

Governance and Audit Committee

23 January 2024

Subject: Quarter 3 Review of Strategic Risks 2023/24

Report by: Assistant Director People & Democratic Services

Contact Officer: Lisa Langdon

Assistant Director People & Democratic Services

Purpose / Summary: To present to the G&A Committee for review, the

strategic risks facing the Council as at

December 2023

RECOMMENDATION(S):

For G&A Committee:

Members are asked to review the register and to consider:

- Do any additional risks of a strategic nature exist?
- Are current controls and proposed actions sufficiently robust?

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None

(N.B.) Where there are legal implications the report MUST be seen by the MO

Financial: FIN/123/24

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

(N.B.) All committee reports MUST have a Fin Ref

Staffing: None

(N.B.) Where there are staffing implications the report MUST have a HR Ref

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights: None

Any changes to projects/services/policies would require their own EIA to be carried out.

Data Protection Implications: None

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities:

The Strategic Risk register records, monitors and mitigates the risks of the Council not achieving its Corporate Plan and statutory objectives. This has been taken into account within these Strategic Risks in line with the Corporate Plan 2023-27.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Considerations: None

Health Implications: None

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-council/how-the-council-works/key-plans-policies-and-strategies/risk-management/

Risk Management Strategy 2019-2023

Call in and Urgency:			
Is the decision one which Rule 14	.7 of the Scrut	iny Procedure	Rules
i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)	Yes	No	x
Key Decision:			
•		No	

Summary of Strategic Risks – as at December 2023

Theme	Description	Owner
Our Council	Inability to set a	Emma Foy
	sustainable balanced	,
	budget for 2024/25	
	Cost related to the	Emma Foy
	proposed asylum	j
	centre at Scampton has	
	an adverse impact on	
	financial sustainability	
	The quality of services	Ady Selby
	do not meet customer	-
	expectations	
	Inability for the	Lisa Langdon
	Council's governance	
	to support quality	
	decision making	
Our People	Inability to raise local	Sally Grindrod-Smith
- Ca. 1 33p.2	educational attainment	Can'y Crimaroa Crimar
	and skills levels	
	Inadequate support is	Sally Grindrod-Smith
	provided for vulnerable	Cany Crimaroa Crimar
	groups and	
	communities	
	Health and wellbeing of	Sally Grindrod-Smith
	the District's residents	Cany Crinaroa Crinar
	does not improve.	
Our Place	The local housing	Sally Grindrod-Smith
our riado	market and the	Cany Crimaroa Crimar
	Council's housing	
	related services do not	
	meet demand	
	The local economy	Sally Grindrod-Smith
	does not grow	Cany Crimaroa Crimar
	sufficiently	
	Insufficient action taken	Nova Roberts
	to create a cleaner and	
	safer district	
	Inability to deliver our	Rachael Hughes
	Climate Change	2.2
	ambitions and not	
	deliver net zero carbon	
	emissions by 2050	
Overarching	Inability to maintain	Ady Selby
	critical services and	- , ,
	deal with emergency	
	events	
	ICT Security and	Nova Roberts
	Information	
	Governance	
	Covernance	

arrangements are ineffective (Parts A-D)	
Inability to maintain service delivery with the amount of change initiatives	Nova Roberts
Failure to comply with legislation including Health and Safety matters	Lisa Langdon
Central Lincolnshire Local Plan does not deliver land required for sustainable development to meet the needs of residents, businesses and communities	Rachael Hughes

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Strategic risks are considered as being those faced by the Council that, if materialised, would adversely impact the delivery of corporate priorities.
- 1.2 This approach reflects the guidance provided by the Association of Local Authority Risk Managers (ALARM). This body advocates that strategic risks should focus on the long-term objectives of the organisation, which can be affected by areas such as financial concerns, political risks, legal and regulatory changes and changes in the physical environment.
- 1.3 The Governance and Audit Committee review the strategic risks on a quarterly basis. (Previously presented September 2023)

2 Monitoring Arrangements

- 2.1 The strategic risks are presented to the Council's Management Team monthly for review.
- 2.2 The Management Team review the risks, control measures and future actions to ensure that they remain sufficiently robust to mitigate the identified risks.
- 2.3 Where corrective action is required and/or additional risks are identified, the strategic risk register is updated accordingly.
- 2.4 Following the production and adoption of the Council's new Corporate Plan 2023-2027, there will be a meeting held with Councillors in January to undertake a review of the Strategic Risk Register.
- 2.5 Since the last report in September 2023 there has been a number of changes. Most changes are to the commentary, current controls or actions needed. However, where changes have affected the score or it is a new risk these are noted below:

Strategic Risk	Change	Owner
ICT Security and	Split into 4 parts to	Nova Roberts
Information	highlight the	
Governance	differences according	
arrangements are	to the NCSC 10	
ineffective	steps of Cyber	
	Security following on	
	from a	
	recommendation	
	from within the Cyber	
	Security Audit	

2.6 The full detailed list of strategic risks are presented in Appendix One.

3. Risk Matrix

3.1 To assess the severity of potential risks, the Council uses the following matrix based on the relationship between the likelihood and impact of risks arising.

I	Critical	4	8	12	16
m	Major	3	6	9	12
р	Minor	2	4	6	8
a	Negligible	1	2	3	4
С	_	Hardly Ever	Possible	Probable	Almost Certain
t	Likelihood				

3.2 The following guidance is available to determine which classification is applied:

You should assign a number in the range 1-4 as follows:		
Likelihood:		
1 = Hardly Ever (<5%)		
2= Possible (5-35%)		
3= Probable (35-75%)		
4= Almost Certain (>75%)		
1 = Negligible Impact: 2 = Minor Impact		
Minor service disruption	 Service disruption 	
Minor Injury	Loss time injury	
 Financial loss < £250k 	 Financial loss >£250k - 	
 Isolated complaints 	£500k	
·	 Adverse local media 	
	coverage	
	Failure to achieve a service	
	plan objective	
3 = Major Impact	4 = Critical	
 Significant service disruption 	 Total service loss for a 	
 Major/disabling injury 	significant period	
 Financial loss >£500k - £1m 	 Fatality to employee, service 	
 Adverse national media 	user or other	
coverage	 Financial loss >£1m 	
Failure to achieve Corporate	 Ministerial intervention in 	
Plan objective	running service	

- 3.3 This methodology enables each risk to be categorised as either low, medium or high in nature and prioritisation as regards mitigations can be applied.
- 3.4 Using the methodology, the Council's Risk Strategy (2019-2023) sets out the requirement for risk owners to score the current (inherent) risk and the target (residual) risk once mitigations have been applied.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to review the register and to consider:

 - Do any additional risks of a strategic nature exist? Are current controls and proposed actions sufficiently robust?