

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
DEPARTMENT OF LANDS, PHYSICAL
PLANNING, HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**



ENGINEER MUNICIPALITY

RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK

November, 2025

© *Engineer Municipality Risk Policy, 2025*

To obtain copies of the document, please contact:

ENGINEER MUNICIPALITY

P. O. Box 701 - 20303

Ol'Kalou,

KENYA

Foreword

The effective stewardship of public resources and the delivery of sustainable development for the people of Nyandarua County are our foremost responsibilities. In today's dynamic environment, a proactive and strategic approach to managing risk is not optional; it is a fundamental pillar of sound governance and accountable leadership.

This Risk Management Policy establishes a robust framework designed to safeguard Municipality assets, ensure the continuity of essential services, and protect the well-being of our citizens. It provides a clear and consistent methodology for identifying, assessing, and mitigating potential threats across all departments and functions, while also enabling us to capitalize on opportunities for innovation and growth.

The adoption of this policy underscores this administration's commitment to transparency, resilience, and prudent fiscal management. It is a critical tool that will guide our decision-making processes, ensuring that we build a more resilient and prosperous municipality for present and future generations.

Hon. Stephen Kinyanjui Mburu
CECM for Lands, Physical Planning, Housing and Urban Development

Preface

This Risk Management Policy provides Engineer Municipality with a structured and proactive framework for safeguarding public resources, ensuring resilient service delivery, and embedding accountability across all operations. It aligns with national legislation and international standards, including ISO 31000:2018 and COSO ERM, and is designed to strengthen governance while preparing for emerging challenges.

The Municipality seeks to cultivate a culture of risk awareness and accountability that positions it as a model of sustainable governance. Through this policy, risks are identified, assessed, and managed consistently, enabling informed decision-making, protecting infrastructure and investments, and preserving public trust.

Governance is anchored in the three lines of defense model, where management acts as risk owners, the risk function provides support and monitoring, and independent assurance is delivered by the Audit Committee and Internal Audit Unit, complemented by external oversight from county and national institutions.

The Municipality operates in a dynamic environment with clear strengths such as a supportive legal mandate and strong community relations, but also faces weaknesses including limited resources and gaps in ICT systems. Opportunities lie in partnerships, donor funding, and rapid urbanization, while threats include climate change, cyber insecurity, and political interference.

To address these realities, the policy emphasizes awareness creation, integration of risk management into planning and budgeting, continuous research on emerging risks, and the development of a Business Continuity Plan. Risks will be documented in registers, escalated through defined flows, and reviewed regularly to ensure continuous improvement. This cycle of evaluation and adaptation ensures that risk management remains responsive, effective, and embedded in municipal processes

Kihiko J. N
Team Leader

Acknowledgement

The establishment of Engineer Municipality in 2023 presents a unique opportunity to embed strong governance and strategic foresight from the very foundation of this new community. This Risk Management Policy is a critical component of that foundation. Approved by the Engineer Municipal Board, the policy provides the framework for proactive decision-making, safeguarding public resources, and enabling sustainable growth. It reflects the Board's unwavering commitment to stewardship, resilience, and accountability to all residents. This document will serve as a guide for navigating challenges and seizing opportunities, ensuring the long-term prosperity and security of Engineer Municipality.

We are especially grateful to the County Executive and staff, led by H.E. Governor Dr. Moses Kiarie Badilisha, for their unwavering support and strategic guidance throughout this process. This milestone reflects the dedication, professionalism, and collaborative spirit of our Board Members, municipal staff, and technical working teams drawn from across departments. Their tireless efforts have strengthened Special recognition goes to the Municipal Board Members, led by Chairperson Tabitha Wambui and fellow Board Member David Kinyanjui Kamau, for their leadership and dedication. We also acknowledge the invaluable guidance of Hon. Stephen Kinyanjui Mburu, the CECM for Lands, Physical Planning, Housing and Urban Development, and Josephine Muiru, Chief Officer, Housing and Urban Development, whose support was instrumental in shaping this policy.

We commend the technical contributions of the three Municipal Managers serving Nyandarua municipalities, together with Director of Physical Planning Rachel Mugo, Director of Legal Services Beatrice Macharia, and Deputy Director of Audit and Risk Assurance Joseph Kihiko. Their insights and oversight were critical in developing a framework that strengthens governance and ensures resilience for years to come.

Special thanks are also extended to fellow team members Joseph Muturi, Supply Chain management Officer, Dorcas Mbugua, Economist, and Elder Mariaria, Head of Human Resources, whose professionalism and commitment enriched the process and ensured that the policy reflects the collective vision of Engineer Municipality.

**Tabitha Gatuhi
Manager
Engineer Municipal Board**

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BEAM – Barriers, Enablers, Assets, Motivators

BCP – Business Continuity Plan

CIDP – County Integrated Development Plan

COSO – Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission

EACC – Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission

ERM – Enterprise Risk Management

ICT – Information and Communication Technology

IIA – Institute of Internal Auditors

ISO – International Organization for Standardization

OAG – Office of the Auditor General

PFM Act – Public Finance Management Act, 2012

PPP – Public-Private Partnership

RMP – Risk Management Policy

SWOT – Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats

UACA – Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011

Definitions of Key Terms

“Business Continuity Plan (BCP)” means a documented strategy outlining how the Municipality will continue critical operations during and after a disruption.

“County Government” means the County Government of Nyandarua.

“Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)” means a structured, organization-wide approach to identifying, assessing, and managing risks in alignment with strategic objectives and decision-making.

“the Municipality” means Engineer Municipality.

“Risk” means the effect of uncertainty on objectives, expressed in terms of causes, potential events, and consequences.

“Risk Appetite” means the level and type of risk the Municipality is willing to pursue or retain in order to achieve its objectives.

“Risk Champion” means a designated officer who facilitates risk management processes within a directorate or unit, builds awareness, and ensures consistent reporting, without assuming ownership of risks.

“Risk Management” means coordinated activities to direct and control the Municipality with regard to risk, including identification, analysis, evaluation, treatment, monitoring, and review.

“Risk Owner” means the individual or entity with the accountability and authority to manage a risk and ensure appropriate treatment.

“Risk Register” means a structured tool used to record identified risks, their analysis, ratings, controls, treatments, and monitoring status.

“Risk Tolerance” means the acceptable variation in outcomes related to specific risks, within the boundaries of the Municipality’s appetite.

“Risk Treatment” means measures selected to modify risk by avoiding, reducing, transferring, retaining, exploiting, or retiring it.

“Three Lines of Defense Model” means a governance model defining roles in risk management: (i) management as risk owners, (ii) the risk management function providing support and monitoring, and (iii) internal audit providing independent assurance.

Executive Summary

- ❖ The Risk Management Policy provides Engineer Municipality with a **structured framework** to safeguard public resources, ensure resilient service delivery, and embed accountability across all operations.
- ❖ It aligns with **ISO 31000:2018**, and Kenya's constitutional and statutory requirements, ensuring compliance and credibility.
- ❖ The **three lines of defense model** defines clear roles:
 - Management (risk owners: Municipal Manager, directorates, staff)
 - Risk function (Risk Unit and Champions)
 - Independent assurance (Audit Committee, Internal Audit), with external oversight from county and national institutions.
- ❖ Situational analysis highlights:
 - **Strengths:** legal mandate, dedicated budget, community support
 - **Weaknesses:** limited resources, weak ICT systems, enforcement gaps
 - **Opportunities:** PPPs, donor funding, rapid urbanization, youthful population
 - **Threats:** climate change, cyber insecurity, political interference, funding constraints
- ❖ Policy objectives include:
 - Promoting a **risk-aware culture**
 - Safeguarding **infrastructure and public assets**
 - Clarifying **roles and accountability**
 - Ensuring **regulatory compliance**
 - Supporting **institutional resilience** through monitoring and continuous improvement
- ❖ Key actions: awareness creation, integration of risk management into planning and budgeting, development of a **Business Continuity Plan**, strengthening ethics and governance compliance, and establishing a network of **Risk Champions**.
- ❖ Monitoring and review: risks documented in registers, escalated through defined flows, reviewed quarterly by directorates, and annually by the Board.

This policy reflects Engineer Municipality's commitment to transparency, resilience, and prudent stewardship, positioning it as a model of accountable and future-ready governance.

CONTENTS

Foreword	2
Preface	3
Acknowledgement	4
Acronyms and Abbreviations	5
Definitions of Key Terms	6
Executive Summary	7
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS	12
1.1 Background Information	12
1.1.1 Devolution Context	12
1.1.2 Introduction to Risk Management	12
1.1.3 Mandates of the Municipality	12
1.1.4. Importance of risk management in the Municipality	13
1.2 Purpose, Vision, Mission, Objectives and Scope	14
1.2.1 Purpose of the Policy	14
1.2.2. Vision	14
1.2.3. Mission	14
1.2.4. Aim and Objectives	15
1.2.5. Scope and Application of the Policy	15
1.3 Location and Context of the Municipality	16
1.3.1. Geographic Position	16
1.4 Situational Analysis	18
1.4.1 PESTEL Analysis (external context)	18
1.4.2 SWOT Analysis (INTERNAL)	21
1.4.3 BEAM Analysis Method	22
1.4.4. Conclusion:	23
1.5 Legal and Institutional Framework	23
1.5.1 Constitution of Kenya, 2010	23
1.5.2 Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011 (amended 2019)	23
1.5.3 County Government Act 2012	24
1.5.4 Public Finance Management Act, 2012	24
1.5.5 Public Audit Act, 2015	24
1.5.6 Access to Information Act, 2016	24
1.5. 7 Mwongozo Governance Code for State Corporations, 2015	25

1.5.8 Public Sectors Risk Management Guidelines 2022.....	25
1.5.9 County Integrated Development Plan III (CIDP3)2023-2028	25
1.5.10 the COSO, Enterprise Risk Management 2017 Framework.....	25
1.5.11 ISO 31000: 2018, Risk Management Guidelines	25
1.6 Policy Rationale	26
CHAPTER 2: RISK MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES	27
2.1 Justification for Adopting the ISO 31000: 2018, Risk Management Guidelines	27
2.2 Principles of Risk Management.....	27
CHAPTER 3: THE RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK	29
3.1 Leadership and Commitment	30
3.2 Integration	30
3.3 Design.....	30
3.3.1 Understanding Entity's Context.....	30
3.3.2 Risk Management Commitment.....	31
3.3.3 Communication and Consultation.....	31
3.3.4 Allocation of Resources	31
3.3.5 Organizational Arrangements	31
3.4 Implementation.....	33
3.5 Evaluation and Improvement	33
CHAPTER 4: RISK GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE	34
4.2 Management (First Line of Defense).	34
4.2.1 Municipal Manager (Accounting Officer)	34
4.2.2 Directorate and Section Heads	34
4.2.3 All Municipal Staff	35
4.3 Risk Management Function (Second Line of Defense).....	35
4.3.1. Risk Management Unit / Section	35
4.3.2. Risk Champion.....	35
4.4 County Risk Management Committee (External Linkage)	36
4.5 Independent Assurance (Third Line of Defense).....	36
4.5.2 Internal Audit Unit	37
4.6 External Oversight and Stakeholders	37
CHAPTER 5: RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS	38
5.1. Introduction	38
5.2. Steps in Risk Management Process	38
5.2.1. Step 1: Establishing the Context	38
5.2.2. Step 2: Risk Identification.....	39

5.2.3. Step 3: Risk Analysis	39
5.2.4. Step 4: Risk Evaluation.....	39
Likelihood and consequence Matrix.....	40
Risk Likelihood Descriptors	40
5.2.6. Step 6: Recording and Reporting	42
5.2.7. Step 7: Communication and Consultation (Continuous).....	43
5.2.8. Step 8: Monitoring and Review (Continuous)	43
5.3. Risk Escalation Flow	45
CHAPTER 6: POLICY ACTIONS ON RISK MANAGEMENT	46
6.1 Awareness Creation and Capacity Building on Risk Management.....	46
6.2 Integration of ERM in Planning, Performance and Quality Management System in Municipality Processes.....	46
6.3 Continuous Capacity Building and Research on Emerging Risk Issues.....	46
6.4 Strengthening Policy, Legal and Regulatory Framework on Risk Management.....	47
6.5 Implement and Monitor the Risk Management Policy.....	47
6.6 Develop and Implement Business Continuity Plan for the Municipality	47
6.7 Strengthening Compliance to Public Service Ethics, Values and Principles of Good Governance	47
6.8 Adequate Resource Allocation for Accountable and Responsible Management of Risk	48
6.9 Establishment of a Network of Performance and Risk Management Champions	48
CHAPTER 7: MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS	49
7.1 Integration with Planning and Budgeting	49
7.2 Monitoring, Reporting, and Review	49
7.3 Policy Effectiveness and Review	49
APPENDICES	50

List of Figures

FIGURE 1- Engineer Municipality Boundaries

FIGURE 2 -Framework (Source ISO 31000:2018, Risk Management Guidelines)

FIGURE 3 - Three Lines Model (Source: The IIA, 2020)

FIGURE 4- Risk Management Process flow chart

List of Tables

Table 1: Pestel Analysis

Table 2: SWOT Analysis

Table 3: BEAM Analysis

Table 4: Risk code

Table 5: Risk Matrix

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

1.1 Background Information

1.1.1 Devolution Context

The Constitution of Kenya (2010) ushered in a devolved system of governance, establishing counties and municipalities as key units of service delivery and citizen engagement. Within this framework, Ol'Kalou Municipality is mandated to drive urban development, infrastructure provision, and inclusive governance. Devolution presents both opportunities and risks, making structured risk management a core requirement for effective municipal administration.

1.1.2 Introduction to Risk Management

Risk is the effect of uncertainty on objectives, often expressed in terms of causes, potential events, and their consequences. Risk management refers to the coordinated activities that guide and control an entity in relation to risk. It involves the systematic application of policies, procedures, and practices to:

- i. Communicate and consult with stakeholders;
- ii. Establish the operational and strategic context;
- iii. Identify, analyze, and evaluate risks; and
- iv. Treat, monitor, and review risks continuously.

Effective risk management is often invisible when it works well, but its absence can lead to service failures, financial losses, or reputational damage. For municipalities, a robust risk framework is essential to pursue strategic objectives confidently, knowing that uncertainties are actively managed to maximize benefits and minimize harm.

1.1.3 Mandates of the Municipality

Municipalities in Kenya, governed by the Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011, are mandated to deliver structured urban development and public services. These functions carry inherent risks that must be proactively managed to ensure compliance, efficiency, and sustainability. Key mandate areas and associated risk considerations include:

1. Urban Planning & Land Use

- **Mandate:** Develop and implement integrated development plans.
- **Risk Lens:** Exposure to planning delays, land disputes, and non-compliance with zoning regulations. *Mitigation:* Strengthen stakeholder engagement and enforce land use controls.

2. Infrastructure & Service Delivery

- **Mandate:** Maintain roads, drainage, lighting, waste systems, and public amenities.

- **Risk Lens:** Project delays, cost overruns, and service disruption due to poor procurement or contractor performance.
- *Mitigation:* Apply robust contract management and performance tracking tools.

3. Governance & Citizen Participation

- **Mandate:** Facilitate inclusive governance and public engagement.
- **Risk Lens:** Reputational risk from low public trust, resistance to reforms, or inadequate communication.
- *Mitigation:* Institutionalize public forums and feedback mechanisms.

4. Economic Development

- **Mandate:** Promote local enterprise and job creation.
- **Risk Lens:** Market failure, informal sector exclusion, or misaligned incentives.
- *Mitigation:* Conduct regular economic impact assessments and support SME integration.

5. Financial Management

- **Mandate:** Budget preparation, fund management, and resource mobilization.
- **Risk Lens:** Financial misreporting, audit queries, and low absorption of development funds.
- *Mitigation:* Enforce PFM Act compliance, automate financial trackers, and conduct quarterly reviews.

6. Control & Accountability

- **Mandate:** Monitor service delivery and enforce compliance.
- **Risk Lens:** Operational inefficiencies, weak internal controls, and delayed reporting.
- *Mitigation:* Establish internal audit committees and risk registers.

1.1.4. Importance of risk management in the Municipality

Risk Management underpins good governance and service delivery in the Municipality by:

1. **Protecting Public Services:** Ensuring continuity in essential services such as water, sanitation, waste management, and emergency response.
2. **Safeguarding Financial Stability:** Preventing losses from fraud, lawsuits, or failed projects.
3. **Enhancing Decision-Making:** Supporting data-driven and forward-looking decisions.
4. **Boosting Public Trust:** Building citizen confidence through transparent and accountable processes.
5. **Responding to Emerging Threats:** Preparing for dynamic risks such as pandemics, climate change, and cyber threats.

1.2 Purpose, Vision, Mission, Objectives and Scope

1.2.1 Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of this Risk Management Policy is to establish a consistent and structured approach for the Municipality to develop, implement, and sustain effective risk management frameworks and processes. It aims to enhance efficiency, accountability, and resilience across all operations and strategic initiatives. In particular, the policy has been developed to:

1. **Provide practical guidance** for designing entity-specific risk management frameworks tailored to the Municipality's operational context.
2. **Define the core principles** of risk management to ensure alignment with national and international standards.
3. **Outline the key requirements** for implementing risk management systems, including governance structures, tools, and reporting mechanisms.
4. **Clarify roles and accountabilities** for risk management implementation, coordination, and oversight across departments and agencies.
5. **Prescribe best practices** for embedding risk management into planning, budgeting, service delivery, and performance evaluation.
6. **Establish a common language** for discussing risk across all levels of the Municipality, promoting clarity and shared understanding.
7. **Provide a baseline for measuring effectiveness**, enabling continuous improvement and benchmarking against recognized standards.
8. **Support sensitization and training** of public officers to build institutional capacity and foster a culture of proactive risk awareness.

1.2.2. Vision

To cultivate a forward-thinking culture of risk awareness and accountability, positioning Engineer Municipality as a model of sustainable governance and operational excellence for future-ready communities.

1.2.3. Mission

To establish a robust and integrated risk management framework that enables Engineer Municipality to proactively identify, assess, and mitigate risks, safeguarding public resources and ensuring resilient service delivery in alignment with our strategic objectives

1.2.4. Aim and Objectives

i. Aim of the Risk Management Policy

The aim of this Policy is to institutionalize a structured and proactive approach to risk management across all municipal functions. It supports the goals of devolution by enhancing stewardship of public resources, safeguarding service delivery, and ensuring strategic alignment with national standards, county priorities, and international best practices.

ii. General Objective

To establish a consistent and integrated approach to managing risk across all municipal activities, supported by clear reporting, accountability, and oversight mechanisms.

iii. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this Policy are to:

- i. **Promote a Risk-Aware Culture:** Foster proactive risk identification, analysis, and mitigation among staff, leadership, and stakeholders to enhance transparency and informed decision-making.
- ii. **Safeguard Public Resources and Infrastructure:** Integrate risk controls into planning, budgeting, and operations to protect municipal assets, investments, and infrastructure.
- iii. **Clarify Roles and Accountability:** Ensure that all staff and leaders are aware of, and accountable for, risks within their areas of responsibility, with risks documented in departmental registers.
- iv. **Align with Regulatory and Strategic Requirements:** Ensure compliance with national legislation, county development plans, donor programs, and international standards such as ISO 31000:2018.
- v. **Support Institutional Resilience and Continuous Improvement:** Establish mechanisms for regular monitoring, review, and refinement of risk management practices to adapt to emerging challenges and opportunities.
- vi. **Preserve Public Trust and Service Delivery Integrity:** Minimize disruptions, reputational damage, and operational inefficiencies by managing uncertainties effectively and sustaining reliable service delivery.

1.2.5. Scope and Application of the Policy

This Policy applies to the Municipal Board, all municipal staff, directorates, affiliated entities, and relevant external stakeholders including contractors, partners, and residents.

It covers all activities, programs, projects, and assets at both strategic and operational levels, ensuring that risk management principles are consistently applied across financial, operational, environmental, legal, technological, and reputational domains.

1.3 Location and Context of the Municipality



1.3.1. Geographic Position

The Engineer municipality is among the three (3) newly created Municipality in Nyandarua County. It was declared a Municipality in 2023 and has a geographical size of 531.10 km².

It squarely lies within Kinangop Sub-County. It touches five (4) wards namely, Engineer, Murungaru, North Kinangop and Gathara Ward.

The municipality is located in a high-altitude area on the Lee-ward side of the Aberdare Ranges which influences the prevalent rainfall and cold climate. This affects the nature of the risks occurrences.

FIGURE 1 ENGINEER MUNICIPALITY BOUNDARIES



1.3.2. Context and Risk Environment

Engineer Municipality is one of the urban areas established within Nyandarua County. It is strategically located along the Njabini – Ol’kalou highway and serves as an administrative and commercial hub for the surrounding agricultural economy.

The Municipality has an approximate human population of 61,663 and 19,752 households, which is steadily growing, with increasing demand for housing, markets, waste management, infrastructure, and social amenities.

Its economy is largely driven by agriculture, trade, and small-scale enterprises, which provide livelihoods but also generate environmental and infrastructural pressures.

Climatic conditions, including heavy rainfall of an annual average of 700mm – 1500mm and flooding, affect infrastructure and waste systems, while limited financial resources, rapid urbanization, and weak compliance culture present additional risks. These dynamics make a risk management framework essential for resilient and accountable service delivery.

1.4 Situational Analysis

A proactive and forward-looking risk management strategy requires a deep understanding of the landscape in which Engineer Municipality operates. This section employs established analytical frameworks to systematically evaluate both the external and internal environment, ensuring a holistic foundation for identifying and prioritizing strategic risks.

This section provides an assessment of the Municipality’s internal and external environment using SWOT, PESTEL, and BEAM tools to highlight opportunities, vulnerabilities, and implications for risk management.

1.4.1 PESTEL Analysis (external context)

The PESTEL framework provides a structured examination of key external factors — Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Environmental, and legal — that could present significant opportunities for advancement or pose threats to municipal objectives. This analysis ensures our governance and strategic planning remain agile and responsive to the broader forces shaping our community's future.

Table 1: Pestel Analysis

S/No.	Factors	Analysis
1	Political	Positive

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political stability – governors hold office for their full term • Political goodwill on devolution – by national government to Counties, and by County Government to municipalities <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a transitional framework in government, causing disruption in continuity of services and projects • Political interference limits municipality's autonomy • Citizens politics due to lack of awareness • Corruption and mismanagement of public funds
2	Economic	<p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic location in the county context • Availability of municipal budgets • Availability of alternative financing through donor funding • Insurance schemes that improve financial resilience • Rich agricultural hinterlands thereby supporting the economy in municipalities • Growing urbanization that expands the tax base • Opportunity of PPPs that provide funding for public projects and services. <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited funding for Municipalities • Limited local revenue / tax base due to economic hardships • dependency on county transfers • Limited funds due to economic downturns leading to reduced emergency response capacity • Rising costs of disaster response and recovery leading to reduced municipality budgets.
3	Social	<p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban growth • A higher youthful population • Cultural diversity <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • youth unemployment

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drug and substance abuse • rising service expectations from residents • increasing levels of crime and social ills • High rural to urban migration resulting to strain in infrastructure and facilities and social amenities • Negative public perception and trust making it hard to pass new initiatives or secure public cooperation
4	Technological	<p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved service delivery due to technological advancement in service delivery • Opportunity for adoption of emerging smart cities technologies • Innovation ecosystems e.g university education hubs • Improvement in communication and citizen engagement through various digital platforms <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost of technology limiting their adoption • Digital divide • Cybercrimes and cyber threats to the data systems • Rapid technological changes
5	Environmental	<p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban areas are underdeveloped thereby providing an opportunity for guided and controlled development • Rich agricultural hinterlands thereby providing Opportunities for value addition and waste reuse • Conducive climate that supports agriculture • Beneficiary of climate change adaptation funding • Presence of strategic natural resources in the municipality e.g. the Lake and the gazette Forest in Engineer • Opportunity for job creation e.g. through waste recycling and reduction <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change vulnerabilities increasing disaster risks and damage to infrastructure • Environmental pollution from urbanization
6	Legal / Regulatory	<p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust legal and regulatory frameworks that support accountability environmental protection and citizen participation

		<p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak enforcement • Uncertain government taxation policies • Legal disputes and litigation risks
--	--	---

1.4.2 SWOT Analysis (INTERNAL)

The SWOT analysis offers an internal assessment of the Municipality's operational strengths and weaknesses, contextualized against the external opportunities and threats identified in the PESTEL scan. This critical evaluation allows us to strategically leverage our innate capabilities, address areas for improvement, and align our resources to mitigate vulnerabilities while capitalizing on potential for growth and innovation.

Together, these analyses form the evidentiary core of our risk identification process, enabling data-driven decision-making and the development of robust treatment strategies tailored to the unique context of Engineer Municipality.

Table 2: SWOT

Strengths	Weaknesses
Delegated authority under the Urban Areas and Cities Act.	Limited financial resources for risk management.
Established Municipal Board and Manager with clear governance mandate.	Gaps in technical capacity and staffing.
Supportive legal and policy framework (Constitution, UACA, CGA, PFM Act, Audit Act, ISO 31000).	Weak ICT and data management systems.
Availability of a dedicated municipal budget	Lack of /inadequate physical infrastructure e.g office space and supporting amenities
A cordial relationship with the community	Poor implementation and enforcement of legal frameworks
Opportunities	Threats
Formulation and adoptions of tailored policies	Cyber insecurity
Potential for public-private partnerships (PPPs) in service delivery.	Climate change and natural disasters.
Availability of donor funding and technical assistance.	Political interference and shifting priorities.
Rapid urbanization creating demand for municipal services.	Public resistance to user charges and non-compliance.

Youthful population	Insufficient funding
Economies of agglomeration and reputation	Freehold Land tenures in the Municipalities limiting expansion

1.4.3 BEAM Analysis Method

Table 3: BEAM Analysis

Category	Factors / Examples	Conclusions	Action points
Barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited budget allocations • weak risk culture across departments • Political interference • fragmented stakeholder coordination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthen financial independence • depoliticize decision-making • build a culture of risk management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build financial sustainability • reduce political interference • train staff.
Enablers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive County Government and national legal framework. • National Treasury guidelines on risk management (2022). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of strong legal and policy framework to anchor risk management on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align with national guidelines • leverage county support • strengthen policy frameworks.
Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Board • Municipal Manager • delegated urban functions. • Existing infrastructure • technical staff • partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of governance structures and institutional capacity to implement risk management but needs reinforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use existing governance structures • expand infrastructure • develop staff capacity
Motivators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident demand for improved service delivery. • Donor support • PPP opportunities. • pressure for accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is strong external pressure and incentives to perform better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harness citizen demand • seek donor partnerships • enhance transparency

1.4.4. Conclusion:

The PESTEL, SWOT and BEAM analyses show that while the Municipality faces barriers such as limited finances, weak ICT capacity, and political interference, it also benefits from strong legal frameworks, governance structures, and external motivators. Effective risk management will depend on leveraging enablers and assets while addressing identified weaknesses and threats.

1.5 Legal and Institutional Framework

Risk management in the Municipality is grounded in Kenya's constitutional and legislative framework. The common themes in the frameworks with regard to risk management are accountability, transparency, prudent use of resources, and effective delivery service. They include:

1.5.1 Constitution of Kenya, 2010

The Constitution of Kenya is the foundation of risk management in the public sector. Articles 10, 201, and 232 establish the principles of good governance, integrity, accountability, and prudent use of public resources, all of which are central to effective risk management.

Chapter 11 on Devolved Government further anchors this responsibility. The objects of devolution include:

- a) Promoting democratic and accountable exercise of power.
- b) Ensuring equitable sharing of national and local resources.
- c) Enhancing checks and balances and the separation of powers.

These constitutional principles provide a clear mandate for Municipalities to adopt structured risk management systems. By embedding a Risk Management Framework, the Municipality ensures that its operations and decisions are consistent with the Constitution, safeguard public resources, and support the effective delivery of devolved functions.

1.5.2 Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011 (amended 2019)

The Urban Areas and Cities Act provide the legal basis for the establishment and governance of municipalities. It mandates municipal boards and managers to ensure accountability, efficiency, and effective service delivery. Risk management is therefore implicit in the requirement for municipalities to develop policies, plans, and strategies that safeguard resources, promote public participation, and uphold good governance in urban management.

1.5.3 County Government Act 2012

The Act entrenches performance management under Section 47, requiring counties to develop performance management plans to evaluate service delivery. These plans include mechanisms for monitoring and addressing risks that may hinder the achievement of strategic objectives.

Risk management is therefore embedded in the Act's emphasis on continuous improvement, accountability, and responsiveness, making it a core component of effective governance at both county and municipal levels.

1.5.4 Public Finance Management Act, 2012

The Constitution of Kenya establishes two levels of government, being the County Governments and the National Government. Accordingly, pursuant to section 1 (2) of The Public Finance Management Act 2012, the Municipality is bound by the provisions of the said Act and the Public finance Management regulations 2015 with regards to risk management. The responsibility is placed on the County Treasury, where by section 107 (2) (f) requires the County Treasury to ensure prudent management of fiscal risk, ensure that County borrowing is done with prudent degree of risk under sections 141 (1) and empowers it to conduct risk based audits under section 155 (2) (b).

These provisions Act then drive towards the need to incorporate risk management in all public finance decisions and in the management of all matters public finance.

1.5.5 Public Audit Act, 2015

The Public Audit Act strengthens oversight by mandating the Auditor-General to evaluate the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the use of public resources. In practice, this includes assessing whether risk management systems are in place and functioning effectively. The Act therefore reinforces the need for municipalities to establish robust risk management frameworks to support accountability and transparency in the use of public funds.

1.5.6 Access to Information Act, 2016

The Access to Information Act gives effect to Article 35 of the Constitution, which guarantees citizens the right to access information held by public bodies. This Act promotes transparency and openness in governance, both of which are key elements of risk management. For municipalities, effective risk management requires timely disclosure of information to the public, ensuring accountability and fostering trust in service delivery processes.

1.5. 7 Mwongozo Governance Code for State Corporations, 2015

This detailed public sector guidelines offers an in-depth look at the requirement for all state entities. The code requires the setting up of appropriate structure to ensure adequate systems and processes of accountability, risk management and control. This document is key in reviewing the parameters within which the Municipality must set up its Risk management mechanisms to meet the required standards.

1.5.8 Public Sectors Risk Management Guidelines 2022

These guidelines issued in line with the foregoing legal instruments are specific instruction to all public sector entities and institutions on the area of Risk management. The guidelines are detailed on the expectations and requirement on risk management within the public sector. This policy is molded around these guidelines.

1.5.9 County Integrated Development Plan III (CIDP3)2023-2028

The CIDP3 is the County's strategic document prepared based on the functions of the Municipality while appreciating that the County and National Governments are interdependent. The plan centers on the inter-linkages of International, National and Local development agendas. For effective stewardship of the assets allocated to the County, the plan is focused on delivery of services and accountability. This approach is linked to risk management, making the CIDP3 a core reference document for this risk management policy.

Together, these instruments establish a clear mandate for municipalities to integrate risk management into planning, budgeting, service delivery, and oversight, ensuring that devolved governance is both resilient and responsive to emerging challenges.

1.5.10 the COSO, Enterprise Risk Management 2017 Framework

The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Tread way Commission (COSO), developed this framework to strengthen internal controls, improve organizational performance, and deter fraud. COSO emphasizes integrating risk management with strategy and performance, providing useful benchmarks for accountability and governance.

1.5.11 ISO 31000: 2018, Risk Management Guidelines

ISO 31000:2018, issued by the International Organization for Standardization which is based in Geneva, Switzerland, is the globally recognized benchmark for risk management. It provides principles, a structured framework, and an implementation process designed to support decision-making, improve performance, and build resilience.

1.6 Policy Rationale

The Municipality faces financial, environmental, institutional, and operational risks that can disrupt service delivery and good governance. Whereas the PESTEL, SWOT and BEAM analyses above has shown that it has strong governance structures and a supportive legal framework, the lack of a structured approach to risk management makes it vulnerable.

This Policy provides a clear framework to safeguard public resources, improve accountability, and ensure efficient and sustainable operations. It helps the Municipality respond to emerging risks while also making use of opportunities to improve services and development outcomes.

The Policy is guided by international standards, especially **ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines**, and follows the National Treasury's requirements for risk management in devolved units through the Public Sector Risk Management Guidelines of November 2022, and Mwongozo: The Code of Governance for State Corporations of January 2015. By linking risk management to planning, budgeting, and decision-making, the Municipality will build a culture of learning, resilience, and innovation.

In this way, the Policy lays a strong foundation for an integrated and practical approach to risk management, ensuring that the Municipality can meet its governance responsibilities and long-term development goals.

The Policy seeks to:

- i. Safeguard public resources and assets.
- ii. Promote accountability, transparency, and efficiency in governance.
- iii. Align municipal practices with national, county, and international risk management standards.
- iv. Build resilience and adaptability in service delivery through continuous learning and innovation.

CHAPTER 2: RISK MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Effective risk management must be grounded in clear principles that provide consistency, accountability, and adaptability across all municipal operations. This Chapter sets out the guiding principles that shall shape the Municipality's risk management approach. While global best practices such as the COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework (2017) and ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines have been reviewed, the Municipality shall primarily align with ISO 31000:2018, as recommended by the National Treasury and Planning in the Public Sector Risk Management Guidelines, 2022.

2.1 Justification for Adopting the ISO 31000: 2018, Risk Management Guidelines

The Municipality adopts ISO 31000:2018 as the primary Risk Management Framework because it is flexible, performance-oriented, and well aligned with Kenya's devolved governance structures. It also complies with the **Public Sector Risk Management Guidelines, 2022**, which recommend ISO 31000:2018 as the standard for public institutions.

2.2 Principles of Risk Management

The Municipality shall adhere to the following principles of risk management, as outlined in **ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines** and benchmarked against the **COSO Enterprise Risk Management 2017**, integrating with strategy and performance framework.

These principles shall guide the design, implementation, and continuous improvement of the Municipality's risk management approach as follows:

1. **Integration**

Risk management shall be integrated into all municipal structures, processes, and decision-making activities, from strategic planning to daily operations.

2. **Structured and Comprehensive**

The approach shall be systematic, consistent, and comprehensive to ensure that all risks are identified, assessed, and managed effectively across departments.

3. Customized

Risk management practices shall be tailored to the Municipality's specific context, objectives, and stakeholder expectations.

4. Inclusive

Stakeholders at all levels - including staff, leadership, and community representatives - shall be engaged in risk identification, evaluation, and response planning.

5. Dynamic and Responsive

The Municipality shall continuously monitor and adapt its risk management practices to reflect changes in internal and external environments.

6. Best Available Information

Decisions shall be based on accurate, timely, and relevant data, while recognizing limitations and uncertainties in available information.

7. Human and Cultural Factors

The Municipality shall consider human behavior, organizational culture, and capacity-building as critical components of effective risk management.

8. Continual Improvement

Risk management processes shall be regularly reviewed and improved to enhance resilience, accountability, and performance.

9. Alignment with Strategy and Performance

Risks shall be managed in a way that supports the achievement of strategic objectives and enhances overall municipal performance.

The above principles provide the foundation for an effective and sustainable risk management culture within the Municipality. To operationalize these principles, the Municipality requires a structured framework that defines the governance arrangements, roles and responsibilities, and processes for risk identification, assessment, treatment, and monitoring.

CHAPTER 3: THE RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Effective risk management requires a clear framework that translates principles into practical governance arrangements, structures, and processes.

The Municipality commits to adopting the ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines as its primary framework, in line with the National Treasury and Planning's Public Sector Risk Management Guidelines (2022). This ensures that risk management is integrated into all municipal structures, strategies, policies, and operations.

The framework is built around six interrelated components, adapted from ISO 31000:2018:

1. Leadership and Commitment
2. Integration
3. Design
4. Implementation
5. Evaluation
6. Improvement

FIGURE 2: FRAMEWORK (Source ISO 31000:2018, Risk Management Guidelines)



3.1 Leadership and Commitment

Good risk management depends on strong governance and leadership. The Municipal Board, as the governing body, and the Municipal Manager, as the Accounting Officer, shall demonstrate their commitment for managing risk by laying the foundations for risk management and shall:

- a) Establish clear governance structures for risk management.
- b) Define and set risk appetite, tolerance, and thresholds.
- c) Assign risk ownership across directorates.
- d) Allocate resources for risk management, including staff, systems, training and technology.
- e) Ensure risk management is a standing agenda item at Board and Directorate meetings.
- f) Promote accountability by embedding risk responsibilities in performance management.
- g) Oversee periodic reviews of the framework to ensure continued relevance.
- h) Ensuring risk information is appropriately and regular reported internally and externally.

3.2 Integration

Risk management shall be embedded into all levels of municipal planning, operations, and decision-making, supplementing the County Integrated Development Plan. The Municipality shall:

- a) Promote a culture of risk awareness through communication, training, and leadership by example.
- b) Ensure risk management informs strategic priorities, project approvals, and service delivery.
- c) Request all Directorates to maintain and update risk registers linked to their work plans.
- d) Encourage open dialogue on risks across Directorates and with stakeholders.

3.3 Design

The risk management framework shall be designed around the Municipality's context, mandate, and stakeholders. The design phase shall include:

3.3.1 Understanding Entity's Context

Risk Management shall be undertaken:

- i. Considering internal and external context i.e. political, social, technological, environmental, and economic.
- ii. Defining objectives and aligning risk management with strategic and operational goals.

- iii. Establishing a strong risk culture through participatory management, accountability, and risk-informed decision-making.

3.3.2 Risk Management Commitment

The Municipal Board shall formalize its commitment to risk management in policy statements and Board resolutions.

3.3.3 Communication and Consultation

The Municipality shall establish clear procedures for communicating and consulting on risks. This shall include:

- i. Internal reporting channels to ensure risks are escalated appropriately.
- ii. Public participation mechanisms to capture community concerns.
- iii. Feedback loops with county government, regulators, and partners.
- iv. Timely reporting of risks and responses to the Board, directorate, and staff levels.

3.3.4 Allocation of Resources

The Board shall ensure there are sufficient resources for risk management, including:


- i. Qualified personnel with relevant skills.
- ii. ICT tools and data management systems for risk reporting.
- iii. Documented processes, procedures, and training.
- iv. Budgetary allocations to support risk treatment measures.
- v.

3.3.5 Organizational Arrangements

Risk management responsibilities shall be based on the **Three Lines of Defense Model** (adapted from IIA, 2020) as follows:

- i. **First Line:** Functional officers who identify, own, and manage risks in their areas.
- ii. **Second Line:** Risk Management Unit / function that supports directorates, designs processes, and monitors implementation.
- iii. **Third Line:** Internal Audit function, which provides independent assurance on the effectiveness of risk management.

Figure 3: Three Lines Model (Source: The IIA, 2020)



3.4 Implementation

Risk management shall be implemented through:

- a) Development and periodic updating of municipal risk registers.
- b) Integration of risk assessments into planning, budgeting, and project cycles.
- c) Staff training and awareness campaigns.
- d) Embedding accountability in performance contracts and appraisals.

3.5 Evaluation and Improvement

The Municipality shall:

- a) Periodically monitor and review risk management performance.
- b) Evaluate effectiveness of the framework against set objectives.
- c) Incorporate lessons learned and stakeholder feedback.
- d) Update the framework to reflect emerging risks and best practices.

CHAPTER 4: RISK GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Effective risk governance ensures that risk management is embedded in all levels of decision-making, accountability, and service delivery. The Municipality shall adopt the **Three Lines of Defense Model** as the foundation for assigning responsibilities in risk management, aligned to ISO 31000:2018 and the Public Sector Risk Management Guidelines (2022).

4.1 The Governing Body – The Municipal Board

The Municipal Board, as the governing body, shall provide overall oversight and direction for risk management. Its responsibilities include:

1. Approving the Risk Management Policy, framework, and implementation plan.
2. Defining its own risk governance roles and establishing relevant committees.
3. Setting and reviewing the Municipality's risk appetite and tolerance levels.
4. Delegating implementation responsibility to the Municipal Manager (Accounting Officer).
5. Maintaining oversight of principal risks and ensuring that mitigation measures are in place.
6. Reviewing reports on risk management effectiveness and demanding accountability from management.

4.2 Management (First Line of Defense).

Management, led by the Municipal Manager, shall be responsible for implementing risk management in day-to-day operations.

4.2.1 Municipal Manager (Accounting Officer)

The Municipal Manager, as the Accounting Officer under the Public Finance Management Act (2012), shall:

- i. Establish risk management structures, systems, and reporting lines in the Municipality.
- ii. Champion a risk-aware culture across directorates.
- iii. Integrate risk management into planning, budgeting, and operations.
- iv. Assign and monitor risk ownership across departments.
- v. Provide assurance to the Municipal Board and report to the County Government on risk matters.
- vi. Appoint a representative of the Municipality to sit in the County Risk Management Committee.

4.2.2 Directorate and Section Heads

Directorate/section heads are **risk owners** within their areas of responsibility. Their role is to:

- i. Identify and manage risks in daily operations.
- ii. Maintain and update departmental risk registers.
- iii. Implement mitigation measures and escalate significant risks.
- iv. Nominate and support risk champions.
- v. Promote risk awareness and accountability among staff.

4.2.3 All Municipal Staff

All staff shall contribute to risk management by:

- i. Identifying and reporting risks to supervisors.
- ii. Supporting the implementation of mitigation measures.
- iii. Complying with policies, by-laws, and controls.
- iv. Contributing to updates of risk registers and documentation.

4.3 Risk Management Function (Second Line of Defense)

4.3.1. Risk Management Unit / Section

The Municipality shall establish and maintain a Risk Management Function, domiciled within its administrative structure, to support and coordinate risk management processes. Its roles include:

- i. Developing and maintaining risk management tools, templates, and registers.
- ii. Providing training, awareness, and technical support.
- iii. Monitoring adequacy and effectiveness of controls and treatment plans.
- iv. Escalating unmitigated or emerging risks to the Municipal Manager and Board.
- v. Consolidating risk reports for submission to the County Government.

4.3.2. Risk Champion

The Risk Champion is a designated officer from each Directorate within the municipality, who serve as a facilitator and change agent in the risk management process. They shall not “own” or make final decisions on risks, but will enable effective identification, assessment, monitoring, and reporting of risks at the operational level.

Key Responsibilities:

1. **Capacity Building:** Familiarize with approved risk tools (e.g., risk registers, scoring systems, and templates) and train departmental staff in their use.
2. **Risk Identification and Assessment:** Facilitate structured identification and scoring risks within departments, ensuring consistency and compliance with the municipal risk management framework.
3. **Support in Risk Mitigation:** Assist risk owners in developing, documenting, and monitoring mitigation measures and treatment plans.
4. **Data Management:** Maintain the accuracy and completeness of departmental risk data and generate timely risk reports for submission to the Risk Management Function.
5. **Technical Facilitation:** Participate in departmental and cross-departmental risk reviews to ensure that risks are understood, communicated, and integrated into decision-making.
6. **Advocacy and Awareness:** Champion a culture of risk awareness, encouraging open discussions and proactive management of risks across the department.
7. **Continuous Improvement:** Contribute insights and lessons learned to improve the Municipality's overall risk management processes.

Performance Expectations:

- Each Risk Champion shall have defined objectives and KPIs for risk management.
- The Municipality shall facilitate annual training and workshops to strengthen their role.

4.4 County Risk Management Committee (External Linkage)

The County Risk Management Committee, established under the Public Finance Management Regulations (2015), provides oversight and coordination of risk management across all County entities, including the Municipality.

The Municipal Manager shall, in consultation with the Board, appoint a representative of the Municipality to sit in this Committee. The Committee's mandate includes:

- i. Reviewing risk policies, frameworks, and strategies across the County.
- ii. Assessing County-wide risk appetite, tolerance, and indicators.
- iii. Ensuring all County entities, including the Municipality, have consistent risk identification and assessment practices.
- iv. Reviewing treatment plans and providing technical guidance.
- v. Monitoring integration of risk management into County operations.

4.5 Independent Assurance (Third Line of Defense)

4.5.1 Audit Committee

The Audit Committee provides independent oversight of risk management for the County and its' entities. Its roles include:

- i. Reviewing implementation of the Municipality's Risk Management Policy and framework.
- ii. Ensuring disclosures on risk are included in financial and annual reports.
- iii. Monitoring adequacy of internal controls and principal risk reporting.
- iv. Reviewing audit plans to ensure alignment with the Municipality's risk profile.

4.5.2 Internal Audit Unit

Internal Audit Unit provides objective assurance by:

- i. Reviewing the design and effectiveness of the Municipality's risk management systems.
- ii. Recommending improvements to strengthen risk management processes.
- iii. Maintaining independence by not assuming operational risk management responsibilities.

4.6 External Oversight and Stakeholders

Beyond internal structures, external bodies provide oversight and assurance. They include:

- a) **Office of the Auditor General (OAG):** Reviews effectiveness of controls and risk management.
- b) **National Treasury and Planning:** Provides capacity-building and enforces public sector risk management guidelines.
- c) **Constitutional Bodies:** Such as the EACC, Controller of Budget, Office of the Ombudsman, and County Assembly.
- d) **Stakeholders:** Residents, private sector, development partners, media, and civil society shall participate in risk management through feedback and public participation.

CHAPTER 5: RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS

5.1. Introduction

The Municipality adopts the ISO 31000:2018 risk management process, which provides a structured, systematic, and iterative approach for identifying, assessing, and addressing risks. This process ensures that risks are managed consistently across all Municipality Directorates and decision-making levels. It includes both cyclical steps (context, identification, analysis, evaluation, treatment) and continuous activities (communication, consultation, monitoring, review, and reporting).

5.2. Steps in Risk Management Process

They are:

1. Establish the Context
2. Identify the risks
3. Analyze the Risk
4. Evaluate the Risk
5. Treat the Risk
6. Communication and Consultation (Continuous)
7. Monitoring and Review (Continuous)
8. Recording and reporting

5.2.1. Step 1: Establishing the Context

Effective risk management begins with a clear understanding of the environment in which the Municipality operates. This involves defining the internal and external context, clarifying objectives, and identifying stakeholders.

Activities include:

- i. Defining legal, political, social, cultural, economic, and technological factors.
- ii. Setting scope and boundaries of risk management.
- iii. Identifying sources and categories of risks.
- iv. Guide questions include:
 - o What are the Municipality's objectives?
 - o What external threats or opportunities could influence them?

- Who are internal and external stakeholders, and how is accountability ensured?

5.2.2. Step 2: Risk Identification

Risks must first be identified before they can be assessed or managed. The Municipality seeks to capture all potential events, both threats and opportunities that may impact objectives.

Activities include:

- i. Engaging stakeholders and subject experts.
- ii. Using structured tools (brainstorming, audits, complaints analysis, incident reports, systems reviews etc).
- iii. Documenting risks in the register with clear descriptions using the 5Ws (What, Why, Where, When, How).

5.2.3. Step 3: Risk Analysis

Once identified, risks must be analyzed to understand their nature, causes, and potential impacts. This step helps determine the likelihood and consequences of risks. Activities include:

- i. Assessing existing controls and their effectiveness.
- ii. Rating risks using the Municipality's risk assessment matrix aligned to its risk appetite.
- iii. Determining.

5.2.4. Step 4: Risk Evaluation

Risk evaluation allows decision-makers to determine whether risks are acceptable or require further treatment.

This step prioritizes risks and aligns them with the Municipality's risk appetite.

Activities include:

- i. Comparing analyzed risks against appetite and tolerance thresholds.
- ii. Deciding whether to accept, monitor, treat, or escalate risks.
- iii. Documenting rationale for decisions.

Municipality Risk Appetite and Tolerance

The Municipality applies a structured risk appetite framework to guide decision-making. Risks are classified at the *controlled level* as follows:

Table 4: Risk code

Risk Level	Colour	Description
Low	Green	Acceptable and managed through routine procedures (e.g., quality management systems). No further action required beyond normal controls.
Moderate	Yellow	Tolerable but requires active monitoring. Directorate or Section Heads must take responsibility, ensure accountability, and implement additional controls where necessary.
High	Amber/Orange	Significant risk requiring the Municipal Manager's oversight and attention of the Board. Remedial action must be planned and resourced.
Extreme	Red	Unacceptable risk requiring immediate action and full commitment of the Board. Strategic interventions must be prioritized

Table 5: Risk Matrix

The Municipality will adopt the following Matrix to rate the risk

Likelihood and consequence Matrix

	1- Insignificant	2 - Minor	3 - Moderate	4 - Major	5 - Catastrophic
5 - Almost Certain	High	High	High	Extreme	Extreme
4 - Likely	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	Extreme
3 - Possible	Low	Moderate	Moderate	High	High
2 - Unlikely	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	High
1 - Rare	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate

Risk Likelihood Descriptors

Level	Descriptor	Indicators (Choose only one)		
		Qualitative	Quantitative	Quantitative

5	Almost Certain	Expected to Occur in most circumstances	Daily to Weekly	90-99% probability of occurrence
4	Likely	Will probably occur in most circumstances	Monthly to Six Months	70-89% probability of occurrence
3	Possible	Could occur at some time	Annually	30-69% probability of occurrence
2	Unlikely	Unlikely in the foreseeable future	Once in 5 Years	10-29% probability of occurrence
1	Rare	Occurrence Requires exceptional Circumstances	Once in 10 Years	1-9% probability of occurrence

5.2.5. Step 5: Risk Treatment

Risk treatment involves selecting and implementing measures to modify risks to an acceptable level. The Municipality will adopt treatment options that are proportionate to the level of risk, available resources, and public interest as follows:

- a) **Risk Avoidance** - Eliminating the activity or decision that gives rise to the risk.
 - Used when the risk is **unacceptable** and cannot be controlled cost-effectively.
 - Example: Deciding not to implement a project if environmental or legal risks outweigh potential benefits.
- b) **Risk Reduction (Control/Modification)** - Reducing the likelihood or impact of the risk.
 - Used when risks are **significant but manageable** with additional controls.
 - Examples:
 - Strengthening waste segregation systems to reduce operational risks.
 - Conducting regular safety training to reduce accident risks.
 - This is the most common treatment method in public sector risk management.
- c) **Risk Transfer or Sharing** - Shifting some or all of the risk to another party.
 - Applied where risks **can be better managed externally, or to limit financial exposure**.
 - Examples:
 - Taking out insurance for municipal vehicles.
 - Outsourcing hazardous waste disposal to licensed providers.
 - Note: Accountability remains with the Municipality even when risks are transferred.

- d) **Risk Retention/Acceptance** - Formally accepting a risk where treatment is impractical, too costly, or unnecessary.
 - Appropriate when:
 - i. The **cost of treatment outweighs benefits**; or
 - ii. The **risk is low and within acceptable tolerance levels**.
 - Example: Accepting minor fluctuations in fuel prices as part of routine operations.
 - Requires clear documentation and approval from the risk owner.
- e) **Risk Exploitation (Opportunities)** - Recognizing risks can also present opportunities for innovation or improvement.
 - Applied when **potential positive outcomes outweigh threats**.
 - Example: Piloting ICT-based systems for fee collection, despite initial technical risks.
- f) **Risk Retirement** - Formally closing or archiving a risk that is no longer relevant or has been fully mitigated.
 - Used when:
 - i. **Objectives or external conditions change**; or
 - ii. **Controls reduce the risk to a negligible level**.
 - Example: Retiring risks related to obsolete technologies after full system upgrades.

Each treatment plan must include:

- i. Risk and treatment description.
- ii. Treatment owner and responsible parties.
- iii. Actions, timelines, and milestones.
- iv. Integration with performance management and reporting processes.
- v.

5.2.6. Step 6: Recording and Reporting

Risks must be documented consistently to enable monitoring, accountability, and informed decision-making.

Activities include:

- i. Maintaining an up-to-date risk register. The register is a living document and must reflect real-time changes.
- ii. Recording risk descriptions, analysis, controls, and treatments.
- iii. Conducting quarterly Directorate / section reviews and updates.
- iv. Submitting consolidated quarterly reports to the Municipal Manager and Audit Committee.

5.2.7. Step 7: Communication and Consultation (Continuous)

Transparent communication and stakeholder engagement are essential for effective risk management.

Activities include:

- i. Consulting staff, leadership, and external stakeholders throughout the process.
- ii. Explaining treatment decisions and progress.
- iii. Maintaining open, two-way communication feedback mechanisms to refine practices.

5.2.8. Step 8: Monitoring and Review (Continuous)

Risk management is an interactive process that requires ongoing review to remain effective.


Activities include:

- i. Directorate / sectional heads conducting quarterly reviews of risk registers.
- ii. Converting completed treatments into ongoing controls.
- iii. Using internal and external audit findings and performance reviews to strengthen controls through independent checks and improvement recommendations.

In line with the ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines, the Municipality shall embed the three continuous themes of **risk recording and reporting, communication and consultation, and monitoring and review** across all stages of the risk management process.

These interactive themes are not stand-alone tasks but continuous practices that ensure transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to change. By institutionalizing them, the Municipality guarantees that risks are systematically identified, effectively managed, and continually improved upon, thereby safeguarding public resources, strengthening governance, and enhancing sustainable service delivery.

Figure 4: Risk Management Process flow chart



5.3. Risk Escalation Flow

The Municipality has adopted a structured escalation mechanism to ensure that risks are addressed at the right level of decision-making. Risks are first identified and managed at the departmental level, but when they exceed defined tolerance levels, they are escalated through management to the Municipal Board.

Step 1: Technical Units Level

Risks are first owned and managed where they arise.

- Staff and technical units identify risks and record them in the Units risk register.
- Risks within the Units appetite are managed locally and monitored regularly.

Step 2: Escalation to Head of Directorate

When a risk exceeds the Units threshold, it is escalated.

- The Head of Directorate reviews the risk for accuracy and completeness.
- A decision is made on whether further escalation is required.

Step 3: Municipal Manager Review

The Municipal Manager ensures strategic oversight of escalated risks.

- Reviews all risks outside departmental appetite.
- Classifies risks as moderate, high, or extreme.
- Allocates additional resources or directs immediate treatments where necessary.

Step 4: Escalation to the Municipal Board

High and extreme risks are escalated to the Board for governance-level oversight.

- The Board provides direction, approves treatment measures, and monitors progress.
- Risk appetite thresholds may be re-examined in light of emerging threats.

Step 5: Downgrading or Returning Risks

Risks can also be downgraded as controls improve, or threats diminish.

- Risks that return to acceptable levels are sent back to departments for local monitoring.
- Downgraded risks remain documented in the register as part of institutional memory.

CHAPTER 6: POLICY ACTIONS ON RISK MANAGEMENT

This chapter sets out strategies and policy statements to embed effective risk management across all municipal operations. While the term “Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)” is often used globally to describe organization-wide risk management, this Policy adopts the simpler term “Risk Management” to emphasize its relevance to the Municipality with the same intent of integrating risk awareness and controls across all functions, in line with ISO 31000:2018 and best practice.

6.1 Awareness Creation and Capacity Building on Risk Management

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Facilitate awareness creation forums on risk management for Municipal public servants;
- Continuously build the capacity of risk champions through periodic training;
- Undertake targeted training for Internal Auditors;
- Communicate all identified risks vertically and horizontally; and
- Cultivate a risk culture in all Municipality processes.

6.2 Integration of ERM in Planning, Performance and Quality Management System in Municipality Processes

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Involve risk champions in planning processes;
- Enrich job descriptions for the Municipality public servants to incorporate Enterprise Risk Management activities;
- Incorporate risk management in strategy documents such as cabinet papers;
- Include risk management in performance contracting; and
- Link Enterprise Risk Management with ISO 9001: 2015.

6.3 Continuous Capacity Building and Research on Emerging Risk Issues

Policy Statements

The Governing body officers shall:

- Demonstrate and exercise risk leadership by example and communicate a positive risk culture;
- Model their behaviors based on principles outlined in this policy framework;
- Understand and oversee the interdependence of risks;
- Ensure effective employee risk competencies by supporting professional development

- and risk management education and training; and
- Align resources with managing risks and opportunities.

6.4 Strengthening Policy, Legal and Regulatory Framework on Risk Management

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Support the development, adoption and enforcement of legal, policy, and regulatory measures for risk management;
- Monitor and report on implementation of such frameworks.

6.5 Implement and Monitor the Risk Management Policy

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Review the status of its risk register on a quarterly basis; and
- Automate the Risk Management processes.

6.6 Develop and Implement Business Continuity Plan for the Municipality

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Develop and implement a business continuity policy;
- Ensure safe custody and protection of essential records and systems;
- Establish, test and update a disaster recovery plan;
- Share the continuity and recovery measures with stakeholders.

6.7 Strengthening Compliance to Public Service Ethics, Values and Principles of Good Governance

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Sensitize Municipal public servants on public service ethics and principles of good governance;
- Develop and operationalize public service codes of leadership and integrity; and
- In liaison with the EACC, develop and implement a corruption prevention programme.

6.8 Adequate Resource Allocation for Accountable and Responsible Management of Risk

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Ensuring reasonable allocation of resources to all actors involved in risk management and Assurance;
- Adequate staffing with relevant skills and competence of the assurance unit;
- Support logistical needs of the assurance unit; and
- Equip the assurance unit with the requisite tools to ensure full implementation of Risk Management.

6.9 Establishment of a Network of Performance and Risk Management Champions

Policy Statements

The Governing body commits to:

- Support risk champions in the discharge of their duties; and
- Build the capacity of risk champions.

Collectively, these policy actions provide a structured approach to managing risks in line with the principles and framework of ISO 31000:2018. By entrenching risk management into all its processes, the Municipality strengthens its capacity to anticipate and respond to uncertainties while seizing opportunities. This ensures that risk management is not an isolated activity but a core enabler of accountability, resilience, and sustainability, ultimately supporting the Municipality's strategic objectives and long-term development goals.

CHAPTER 7: MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

7.1 Integration with Planning and Budgeting

Risk management shall be embedded in the Municipality's planning and budgeting processes to ensure that resource allocation reflects both identified risks and strategic priorities. All Directorates shall demonstrate how risks are addressed and mitigated in their annual work plans and budget submissions.

7.2 Monitoring, Reporting, and Review

The implementation of this Policy shall be monitored through regular risk reporting at Directorate, Management, and Board levels. The Municipal Manager, supported by the risk champion, shall ensure that quarterly risk reports are prepared and presented to the Municipal Board for oversight.

7.3 Policy Effectiveness and Review

This Policy shall come into force upon approval by the Municipal Board and subsequent gazetement in accordance with the applicable legal and regulatory framework. The Policy shall be reviewed every three (3) years, or earlier where circumstances so dictate.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: RISK REGISTERS


Appendix 2. Risk Management Plan

Element	Description	When	Who
Define Scope and objective of County activities	Risk management will be incorporated into normal County activities including planning, decision making and operational processes, leading to the achievement of County Government goals.	Annually	Management
Risk Management Policy	Policy review is every year. This allows for any updates and administrative changes to be incorporated into the policy and keep the information as contemporary as possible.	Annually	Senior Management
Risk Management Framework	A review every two years of the framework allows the Municipality to continually improve its processes without deviating too far from the policy and procedures.	Biennially	Risk Management Function
Risk Assessments	Formal risk assessment workshops are to be undertaken as part of the annual operational plan cycle.	Annually	All administrative County
Roles and responsibilities	Roles and responsibilities are reviewed on a quarterly basis during the reporting cycle. If responsibilities for risks, controls or treatments have changed, it will be reflected in the report.	Quarterly	All administrative County

Training and education	Risk awareness training to be done	Bi-annually	Risk Management Function
Risk Management Reporting Process	Heads of Directorates review risk registers on a quarterly basis and report to the Accounting Officer. The accounting officer reports to the Board	Quarterly	All administrative Entities
Escalation Process (Appendix 3)	Any risks that have a high or extreme controlled level of risk OR have controls rated as less than effective require treatment plans. If the treatment plan does not reduce the level of risk or increase control effectiveness, the risk is required to be escalated to Senior management for further attention. The Risk Management committee to further review the risk and determine whether the risk is to be on the strategic risk register.	As required	All administrative Entities
Risk Treatment Plans	Risk treatment plans exist where a risk has a controlled level of risk rated as either extreme or high, or the control effectiveness has been rated as less than effective. These treatment plans are reviewed on a regular basis by the risk, control and treatment owners however they are only reported on a quarterly basis.	Quarterly	All administrative Entities
Communication	Communication and consultation occurs on a regular basis to ensure key stakeholders (both internal and external) are consulted, engaged and actively involved throughout the risk management process. This promotes a consolidated awareness of the department's risk management system and influences behavioral shifts in relation to management of risks. The County Government also has regular Risk Assessment workshops sharing of information and entrenching the culture of risk management.	Continually	Risk Management Function

Monitor and Review	This allows for lessons learned to be identified and applied to continuously improve upon the risk management framework and associated practices. This encourages and increases the successful achievement of strategic and operational objectives.	Quarterly	All administrative Entities
--------------------	---	-----------	-----------------------------

Appendix 3. Risk Management Escalation Matrix



Appendix 4 :Risk Function Implementation Matrix

	ACTIVITY	TIMELINES	RESPONSIBLE OFFICE
1	Appointment of the officer in charge of the risk function	February 2026	Manager
2	Approval of Risk Management Policy Framework	By January 2026	Board
3	Creation of Risk activity budget	By February 2026	Appointed officer in charge of the Risk function/ Director of planning
4	Appointment of finance committee on risk		CECM Finance
5	Sensitization to Departments	Bi annually	Appointed officer in charge of the Risk function
6	Finalization of the framework of the risk management function	July 2026	Appointed officer in charge of the Risk function
7	Review of risk policy & registers	July 2028	Appointed officer in charge of the Risk function
8	Launching of the policy	By February 2026	H.E the Governor