

## **Strategic Risk Register**

**Report Author(s):** Helen Hall  
Performance Lead  
01508 533633  
[Helen.Hall@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk](mailto:Helen.Hall@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk)

**Portfolio:** Leader - Policy

**Ward(s) Affected:** None

### **Purpose of the Report:**

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the current position of the Strategic Risk Register for Broadland District Council.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Review and note the Strategic Risk Register for the Council.

## **1 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report provides the committee with an update and overview of the current position in terms of strategic risk for Broadland District Council.

## **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Risk Management Policy sets out the approach for the Council in terms of how it will identify, manage, reduce and mitigate risks of all levels to the organisation.
- 2.2 To facilitate the management of risk throughout the organisation, the Council maintains a system of risk registers. The risks are identified through the Corporate Leadership Team's (CLT) assessment of the risks to the delivery of the Council's Strategic Plan and Delivery Plan. The Strategic Risk Register records the strategic risks faced by the Council. Attached to this report is the latest update of the Strategic Risk Register.
- 2.3 The Strategic Risk Register forms part of the Council's quarterly (reported formally to Cabinet in Q2, Q3 and Q4) performance, risk and finance reports. The Strategic Risk Register is a document which is reviewed on a regular basis and subject to change depending upon the current circumstances in which the Council is operating.
- 2.4 As set out in the Policy, Cabinet has ultimate responsibility for:
- Setting the culture for risk management at the Council
  - Approving the Policy
  - For developing and approving Risk Appetite
- 2.5 Detailed oversight of the risk management process is delegated to the Audit Committee, who are responsible for scrutinising the scope and effectiveness of the risk management systems in place.
- 2.6 In developing the Strategic Risk Register, CLT (including Assistant Directors in conjunction with Portfolio Holders) are responsible for identifying, evaluating and reporting on significant strategic risk faced by the Council. Strategic risks are risks that are significant in size, impact and duration and could impact on the performance of the Council as a whole. This may include operational risks escalated from particular services to the leadership level due to the potential scale of their impact.
- 2.7 Risks in the Strategic Risk Register are assessed for both their likelihood (on a scale of 1-5) and their impact if they were to happen (on a scale of 1-5), which are then combined to give each risk a severity score. Once all ongoing and planned mitigating actions are taken in consideration, each risk's "residual severity score" is recorded. The higher the severity score, the more significant the risk is.
- 2.8 Alongside the Strategic Risk Register, each directorate across the Council manages their Directorate Risk Registers. Directorate Risk Registers detail the

more operational risks to the organisation and are the responsibility of the Director and Assistant Directors in that directorate to manage. If a risk on a Directorate Risk Register scores a high severity score above our risk appetite as a Council, this will be escalated to the Strategic Risk Register and reported to Cabinet and the Committee. There is also support, guidance and templates on identifying and managing risk (including project risk) available on our internal intranets for staff.

### **3 CURRENT POSITION/FINDINGS**

- 3.1 CLT have reviewed and updated the Strategic Risk Register to ensure we are managing the risks effectively and that we are taking the right action to prevent the risk from escalating and ultimately reduce the risk where possible. As part of reviewing the register, CLT take into consideration:
- Whether risks are still relevant
  - Any emergent risks which have been identified
  - Whether the likelihood and impact of risks has changed
  - Whether controls which are in place are still effective
- 3.2 As part of our ongoing continuous improvements to the way we manage and report risk, CLT have reviewed the format of the strategic risk register and have now included columns showing Inherent Risk as well as Mitigated Risk. This is to support Members and Staff to fully understand the impact of our mitigating actions and to ensure that we are able to track progress of the risk through its lifecycle.
- 3.3 Inherent Risk - we will now be using the first risk score in the register to score the inherent risk to the organisation. This is the score which reflects the natural risk level in an environment where the risk has not been controlled or new/additional mitigating actions taken. This score can change over time if the inherent risk changes e.g. the external environment changes.
- 3.4 Mitigated Risk (current risk) score will be used to reflect how effective the mitigating actions have been on the inherent risk. This score should be lower than the inherent risk if the mitigating actions are effective.
- 3.5 Since the risk register was last seen by the committee, no new strategic risks have been identified.
- 3.6 Two strategic risks have had their scores reduced. These are:
- BDCM4: Ambitions in the Delivery Plan do not match the capacity of the organisation - The likelihood of occurrence has reduced as we begin to progress the mitigating actions owned by the Project Management Office.
  - BDCP3: Implications arising from the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy and the Environment Act 2021 - In October the Government published the response to the Consistency in Collections consultation which included that Local Authorities could continue to charge for garden waste collections, and from April 2026 all Local Authorities will receive revenue funding to meet the cost of providing a weekly food waste service. This has reduced the likelihood and impact scores of this risk.

3.7 The below heatmap provides an overview of the current risk register with the risks which are being managed at a strategic level. A full version of the Strategic Risk Register can be found in appendix 1, alongside a summary of the key changes to the risks since the last committee meeting.

Risk Scoring Matrix		1	2	3	4	5
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Significant	Severe
5	Expected					
4	Highly Likely				BDCP3 – Government's Waste Strategy (risk reduced)	BDCM5 – Cyber attack (no change)
3	Likely				BDCM2 – Reform and Devolution (no change) BDCM4 - One Team Capacity and Capability (risk reduced)	
2	Not Likely					BDCM1 – Financial (no change) BDCS13 – Housing demand (no change)
1	Rare					

#### 4 PROPOSED ACTION

4.1 The Strategic Risk Register, alongside the Directorate Risk Registers will continue to be managed and reviewed into the next quarter.

#### 5 OTHER OPTIONS

5.1 None.

#### 6 ISSUES AND RISKS

6.1 Any specific implications are captured in the individual risks listed in the Appendix.

6.2 **Resource Implications** – each risk has associated resources aligned to each action.

6.3 **Legal Implications** – no other implications.

6.4 **Equality Implications** – no other implications.

6.5 **Environmental Impact** – no other implications.

6.6 **Crime and Disorder** – no other implications.

6.7 **Risks** – captured in the appendix.

#### 7 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review and note the Strategic Risk Register update for the Council.

## **Appendix 3**

### **Broadland District Council – Strategic Risk Register**

**Last reviewed – January 2024**



## Broadland District Council – Strategic Risk Management

The risk appetite of the Council is outlined by a risk appetite statement as set out below:

***South Norfolk and Broadland are both dynamic, innovative and commercially minded Council's that empower staff to make well-rounded decisions and take proportionate risks within our boundaries based on intelligence, reason and insight, seizing opportunities to enhance the wellbeing of our communities, economy and staff, reimagining the role of local government.***

The statement outlines the Council's approach to risk appetite and is accompanied by a risk scoring matrix (see below) which indicates whether the combined risk likelihood and impact score is above the appetite of the Council. The appropriate approach for managing the risk is then highlighted depending on the combined score. There is a copy of the likelihood and impact matrix from our Risk Management Policy at the end of this report for reference.

Any risk with a combined score of 10-25 is outside the risk appetite and action must be taken to reduce the score down to an acceptable level to protect the achievement of the Council's strategic aims and objectives. The following pages of this report sets out the current Strategic Risks to the Council, their current risk scores and the actions being taken to reduce the scores.

Risk Scoring Matrix		1	2	3	4	5
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Significant	Severe
5	Expected	Medium 5	Medium 10	High 15	Very High 20	Very High 25
4	Highly Likely	Low 4	Medium 8	High 12	High 16	Very High 20
3	Likely	Low 3	Medium 6	Medium 9	High 12	High 15
2	Not Likely	Very Low 2	Low 4	Medium 6	Medium 8	Medium High 10
1	Rare	Very Low 1	Very Low 2	Low 3	Low 4	Medium 5
<b>Very High 20-25</b>		Risks scored here represent a severe threat to the delivery of the Council's objectives and service delivery and are outside of the risk appetite of the Council. Risks scored at this level should be treated as a priority and should either be reduced to a score within tolerance or removed. Reporting on progress will be required at Cabinet/Audit Committee and at CMLT until risk level is reduced to tolerance.				
<b>High/Medium High 10-16</b>		Risks scored here represent a significant threat to the delivery of the Council's objectives and service delivery and are outside the risk appetite. Action is required to reduce the rating to a score within tolerance. Reporting on progress is required at Cabinet/Audit Committee and CMLT until risk level is reduced to tolerance.				
<b>Medium 5-10</b>		Risks scored here represent a moderate threat to the delivery of the Council's objectives and service delivery and are within the risk appetite of the Council with some proportionate mitigation and regular monitoring required. These risks can be managed at operational/service level but regular management review of assurance on control effectiveness should occur. Routine reviews should also be carried out to ensure there is no change.				
<b>Low 3-4</b>		Risks here represent a minor threat to the delivery of the Council's objectives and service delivery and are within the risk appetite. Review required to ensure risk score does not change/increase, however these risks can be managed at operational/service level.				
<b>Very Low 1-2</b>		Risks scored here represent an insignificant threat to the delivery of the Council's objectives/service delivery and are within the risk appetite. No further action is required.				

## Key Changes to Strategic Risks

The most recent review of the of the strategic risk has generated the following changes:

Risk Ref	Risk Score Change	Risk description change	Risk consequence change	Risk mitigations change	Risk owner change	New Strategic Risk	Commentary
BDCM1							
BDCM2							
BDCM4	x		x	x			Risk and mitigated scores reduced. Mitigation action completed (mitigation 8) New mitigation action added (mitigation 10).
BDCM5				x			New mitigation added (mitigation 9)
BDCSI3							
BDCP3	x		x				Risk and mitigated risk score reduced

## Strategic Risk Register

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk			
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Annexe 2?	Comments and progress on actions
Moving with the times, working smartly and collaboratively	BDCM1	<p><b>Risk</b> - Ambitions in the Delivery Plan do not match the revenue and capital budgets.</p> <p><b>Consequence</b> - Failure to deliver the Delivery Plan set out at the start of the financial year.</p>	<p>Regular review and monitoring of the Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Medium Term Financial Plan budget process and scenario planning.</p> <p>Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) relationship building and liaison with key stakeholders such as central Government departments and professional bodies.</p> <p>Regular Horizon Scanning.</p> <p>Implementing Broadland/South Norfolk Collaboration.</p> <p>Quarterly review of performance and risks to the organisation.</p> <p>Active Membership of different groups such as the District Councils Network (DCN), Local Government Association (LGA), Rural Services Network (RSN) etc.</p>	3	5	15	Reduce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lobby government for adequate funding, acknowledging impact on costs &amp; demand of cost of living rises.</li> <li>2. Respond to Government Consultations to ensure any potential impact on the Council finances is conveyed to Government.</li> <li>3. Feed into any relevant networks e.g. Local Government Association and District Council Network to influence policy creation.</li> <li>4. Ensure local MP's are aware of the Council financial position and potential impact of any forthcoming Government policies as part of the regular MP briefings.</li> <li>5. Continued</li> </ol>	Assistant Director Finance	Cllr Steve Riley	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to Autumn budget</li> <li>2. As appropriate when consultations open</li> <li>3. As Appropriate</li> <li>4. At regular MP Briefings</li> <li>5. Monthly</li> <li>6. Quarterly</li> </ol>	2	5	10	No	<p><b>No change to the risk score - Provisional Settlement for 24/25 has provided a 3% increase in core spending power, but again this is only a one year settlement.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requirement to continue to lobby for a multi-year settlement in future &amp; recognition that cost of living rise will squeeze council budgets as both costs &amp; demand for services increase.</li> <li>2. As appropriate when consultations open.</li> <li>3. As appropriate.</li> <li>4. At regular MP Briefings.</li> <li>5. Monthly horizon scanning and policy reports are developed for CLT.</li> <li>6. Completed on a quarterly basis.</li> </ol>



Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)															Mitigated Risk	
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions
								regular horizon scanning and policy updates to Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) and management team to ensure we stay abreast of changes and are able to have influence. 6. Regular monitoring of our current position and reporting to Members.								
Moving with the times, working smartly and collaboratively	<b>BDCM2</b>	<p><b>Risk</b> - The Council fails to take advantage and act quickly and proactively on the opportunities of Local Government Reform, devolution and wider government policy.</p> <p><b>Consequence</b> - Failure to achieve potential for greater devolved funding and/or decision making to the region and the benefits this would bring for residents and</p>	<p>Regular Horizon Scanning.</p> <p>Active Membership of different groups such as the District Councils Network, Local Government Association, Rural Service Network etc</p> <p>Implementing Broadland/South Norfolk Collaboration.</p> <p>Quarterly review of performance and risks to the organisation.</p> <p>CLT relationship building and liaison with key stakeholders such as central Government departments and professional bodies.</p>	3	4	<b>12</b>	<b>Reduce</b>	<p><b>1. Review the outcomes of the Devolution White Paper when it is released</b></p> <p>2. Continued regular horizon scanning and policy updates to CLT, management team and Members to ensure we stay abreast of changes and are able to have influence.</p> <p>3. Lobby MPs on specific policy issues and the implications for our residents.</p> <p>4. Work with our partners where</p>	<b>Director of Resources</b>	<b>Cllr Susan Holland</b>	<p><b>1. Expected in Autumn 2021</b></p> <p>2. Monthly</p> <p>3. As appropriate</p> <p>4. As appropriate</p> <p><b>5. April 2023</b></p>	3	4	<b>12</b>	<b>No</b>	<p><b>No change to the risk score</b></p> <p>2. Regular policy updates are presented to CLT and the wider organisation to ensure we stay abreast of key changes. A monthly horizon scanning report is produced for CLT and the Strategy Team attends Directorate meetings on a regular basis to provide an overview of recent policy updates.</p> <p>3. This is ongoing and done as appropriate, with MPs briefed on the levelling up option that would be favoured as Districts to deliver the best outcome for our residents.</p> <p>4. This is ongoing and done as appropriate.</p>

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk			
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions
		businesses in our area.						appropriate to present a collaborative response to political changes. <b>5. Respond to the Deal for Norfolk consultation</b>								
Moving with the times, working smartly and collaboratively	<b>BDCM4</b>	<p><b>Risk</b> - Ambitions in the Delivery Plan do not match the capacity and capability of the organisation.</p> <p><b>Consequence</b> - Failure to deliver the Delivery Plan set out at the start of the financial year.</p>	<p>Four-year Strategic Plan developed and in place which sets out the ambitions for the Council over the coming years.</p> <p>Delivery Plan for the Council developed and in place which sets out the detailed projects and Business as usual for the Council in the coming year to 2024.</p> <p>Management/Leadership Training and Development in progress.</p> <p>Regular Budget Monitoring.</p> <p>Project Management Office in place with the core purpose of aligning Transformation projects in the pipeline and resource for delivery</p>	4	4	<b>16</b>	<b>Reduce</b>	<p>1. Identification and management of known resource issues across the organisation (e.g. procurement)</p> <p>2. Scope and develop a talent management programme.</p> <p>3. Build our own talent - Develop projects to consider our use and opportunities of apprenticeships, internships, career placement, graduates etc.</p> <p><b>4. Implement successful recruitment campaigns particularly in service areas where there are specific needs for skills which are hard to recruit to or shortage of</b></p>	<p><b>1 - CLT</b></p> <p><b>2 - 4 Chief of Staff</b></p> <p><b>5 - Director of Resources</b></p> <p><b>6 - 7 - Chief of Staff</b></p> <p><b>8 - 9 – 10 Assistant Director ICT/Digital and Transformation</b></p>	<b>CIlr Dan Roper</b>	<p>1. Throughout the Delivery Plan period (2020-2024)</p> <p>2 and 3. Throughout the Delivery Plan period (2020-2024)</p> <p><b>4. April 2022 - March 2023</b></p> <p>5. Ongoing and now a part of business as usual</p> <p>6. September 2023</p> <p>7. Throughout the Delivery Plan period (2020-2024)</p> <p><b>8. Throughout the Delivery Plan period (2020-2024)</b></p> <p><b>9. Starting to widen approach 2023/24</b></p> <p><b>10. Integrated approach defined and implemented by Q1 24/25</b></p>	4	4	<b>12</b>	<b>No</b>	<p><b>Risk reduced</b></p> <p>1. The procurement team is now more stable, and progress has been made in ensuring the contracts register is up to date and advice is provided promptly. However, there is still further work to do to ensure consistency of advice. Other areas currently being reviewed for resources are those associated with capital programmes, mainly SNC projects. Improvements are also being made to business cases to ensure we have the right capacity and capability to take forward key initiatives i.e. capitalisation of Project Manager for HR &amp; Payroll system.</p> <p>2. Ongoing</p> <p>3. Ongoing, now BAU</p> <p>5. The portfolio approach has been established for transformation governance providing greater viability over project and programme delivery and is being rolled out to other portfolios.</p> <p>6. Ongoing, now BAU</p> <p>7. Still work in progress, focus is currently on the implementation of the new HR &amp; Payroll system which will result in our own data being better and timelier, we can</p>

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk				
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions	
								<p>resource available (e.g. nationally). Agile Working Policy enables a broader approach to recruitment</p> <p>5. Additional financial monitoring of key projects.</p> <p>6. Delivery of agile working approach and cultural shift to better attract and retain talent.</p> <p>7. Local authority benchmarking across the region and wider to ensure pay and benefits on a role specific basis remain comparable and competitive.</p> <p>8. Track and monitor external Project Management resource volumes deployed to deliver projects and where appropriate employ resource to align with project pipeline demonstrating better value for</p>									<p>then look to pick up the benchmarking again.</p> <p>9. Transformation portfolio is in operation, the final portfolio and its underpinning boards are currently being finalised.</p> <p>10. In progress</p>

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk			
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions
								money. 9. Starting to widen approach defined and implemented by Q1 24/25. 10. Further integrate the budget setting and planning								
Moving with the times, working smartly and collaboratively	<b>BDCM5</b>	<p><b>Risk</b> - National Cyber Security Centre has advised of a heightened cyber threat for UK organisations due to the volatile situation in Ukraine and the potential for state-sponsored attacks on NATO members, which includes the UK.</p> <p><b>Consequence</b> - A successful cyber-attack could render the ICT infrastructure and line of business systems unusable for a protracted period of time, significantly impacting the Council's ability to function result in a significant</p>	<p>Geo-blocking of traffic originating from black-listed countries.</p> <p>Timely application of security updates to all software and firmware</p> <p>Ensuring Anti-Virus software updated and functioning</p> <p>Monitoring of adherence to security policy ensuring there are no exceptions</p> <p>Ringfenced £125,000 from the Future Councils funding to dedicate to improving our approach to cyber security and to implementing the actions resulting from the Cyber Assessment Framework.</p>	5	5	<b>25</b>	<b>Reduce</b>	<p>1. Ensure the effectiveness of the Controls - commission a third-party review of the Council's security posture</p> <p>2. Review the organisation structure to ensure clear accountability for the effective implementation of security controls and the day to day monitoring and management of security events</p> <p>3. Raise awareness of the risk of cyber-attack with the business and the importance of adhering to the security policy</p> <p>4. Ensure ICT staff adequately trained and skilled to apply security control</p>	<b>Assistant Director ICT/Digital and Transformation</b>	<b>Cllr Dan Roper</b>	1. Ongoing, annual requirement 2. Ongoing 3. Ongoing 4. Ongoing 5. Ongoing requirement 6. Roll out expected Sep/Oct 23 7. Recommendation output expected December 23 8. Implementation 23/24 from Q4 9. Q1 24/25	4	5	<b>20</b>	<b>No</b>	<p><b>No change to risk score</b></p> <p>1. Cyber Assessment Framework is underway now due for December completion</p> <p>2. CISO role recruited this action is complete the review of monitoring tool is underway and will be part of action 8.</p> <p>3. No update this will be a direct output of the CAF</p> <p>4. IT have planned several training sessions with Norfolk &amp; Suffolk Police Cyber Protect Team to be held in Q3 23/24 to practice scenarios and planning scenarios should the Council be subject to a cyber-attack. However, this does not directly influence the mitigated score as it is in relation to dealing with an incident should it occur.</p> <p>5. as above - no update</p> <p>6. The implementation of this training programme is dependent on the outputs of the Cyber Assessment Framework (CAF) results. These results will be used to inform the training programme based on the identified areas of development.</p> <p>7. The CAF process is being led by a third party in which there has been a delay to the timescale</p>

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk				
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions	
		financial impact to the business.						and manage security events 5. Ensure Members are aware of Cyber-security risks through the completion of Skills Gate 6. Review and implement a bespoke Cyber Security awareness training package making it an annual requirement delivered to all Council staff and members to improve the organisations Cyber security culture. 7. Undertake the NCSC Cyber Assessment Framework to identify any gaps to the NCSC LG profile. 8. Review and consider any further monitoring tools required to prevent and reduce the risk of Cyber Security events. <b>9. Seek cyber insurance</b>									of the outputs of this report. The roll out of this will be delayed coinciding with receipt of the CAF results expected December 8. As above - action 7 <b>9. In progress</b>

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)									Mitigated Risk		
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions	
Supporting individuals and empowering communities	BDCS13	<p><b>Risk</b> - There is insufficient affordable private housing and insufficient social housing supply, and access to temporary accommodation to meet the homelessness needs of our residents.</p> <p><b>Consequence</b> - The Council is unable to provide sustainable housing options which results in greater numbers in temporary accommodation. This will result in increased costs and poorer outcomes for vulnerable residents.</p>	<p>Well managed allocation policy, and clear banding guidelines.</p> <p>Online form to allow early access to support, including linking to help hub infrastructure.</p> <p>Current team resources in place and funded. Ukraine and cost of living programmes established and working well</p> <p>Housing enablement partnership in place to consider options to increase additional stock.</p>	4	5	20	Reduce	<p>1. Maintain current staff resource levels, which is being worked through in customer journey report.</p> <p>2. Additional funding to provide temporary accommodation to ensure adequate emergency options are available to residents</p> <p>3. Temporary Accommodation review looking at future housing options including buying more property which will offset longer term costs.</p> <p>4. More strategic approach to future housing strategy and delivery, including being confident to explore new and different options.</p> <p>5. Manage housing register more closely to reflect reality and demand alongside</p>	Assistant Director of Individuals and Families	Cllr Natasha Harpley	<p>1. Staff resource in place until 2024</p> <p>2. In place from Oct 2022</p> <p>3. Report</p> <p>4. Ongoing</p> <p>5. Ongoing.</p> <p>6. Ongoing.</p> <p>7. Ongoing.</p> <p>8. By 31 Mar 24</p>	2	5	10	No	<p><b>No change to risk score</b></p> <p>Temporary accommodation has been purchased. A cost of living policy report is being prepared for March 2024 to understand the future needs of residents to inform policy.</p>	



						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)									Mitigated Risk		
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions	
								support. 6. Long term move on plan for Ukraine residents in place. 7. Cost of living demand monitored. 8. Purchase of LAHF properties (potential risk that available properties does not meet Govt funding timelines)									
Protecting and improving our natural and built environment, whilst maximising quality of life / Growing the Economy	<b>BDC P3</b>	<p><b>Risk -</b> Implications arising from the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy and the Environment Act 2021</p> <p><b>Consequence -</b> Requirement for significant changes to service delivery, increased costs and loss of income</p>	Currently there is very little clarity from the Government on the precise details, timelines or funding that will be provided or income that could be lost following the introduction of the Deposit Return Scheme, Extended Producer responsibilities and Consistency of Collections. Officers continue to attend Defra Webinars and are undertaking scenario planning.	5	5	<b>25</b>	Reduce	1. Lobby government for adequate funding for the implementation of the proposed changes. 2. Respond to Government Consultations to ensure sufficient time and funding is provided to implement the changes. 3. Feed into any relevant networks e.g. LGA and DCN to influence policy direction and implementation. 4. Ensure local MPs are aware of the financial and service implications.	<b>Assistant Director Community Services</b>	<b>Cllr Jan Davis</b>	Ongoing	5	4	<b>16</b>	<b>No</b>	<p><b>Risk score reduced</b></p> <p>1-6 Officers continue to attend Defra workshops on the proposals. All information on Waste Data Flow has been updated and a benchmarking exercise has been undertaken for the Council by WRAP.</p>	

						Inherent Risk (if no further action taken)							Mitigated Risk			
Objective	Ref	Risk description	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Risk Response	Planned mitigating actions	Risk Owner	Portfolio Holder	Delivery timescales	Likelihood	Impact	Severity score	Within Risk Appetite?	Comments and progress on actions
								5. Ensure the necessary up to date information is fed into Waste Data Flow. 6. Undertake scenario for each planned service strand change to understand the potential implications.								

### De-escalated/closed risks in 23/24

Risk Ref	Reason risk was de-escalated/closed	Quarter risk was de-escalated/closed
BDCP2 - The inability to find Gypsy Traveller (G&T) sites to meet the need and enable the Greater Norwich Local Plan to be found sound	Mitigated risk score reduced due to positive progress against mitigating actions. To be managed at an operational level via the Place Directorate Risk Register	Q2
BDCP1 - Nutrients Neutrality advice impacts all planning decisions for overnight accommodations.	Mitigated risk score has reduced to reflect the recent Government announcement. This will be monitored closely as the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill makes its way through Parliament. To be managed at an operational level via the Place Directorate Risk Register	Q2
BDCM3 - The Council is unable to take advantage of the benefits and opportunities from collaborative working with South Norfolk Council and other key partners through autonomous policy decision-making.	Mitigated risk score has been within risk appetite for the past year. To be managed at an operational level via the Resources Directorate Risk Register	Q2

### Risk likelihood and impact matrix



<b>Likelihood Matrix</b>			
<b>Likelihood</b>		<b>Description</b>	<b>Timing</b>
<b>5</b>	<i>Expected</i>	<i>Risk event or circumstance is relatively certain to occur</i>	<i>More than once per year</i>
<b>4</b>	<i>Highly Likely</i>	<i>Risk event or circumstance is highly likely to occur</i>	<i>Once per year</i>
<b>3</b>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>The risk event or circumstance is more likely to occur than not</i>	<i>At least once between 1-5 years</i>
<b>2</b>	<i>Not likely</i>	<i>The risk event or circumstance is possible</i>	<i>At least once between 5-10 years</i>
<b>1</b>	<i>Rare</i>	<i>This will probably never happen</i>	<i>Probably within 10-15 years</i>

<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Impact Matrix</b>				
	<b>Insignificant</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Severe</b>
Financial loss	£0k - <£10k	£10k - <£25k	£25k - <100k	£100k - £500k	Over £500k
Service provision	Inconsequential disruption to a service.	Minimal disruption to Council activities/service.	Significant disruption to service delivery.	Significant disruption to large parts of the Council or suspension of service.	Service suspended long term.
Projects	Minor delay	Minor milestones missed	Significant milestones missed or delayed	Major milestones missed	Project will not achieve objectives and misses majority of milestones
Objectives	No effect	Some team objectives not met	Team objectives not met	Portfolio objectives not met	Strategic objectives not met
Health and Safety	Isolated incident/injury/illness. No lost time to injury days.	Minor injury or illness requiring medical treatment.	Threat of violence, serious injury or illness requiring medical attention.	Significant/extensive/multiple injury or illness, permanent or partial disability.	Fatality. Multiple major injuries/illness. Permanent total disability.
Staff Engagement	Isolated events of dissatisfaction	Some hostile relationships/minor non-co-operation	Hostile relationships. Major non-co-operation across the organisation	Industrial Action	Mass staff walkout/leaving
Reputational	Minor unfavourable social media coverage/attention	No media coverage. Minor letters of complaint	Adverse local media/social media coverage relating to conduct of leader or members or Council	Adverse national media exposure	Prolonged adverse national exposure
Statutory/Legal	Isolated non-compliance. Informal recommendation not followed up.	Non-compliance Warning received	Breach. Improvement Notice	Enforcement Action	Prosecution Fine Successful Judicial Review