

RISK HEADING	CONTROL ASSESSMENT STATUS	MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STATUS	OVERALL RISK LEVEL STATUS
1. Non-compliance with Health & Safety at Work Act 2015	The management and documentation framework manual is being implemented. Further site hazard inspections will be scheduled on completion of initial seismic assessments for all buildings.	Draft implementation plans have been prepared to address the results to date of the hazard assessments of three properties. Some responses have already been actioned.	A co-ordinated approach to implementation of the legislation is under way. The level of risk will fall as we work through the establishment of a management and documentation regime, and develop and implement an associated action plan.
2. Threat to rental income security	Trustees have identified strategic objectives of improving the WALT, reducing the proportion of Greytown based property making up its portfolio and reducing exposure to residential and to a lesser extent retail tenancies. However, ability to mitigate and manage this risk is limited in the short to medium term.	There has been recent improvement in the WALT as a result of take up of renewal terms, particularly relating to Farmlands, Greytown, which is one of the Trust's major rent contributors. However, recent failed attempts at securing longer/better lease terms from them and other key tenants by offering upgrade inducements have highlighted the limitations on the Trust's control.	It needs to be acknowledged that securing an improved WALT will be a long term exercise. Progress in reducing the Trust's reliance on Greytown property and reducing exposure to residential property is being achieved through property disposals - two last year, two more imminent this year. Also, recent alterations to 124 Main St have helped reduce exposure to retail tenancies.
3. Severe earthquake, other natural disaster, fire, security or police emergency	The imminent report by structural engineers containing initial seismic assessments of all Trust buildings will supply information to enable Trustees to assess the level of risk for each property and respond accordingly. At present though the risk is high given the lack of information.	Updated information indicates the proposal for a possible joint disposal of our Carterton properties, which do not meet the Trust's minimum seismic rating standard, and the South Wairarapa Vets premises is not feasible. In the meantime an adjacent building owner has advised his building, which shares a party wall, has received a low seismic rating. This may impact implementation of the Trust's disposal strategy.	Until the outcome of the review of seismic ratings of buildings in the portfolio is known it seems prudent to assume the level of risk is high.
4. Death or incapacity of a staff member	In an environment where the operations of the Trust are reliant on the health of	A BCP has been drafted and covers off this risk. Proposed back-up	Proposed back-up arrangements have been identified and should help mitigate

impacts Trust operations	just two staff, mitigation of this risk is limited to implementing a combination of appropriate fall-back operating procedures and a business continuity plan	arrangements need to be confirmed.	this risk. However it is likely there will always be a level of residual risk whatever mitigation and management measures are implemented.
5. Community disagreement with Trustees' decisions	Trustees are sufficiently in tune with community sentiment to be able to assess when there is a requirement for public consultation. Disagreement is likely to be issue driven and not necessarily indicative of poor decision making.	Any action will be on a case by case basis, as they arise.	Only represents a risk in the extreme event Trustees deliberately ignore community sentiment, which is unlikely.
6. Community not kept adequately informed	The principal control is compliance with LGOIMA. With recent improvements in making information available to beneficiaries, the level of compliance is assessed as high.	Management objectives of making agendas and Board papers available online for beneficiaries' information and publicising the Trust's annual plan have been met.	The principal measure of the level of risk is the existence of publicly stated disquiet over the activities of the Trust. There is nor has there been any criticism related to lack of information.
7. Perception by tenants of not bargaining in good faith	Some criticism has been levelled at the Trust in this regard. Better control should be achieved in future now that policy targets re. new development proposals have been set. Better control needs to be exercised over the wording of lease terms and conditions to ensure this is consistent from one lease to the next.	The lessons learned to date will be incorporated into future design, build, lease negotiations, into the wording of leases, and into discussions around the application of lease terms and conditions.	Time will tell whether past perceptions will be erased.
8. Non-compliance with Resource Management Act 1991	There is adequate control over the Trust's own compliance. There is a case though for more control to be exercised over tenants' compliance.	Implementation of a disclosure regime around new tenants' activities will be implemented to ensure no "comeback" on the Trust around non-compliance. It will be possible to proactively monitor tenants' compliance once a routine quarterly property inspection routine has	The risk of non-compliance by tenants impacting the Trust needs to be lowered.

		been established.	
9. Loss of important computer data or paper based information	Controls need to be improved over retention of critical information held in paper format. The BCP process has identified that issues around non-cloud based computer files are minimal.	An improvement programme is being implemented now that the BCP has been finalised.	The risk has been lowered but there needs to be improvement in regard to control over critical property related paper based information eg. CCCs, building services plans, etc.
10. Non-compliance with Greytown District Trust Lands Act 1979	Institutional knowledge, backed up by legal opinion where necessary, is key to ensuring compliance. This is well understood by Trustees/management.	Amendment of the Act to update and/or clarify provisions may deliver more certainty around compliance. A review needs to establish the requirements for change.	The risk level is considered low at present but could worsen as institutional knowledge is lost.
11. Non-compliance with Construction Contracts Act 2003	The principal area of concern relates to contracts covering new building construction.	Focus on compliance will increase if/when the Trust undertakes construction of another new building.	This is not a major risk at present as the Trust has no construction contracts under way.
12. Non-compliance with Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987	See item 6. Compliance can be demonstrated by increased exposure of the Trust's affairs to public scrutiny. The adoption of Standing Orders in order to formalise required procedures will further strengthen compliance.	See item 6 re. recent improvements relating to publication of information.	See item 6. The level of risk is considered to be low.
13. Community dividend does not meet community needs	The purposes for which grants are awarded are governed by the Act. Current processes for advertising and handling grant applications are good.	A review of whether the current grant structure and allocation priorities meet community needs is under way.	There has been no indication on the part of the community that it is dissatisfied with the level or allocation of the dividend.
14. Trust incurs loss through fraud, misappropriation of funds or theft in service	Internal controls are generally good. Ensuring adequate separation of duties will at times be a challenge.	Systems, processes and procedures will be kept under constant review. Work on compiling an "operations manual" has yet to be commenced. Establishment of the new Risk and Audit Committee will improve Board oversight.	Generally the level of risk is considered to be low.