.

Today of course with satellite TV, images would be round the world in a trice and in any case, the race would have been red flagged to protect rescue workers. But the question still arises: do we now over react to disasters? I would appreciate your comments, especially if we worry too much about “what will people say and what will people think”. Also, if necessary, how current perception / assessment of public reaction could be improved?

Another point

I know that I brought up Reporting yet again in last month's issue, but it was the very first FAQ you submitted after we started our SIG, plus it was very much on the delegates' minds at the *Keele Forum*.

I am grateful to Pauline Bird, a member with a large accountancy firm, for pointing out that we have not yet touched on error caused by Partners – this is perhaps more of an issue in professional firms, where the physical risk from clerical operations is low and it is fairly easy to have professional controls in place for staff, especially as many procedures are specified for “compliance” in legislation and codes of conduct.

Over the next few issues, we will progress through areas such as emotional literacy, training and risk frameworks, leading into people in decision making, practitioner error and the general management ethos. Then of course, our first round of study into *People Risk* will terminate with the most senior of management, the main boards – *bless them, what would we do without the bosses*.

The future

A number of you have pointed out that it is some time since our inaugural (and only) meeting at Staffordshire Fire and Rescue HQ in January. We need another meeting to take stock of progress and discuss the longer term way ahead for the SIG – also to put a few more faces to names, perhaps with a guest speaker and / or some other attraction. We (Michael, the **irm** office and I) are working on this and I hope to let you have some more news in the next issue.

Newsletter - No. 11

Should be out during November.

ANY COMMENTS IN THE MEANTIME, you know where I am:.

Bruce Widdowson

Secretary

e-mail bruce.writer@btinternet.com Tel/Fax 0115 986 3254

