

Appendix 3 Programme Risk Register

Project:	UKSPF
Project	Sally Grindrod-Smith
Last Up	26-Apr-24

Headers for each category of Risk should be considered:

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

Risk Number	Risk Description	Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
			LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	Risk Rating				
Political									
Economical									
E3	Failure to spend allocated funding by 31st March 2025	The Government claw back underspend at the end of the programme, leaving the Council with a potential risk of non-delivery of outputs and outcomes'	Possible	Moderate	9	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 Communities 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. Updates via programme board.	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	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.	Possible	Moderate	9	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 organisations 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	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 organisations 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	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	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	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	
E10	Feasibility studies fail to attract future investment.	Leading to the expected level of benefits being delayed or reduced.	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	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	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	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									

Risk Number	Risk Description	Environmental Description of Potential IMPACT (quantified wherever possible)	Prevailing Risk Ratings			Risk Responses	Date Added	Live/ Closed	Date Closed
			LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	Risk Rating				
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	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 .	Remote	Minor	2	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	
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	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.	Unlikely	Moderate	6	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	
S7	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	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	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	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	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	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.	Unlikely	Minor	4	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.	Unlikely	Minor	4	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	