

From: Freedom of Information

Sent: 14 October 2020 15:45

To:

Subject: Freedom of Information Response (Our Ref: K/20/363)

Dear

Freedom of Information Response (Our Ref: K/20/363)

Thank you for your Freedom of Information (FOI) request dated 17 September 2020 reference K/20/363.

Your request read:

“Risk:

1. Does your institution have a risk appetite statement and, if yes, please will you submit a copy of this to me?
2. Please use the table below to indicate your university’s risk appetite
[table not reproduced due to size]
3. Is there a specific committee or group which assesses risk within your institution – if yes, please provide the terms of reference.
4. Is a risk assessment completed prior to the implementation of a new project, venture, investment, product, or activity?

If yes:

5. Are risks generally classified based on impact vs probability or equivalent terminology? – Please will you provide any written guidance on how risks are classified and quantified at your institution?

If yes:

6. Please will you provide a breakdown of risk scoring at your institution (where this is not included within the guidance already requested)? i.e. quantifiable categories referenced above

Please will you also provide the following information for the academic years 2016-17 to 2018/19 inclusive? (see table below for further explanation):

- Number of risk assessments completed in relation to new projects, ventures, investments, products, or activities.
- Breakdown of risk assessment classifications of the above assessments, both prior to mitigation and with mitigation factored in; i.e. prior to mitigation, 12 risks classified as high, prior to mitigation, 5 high, 4 medium and 3 low.
- Number of new ventures, investments, products, or activities etc. which proceeded past the risk assessment phase, broken down by classification post mitigation (high, medium, low, or equivalent classification)
- Rationale for decision to proceed by number, broken down into the following categories: Equivalent or substantial risk associated with inaction / failure to proceed; Benefits of

proceeding deemed to outweigh risks identified; Risks regarded as negligible; and other.

Financial:

Please provide the following information for the financial years, 2014-2-15 to 2018-2019 inclusive.”

Financial year	Total income for the year	Surpluses for the year	Liquidity days at year end	Operating expenditure	Capital expenditure	Total expenditure	Borrowing within the year	Total debt	Total equity
2014-15									
2015-16									
2016-17									
2017-18									
2018-19									

The University of Leeds holds some of this information. For your convenience we have responded to each of your questions in turn below.

- 1. Does your institution have a risk appetite statement and, if yes, please will you submit a copy of this to me?**

Please refer to our [Annual Report and Accounts](#), page 17.

- 2. Please use the table below to indicate your university’s risk appetite**

The Freedom of Information Act entitles you to request recorded information which you believe a public authority holds. However, where information is not already recorded public authorities are not required to create new records in order to answer a request. We do not categorise risk in this way and as such do not hold the information you have asked for.

- 3. Is there a specific committee or group which assesses risk within your institution – if yes, please provide the terms of reference.**

Yes, the [Audit and Risk Committee](#). Terms of Reference are available at the given link.

- 4. Is a risk assessment completed prior to the implementation of a new project, venture, investment, product, or activity?**

Please refer to our [Annual Report and Accounts](#), page 17 (“Process” section).

If yes:

5. Are risks generally classified based on impact vs probability or equivalent terminology? – Please will you provide any written guidance on how risks are classified and quantified at your institution?

Risks are classified based on impact and probability using an escalating scale for both.

Impact scale:

- 1 – Low impact
- 2 – Medium impact
- 3 – High impact
- 4 – Critical impact

Likelihood scale:

- 1 – Unlikely
- 2 – Possible
- 3 – Likely
- 4 – Almost certain

The combination of the impact multiplied by the likelihood determines the positioning of a risk on a risk matrix. The positioning of each risk is determined by taking into account any existing controls that are in place that help to mitigate the risk.

If yes:

6. Please will you provide a breakdown of risk scoring at your institution (where this is not included within the guidance already requested)? i.e. quantifiable categories referenced above

Please refer to the attached document “Risk Management Scoring Guidance”.

Please will you also provide the following information for the academic years 2016-17 to 2018/19 inclusive? (see table below for further explanation):

- **Number of risk assessments completed in relation to new projects, ventures, investments, products, or activities.**
- **Breakdown of risk assessment classifications of the above assessments, both prior to mitigation and with mitigation factored in; i.e. prior to mitigation, 12 risks classified as high, prior to mitigation, 5 high, 4 medium and 3 low.**
- **Number of new ventures, investments, products, or activities etc. which proceeded past the risk assessment phase, broken down by classification post mitigation (high, medium, low, or equivalent classification)**

- **Rationale for decision to proceed by number, broken down into the following categories: Equivalent or substantial risk associated with inaction / failure to proceed; Benefits of proceeding deemed to outweigh risks identified; Risks regarded as negligible; and other.**

We do not have this level of data for those years other than what is provided in the [Annual Reports and Accounts](#). Prior to 2019/20 the risk process was a manual exercise at the institutional level with the result being the annual accounts summary.

Please provide the following information for the financial years, 2014-2-15 to 2018-2019 inclusive:

This information can be found in our published [Annual Reports and Accounts](#). Please note that we do not have a figure for “total equity”, as the University is not a company, but a charity established by Royal Charter. Liquidity Days are not specifically set out in the Report and Accounts, but can be calculated as follows:-

(Current Asset: Investments + Cash at Bank and in Hand)/ Total Expenditure *
365

We hope this information is helpful. If you have any questions about this email, however, please do not hesitate to contact us on foi@leeds.ac.uk

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, you can request an Internal Review. Requests for Internal Review should be made in writing using the following contact information:

Post: Mr D Wardle
Deputy Secretary
The University of Leeds
Leeds
LS2 9JT

Email: foi@leeds.ac.uk

Requests for Internal Review should be submitted within 40 working days of receiving the University’s response to your request. Further information about how the University manages Freedom of Information requests and about our complaints procedure is also available on our website (www.leeds.ac.uk).

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review/complaints procedure provided by the University. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: Information Commissioner’s Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.

Kind regards

Chloe Wilkins

Freedom of Information Officer

Secretariat

University of Leeds