

Appendix 3 Programme Risk Register

Project:	UKSPF
Project lead:	Sally Grindrod-Smith
Last Updated:	30-Jan-23

Headers for each category of Risk should be considered:

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

Risk Number	Risk Description	Environmental	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Target Risk Rating			Risk Owner	Action Owner	Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
		Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	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	Moderate	9	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Position established through Investment Plan and reconfirmed through Management Case within FBC. Ensure members 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	The UKSPF programme does not align with emerging Corporate Plan.	Lack of coordination between strategies undermines basis for the investment plan.	Possible	Moderate	9	Remote	Negligible	1	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Ellen King	The Council's Corporate Plan 2019-2023 is currently being updated and redrafted. There is an opportunity to ensure that the challenges and goals identified through the Theory of Change process are reflected and strengthened in the new Corporate 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 acting unfairly and lacking transparency.	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	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	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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	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	
Economical														
E1	Investment Plan funding profile is very tight to spend and funding may not be spent in year, leading to a delay in release of funding in following years.	Programme slips and projects do not have sufficient time to be deliver 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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	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	Failure to consider alignment of benefits and dependencies from other funded schemes eg DEFRA schemes	Risk of duplicating funding available from other sources	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Ensure that all other funding sources and projects are identified and considered at FBC stage.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E3	Failure to allocate funding by 31st March 2025.	The Government claw back underspend at the end of the programme, leaving the Council with a potential shortfall in funding.	Possible	Major	12	Unlikely	Major	8	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Sense check project plans and grant applications to ensure that projects can be delivered to time and to budget. Close grant application period Q3 2024/25 with last grant fund allocation being made in Feb 2025 for Communitites and Place/ Business Support. Use UKSPF funding before match/Council funding. People ans Skills deadline December 2024 to ensure Skills providers have sufficient time to progress courses/support.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
E4	Delays to awards or lack of progress by organisations receiving grant funding	Leading to slippage in expenditure and timetable to meet outputs and outcomes	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Ensure robust grant process. Grant funding agreements will make it clear that slippage beyond 2024/5 will not be eligible for funding	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E5	Cost inflation (particularly construction inflation) rising at levels higher than planned in bid	Intended projects are unable to be delivered within indicative funding envelopes. The council is unable to demonstrate VfM, outputs and outcomes.	Likely	Major	16	Possible	Moderate	9	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	A reasonable expectation for level of inflation has been built in, with a suitable deflater for costs and benefits based upon latest OBR's inflation estimates. A sizeable optimism bias figure has been used in the overall benefit cost calculation too. Other options includes scope reduction, additional match funding (including increasing Council ask) and cost re-engineering.	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
E6	Grant receiving organisation fail to deliver on outputs and outcomes in the funding agreement	Council cannot demonstrate VfM, provide outputs and outcomes meet the requirements of MOU agreed with DLUHC	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Project delivered via the SLA/Contract will identify a contractual obligation to deliver programme outputs/outcomes. Although it is unlikely, business grant beneficiaries will be formally contracted to deliver outputs/outcomes (given the size of grant award), they will be obliged to report on any outputs/outcomes accrued via a grant contract reporting obligation. Ongoing reportin to DLUHC to identify early any likley issues	28-Nov-22	LIVE	
E7	Grant receiving organisation fail to comply with grant conditions (such as monitoring)	Council cannot demonstrate VfM, provide outputs and outcomes meet the requirements of MOU agreed with DLUHC	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Any organisation will be obliged to enforce compliance with grant reporting obligations (with 'mitigating factors' loop incorporated for legitimate non-compliance).	28-Nov-22	LIVE	
E8	Insufficient financial resources available to fund interventions through to completion	Grant recipients fail to deliver the scheme they are contracted to do as part of the grant agreement. The council unable to demonstrate VfM, outputs and outcomes.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			1) Develop a contractually binding grant agreement - with requirement for early notification if the recipient organisation considers itself unlikely to be able to deliver including the recipient's suggestions on how to rectify 2) WLDC to consider any amendments required in light of notifications in terms of impact on budget and overall outcomes through its monitoring and governance processes 3) Consider all available options to resolve - whether this is an increased contribution from the recipient, transferring budget that is yet to be allocated, seeking further alternative funding or relaxing outputs or outcomes to be delivered - if this leads to a material reduction in overall outcomes, write to Government to explain change and reasoning.	28-Nov-22	LIVE	
E9	Insufficient demand for grants from businesses and community groups.	Leading to the expected level of benefits being delayed or reduced.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Specific engagement with local suppliers and advertisement of grants will maximise uptake. Ongoing monitoring of applications and approvals; there will be the opportunity to change the area of coverage, grant criteria or reallocate funding if there is insufficient interest in the market.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	

Risk Number	Risk Description	Environmental	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Target Risk Rating			Risk Owner	Action Owner	Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
		Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	Risk Rating	Target LIKELIHOOD rating	Target IMPACT Rating	Target Risk Rating						
E10	Feasibility studies fail to attract future investment.	Leading to the expected level of benefits being delayed or reduced.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			Benefits have been estimated prudently and a large optimism bias element applied consistent with the early stages of project development. Feasibility is needed in these areas and in some cases investment may prove unfeasible. However, as much work as possible will be carried out in advance to seek to develop the most promising opportunities, to maximise the possibility of choosing the most viable options.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
E11	Successful Pilot Projects require on-going funding	On going demand on council resources as currently not funding past March 2025.	Likely	Moderate	12	Likely	Moderate	12			Communication that projects are pilots and for those projects with fixed-term staff contracts, additional funding will be required to sustain those positions. The pilots should produce evidence, which can then inform conversations with other stakeholders to gain funding.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
E12	Fraud risk; risk that grant schemes could be abused by fraudulent claims	Reputational damage to the council and reduced realisation of the expected outputs and outcomes.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Possible	Moderate	9			The Council will introduce a proportionate level of due diligence prior to any payments being made and periodically during duration of the programme. This will be in line with the mandatory due diligence checks required by the government in the Guidance for General Grants. Minimum Requirement Seven: Risk, Controls and Assurance	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
E13	External match funding is not secured	Leading to a shortfall in funding and potential to stop or reduce scope of project.	Possible	Moderate	9	Possible	Moderate	9			There are multiple sources (private sector and central Government) – additional funding from the other party can be sought should one source be unsuccessful. Plans for intervention and the anticipated grant funding agreement can be developed to cap WLDC's contribution to funding is has available (noting that this may reduce the planned outputs and outcomes if the funding available is lower than intended).	30-Dec-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	James Makinson-Sanders	James Makinson-Sanders	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	Unlikely	Minor	4	Ellen King	Business Case leads	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	
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	Remote	Moderate	3	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Business Case leads	Resources identified to lead each business case and each project intervention	16-Sep-22	LIVE	
S4	Failure to recruit to key roles	A lack of resource to deliver projects in a timely manner and meet the requirements of the submitted Investment Plan.	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Several projects require the recruitment of a staff member or the procurement of a third-party organisation. The Council will ensure the opportunity is widely promoted and develop an attractive proposal. Where this is unsuccessful alternative delivery options will be considered.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
S6	Lack of demand by skills training providers to offer pilots / new areas of provision for the expected subsidy being offered	Scope of project is reduced or redefined. Risk of delay in delivering the outcomes and outputs. DLUHC reduce funding for following year.	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Amanda Boutell	Amanda Boutell	There is already established set of providers and provision, so the areas of need and appetite to provide are well known locally. The grants criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow innovation to be proposed by training providers and allocations (within the overall funding envelope) to be set to maximise outcomes.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	
S6	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	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Ensure that a requirement of funding is that all recipients of funding are aware of requirement to baseline. The Council to invest into a range of solutions from surveys to purchase of data sets such as footfall. 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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	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)'.	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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	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	Sally Grindrod-Smith	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	
Environmental														
EV1	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	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	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	
EV2	Baselining and measuring environmental improvement may be challenging	The council unable to demonstrate VfM, outputs and outcomes.	Possible	Moderate	9	Unlikely	Moderate	6	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Sally Grindrod-Smith	Ensure that all bidders demonstrate the likely impact the funding will have upon environmental improvements within their organisation. Supplement this with dedicated monitoring and evaluation tools and support, learning from the practice employed through Levelling Up monitoring and evaluation approach.	30-Dec-22	LIVE	