

Headers for each category of Risk should be considered:

Project:	UK SPF
Project lead:	Sally Grindrod-Smith
Last Updated:	08-Nov-22

- Political
- Economical
- Sociological
- Technological
- Legal
- Environmental

Risk Number	Risk Description	Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Target Risk Rating			Risk Owner	Action Owner	Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
			LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	Risk Rating	Target LIKELIHOOD rating	Target IMPACT Rating	Target Risk Rating						
Political														
P1	Lack of political support to procure/commission services jointly with other LA's in Lincolnshire	UKSPF prospectus indicates that it supports joint commissioning, failure to do this would go against guidance. Increase cost to council to procure independently and/or delays in procuring projects or services leading to reduced outputs and outcomes.	Possible	Major	12	Possible	Major	12	Sally Grindrod-Smith		Ensure politicians are regularly updated and views canvassed to allow business cases to be progressed. Progress conversations with Lincolnshire Councils. LEP and County Council to identify areas that can be procured jointly	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P2	Development and sign off of the businesses cases are delayed as politicians consider their priorities in relation to elections due in May 2023.	Delay or failure to deliver projects within the time period set out in the investment plan will lead to reputational damage with public and government. There is a risk that government will not release funding to until sufficient progress has been made.	Remote	Moderate	3	Remote	Moderate	3	Sally Grindrod-Smith		Early engagement with politicians to ensure that the projects will be supported and where necessary get approvals for individual projects to be brought forward to meet investment plan.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P3	Multiple and competing projects with insufficient funding to meet needs of communities and business.	Damage reputation to council as being seen as unfair and lacking transparency.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	WLDC officers to be ID for each of 3 BC	WLDC to create clear criteria for prioritisation within each project/programme. WLDC to carry out stakeholder involvement where necessary and develop comms plan to ensure stakeholders and providers are kept informed.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P4	Conflicts of interest within the Local Partnership Group (LPG) due to potential recipients of funding having access to privileged information on potential contracts/grants	Potential recipients who sit on the LPG get a commercial advantage when bidding for work. Reputational and potential legal challenge against procurement and commissioning made by other providers.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Review the LPG composition once the fund is in place to ensure that no advantage is given to any groups when bidding/submitted bids or starts	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P5	Scope creep, for example Government releases further funding to be integrated into the business cases and to be delivered by March 2025.	Business cases are delayed whilst the impact of any funding is considered leading to time and cost pressures, reputational damage to council with the public	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Accept risk. Consider approving projects individually to allow some progress to be made. Ensure effective communications plan to keep stakeholders informed.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P6	Failure to integrate the Rural England Prosperity Fund Investment Plan into business cases	Potential to miss opportunities to maximise affect of funding on local communities and businesses.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6			Review existing projects to identify any synergistic benefits and interdependencies. Identify any additional interventions required. Complete the Rural England Fund as soon as possible to allow the business case to progress.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
P6	Failure to integrate the Rural England Prosperity Fund Investment Plan into business cases	Potential to miss opportunities to maximise affect of funding on local communities and businesses.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6			Review existing projects to identify any synergistic benefits and interdependencies. Identify any additional interventions required. Complete the Rural England Fund as soon as possible to allow the business case to progress.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
Economical														
E1	Investment Plan funding profile is very tight to spend and funding may not be expended in year, leading to a delay in release of funding in following years.	Programme slips and projects do not have sufficient time to be delivered outputs and outcomes leading to potential clawback and reputational damage. Government have stated that any underspends in the final year of the programme (2024/25) will be repaid to DLUHC. Delays in projects may lead to costs increasing.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Sense check project plans and risks to ensure that the projects can be delivered to time and budget. Consider delivering projects earlier than Investment Plan spend profile to deal with cost inflation and time over runs (potentially funded by reserves and refunded by Investment Plan funding). Consider using 2022/23 funding to support existing projects retrospectively where they meet interventions and use the substituted funding for future years (subject to Chief Finance Officer agreement).	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E2	Inability of 3rd parties, in receipt of funding, to recover VAT from their projects could lead to an increase in the funding requirement and additional cost for the Council	Projects business cases may rely on VAT being recovered to make them viable. If non VAT registered organisations receive funding there may be an up to 20% increase in the project cost.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Early engagement with finance and external tax advice. Restructure the deal to reduce tax burden for example the council undertake work on their behalf (dependent on the risk profile).	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E3	Unexpected tax liabilities within projects leading to breaching the partial exemption limit on VAT	Projects business cases may rely on VAT partial exemption limit to make them viable. Failure to consider will increase the cost of projects and effect the viability.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Early engagement with finance and external tax advice.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E4	Failure to consider alignment of benefits and dependencies from other funded schemes	Funding could contribute to meeting outputs and outcomes of UKSPF	Remote	Moderate	3	Remote	Moderate	3			Ensure that all other funding sources and projects are identified and considered at FBC stage.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E5	Failure to finalise outputs and outcomes for a number of projects	The Council may over estimate its ability to deliver the outputs and outcomes it submitted as part of its Investment Plan leading to reputational damage with central government for failing to deliver. Government may withhold or delay payments for future years leading to a shortfall of funding for projects.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			There are currently a number of projects where the outputs and outcomes have not been fully defined. This work needs to be completed as part of the FBC or the Council accepts that this will require further work post FBC. Government guidance allows for amendments.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E6	We cannot demonstrate a positive value for money case for one or more interventions	Lack of confidence or evidence base around likely outcomes may lead to a low projected benefit, which in turn would question the viability and VFM for an intervention	Possible	Minor	6	Possible	Minor	6			Early exercise to identify measurable outcomes from each scheme linked through to ways benefits can be calculated Early development of a benefit / cost tool with some indicative numbers to check likely impact.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E7	Cost inflation (particularly construction inflation) rising at levels higher than planned in bid	Intended propositions being unable to be delivered within indicative funding envelopes	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Cost re-engineering Look at scope reduction Find additional match funding (including increasing Council ask)	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
Sociological														
S1	Equalities impacts are not considered sufficiently and not embedded into projects.	Reputational impact on Council, requirement to rework projects leading to a time and cost delay.	Remote	Moderate	3	Remote	Moderate	3			Undertake Equality Impact Assessments and keep under review to ensure still relevant.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
S2	Data used to make investment plan decisions on interventions are out of date or no longer valid.	Incorrect decisions made on choice of projects to deliver interventions in business case due to new data being released through for example the 20202 census .	Possible	Minor	6	Possible	Minor	6	WLDC officers to be ID for each of 3 BC	WLDC teams to confirm that information is still valid or ID any changes that would affect the business case. Accept that new data will emerge throughout the Investment Plan but commit to agreed business cases to ensure delivery by March 2025.	16-Sep-22	LIVE		

Risk Number	Risk Description	Environmental Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Target Risk Rating			Risk Owner	Action Owner	Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
			LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	Risk Rating	Target LIKELIHOOD rating	Target IMPACT Rating	Target Risk Rating						
S3	Lack of In house capacity and capability to provide information to develop business cases	Failure to deliver information to complete business cases and gain subsequent internal approval, leading to issues of clawback and reputational damage with public and government.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	WLDC officers to be ID for each of 3 BC	Sally G-S to identify resources internally to support drafting of business cases and procure external advice or support as required	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
S4	Lack of evidence of wider stakeholder consultation on one or more key areas of business cases	Potential for objections at later stages of process, lobbying of / representations made to Councillors	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6			Development and review of consultation and communication plan	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
Technological														
T1	Lack of information on baseline data for outputs and outcomes on returns to government	Unable to show progress against agreed targets leading to potential for further funding not being released	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Ensure that a requirement of funding is that all recipients of funding are aware of requirement to baseline. Officers should follow the government guidance found in 'UK Shared Prosperity Fund: outputs and outcomes definitions (2)'. Potential baseline methods could include purchase of specialist information to baseline and monitor i.e. footfall counting	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
T2	Lack of clear methodology to monitor outputs and outcomes	Lack of consistency in monitoring across and within projects leading to inaccurate or misleading information being reported to government.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Ensure that a monitoring protocol is developed for projects. This will ensure the correct information is collected in a consistent way and the quality of information is monitored. Officers should follow the government guidance found in 'UK Shared Prosperity Fund: outputs and outcomes definitions (2)'. Identify individual/team responsibility to monitor progress in line with government guidance 'UK Shared Prosperity Fund: reporting and performance management (3)' Consider integrating into corporate performance monitoring framework.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
T3	Lack of monitoring of the data received against the outputs and outcomes	Unable to show progress against agreed targets leading to potential for further funding not being released	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Identify individual/team responsibility to monitor progress in line with government guidance 'UK Shared Prosperity Fund: reporting and performance management (3)' Consider integrating into corporate performance monitoring framework.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
Legal														
L1	Subsidy Control for specific projects/interventions is not identified and dealt with as programme is developed and delivered.	Failure to consider subsidy control will lead to the Council potentially using/allocating funding illegally leading to reputational damage and potential claw back	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	TBC	Legal advice sought to ensure that any projects or programmes are subsidy control compliant and follow the council's financial and legal guidance.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
L2	Failure to identify procedural issues which may delay completion of the FBC including: -restrictive covenants /wayleaves - securing planning permissions on sites - match funding criteria	Procedural issues may effect the outputs, outcomes, cost and timescales for the delivery of the projects leading to potential overspend, failing to deliver in the timescales and reputational damage to the council.	Remote	Major	4	Remote	Major	4	Sally Grindrod-Smith	TBC	Review of projects to identify any procedural issues that need to be considered and include and understand the risks associated with them.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
Environmental														
EV1	Failure to identify environmental issues at FBC stage that could effect deliver of projects, such as land contamination and flooding.	Increase cost to deal with issues and time delay. Project may become unviable leading to reputational damage with public and government.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Unlikely	Moderate	6			Undertake due diligence on projects to identify any issues that need to be considered. Review projects in light of findings to decide how to progress. Cost re-engineering / seek additional match funding	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
EV2	Projects fail to contribute to government's net zero target by 2050	Project delivery fails to consider and meet governments core requirements leading to reputational damage and the council not contributing to its own net zero carbon targets.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			NET zero is considered as a core component of the business case and is embedded in the individual projects. Consideration to be given to setting net zero criteria as part of any grant funding or capital works.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
EV3	Projects fail to contribute to government's nature recovery objectives (Rural England PF)	Project delivery fails to consider and meet governments core requirements leading to reputational damage and the council not contributing to the nature recovery agenda in its area.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Nature recovery is considered as a core component of any business case and is embedded in the individual projects. Consideration to be given to setting nature recovery objective criteria as part of any grant funding or capital works.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	