

Governance and Audit Committee

29 July 2025

Subject: Quarter One Review of Strategic Risks 2025/26

Report by: Assistant Director People & Democratic Services

Contact Officer: Lisa Langdon

Assistant Director People & Democratic Services

Purpose / Summary: To present to Governance and Audit Committee

for review, the strategic risks facing the Council

as at June 2025

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Governance and Audit Committee 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: FIN5526MTVA

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 2015-2029

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	x

Summary of Strategic Risks – as at June 2025

Theme	Reference	Description	Owner
Our Council	CO1	Inability to set a sustainable Peter Davy	
		balanced budget for 2025/26	
	CO3	The quality of services do not meet customer expectations	Nova Roberts
	CO4	The Council is underprepared	Sally Grindrod-
	004	for the impact of extreme	Smith
		weather due to the change in	
		environmental conditions	
	CO5	Inability for the Council's	Lisa Langdon
		governance to support quality	
		decision making	
Our People	PE1	Inability to raise local	Sally Grindrod-
		educational attainment and	Smith
	DEC	skills levels	Cally Cally at 1
	PE2	Inadequate support is	Sally Grindrod- Smith
		provided for vulnerable groups and communities	SITIILIT
	PE3	Health and wellbeing of the	Sally Grindrod-
	1 23	District's residents does not	Smith
		improve.	
Our Place	PL1	The local housing market and	Sally Grindrod-
		the Council's housing related	Smith
		services do not meet demand	
	PL2	The local economy does not	Sally Grindrod-
		grow sufficiently	Smith
	PL3	Insufficient action taken to	Nova Roberts
		create a cleaner and safer	
	PL4	district	Pachael Hughes
	PL4	Inability to deliver our Climate Change ambitions and not	Rachael Hughes
		deliver net zero carbon	
		emissions by 2050	
Overarching	OV1	Inability to maintain critical	Bill Cullen
		services and deal with	
		emergency events	
	OV2	ICT Security and Information	Nova Roberts
		Governance arrangements	
	0)/2	are ineffective (Parts A-D)	Neve Daharta
	OV3	Inability to maintain service	Nova Roberts
		delivery with the amount of change initiatives	
	OV4	Failure to comply with	Lisa Langdon
		legislation	Liou Larigaon
	OV5	Central Lincolnshire Local	Rachael Hughes
		Plan does not deliver land	
		required for sustainable	
		development to meet the	
		needs of residents,	
		businesses and communities	

Theme	Reference	Description	Owner
	OV6	Inability to deliver the	Bill Cullen
		Council's strategic priorities	
		(the Corporate Plan)	

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 Year End on 22 April 2025) with this being the reporting of quarter one for 2025/26.

2 Monitoring Arrangements

- 2.1 The strategic risks are presented to the Council's Management Team monthly for review with the latest being during June 2025. Each Strategic Risk is allocated an individual reference which relates back to the related theme within the Corporate Plan.
- 2.2 Management Team review each strategic risk to ensure they are monitored, mitigated, reviewed and updated to ensure that they remain sufficiently robust and consider any recommendations from Government and Audit Committee.
- 2.3 Since the last report in April 2025 there has been a number of changes of which were mostly to the commentary, current controls or actions needed. One change has been identified which is an amendment to the title and two are under new ownership.

Ref:	Strategic Risk	Change	Owner
CO3	The quality of services do not Amen		Nova Roberts
	meet realistic customer		
	expectations		
OV1	Inability to maintain critical	New Owner	Bill Cullen
	services and deal with		
	emergency events		
OV6	Inability to deliver the	New Owner	Bill Cullen
	Council's strategic priorities		
	(the Corporate Plan)		

2.4 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
а	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 4 = Critical 3 = Major Impact Significant service disruption Total service loss for a Major/disabling injury significant period Financial loss >£500k - £1m Fatality to employee, service user or other Adverse national media Financial loss >£1m coverage 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 Management Strategy (2025-2029) sets out the requirement for risk owners to score the current (residual) risk and the target risk once mitigations have been applied.
- 3.5 According to the risk matrix the current risks have been mapped to allow for an insight into how our strategic risks are positioned against this risk

matrix. From the table below, the strategic risks have all been referenced according to how they appear in the Strategic Risk Register. The below table allows us to holistically review our risks and easily identify risks outside tolerance.

			Likeli	ihood	
		Hardly	Possible	Probable	Almost
		Ever - 1	- 2	- 3	Certain -
					4
	Critical -	PL4	CO1		
	4	OV2a	PL3		
			OV2b		
			OV2c		
			OV2d		
			OV3		
t			OV4		
Impact	Major - 3		CO3	PE1	OV6
<u>=</u>			CO4	PE2	
			CO5	PE3	
			OV1	PL1	
			OV5	PL2	
	Minor - 2				
	Negligible				
	- 1				

3.6 To show how mitigations and controls are impacting the scores of risks, the direction of travel is included in Appendix One for each Strategic Risk compared to the last quarter excluding the new risk. As a summary the following table highlights how many residual risk scores have improved, stayed the same or deteriorated since year end 2024/25.

↑ Improved	0
= Stayed the same	20
↓ Deteriorated	0

4. Emerging Risks

4.1 As part of the development of the Strategic Risks, it is important to highlight what areas may need to be considered for future risks. These areas are highlighted below and will be reviewed as part of an overall corporate planning process.

Emerging areas for consideration:
Mayoral County Combined Authority
White Paper on re-organisation
Planning Reform

5. Recommendation

5.1 Governance and Audit Committee 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?