

Audit & Risk Management Committee Meeting Minutes

18 March 2025

This page has been left intentionally blank



1	OPENING & ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	2
2	ANNOUNCEMENTS OF PRESIDING MEMBER.....	2
3	ATTENDANCE RECORD	2
3.1	Present	2
3.2	Apologies.....	2
3.3	Leave of Absence Previously Granted	2
4	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	2
5	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	2
5.1	Audit & Risk Management Committee Meeting – 10 December 2024	2
6	REPORTS.....	3
6.1	Shire of Dalwallinu Compliance Audit Return review*	3
6.2	Shire of Dalwallinu Audit & Risk Management Committee Risk Dashboard Report*	5
7	SCHEDULING OF MEETING.....	7
8	CLOSURE	7
9.	CERTIFICATION.....	7



SHIRE OF DALWALLINU

MINUTES of the Audit & Risk Management Committee Meeting of Council held in the Council Chambers, Shire Administration Centre, Dalwallinu on Tuesday 18 March 2025.

1 OPENING & ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chairperson opened the meeting at 3.33pm.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS OF PRESIDING MEMBER

Nil

3 ATTENDANCE RECORD

3.1 Present

Chairperson	Mr I Hyde
	Cr KL Carter
	Cr SC Carter
	Cr S Dawson
	Cr MM Harms

Chief Executive Officer	Mrs JM Knight
Manager Corporate Services	Mrs Hanna Jolly

3.2 Apologies

Nil

3.3 Leave of Absence Previously Granted

Nil

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

5.1 Audit & Risk Management Committee Meeting – 10 December 2024

MOTION

Moved Cr SC Carter
Seconded Cr MM Harms

That the Minutes of the Audit & Risk Management Committee Meeting held on the 10 December 2024 be confirmed.

CARRIED 5/0

For: Chairperson Mr IW Hyde, Cr KL Carter, Cr SC Carter, Cr S Dawson, Cr MM Harms

Against: Nil



6 REPORTS

6.1 Shire of Dalwallinu Compliance Audit Return review*

Report Date	18 March 2025
Applicant	Shire of Dalwallinu
File Ref	GO/4 – Compliance Audit Return
Previous Meeting Reference	Nil
Prepared by	Hanna Jolly, Manager Corporate Services
Supervised by	Jean Knight, Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest	Nil
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Local Government Compliance Audit Return 2024 Questions

Purpose of Report

The Audit Committee is requested to review the Compliance Audit Return (CAR) as presented for the year ended 31 December 2024.

Background

The Shire is required to carry out an annual audit of statutory compliance in accordance with Regulation 14 of the *Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996*. The Department of Local Government, Sports and Cultural Industries distributed a Compliance Audit Return for the period of 1 January to 31 December 2024 which has been followed to complete the return.

The Audit Committee is to review the compliance audit return and report to council the results of that review.

Consultation

Chief Executive Officer

Legislative Implications

State

Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 s14 and s15

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

General Function Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

Site Inspection

Site inspection undertaken: Not applicable



Sustainability & Climate Change Implications

Economic implications

There are no known significant economic implications associated with this proposal.

Social implications

There are no known significant social implications associated with this proposal.

Environmental implications

There are no known significant environmental implications associated with this proposal.

Officer Comment

The Completed Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January to 31 December 2024 is attached to this item for Audit Committee's consideration and review.

One item of non-compliance was identified under Disposal of Property section. Dalwallinu Town Hall and Dalwallinu Discovery Centre (renewal) were leased during the year by way of lease and no public notice was given before the commencement of these leases.

Following Council's adoption, the 2024 Compliance Audit Return must be submitted to the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries by 31 March 2025.

Officer Recommendation/Committee Resolution

MOTION

Moved Cr MM Harms
Seconded Cr KL Carter

That the Audit & Risk Management Committee:

1. Review the Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2024 to 31 December 2024 and report to Council at the March 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting;
2. Requests that Council authorise the Shire President and Chief Executive Officer to sign the completed Compliance Audit Return and submit to the Department of Local Government, Sport & Cultural Industries by 31 March 2025.

CARRIED 5/0

For: Chairperson Mr IW Hyde, Cr KL Carter, Cr SC Carter, Cr S Dawson, Cr MM Harms
Against: Nil



Compliance Audit Return

Start ✓
Details ✓
Commercial Enterprises ✓
Delegation ✓
Disclosure of Interest ✓
Disposal of Property ✓
Elections ✓
Finance ✓
Integrated Planning and Reporting ✓
Employees ✓
Conduct ✓
Other ✓
Tenders ✓
Documents ✓
Review

Finalise for Council adoption

Below is a copy of your responses to the CAR for your review. You can also print a draft copy for review.

If you print a draft copy for review, please note this is not the version for submission to Council. You can access this version on the next tab.

Print Draft

Details

Local Government

Dalwallinu, Shire of

Created By

Hanna Jolly

Year of Return

2024

Commercial Enterprises by Local Governments

1. Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major trading undertaking that was not exempt in 2024? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

2. Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major land transaction that was not exempt in 2024? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

3. Has the local government prepared a business plan before entering into each land transaction that was preparatory to entry into a major land transaction in 2024? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

4. Has the local government complied with public notice and publishing requirements for each proposal to commence a major trading undertaking or enter into a major land transaction or a land transaction that is preparatory to a major land transaction for 2024? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

5. During 2024, did the council resolve to proceed with each major land transaction or trading undertaking by absolute majority? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

Delegation of Power/Duty

1. Were all delegations to committees resolved by absolute majority? *

N/A

☒ **Add comments**

Please enter comments *

No delegations to committees

2. Were all delegations to committees in writing? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

3. Were all delegations to committees within the limits specified in section 5.17 of the Local Government Act 1995? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

4. Were all delegations to committees recorded in a register of delegations? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

5. Has council reviewed delegations to its committees in the 2023/2024 financial year? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

6. Did the powers and duties delegated to the CEO exclude those listed in section 5.43 of the Local Government Act 1995? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

7. Were all delegations to the CEO resolved by an absolute majority? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

8. Were all delegations to the CEO in writing? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

9. Were all delegations by the CEO to any employee in writing? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

10. Were all decisions by the Council to amend or revoke a delegation made by absolute majority? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

11. Has the CEO kept a register of all delegations made under Division 4 of the Act to the CEO and to employees? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

12. Were all delegations made under Division 4 of the Act reviewed by the delegator at least once during the 2023/2024 financial year? *

Yes

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

26 March 2024

13. Did all persons exercising a delegated power or duty under the Act keep, on all occasions, a written record in accordance with Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, regulation 19? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

Disclosure of Interest

1. Where a council member disclosed an interest in a matter and did not have participation approval under sections 5.68 or 5.69 of the Local Government Act 1995, did the council member ensure that they did not remain present to participate in discussion or decision making relating to the matter? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

2. Were all decisions regarding participation approval, including the extent of participation allowed and, where relevant, the information required by the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 regulation 21A, recorded in the minutes of the relevant council or committee meeting? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

3. Were disclosures under sections 5.65, 5.70 or 5.71A(3) of the Local Government Act 1995 recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the disclosures were made? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

4. Was a primary return in the prescribed form lodged by all relevant persons within three months of their start day? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

5. Was an annual return in the prescribed form lodged by all relevant persons by 31 August 2024? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

6. On receipt of a primary or annual return, did the CEO, or the Mayor/President, give written acknowledgment of having received the return? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

7. Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained the returns lodged under sections 5.75 and 5.76 of the Local Government Act 1995? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

8. Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained a record of disclosures made under sections 5.65, 5.70, 5.71 and 5.71A of the Local Government Act 1995, in the form prescribed in the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, regulation 28? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

9. When a person ceased to be a person required to lodge a return under sections 5.75 and 5.76 of the Local Government Act 1995, did the CEO remove from the register all returns relating to that person? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

10. Have all returns removed from the register in accordance with section 5.88(3) of the Local Government Act 1995 been kept for a period of at least five years after the person who lodged the return(s) ceased to be a person required to lodge a return? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

11. Did the CEO keep a register of gifts which contained a record of disclosures made under sections 5.87A and 5.87B of the Local Government Act 1995, in the form prescribed in the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, regulation 28A? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

12. Did the CEO publish an up-to-date version of the gift register on the local government's website? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

13. When people cease to be a person who is required to make a disclosure under section 5.87A or 5.87B of the Local Government Act 1995, did the CEO remove from the register all records relating to those people? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

14. Have copies of all records removed from the register under section 5.89A(6) of the Local Government Act 1995 been kept for a period of at least five years after the person ceases to be a person required to make a disclosure? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

15. Where an employee had an interest in any matter in respect of which the employee provided advice or a report directly to council or a committee, did that person disclose the nature and extent of that interest when giving the advice or report? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

16. Where council applied to the Minister to allow the CEO to provide advice or a report to which a disclosure under section 5.71A(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 relates, did the application include details of the nature of the interest disclosed and any other information required by the Minister for the purposes of the application? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

17. Was any decision made by the Minister under section 5.71B(6) of the Local Government Act 1995, recorded in the minutes of the council meeting at which the decision was considered? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

18. Did the local government prepare and adopt, by absolute majority, a code of conduct to be observed by council members, committee members and candidates that incorporates the model code of conduct? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

19. Did the local government adopt additional requirements in addition to the model code of conduct? *

No

☐ Add comments

—

20. Has the CEO published an up-to-date version of the code of conduct for council members, committee members and candidates on the local government's website? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

21. Has the CEO prepared and implemented a code of conduct to be observed by employees of the local government? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

21a. Has the CEO published an up-to-date version of the code of conduct for employees on the local government's website? *

Yes

Disposal of Property

1. Where the local government disposed of property other than by public auction or tender, did it dispose of the property in accordance with section 3.58(3) of the Local Government Act 1995 (unless section 3.58(5) applies)? *

No

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

Disposal by way of lease - no public notice given:

Dalwallinu Town Hall lease

Dalwallinu Discovery Centre officer space lease renewals (2)

2. Where the local government disposed of property under section 3.58(3) of the Local Government Act 1995, did it provide details, as prescribed by section 3.58(4) in the required local public notice for each disposal of property? *

No

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

Disposal by way of lease - no public notice given:

Dalwallinu Town Hall lease

Dalwallinu Discovery Centre officer space lease renewals (2)

Elections

1. Did the CEO establish and maintain an electoral gift register and ensure that all disclosure of gifts forms completed by candidates and donors and received by the CEO were placed on the electoral gift register at the time of receipt by the CEO and in a manner that clearly identifies and distinguishes the forms relating to each candidate in accordance with regulation 30G(1) and regulation 30G(2) of the Local Government (Elections) Regulations 1997? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

Nil received

2. Did the CEO remove any disclosure of gifts forms relating to unsuccessful candidates, or successful candidates that completed their term of office, from the electoral gift register, and retain those forms separately for a period of at least two years in accordance with regulation 30G(4) of the Local Government (Elections) Regulations 1997? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

Nil received

3. Did the CEO publish an up-to-date version of the electoral gift register on the local government's official website in accordance with regulation 30G(5) of the Local Government (Elections) Regulations 1997? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

Nil received

Finance

1. Has the local government established an audit committee and appointed members by absolute majority in accordance with section 7.1A of the Local Government Act 1995? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

2. Where the council delegated to its audit committee any powers or duties under Part 7 of the Local Government Act 1995, did it do so by absolute majority? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

3. Was the auditor's report for the financial year ended 30 June 2024 received by the local government by 31 December 2024? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

4. Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report prepared under section 7.9(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 required action to be taken, did the local government ensure that appropriate action was undertaken in respect of those matters? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

No actions required

5. Where matters identified as significant were reported in the auditor's report, did the local government prepare a report that stated what action the local government had taken or intended to take with respect to each of those matters? Was a copy of the report given to the Minister within three months of the audit report being received by the local government? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

No actions required

6. Within 14 days after the local government gave a report to the Minister under section 7.12A(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1995, did the CEO publish a copy of the report on the local government's official website? *

N/A

☐ **Add comments**

—

7. Was the auditor's report for the financial year ending 30 June 2024 received by the local government within 30 days of completion of the audit? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

Integrated Planning and Reporting

1. Has the local government adopted by absolute majority a strategic community plan? *

Yes

☒ **Add comments**

Please provide the adoption date or the date of the most recent review *

26/09/2017

Please enter comments *

Currently under review

2. Has the local government adopted by absolute majority a corporate business plan? *

Yes

☒ **Add comments**

Please provide the adoption date or the date of the most recent review *

26/09/2017

Please enter comments *

Currently under review

3. Does the corporate business plan comply with the requirements of Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 19DA(2) & (3)? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

Local Government Employees

1. Were all CEO and/or senior employee vacancies advertised in accordance with Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, regulation 18A? *

N/A

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

No vacancies during 2024

2. Was all information provided in applications for the position of CEO true and accurate? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

3. Was the remuneration and other benefits paid to a CEO on appointment the same remuneration and benefits advertised for the position under section 5.36(4) of the Local Government Act 1995? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

4. Did the CEO inform council of each proposal to employ or dismiss senior employee? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

5. Where council rejected a CEO's recommendation to employ or dismiss a senior employee, did it inform the CEO of the reasons for doing so? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

Official Conduct

1. Has the local government designated an employee to be its complaints officer? *

Yes

☒ Add comments

Please enter comments *

CEO

2. Has the complaints officer for the local government maintained a register of complaints which records all complaints that resulted in a finding under section 5.110(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 1995? *

Yes

☒ **Add comments**

Please enter comments *

No complaints received

3. Does the complaints register include all information required by section 5.121(2) of the Local Government Act 1995? *

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

4. Has the CEO published an up-to-date version of the register of the complaints on the local government's official website? *

N/A

☒ **Add comments**

Please enter comments *

No complaints received

Other

1. Did the CEO review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local government's financial management systems and procedures in accordance with the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 regulations 5(2) (c) within the three financial years prior to 31 December 2024?

Yes

☒ **Add comments**

Please provide the date of council's resolution to accept the report. *

28/02/2023

Please enter comments *

Motion 10042

2. Did the CEO review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local government's systems and procedures in relation to risk management, internal control and legislative compliance in accordance with Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 regulation 17 within the three financial years prior to 31 December 2024?

Yes

☒ **Add comments**

Please provide the date of council's resolution to accept the report. *

28/02/2023

Please enter comments *

Motion 10042

3. Where a disclosure was made under sections 5.87A or 5.87B of the Local Government Act 1995, were the disclosures made within 10 days after receipt of the gift? Did the disclosure include the information required by section 5.87C of the Act?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

4. Did the local government prepare, adopt by absolute majority and publish an up-to-date version on the local government's website, a policy dealing with the attendance of council members and the CEO at events?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

—

5. Did the CEO publish information on the local government's website in accordance with sections 5.96A(1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Local Government Act 1995?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

6. Did the local government prepare and adopt (by absolute majority) a policy in relation to the continuing professional development of council members?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

7. Did the local government prepare a report on the training completed by council members in the 2023/2024 financial year and publish it on the local government's official website by 31 July 2024?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

8. By 30 September 2024, did the local government submit to its auditor the balanced accounts and annual financial report for the year ending 30 June 2024?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

9. When adopting the annual budget, did the local government take into account all its expenditure, revenue and income?

Yes

☐ **Add comments**

Tenders for Providing Goods and Services

1. Did the local government comply with its current purchasing policy, adopted under the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, regulations 11A(1) and (3) in relation to the supply of goods or services where the consideration under the contract was, or was expected to be, \$250,000 or less or worth \$250,000 or less? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

2. Subject to Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, regulation 11(2), did the local government invite tenders for all contracts for the supply of goods or services where the consideration under the contract was, or was expected to be, worth more than the consideration stated in regulation 11(1) of the Regulations? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

3. When regulations 11(1), 12(2) or 13 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, required tenders to be publicly invited, did the local government invite tenders via Statewide public notice in accordance with Regulation 14(3) and (4)? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

4. Did the local government comply with Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 12 when deciding to enter into multiple contracts rather than a single contract? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

5. If the local government sought to vary the information supplied to tenderers, was every reasonable step taken to give each person who sought copies of the tender documents or each acceptable tenderer notice of the variation? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

6. Did the local government's procedure for receiving and opening tenders comply with the requirements of Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 15 and 16? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

7. Did the information recorded in the local government's tender register comply with the requirements of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 17 and did the CEO make the tenders register available for public inspection and publish it on the local government's official website? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

8. Did the local government reject any tenders that were not submitted at the place, and within the time, specified in the invitation to tender? *

No

☐ Add comments

—

9. Were all tenders that were not rejected assessed by the local government via a written evaluation of the extent to which each tender satisfies the criteria for deciding which tender to accept? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

10. Did the CEO give each tenderer written notice containing particulars of the successful tender or advising that no tender was accepted? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

—

11. Did the local government's advertising and expression of interest processes comply with the requirements of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulations 21 and 22? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

12. Did the local government reject any expressions of interest that were not submitted at the place, and within the time, specified in the notice or that failed to comply with any other requirement specified in the notice? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

13. Were all expressions of interest that were not rejected under the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 23(1) & (2) assessed by the local government? Did the CEO list each person as an acceptable tenderer? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

14. Did the CEO give each person who submitted an expression of interest a notice in writing of the outcome in accordance with Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 24? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

15. Did the local government invite applicants for a panel of pre-qualified suppliers via Statewide public notice in accordance with Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulations 24AD(4) and 24AE? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

16. If the local government sought to vary the information supplied to the panel, was every reasonable step taken to give each person who sought detailed information about the proposed panel or each person who submitted an application notice of the variation? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

17. Did the local government's procedure for receiving and opening applications to join a panel of pre-qualified suppliers comply with the requirements of Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 16, as if the reference in that regulation to a tender were a reference to a pre-qualified supplier panel application? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

18. Did the information recorded in the local government's tender register about panels of pre-qualified suppliers comply with the requirements of Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 24AG? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

19. Did the local government reject any applications to join a panel of pre-qualified suppliers that were not submitted at the place, and within the time, specified in the invitation for applications? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

20. Were all applications that were not rejected assessed by the local government via a written evaluation of the extent to which each application satisfies the criteria for deciding which application to accept? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

—

21. Did the CEO send each applicant written notice advising them of the outcome of their application? *

N/A

☐ Add comments

22. Where the local government gave regional price preference, did the local government comply with the requirements of Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Regulation 24E and 24F? *

Yes

☐ Add comments

Documents

There are no notes to display.

Close

Previous

Continue

6.2 Shire of Dalwallinu Audit & Risk Management Committee Risk Dashboard Report*

Report Date	18 March 2025
Applicant	Shire of Dalwallinu
File Ref	FM/9 – Financial Management – Financial Reporting
Previous Meeting Reference	Nil
Prepared by	Hanna Jolly, Manager Corporate Services
Supervised by	Jean Knight, Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest	Nil
Voting Requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Shire of Dalwallinu Risk Dashboard Report February 2025

Purpose of Report

The Audit & Risk Management Committee is requested to note the actions in the Risk Dashboard Report February 2025.

Background

It is essential to monitor and review the management of risks as changing circumstances may result in some risks increasing or decreasing in significance. By regularly reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of control and appropriateness of treatment/action, it can be determined if the organisation's resources are being put to the best use possible.

Consultation

Chief Executive Officer

Legislative Implications

State

Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 s16 and s17

Policy Implications

Nil

General Function Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Shire of Dalwallinu Strategic Community Plan 2017-2027

Outcome 4.4.5 - Strive to ensure "best practice" local governance is maintained.

Site Inspection

Site inspection undertaken: Not applicable



Sustainability & Climate Change Implications

Economic implications

There are no known significant economic implications associated with this proposal.

Social implications

There are no known significant social implications associated with this proposal.

Environmental implications

There are no known significant environmental implications associated with this proposal.

Officer Comment

The Risk Dashboard Report shows a snapshot of our current recognised risks and the current issues, actions and treatments for each risk. Following the snapshot is a detailed description of each risk and the potential causes, key controls and indicators for each risk.

This report is provided to the Audit & Risk Management Committee to ensure that the organisation is monitoring and controlling all risks.

Officer Recommendation/Committee Resolution

MOTION

Moved Cr SC Carter
Seconded Cr MM Harms

That the Audit & Risk Management Committee receives the Risk Dashboard Report for February 2025.

CARRIED 5/0

For: Chairperson Mr IW Hyde, Cr KL Carter, Cr SC Carter, Cr S Dawson, Cr MM Harms
Against: Nil



Shire of Dalwallinu

Risk Dashboard Report

Feb-25

<u>Misconduct</u>		Risk	Control
		Low	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Review Purchasing Policy and Procurement Process	Mar-25	CEO/MCS	
Review and Document Organisations Controls and Systems	Ongoing	CEO/MCS	
Centralise Checklists, Controls and Procedures	Ongoing	CEO/MCS	

<u>Business Disruption</u>		Risk	Control
		High	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Review Business Continuity Plan - Council Agenda March 2024	Mar-27	CEO	
Admin Generator maintained and serviced quarterly (if not active)	Jun-25	WS	

<u>Errors, omissions, delays</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Procedure Manuals to be tested regularly	Ongoing	MCS	

<u>Failure to fulfil statutory, regulatory or compliance requirements</u>		Risk	Control
		Low	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Corporate Governance Calendar Checklist to be monitored monthly	Ongoing	CEO	

<u>Inadequate Project/Change Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	

<u>Inadequate Document Management Processes</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Undertake monthly records audits	Monthly	MCS	
Annual Refresher for all Employees on Records Management	Jun-25	CEO	

<u>External Theft & Fraud</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Review Fraud & Corruption Control Plan (review undertaken Sept 2023)	Sep-25	CEO	
Review Key Register Quarterly	Mar-25	TSO	

<u>Damage to Physical Assets</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
All plant to have prestarts before each use or as instructed	Ongoing	All Staff	

<u>Failure of IT &/or Communications Systems and Infrastructure</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Staged migration from Synergy to Altus commencing 22-23	Ongoing	MCS	

<u>Providing inaccurate advice/information</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	

<u>Inadequate Organisation and Community Emergency Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Lack of resources in LG		CEO	

<u>Inadequate employee and visitor safety and security</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Check all contractors have been inducted prior to commencing work	ongoing	Management	

Shire of Dalwallinu

Risk Dashboard Report

Feb-25

<u>Inadequate engagement of Community/Stakeholders/Elected Members</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Review Communication Plan (every two years)	May-25	CEO	
Review Community Engagement Plan (every two years)	May-25	CEO	

<u>Inadequate Asset Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Maintain training register	Ongoing	MWS	
Organise SOP's to be completed for all plant and equipment - all completed May 2024	May-25	MWS	
Develop and maintain footpath plan for Dalwallinu and Kalannie townsites	Completed	MWS	

<u>Inadequate Natural Environmental Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	

<u>Inadequate supplier/Contract Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	

<u>Ineffective management of Facilities/Venues/Events</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Develop Event Management Framework - Not completed	Sep-23	MPDS	
Booking forms, facility checks completed for each hire	Ongoing	CSO/MCS	

<u>Inadequate Procurement, Disposal or Tender Practices</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Annual Review of Purchasing Policy	Mar-25	CEO	
Annual Review of Tender Register	Jun-25	EA	

<u>Inadequate Financial, Accounting or Business Acumen</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	

<u>Inadequate Stock Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Adequate
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Monthly Stocktake for fuel & bulk oils	Monthly	MCS/FO	

<u>Ineffective People Management</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Review Performance Appraisal documentation - done annually in M	Mar-25	CEO	
Review Workforce Plan - Council July 2024	Jun-25	CEO	

<u>Not meeting Community expectations</u>		Risk	Control
		Moderate	Effective
Current Issues/Actions/Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Conduct Community Satisfaction Survey - Survey Completed Oct 20	Dec-26	CEO	

Intentional activities in excess of authority granted to an employee, which circumvent endorsed policies, procedures or delegated authority. This would include instances of:

- Relevant authorisations not obtained.
- Distributing confidential information.
- Accessing systems and / or applications without correct authority to do so.
- Misrepresenting data in reports.
- Theft by an employee
- Inappropriate use of plant, equipment or machinery
- Inappropriate use of social media.
- Inappropriate behaviour at work.
- Purposeful sabotage

This does not include instances where it was not an intentional breach - refer Errors, Omissions or Delays, or Inaccurate Advice / Information.

Potential causes include;

Inadequate training of code of conduct \ induction	Greed, gambling or sense of entitlement
Changing of job roles and functions/authorities	Collusion between internal & external parties
Delegated authority process inadequately implemented	Password sharing
Disgruntled employees	Sharing of confidential information
Lack of internal checks	Low level of Supervisor or Management oversight
Covering up poor work performance	Believe they'll get away with it
Poor enforcement of policies and procedures	Undue influence from Manager / Councillor
Information leaked to Tenderers during the Tender process	Poor work culture
Insubordination	By-passing established administrative procedures

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Delegated authority for procurement	Preventative		Effective
Delegation control / framework	Detective		Effective
External Audits	Detective		Effective
Police clearances	Detective		Effective
Annual drivers licence checks	Preventative		Effective
Cash handling policy and procedures	Preventative		Adequate
IT security access framework (profiles & passwords)	Preventative		Effective
Induction Process (Code of Conduct)	Preventative		Effective
Segregation of duties (Financial / I.T.)	Preventative		Effective
Social Media policy	Preventative		Effective
Strong management culture (Zero tolerance for misconduct)	Preventative		Effective
Insurance for loss	Recovery		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:	Effective
---------------------------------	------------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:	Rare (1)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Low

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Budget variances	Lagging	5%
Audit notifications	Lagging	Zero
Incidents warranting dismissal	Lagging	Zero
Wilful breach of segregation of duties	Leading	Zero
Suppliers not being paid or complaints from suppliers (not involved in collusion or bribery with staff)	Lagging	Zero
Disregarding or manipulating procurement process for own benefit	Leading	Zero
Internal and external complaints (PID)	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Review Purchasing Policy and Procurement Process	Mar-25	CEO/MCS
Review and Document Organisations Controls and Systems	Ongoing	CEO/MCS
Centralise Checklists, Controls and Procedures	Ongoing	CEO/MCS

Loss of funds, assets, data or unauthorised access, (whether attempted or successful) by external parties, through any means (including electronic), for the purposes of;

- Fraud: benefit or gain by deceit
- Malicious Damage: hacking, deleting, breaking or reducing the integrity or performance of systems
- Theft: stealing of data, assets or information

Potential causes include;	
Inadequate security of equipment/supplies/cash	Inadequate provision for patrons belongings
Robbery	Lack of supervision
Scam Invoices	Collusion with intenal staff
Cyber Crime	

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Building Security access controls (alarms, CCCTV, keypad access)	Preventative		Effective
Equipment storage security access controls (locked after hours and whne unmanned)	Preventative		Effective
Cash handling processes	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
Spare keys in strong room/key cabinet	Preventative		Effective
Stringent IT security systems	Preventative		Effective
Insurance for loss	Recovery		Adequate
Photographic record of assets	Recovery		Effective
Care when opening emails with attachments	Preventative		Effective
Fraud & Corruption Control Plan	Preventative		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
---------------------------------	--	--	-----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Cyber breaches	Lagging	Zero
Insurance Claims	Lagging	Zero
Number of incidents of theft or fraud	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Review Fraud & Corruption Control Plan (review undertaken Sept 2023)	Sep-25	CEO
Review Key Register Quarterly	Mar-25	TSO

Failure to adequately prepare and respond to events that cause disruption to the local community and / or normal business activities. This could be a natural disaster, weather event, or an act carried out by an external party (e.g. sabotage / terrorism).

This includes;

- Lack of (or inadequate) emergency response / business continuity plans.
- Lack of training for specific individuals or availability of appropriate emergency response.
- Failure in command and control functions as a result of incorrect initial assessment or untimely awareness of incident.
- Inadequacies in environmental awareness and monitoring of fuel loads, curing rates etc

This does not include disruptions due to IT Systems or infrastructure related failures - refer "Failure of IT & communication systems and infrastructure".

Potential causes include;			
Cyclone, storm, fire, earthquake	Extended utility outage		
Terrorism / sabotage / criminal behaviour	Economic factors		
Epidemic / Pandemic	Loss of Key Staff		
Loss of suppliers	Loss of key infratructure		
Climate change			
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Regular Local and District Emergency Management Committee meeting (LEMC/DEMC)	Detective		Effective
Community recovery preparation	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
Community fire prevention education	Preventative		Effective
Current Emergency Management Plan	Preventative		Effective
Business Continuity Framework	Preventative		Effective
Generator (Admin centre)	Recovery		Adequate
IT Disaster Recovery Plan	Recovery		Effective
Insurance for Loss	Recovery		Effective
Generator (Rec Centre Precinct)	Recovery		Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Major (4)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		High
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Missed LEMC/DEMC Committee meetings	Lagging	Zero	
Non Compliance with EM legislation	Lagging	Zero	
Resignations/terminations of key personnel	Lagging		
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments		Due Date	Responsibility
Review Business Continuity Plan - Council Agenda March 2024		Mar-27	CEO
Admin Generator maintained and serviced quarterly (if not activated)		Jun-25	WS

Damage to buildings, property, plant & equipment (all assets) that does not result in a disruption to business objectives (refer Business Disruption). This could be a result of a natural disaster or other events, or an act carried out by an external party (inc graffiti and/or vandalism)

Potential causes include;			
Cyclone, storm, fire, earthquake			
Vandalism			
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Locking of unmanned areas	Preventative		Effective
CCTV	Preventative		Effective
			Effective
		Responsibility	Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Damage to Physical Assets	Lagging	Zero	
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments		Due Date	Responsibility
All plant to have prestarts before each use or as instructed		Ongoing	All Staff

Errors, omissions or delays in operational activities as a result of unintentional errors or failure to follow due process including incomplete, inadequate or inaccuracies in advisory activities to customers or internal staff. Examples include;

- Incorrect planning, development, building, community safety and Emergency Management advice
- Incorrect health or environmental advice
- Inconsistent messages or responses from Customer Service Staff
- Any advice that is not consistent with legislative requirements or local laws.
- Human error
- Inaccurate recording, maintenance, testing or reconciliation of data.
- Inaccurate data being used for management decision-making and reporting.
- Delays in service to customers

This excludes process failures caused by inadequate / incomplete procedural documentation - refer "Inadequate Document Management Processes".

Potential causes include;			
Human Error	Incorrect information		
Inadequate formal procedures or training	Miscommunication		
Lack of trained staff	Work pressure/stress		
Poor use of procedures	Lack of understanding		
Unrealistic expectations from community, council or management	Health issues		
Poor internal communications between teams	Historical decisions/advice		
Disconnect between financial receipting and systems	Complex legislation		
Changes to legislation			
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Membership of professional associations	Detective		Effective
Complaints register	Detective		Effective
Documented information sheets / website information / FAQ's to assist in providing advice to customers	Preventative		Effective
External consultants such as legal	Preventative		Effective
External stakeholder communications (website, news articles)	Preventative		Effective
Staff training program (mentoring, formal & on-the-job)	Preventative		Adequate
Draw information from other Government agencies (DWER etc)	Preventative		Effective
Complaints resolution process	Recovery		Effective
Procedure Manuals tested by other Officers	Preventative		Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Minor (2)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Referral to Ombudsman/Management/Council	Lagging	Zero	
Substantiated complaints regarding errors, omissions, delays or inaccurate advice/information	Lagging	Zero	
Insurance Claims	Lagging	Zero	
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments		Due Date	Responsibility
Procedure Manuals to be tested regularly		Ongoing	MCS
Review checklists for weekly/monthly tasks		Ongoing	MCS

Instability, degradation of performance, or other failure of IT or communication system or infrastructure causing the inability to continue business activities and provide services to the community. This may or may not result in IT Disaster Recovery Plans being invoked. Examples include failures or disruptions caused by:

- Hardware or software
- Networks
- Failures of IT Vendors

This also includes where poor governance results in the breakdown of IT maintenance such as;

- Configuration management
- Performance monitoring

This does not include new system implementations - refer "Inadequate Project / Change Management".

Potential causes include;

Weather impacts	Non renewal of licenses
Power outage on site or at service provider	Inadequate IT incidents, problem management & Disaster Recovery Processes
Out dated, inefficient or unsupported hardware or software	Lack of process and training
Incompatibility between operating systems	Vulnerability of user error
Cyber crime and viruses	Failure of vendor
Turnover of system administration support	Equipment purchases without input from IT department
Software vulnerability	

Key Controls	Type	Responsibility	Rating
Performance monitoring by contractor	Detective		Effective
Maintenance program	Preventative		Effective
Formal IT Infrastructure replacement / refresh program	Preventative		Effective
IT security access protocols and firewalls	Preventative		Effective
Service level agreement with contractor / Vendor	Preventative		Effective
Disaster Recovery Plan	Recovery		Adequate
Multiple data back-up systems	Recovery		Effective
Generator	Recovery		Effective
UPS (90min)	Recovery		Effective
Computer/Server/UPS Replacement Plan	Preventative		Effective
Moving Syerngy programs to Altus	Preventative		Adequate

Overall Control Ratings:	Effective
---------------------------------	------------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Major (4)
	Likelihood:	Unlikely (2)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Cyber breaches	Lagging	Zero
Non availability of network infrastructure during business hours	Lagging	1 day per year
System downtime	Lagging	1 week

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Staged migration from Synergy to Altus commencing 22-23	Ongoing	MCS
On hold - IT Vision taken over by Readytech. Waiting for a new plan		

Failure to correctly identify, interpret, assess, respond and communicate laws and regulations as a result of an inadequate compliance framework. This could result in fines, penalties, litigation or increase scrutiny from regulators or agencies. This includes, new or proposed regulatory and legislative changes, in addition to the failure to maintain updated legal documentation (internal & public domain) to reflect changes. This does not include: Issues in relation to WHS, procurement, HR based legislation

Potential causes include:

Lack of training, awareness and knowledge	Lack of legal expertise
Staff turnover	No Compliance Officer or person responsible for Compliance oversight and enforcement
Inadequate record keeping/failure of corporate electronic systems	Breakdowns in the tender or procurement process
Ineffective policies & processes	Ineffective monitoring of changes to legislation
Impulsive decision making	Attitudinal problems
Councillor turnover	

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Compliance Audit Return (DLGC)	Detective	Responsibility	Effective
External Auditor reviews (compliance)	Detective		Effective
Membership of professional associations (AIBS, Building Commission)	Detective		Effective
Strict tender and procurement process (including eQuotes)	Preventative		Adequate
Compliance framework / calendar & standard operating procedures	Preventative		Effective
Subscriptions (WALGA / DLGC / LGMA and other peak bodies)	Preventative		Effective
Audit Committee	Preventative		Effective
Standardised forms & checksheets	Preventative		Adequate
State Administrative Tribunal / Ombudsman	Recovery		Adequate
Corporate Governance Calendar Checklist	Preventative		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:	Effective
---------------------------------	------------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:	Rare (1)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Low

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Internal monitoring of operations and procedures	Leading	
Audit notifications	Leading	
Increased scrutiny from regulators or agencies	Lagging	
Litigation, fines or penalties	Lagging	

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Corporate Governance Calendar Checklist to be monitored monthly	Ongoing	CEO

Incomplete, inadequate or inaccuracies in professional advisory activities to customers or internal staff.

Potential causes include;			
Unqualified staff			
Not following procedures			
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Employ qualified Staff	Preventative		Effective
Ensure staff are following procedures	Preventative		Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Number of Complaints	Lagging	Zero	
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments		Due Date	Responsibility

Inadequate analysis, design, delivery and / or status reporting of change initiatives, resulting in additional expenses, time delays or scope changes. This includes:

- Inadequate change management framework to manage and monitor change activities.
- Inadequate understanding of the impact of project change on the business.
- Failures in the transition of projects into standard operations.
- Failure to implement new systems
- Inadequate handover process

This does not include new plant & equipment purchases. Refer "Inadequate Asset Sustainability Practices"

Potential causes include;	
Lack of communication and consultation	Excessive growth (too many projects)
Lack of investment	Inadequate monitoring and review
Ineffective management of expectations	Project risks not managed effectively
Inadequate project planning	Loack of project methodology knowledge and reporting requirements
Failures of project Vendors/Contractors	Geographic or transport difficulties sourcing equipment/materials
External consultants underquoting on costs	Pandemic - escalating costs and contractor shortage

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Post-project debriefs	Detective	Responsibility	Adequate
Adhere to formal project management methodology	Preventative		Not Rated
Community engagement policy and framework	Preventative		Adequate
Preferred list of contractors	Preventative		Adequate
Risk assessments are conducted before, during and after handover	Preventative		Not Rated
Stakeholder meetings and consultation	Preventative		Effective
Follow Project Management Methodology	Preventative		Effective
Implement Risk Assessment Process for all Projects	Preventative		Effective
Photos are taken during projects and completed works	Recovery		Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Missed deadlines/milestones	Lagging	10%
Budget overruns/blow outs	Lagging	5%
Failed objectives	Lagging	Zero
Deviations from the project scope	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility

Failure to adequately conduct Prevention, Preparation, Response and Recovery (PPRR) in the organisation structure and community elements, inclusive of the management of all emergencies.

Potential causes include:

Lack of (or inadequate) emergency response plans	Failure in command and control functions as a result of incorrect initial assessment or untimely awareness of incident
Lack of training to specific individuals or availability of appropriate emergency response	Inadequacies in environmental awareness of fuel loads, curing rates etc

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Response Plans reviewed	Preventative		Adequate
Training for Staff	Preventative		Not Rated

Overall Control Ratings:	Adequate
--------------------------	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Not well managed emergency	Lagging	zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Lack of resources in LG		CEO

Failure to adequately capture, store, archive, retrieve, provide or dispose of documentation. This includes:

- Contact lists.
- Procedural documents, personnel files, complaints.
- Applications, proposals or documents.
- Contracts.
- Forms or requests.

Potential causes include;

Spreadsheet/database/document corruption or loss	Outdated record keeping practices
Inadequate access and / or security levels	Lack of system/application knowledge
Inadequate Storage facilities (including climate control)	High workloads and time pressures
High Staff turnover	Standard Operating Policies not followed
Incompatible systems	Incomplete Authorisation Trails
Lack of awareness of the State Records Act	Lack of awareness of use of network drives and folders
Historical legacies	

Key Controls	Type	Responsibility	Rating
Record Keeping Plan	Detective		Adequate
Records training on Induction	Preventative		Adequate
Annual Refresher on Records Management	Preventative		Not Rated
Documentation Management Audits	Detective		Effective
Records Management Procedures	Preventative		Adequate
Archival processes	Preventative		Adequate
Document disaster recovery plan	Recovery		Adequate
Electronic records back up (Synergy)	Recovery		Adequate
Training for Staff	Preventative		Adequate

Overall Control Ratings:	Adequate
---------------------------------	-----------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Number of documents without relevant attachments	Leading	Zero
Number of outstanding records per month	Lagging	<10 per month
Complaints relating to lost documentation	Lagging	<2 per month

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Undertake monthly records audits	Monthly	MCS
Annual Refresher for all Employees on Records Management	Jun-25	CEO

Inadequate employee and visitor safety and security				Feb-25
Non compliance with Work, Health & Safety (WHS) Regulations and physical security requirements				
Potential causes include:				
Inadequate Policy, Frameworks, Systems and Structure to prevent the injury of visitors, staff, contractors and/or tenants in the provision of a working or business environment		Public Liability Claims, due to negligence or personal injury		
Inadequate security protection measures in place for buildings, depots and other places of work		Employee Liability Claims due to negligence or personal injury		
Key Controls		Type		Rating
Online and Part B Employee Inductions		Preventative		Adequate
Online and Part B Contractor Inductions		Preventative		Adequate
Onlien and Part B Volunteer Inductions		Preventative		Adequate
Sign in register in Admin Centre		Preventative		Adequate
Depot gates locked when no one in attendance		Preventative	Responsibility	Adequate
Overall Control Ratings:				Adequate
Consequence Category		Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance		Consequence:		Moderate (3)
		Likelihood:		Unlikely (2)
		Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators		Type	Benchmark	
Employee/Contractors/Volunteers with no completed induction		Lagging	Zero	
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments			Due Date	Responsibility
Check all contractors have been inducted prior to commencing work			ongoing	Management

Inadequate engagement of Community/Stakeholders/Elected Members

Feb-25

Failure to maintain effective working relationships with the Community (including local Media), Stakeholders, Key Private Sector Companies, Government Agencies and / or Elected Members. This includes activities where communication, feedback or consultation is required and where it is in the best interests to do so. For example;

- Following up on any access & inclusion issues
- Infrastructure Projects
- Local planning initiatives
- Strategic planning initiatives

This does not include instances whereby Community expectations have not been met for standard service provisions such as Community Events, Library Services and / or Bus/Transport services.

Potential causes include:

Relationship breakdowns with community groups	Short lead times
Leadership inattention to current issues	Miscommunication / poor communication
Inadequate documentation or procedures	Inadequate Regional or District Committee attendance.
Budget / funding issues	Inadequate involvement with, or support of community groups
Geographic distance	Media attention

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Advisory groups (as required)	Detective		Effective
Availability of staff for meetings on demand	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
Community based forums and workshops	Preventative		Effective
Community Engagement Plan	Preventative		Effective
Communication Plan	Preventative		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:	Adequate
---------------------------------	-----------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Number of substantiated complaints referring to poor engagement	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Review Communication Plan (every two years)	May-25	CEO
Review Community Engagement Plan (every two years)	May-25	CEO

Inadequate Procurement, Disposal or Tender Practices

Feb-25

Failure in the procurement, acquisition, acceptance or disposal process for assets as governed by the Act.

Potential causes include:

Lack of formalised process to identify specific requirements prior to procurement	Acceptance of assets without reference to a formalised process to ensure correct receipt and/or notification of receipt
Disposing of P&E (either through sale or decommissioning) that did not meet expectations from either a time or financial perspective	Failures in the Tender process from RTF preparation, advertising, due diligence and awarding

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Council's Purchasing Policy	Preventative		Effective
Tender register	Detective		Effective
RFQ Register	Detective		Effective
Internal Audit by third party to the process	Detective		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:			Adequate
--------------------------	--	--	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Number of purchases not adhered to policy/process	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Annual Review of Purchasing Policy	Mar-25	CEO
Annual Review of Tender Register	Jun-25	EA

Failure or reduction in service of infrastructure assets, plant, equipment or machinery.

These include fleet, buildings, roads, playgrounds, boat ramps and all other assets during their lifecycle from procurement to disposal. Areas included in the scope are;

- Inadequate design (not fit for purpose)
- Ineffective usage (down time)
- Outputs not meeting expectations
- Inadequate maintenance activities.
- Inadequate financial management and planning (capital renewal plan).

It does not include issues with the inappropriate use of the Plant, Equipment or Machinery. Refer Misconduct.

Potential causes include;	
Skill level & behaviour of operators	Unavailability of parts
Lack of trained staff	Lack of formal or appropriate scheduling (maintenance / inspections)
Outdated equipment	Unexpected breakdowns
Insufficient budget to maintain or replace assets	

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Asset Management System (Synergy)	Detective		Adequate
Asset Management System (Roads - RAMM)	Detective		Adequate
10 Yr Plant Replacement Program	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
Staff skills training and licencing	Preventative		Effective
10 Year Building Maintenance Plan	Preventative		Effective
Insurance for loss	Recovery		Effective
Routine maintenance program (roads, footpaths)	Preventative		Effective
Routine maintenance program (parks, reserves)	Preventative		Effective
Tender register	Detective		Effective
Staff training for all large plant	Preventative		Adequate
RFQ Register	Detective		Effective
Internal Audit by third party to the process	Detective		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:		Adequate
--------------------------	--	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Accidents and/or damage to equipment	Lagging	Zero
Breakdowns	Lagging	2 per month

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Maintain training register	Ongoing	MWS
Organise SOP's to be completed for all plant and equipment - all completed May 2024	May-25	MWS
Develop and maintain footpath plan for Dalwallinu and Kalannie townsites	Completed	MWS

Inadequate identification or quantification of financial exposure or risk associated with decisions to invest in land transactions, financial derivatives or investments or poor long term forecasting/assumptions.

Potential causes include;

Poor credit management (short or long term borrowing restricting capacity or flexibility)	Ineffective market analysis
Ineffective Business Planning (poor scope/competition analysis)	Ineffective financial modelling, forecasting and projection techniques/processes

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Project Plans for all projects	Preventative		Adequate

Overall Control Ratings:	Adequate
--------------------------	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Poor financial decisions	Lagging	Zero
Poor project planning	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility

Inadequate prevention, identification, enforcement and management of environmental issues.

The scope includes;

- Lack of adequate planning and management of coastal erosion issues.
- Failure to identify and effectively manage contaminated sites (including groundwater usage).
- Waste facilities (landfill / transfer stations).
- Weed & mosquito / Vector control.
- Ineffective management of water sources (reclaimed, potable)
- Illegal dumping.
- Illegal clearing / land use.

Potential causes include;	
Inadequate management of landfill sites	Inadequate reporting / oversight frameworks
Lack of understanding / knowledge	Community apathy
Inadequate local laws / planning schemes	Differing land tenure (land occupancy or ownership conditions)
Prolific extractive industry (sand, limestone, etc)	Competing land use (growing population vs conservation)
Poor management of contaminated sites	Weed and pest management difficulties
Clandestine drug labs disposing of chemicals illegally	Bio-diversity hotspots
Weather events / natural disasters	Fuel or chemical spills
Climate change	Illegal firewood collection / burning / hunting
Complex legislation	

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Soil and water testing	Detective		Adequate
Support environment and land care groups	Preventative		Effective
Conduct environmental health inspections	Preventative		Adequate
Litter collection schedules	Preventative		Adequate
Encourage recycling	Recovery		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:	Adequate
--------------------------	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Tonnes per capita recyclable generation	Leading	>5 Tonnes
Decline in vegetation cover	Lagging	5% since last GIS data set (12 years)
Number of validated environmental incidents	Lagging	5 per year
Complaints from environmental groups	Lagging	

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility

Lack of stock to ensure continuity of operations or oversupply of stock resulting in dormant (non performing) assets. Stock includes consumables, stationery, spare parts and other items used for operational purposes.

Potential causes include:			
Incorrect recording on fuel usage sheets		Lack of stock management	
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Fuel Audits	Detective		Adequate
Cleaning Materials Distribution List	Detective		Adequate
Stationery Monitoring	Detective		Adequate
Overall Control Ratings:			Adequate
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Minor (2)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Not being able to account for monthly fuel discrepancies	Lagging	<50 litres per month	
Cleaning materials utilised too quickly	Lagging	Zero	
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility	
Monthly Stocktake for fuel & bulk oils	Monthly	MCS/FO	

Inadequate management of external Suppliers, Contractors, IT Vendors or Consultants engaged for core operations. This includes issues that arise from the ongoing supply of services or failures in contract management & monitoring processes. This also includes:

- Contract issues (contracts awarded to one supplier)
- Vendor sustainability

Potential causes include;	
Insufficient funding	Inadequate contract management practices
Complexity and quantity of work	Ineffective monitoring of deliverables
Inadequate tendering process	Lack of planning and clarity of requirements
Contracts not renewed on time	Historical contracts remaining
Suppliers not willing to provide quotes	Limited availability of suppliers
Pandemic	

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Strict tender/procurement processes	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
Utilise WALGA preferred supplier	Preventative		Effective
WHS Inductions	Preventative		Effective
Tender Register to monitor expiration dates	Detective		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:			Adequate
--------------------------	--	--	----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Moderate (3)
	Likelihood:		Unlikely (2)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Number of expired contracts not yet renewed	Lagging	Zero
Tender processes not adhered to	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility

Failure to effectively manage and lead human resources (full-time, part-time, casuals, temporary and volunteers).

This includes:

- Not having appropriately qualified or experienced people in the right roles.
- Insufficient staff numbers to achieve objectives.
- Breaching employee regulations.
- Discrimination, harassment & bullying in the workplace.
- Poor employee wellbeing (causing stress).
- Key person dependencies without effective succession planning in place.
- Industrial activity.

Potential causes include;	
Leadership failures	Ineffective performance management programs or procedures
Key / single-person dependencies	Limited staff availability - labour market conditions
Poor internal communications / relationships	Inadequate induction practices
Ineffective Human Resources policies, procedures and practices	Inconsistent application of policies

Key Controls	Type		Rating
Annual Performance Appraisals	Detective		Effective
Encourage staff social activities	Preventative		Adequate
Induction process on commencement	Preventative	Responsibility	Effective
WHS Induction on commencement	Preventative		Effective
Workforce Plan	Preventative		Adequate
Employee Assistance Program	Preventative		Effective
Staff training programs as required	Preventative		Adequate

Overall Control Ratings:	Effective
--------------------------	-----------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Likely (4)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Employee Satisfaction Survey	Leading	
Suitable budget for training	Leading	Zero
Average absenteeism	Lagging	10% per annum
Employee turnover	Lagging	20% per annum
Workers Compensation (Stress) Claims	Lagging	Zero
Suitable budget for training	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Review Performance Appraisal documentation - done annually in March	Mar-25	CEO
Review Workforce Plan - Council July 2024	Jun-25	CEO

Failure to effectively manage the day to day operations of facilities, venues and / or events. This includes;

- Inadequate procedures in place to manage quality or availability.
- Poor crowd control
- Ineffective signage
- Booking issues
- Stressful interactions with hirers / users (financial issues or not adhering to rules of use of facility)
- Inadequate oversight or provision of peripheral services (e.g.. cleaning / maintenance)

Potential causes include;

Double bookings	Traffic congestion or vehicles blocking entry or exit
Illegal / excessive alcohol consumption	Insufficient time between bookings for cleaning or maintenance
Bond payments poorly managed	Difficulty accessing facilities / venues.
Inadequate oversight or provision of peripheral services (e.g.. cleaning / maintenance)	Poor service from contractors (such as catering or cleaning)
Falsifying hiring agreements (alcohol on site / lower deposit)	Renovations
Unaccompanied minors/children	Animal Contamination
Failed chemical / health requirements	

Key Controls	Type	Responsibility	Rating
Bookings Procedure followed	Preventative		Effective
Cleaning Audits of all Shire Facilities	Detective		Effective
Shire approval for significant events	Preventative		Effective
Key Bonds taken/returned	Preventative		Effective
Insurances for hirers checked	Preventative		Effective
Booking forms completed	Preventative		Effective
Well organised Shire events	Preventative		Effective
10 Year Building Maintenance Plan	Detective		Effective

Overall Control Ratings:	Effective
---------------------------------	------------------

Consequence Category	Risk Ratings	Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:	Minor (2)
	Likelihood:	Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:	Moderate

Indicators	Type	Benchmark
Attendance at Shire events	Leading	Within 20% of anticipated numbers
Community complaints regarding facilities	Lagging	<5 per annum
Injuries/incidents	Lagging	Zero

Current Issues / Actions / Treatments	Due Date	Responsibility
Develop Event Management Framework - Not completed	Sep-23	MPDS
Booking forms, facility checks completed for each hire	Ongoing	CSO/MCS

Failure to provide expected levels of service, events and benefit to the community. This includes where precedents have set Community perceptions or where services are generally expected. This will normally result in reputational impacts, however may have financial considerations with re-work, compensations or refunds.

Potential causes include;			
Reducing the number or quality of events	Loss of new or ongoing funding requirements for projects, events and other initiatives		
Withdrawing support (or not supporting) other initiatives to provide relief/benefits to the community	Technology expectations		
Key Controls	Type		Rating
Annual Street Party is held	Preventative		Effective
Youth Programs are funded	Preventative		Effective
Communication Plan adhered to	Preventative		Effective
Overall Control Ratings:			Effective
Consequence Category	Risk Ratings		Rating
Reputation / Finance	Consequence:		Minor (2)
	Likelihood:		Possible (3)
	Overall Risk Ratings:		Moderate
Indicators	Type	Benchmark	
Annual Street Party held	Leading		
Youth Programs funded	Leading		
Current Issues / Actions / Treatments		Due Date	Responsibility
Conduct Community Satisfaction Survey - Survey Completed Oct 2024		Dec-26	CEO

7 SCHEDULING OF MEETING

The next scheduled dates for the 2025 Audit & Risk Management Committee Meetings are

- Tuesday 17 June 2025
- Tuesday 23 September 2025
- Tuesday 9 December 2025

at a time to be decided.

8 CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson closed the meeting at 3.40pm.

9. CERTIFICATION

I, Ian William Hyde, certify that the minutes of the Audit & Risk Management Committee meeting held on the 18 March 2025 as shown on pages 1 to 56 were confirmed as a true record at the meeting held on 00 Month 2025.

CHAIRPERSON

DATE

