



A place to start,
to stay, to grow!

Staveley Town Deal Programme Strategic Risk Register

Risk ref	Risk description	Risk area	Risk effect	Existing controls to mitigate the risk	Current risk rating			Further mitigating action identified and dates for completion	Target risk rating			Risk lead
					Likelihood	Impact	Risk rating		Likelihood	Impact	Risk rating	
1	Resources for developing and delivering the programme are unable to meet the demands and expectations from partners and/or government. To include the risk of staff leaving/retention towards the end of the programme	Resources	Programme fails to deliver planned outputs and outcomes; programme fails to draw down maximum funding on offer	Allocation of funding from Towns Fund towards programme resources with further allocation made by CBC; dedicated resources and budgets to be put in place	4	5	20	Recruitment into Core Town Deal Team – complete by September 2021 Regular review of resource implications at Town Deal Programme Board - ongoing	2	5	10	LS
2	Failure to comply with government guidance	Legal/reputational	Programme delivery is delayed and/or placed under increased scrutiny; potential for funding to be withheld or withdrawn	Assurance framework drafted to ensure the local processes and decision making is compliant	3	5	15	Utilise the lines of assurance in the framework to check compliance, in particular the Town Deal Programme Board should play an active role	2	5	10	LW
3	The collective project funding ask exceeds the programme and match funding available	Financial	Projects approved by the Board within the Town Investment Plan cannot all go ahead; negative reputational impact and impact on communities supporting the projects	Proposals set out for Staveley Town Deal Board on managing the current over-programming; business case development process to include consideration of 5-10% funding reductions	4	4	16	Development of proposals to deal with continued over-programming – by July 2021; Town Deal Programme Board to ensure that business cases undertake sufficient sensitivity tests; consideration of alternative match funding strategies	3	3	9	LW
4	Project sponsors are unable to develop compliant business cases within the 12 month window	Reputational	Programme at risk of underspend; communities disappointed if anticipated projects are not delivered	Bid for capacity funding successful and plan for it utilisation approved including direct support for project sponsors; timeline for development of cases under construction to allow regular monitoring	4	4	16	Ensure that capacity funding is effectively deployed; closely monitor and stay in touch with project sponsors; develop alternatives for utilising any programme underspend if projects cannot be delivered – by July 2021	3	3	9	LW

ITEM 6

5	Programme development is disrupted by new policy priorities and/or further impacts from the pandemic	Resources	Delays to development of business cases and approval processes, leading to loss of funding	Systems in place for conducting business during pandemic; regular dialogue with HMG in place to mitigate risk of new policy priorities; MPs engaged at Town Deal Board	3	4	12	Ensure that sound programme management disciplines in place to mitigate slippage in development; reallocate resources if required to ensure programme does not lose the allocated funding	2	3	6	LS
6	CBC's role as accountable body and the pressure the Town Deal will put on other teams (legal/finance/comms)	Resources	Delays in business case assessment and approval, leading to loss of funding	Internal Programme Board established with key internal stakeholders represented, who are briefed on workload and upcoming calls on time/resources	2	3	6	Regular meetings of Internal Programme Board are set for the year.	2	2	4	LJW
7	Failure to procure specialist advice/support – legal/external appraisal	Resources	Delays in business case assessment and approval, leading to loss of funding	Budget confirmed (capacity funding) Clear understanding of requirements around procurement to be developed. Explore collaboration with other Town Deal areas to make more attractive in market place	2	3	6	Explore using Framework to call off, to be identified	2	2	4	LJW
8	Public perception should there be fallout from project sponsors impacting on programme if we fail to approve business cases/negative. Perceptions amongst local residents and partners/stakeholders.	Reputational	Programme at risk of underspend; communities disappointed if anticipated projects are not delivered	Established clear Governance arrangements for projects to work to. Provision of 121 support (CBC and ARUP) and regular Project Sponsor meetings to identify and address any weaknesses in business cases. Established Comms Group and Comms Protocol.	3	4	12	Continue to support projects, access advise to support business case development (through the capacity fund). Proactive delivery of Scheme and project level communications. Asking for early draft Business Case will help ensure quality of final submission.	2	3	6	LJW
9	Breakdown on relationships on Board/effectiveness of Board	Legal/reputational	Programme delivery is delayed and/or placed under increased scrutiny; potential for funding to be withheld or withdrawn	With regular meetings, clear TOR, briefings of Chair, external advice and support from CLG	2	2	4	Appropriate training, skills support for Board members to be provided if need identified	1	1	1	LJW/ IF
10	Risk of not securing and delivering TIP outputs and outcomes	Financial/reputational	Potential claw back of funding	Once contracted, ensure projects continue to focus on output delivery; should a project not proceed, TD Board will need to consider alternative options to delivery outputs/outcomes	2	3	6	Engagement “on the ground” to identify pipeline projects. Liaise with CLG regularly to notify of any such potential changes and explore contract variations.	2	2	4	LJW

ITEM 6

Notes

- The risks at this stage focus on the development of the programme. As it moves into delivery there will be further risks that will need to be identified and mitigated
- The existing council strategy states that impact should include consideration of financial impact and that where this is over 500k, the impact rating should be very high (5). This has informed the above scoring.
- Risk area has been interpreted as 'category' but a list of categories is not available with the template so this may need to be checked