

CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT - QUARTERLY UPDATE

Governance and Audit Committee 8th March 2023

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Report Author | Chris Blundell, Acting Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer |
| Portfolio Holder | Councillor Ashbee, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Performance and Risk |
| Status | For information |
| Classification: | Unrestricted |
| Key Decision | No |
| Ward: | All |

Executive Summary:

This report provides the Governance & Audit Committee with a quarterly review of corporate risks.

Recommendation(s):

To approve the review of corporate risks and discuss annexed risks

Corporate Implications

Financial and Value for Money

The way in which the council manages risks has a financial impact on the cost of insurance and self-insurance. The council maintains reserves including a risk reserve, the size of which is commensurate with the financial impact of current and future risks. There are no specific financial implications arising from this report.

It is the role and responsibility of the Section 151 Office to have active involvement in all material business decisions to ensure immediate and longer term implications, opportunities and risks are fully considered.

Legal

Whilst the corporate risk register includes consideration of legal matters in as far as they relate to risks to the council, there are no legal implications for the recommendation required by this report.

Corporate

Governance & Audit Committee approved the revised Risk Management Strategy on 27 July 2022, which includes a requirement to provide regular corporate risk updates to G&A Committee.

Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty

There are no equity and equalities implications arising directly from this report, but the council needs to retain a strong focus and understanding on issues of diversity amongst the local community and ensure service delivery matches these.

It is important to be aware of the council's responsibility under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and show evidence that due consideration has been given to the equalities impact that may be brought upon communities by the decisions made by council

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

This report relates to the following corporate priorities: -

- Growth
- Environment
- Communities.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Council monitors and manages its Corporate Risks through the Corporate Risk Register. The contents of the report highlight the high-priority corporate risks and show the arrangements in place to ensure these risks are monitored and managed appropriately. The Council is dedicated to a proactive methodology on Risk Management and interdepartmental cooperation on Risk Strategy to drive an improved and synergetic risk model and landscape.

2. Background and Current Progress

- 2.1. The strategy defines corporate risks as *'those which could impact across the whole council'*. Operational risks are identified from the 'bottom up', through service planning for the year ahead and through continuous review during the year. Operational risks may be escalated and considered Corporate level risks depending on the evaluation of the risk and through engagement with Senior Management.
- 2.2. The strategy prescribes that these risks should be assessed by the Corporate Management Team (CMT) and the Member Risk Management Champion and then reported to the Governance and Audit Committee (G&A) on a regular basis.
- 2.3. The Risk Management Strategy 2022 was approved at the G&A committee on the 27th July 2022. Consequently, the council is in the process of transitioning to operating under the new risk management strategy and our associated new way of monitoring, evaluating and reporting risk. Substantial progress has been made during

this risk reporting cycle, with nearly all of the service areas responding, representing a significant improvement on the previous reporting cycles.

- 2.4. As such, it is now possible to report our Corporate Risks to the committee in accordance with our updated Risk Management Strategy, This is most notably demonstrated in Annex 1, with the presentation of risks through the lens of Current / Emerging / Future risks from all service areas and their scoring which aligns to the risk matrix.
- 2.5. Future work will be taken in subsequent reporting to the committee to apply this framework to the High Scoring Corporate Risks shown at section 4 and also the addition of graphical illustration and tracking of risk scores.

3. Risk, Risk Management and Responsibilities

- 3.1. **What is risk** - Risk is defined as the uncertainty of outcome, whether positive opportunity or negative threat, of actions and events.

- 3.2. **Risk Management** -

Risk can be a threat (downside) or an opportunity (upside)

- 3.3. **Responsibilities**

A local authority's purpose is generally concerned with the delivery of service or with the delivery of a beneficial outcome in the public interest. The delivery of these objectives is surrounded by uncertainty which both poses threats to success and offers opportunity for increasing success.

- 3.4. **What risk management** - Risk Management was defined by the Audit Commission as:

*'Risk Management is the process by which risks are **identified, evaluated and controlled**. It is a key element of the framework of governance together with community focus, structures and processes, standards of conduct and service delivery arrangements'*

(Audit Commission)

The Government's [Orange Book](#) on risk management also states that:

Risk management shall be an essential part of governance and leadership, and fundamental to how the organisation is directed, managed and controlled at all levels.

Each public sector organisation should establish governance arrangements appropriate to its business, scale and culture

(Source Orange Book - Gov.co.uk)

3.5. Risk Evaluation

3.6. Risks have to be assessed in respect of the combination of the likelihood of something happening, and the impact which arises if it does actually happen. Risk management includes identifying and assessing risks and then responding to them. Risk is unavoidable, and every organisation needs to take action to manage risk in a way which it can justify to a level which is tolerable. The amount of risk which is judged to be tolerable and justifiable is the “risk appetite”.

3.7. The likelihood of a risk occurring is evaluated against the following criteria:

| Rating | Score | Likelihood |
|-------------|-------|--|
| Very Likely | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 85% chance of occurrence • Regular occurrence • Circumstances frequently encountered |
| Likely | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 65% chance of occurrence • Likely to occur within next 12 months • Circumstances have been encountered |
| Unlikely | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31%-65% chance of occurrence • Likely to happen within next 2 years • Circumstances occasionally encountered |
| Rare | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 30% chance of occurrence • Circumstances rarely encountered or never encountered before |

3.8. The possible impact on the council should the risk occur is then assessed across a range of categories. The risk score is determined by the highest scoring possible outcome against any of the risk headings.

| Headings | Reputation | Strategic | Wellbeing | Service Delivery | Finance | Compliance |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 4 Severe | Council receives nationally adverse publicity perceived as failing in a significant area of responsibility | Failure to deliver council priorities / services / major corporate project | Significant staff dissatisfaction / long term absence / increased staff turnover including key personnel | Loss of service for a significant period | Financial loss or overspend greater than £500k | Breach of law leading to some sanction Litigation almost certain with some / minimal defence |
| 3 Significant | Significant adverse local publicity | Possible impact on the delivery of council priorities | Declining staff dissatisfaction / loss of staff due to absence or turnover | Reduction in service performance / service disruption for 1 – 2 days | Financial loss or overspend between over £250k | Breach of regulation or responsibility or internal standard Litigation possible |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 2 Moderate | Minor impact on staff morale/public attitudes | Minor / adverse impact on Council priorities | Possible short-term staff dissatisfaction / likely impact on absence and turnover | Poor service / service disruption up to one day | Financial loss or overspend between £50k - £250k | Breach of internal procedure or policy Complaints likely |
| 1 Minor | Unlikely to cause adverse publicity | No significant impact on the delivery of Council priorities | Loss of staff morale but unlikely to result in absence or turnover of staff | No significant difficulty providing a service or delivery of a project | Financial loss or overspend under £50k | Minor breach of policy or internal procedure Complaints Unlikely |

3.9. The overall risk scores are then arrived at by multiplying the “likelihood” score by the “impact” score, where the maximum score for each is four, so the maximum total score is sixteen.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Likelihood | Very Likely (4) | Moderate (4) | High (8) | Extreme (12) | Extreme (16) |
| | Likely (3) | Low (3) | Moderate (6) | High (9) | Extreme (12) |
| | Unlikely (2) | Very low (2) | Low (4) | Moderate (6) | High (8) |
| | Rare (1) | Very low (1) | Very low (2) | Low (3) | Moderate (4) |
| | | Minor (1) | Moderate (2) | Significant (3) | Severe (4) |
| | Impact | | | | |

- 3.10. **Roles and responsibilities** - The primary member oversight on risk is provided by the Governance and Audit Committee. Cabinet also has a member Risk Champion (the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Performance and Risk) who promotes risk management and its benefits throughout the council.
- 3.11. At staff level, the high-level corporate risk register is regularly considered by the Corporate Management Team (CMT). G&A Committee considers changes to the corporate risk register, the reasons for the changes and the actions being taken to mitigate the likelihood and impact of those risks. A view is also taken regarding the extent to which the risks should be tolerated.
- 3.12. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Position Statement on Audit Committees (2018) sets out the key principles for audit committees operating in local government.
- 3.13. The statement sets out the key responsibilities of the committee to include:
- ‘consider the **effectiveness** of the authority’s **risk management arrangements** and the control environment, reviewing the risk profile of the organisation and **assurances that action is being taken** on risk-related issues, including partnerships and collaborations with other organisations’*
- 3.14. The report seeks to aid the committee to discharge these responsibilities.

4. Corporate risk register

- 4.1. A summary of the highest scoring corporate risks on the register is set out in the table and the following narrative below, together with the comparative scores noted by the Governance & Audit Committee on 28th september 2022
- 4.2. The scores are arrived at by multiplying the “likelihood” score by the “impact” score, where the maximum score for each is four, so the maximum total score is sixteen.

| Ref | Description | Nov 22 Score | Mar 23 Score | Change |
|--------|--|--------------|--------------|------------|
| CR-03 | Political Stewardship | 8 | 8 | |
| CR-12 | Cyber Attack | 16 | 16 | |
| CR-13 | Governance | 8 | 8 | |
| CR-01 | Limited Resources | 12 | 12 | |
| CR-17 | Inflation / Cost of living | 16 | 16 | |
| CR-09 | Economic Environment & Supply Chain | 12 | 12 | |
| QQ | Homelessness | 16 | 16 | |
| CR-14 | Berth 4/5 | 12 | 12 | |
| CR-11 | Covid-19 | 8 | 8 | |
| CR-15 | Environmental Act 2021 | 12 | 16 | Yes |
| CR-19 | EPC requirements | 12 | 12 | |
| CR-21 | Manston Road Depot Building and EA/CAR | 16 | 12 | Yes |
| CR- 22 | Net Zero Strategy | 16 | 16 | |

- 4.3. Each corporate risk is the responsibility of a member of CMT and they manage risk mitigation plans with the aim of reducing the likelihood and/or impact of each risk to a manageable level. As time moves on, the external environment changes and this can have an impact on the effectiveness of mitigating actions as well as on the likelihood and impact of a risk: hence the need to maintain vigilance in respect of mitigation plans as well as new and changing risks.
- 4.4. It is more difficult to take action to reduce the impact of a risk occurring, than it is to take action to reduce its likelihood. Hence in some cases, the scores after mitigation will remain relatively high.

5. Highest-scoring risks

5.1. Cyber Attack (Impact 4, Likelihood 4) Future risk

Reputation, Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

The Council is becoming more and more aware of cyber attacks across the local government sector.

At a time when some staff are working from home and on a hybrid basis, a much higher reliance on IT systems is needed and therefore the risk of disruption to Council services as a result of a Cyber attack is heightened.

The Council is mitigating the impact of any potential attack by ensuring IT systems are as robust as possible, but as we've seen globally, even the larger international companies are still susceptible to attack.

The Council did consider Cyber insurance as an mitigating action to protect itself against the financial impact that could be caused by such an event. Unfortunately the cyber market is now not conducive to our risk profile.

With that in mind officers have been liaising with our risk management partners through our insurers and are exploring other risk management solutions with them in lieu of Cyber Insurance.

Ransomware is one of the largest digital risks facing the authority and as such it has become increasingly important to protect our data and have readily available access to offline copies. To facilitate this the Head of ICT led a backup replacement project across the partnership, utilising £350,000 funding from the DLUHC to implement the new back up system, which is now in place and live.

The MHCLG made this funding available following post-incident reviews of cyber attacks against local government organisations. During some attacks backups were deleted to prevent their use, making it harder to avoid paying any ransom. Mitigating this change in tactics, for many councils, required a substantial investment in 'Offline' technology. The designed solution will install an identical set of backup appliances in each of three geographic locations.

The security team within ICT continues to monitor vulnerabilities and these are reported within the report provided to the Corporate Information Governance Group (CIGG). Compliance tickets are raised and monitored to ensure that out of date devices and software are dealt with.

Regular meetings have now started with the EKS Security Team and the council to review security risks and to discuss digital projects and preventative measures to be put in place for the authority.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Head of ICT (EKS)

5.2. **Limited Resources (Impact 4, Likelihood 3) Current/Emerging/Future**

Strategic, Financial Risk Score 4

The high score for Limited Resources reflects the fact that it is one of the few risks that could result in the council losing control of its own destiny.

As in prior years this means that the Council is restricted to setting a meaningful budget for only one year and although scenarios can be put forward through the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), a budget position can not be guaranteed due to the various factors outside of the Council's control.

To mitigate this risk the Council undertakes a rigorous approach to budget setting, exploring a wide range of opportunities to minimise spending pressures and maximise our income streams. For the 2023/24 budget setting process this has included the addition of a Star Chamber process, where Service Directors have been required to articulate and justify their budgetary requirements to a panel comprising the Leader, the Portfolio Holder for Finance and the Chief Executive and s151 Officer. This process will inform the shape and substance of next year's budget adjustments. In addition, the cross-party Fees and Charges Cabinet Advisory Group has reconvened again this year and will advise Cabinet of the proposed changes to fees and charges for 2023/24.

Due to the changing nature and composition of Local Government funding, authorities are becoming increasingly reliant on locally raised sources of funding such as Council Tax and Fees and Charges. Therefore, to mitigate the risk of 'Limited Financial Resources' and enhance our long-term financial sustainability and resilience, it is the view of the section 151 officer that it is essential to optimise these local raised income streams, whilst also considering the affordability constraints of our residents and service users.

In addition, the council has a range of budgetary controls in place to manage spending pressures in-year, including regular reporting of spending forecasts to the Corporate Management Team and Cabinet.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Deputy Chief Executive & s151 Officer

5.3. **Inflation/Cost Of Living (Impact 4, Likelihood 4) Current/Emerging/Future**

Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

The UK economy continues to experience inflationary pressures, with the Consumer Price Index rising even further and hitting a 11.1% 40 year high in November 2022.

This has an impact on all items of goods and services that the council has to purchase and consequently presents a risk of overspending against a number of budget headings. Wherever possible this is being managed within the confines of existing approved budgets, but inflationary pressures will be one of the key budgetary constraints to delivering a balanced budget for 2023/24.

This is particularly prevalent in the construction industry and could lead to a rationalisation of some of our capital projects, to ensure they are delivered within budget, or the potential for significant overspends.

The cost of living crisis is a significant issue for both the Council and all Thanet residents. The effect of the cost of living is likely to force more households to be homeless (see Homelessness risk below), force more into fuel poverty and have a direct impact on jobs in leisure/retail with households having less disposable income. The council continues to provide financial support and advice to residents where it can, for example via the administration of government funding (e.g. Household Support Fund, Council Tax Energy Rebate) or the provision of tools and information regarding [benefit entitlement](#) on our website and information channels.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Deputy Chief Executive & s151 Officer

5.4. Economic Environment & Supply Chain (Impact 3, Likelihood 4) Current/Emerging/Future

Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

A combination of the EU Exit and Covid has also had a significant impact on the Council's supply chain.

For example, the combination of these factors has meant a shortage of HGV drivers and combined with the increased costs of products being imported via shipping containers, has created the perfect storm of increased prices and shortage of supplies. To mitigate this risk, the council has offered enhanced pay, via the form of market supplements, to ensure it can recruit and retain a sufficient number HGV drivers required to deliver its waste and recycling collection service.

The cost of living crisis and the impact of rising inflation continues to place pressure on staffing budgets. For 2022/23 the Council needed to reopen pay negotiations in order to consult on a revised offer. This revised offer resulted in an increase of 1% from 2% to 3% for 22/23, adding an additional cost pressure to be accommodated as part of the 23/24 budget setting process. A 4% offer was agreed with the unions for 2023/24.

Furthermore, given the current economic environment, there is a heightened risk of a reduction in supplier base through mergers, business closure/insolvency, which could impact on our services and also make further procurement more difficult through depleted markets and lack of competition. This risk is addressed through the central management of our supplier base by the Procurement team, who scrutinise the rationale for supplier adoption and undertake a company credit check via Creditsafe.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Deputy Chief Executive & s151 Officer

5.5. Homelessness (Impact 4, Likelihood 4) Highest scoring mechanism is financial risk at 4 Current/Emerging/Future

Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

During 2021, the Council experienced an increased requirement to provide temporary accommodation (TA) for homeless households, and this trend has continued during 2022.

- Increasing costs in the private rented sector, leading to more households struggling with their rent costs.
- Landlords leaving the market for sale or short-term letting alternatives.
- Increased demand for private renting in the district, leading to a reduction in the number of private sector lets that are affordable to households on low incomes.

Changing working patterns nationally, the lifting of the 2020/2021 evictions ban on 1 June 2021 and the current cost of living crisis are all compounding these pressures. Local housing allowances have fallen significantly behind average private sector rents as a result of rent inflation. Cases that were delayed as a result of the eviction ban are now progressing through the courts, resulting in additional service and financial pressures.

These pressures have made it much more difficult for the council to prevent homelessness and find suitable, affordable solutions for people facing homelessness in the private rented sector. This has resulted in an increased number of households living in temporary accommodation.

The financial pressure is currently estimated at up to £1m for 2022/23 based on current homelessness levels.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Corporate Director of Place

5.6. Berth 4/5 (Impact 4, Likelihood 3): Current/Emerging/Future

Reputation, Service Delivery and Financial risk score 4

The project was delayed whilst an environmental impact assessment was developed to inform planning and marine licensing consents. The original berth was taken out of service in November 2020 due to its deteriorated condition.

A Cabinet decision was made in July 2021 to increase budget provision for the project. The EIA was completed in January 2022. The Planning Prior Approval and Marine Licence were both granted in May 2022.

The berth installation works commenced in June 2022 and reached substantial completion at the end of September 2022. However the berth is not yet in service because there is some residual work that still needs to be completed. This includes:

- remedial work to the gangway
- electrical supply and service lighting installation
- installation of the aggregate conveyor

Works to address the first two points are anticipated to take place in March 2023. The timescale for the installation of the conveyor by Brett Aggregates has not yet been confirmed, but this is not reliant upon completion of the works mentioned in the first two points.

The change in project programme following the notification that an Environmental Impact Assessment was required has resulted in a financial risk to the council due to extended berth outage and associated contractual costs.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Project Director Levelling Up

5.7. Environmental Act (Impact 4, Likelihood 4) Current/Emerging/Future

Reputation, Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

The Environment Act became law on 9 November 2021. This includes fundamental changes in responsibility for waste and recycling, which will have implications for the way we deliver statutory household waste collections.

As a member of the Kent Resource Partnership, TDC responded to Government consultations this year on consistency of household collections, the Extended Producer Responsibility and a Deposit Return Scheme. Changes affecting household waste as a result of the new act are likely to be implemented in 2023. Whilst the act includes provision for funding and support to local authorities for the proposed changes, the implications for our vehicle fleet and resourcing, income associated with green waste and income from recycling and waste diverted from landfill are not yet clear.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Director of Finance and Operations

5.8. **Change to EPC Requirements in 2023 (Impact 3 Likelihood 4)
Current/Emerging/Future**

Reputation, Service Delivery, Strategic risk score 3

On 1 April 2023, the next round of EPC Regulations will come into force as part of the government's push to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 (under the Energy Performance of Buildings (England and Wales) Regulations 2012)

All rented commercial property will need to have an energy performance certificate (EPC) rating of band 'E' or better and failure to achieve this will see landlords face potential fines, and/or the inability to continue with current leases and/or enter into new lease agreements with potential tenants. This translates to the risk of additional costs or lost revenue to the authority.

There are a number of council tenanted properties that are at risk of not meeting these impending changes, either because their current EPC rating is below the E rating (i.e F or G) or there are no coherent records to evidence an EPC assessment has been undertaken. There is also a high probability that these properties will require some form of improvement works in order to achieve the required E rating (which is a landlord cost). To establish a clear cost analysis, EPC assessments need to be undertaken as a priority. The council has recently increased its assessors available from 2 to 3.

The project plan/timetable to address this risk is as follows:

- Instruction is to be given at the end November to independent assessors,
- Establish current situation of EPC ratings by end December and provide cost and Planned Maintenance Programme January 2023 for the properties to be brought up to standard by April 2023

Corporate Risk Owner: Interim Director of Property

5.9. **Manston Road Depot Buildings (Impact 4 Likelihood 3)
Current/Emerging/Future**

Reputation, Service Delivery, and Financial risk score 4

Manston Road Depot is pivotal to the delivery of Recycling, Waste Collection and Street Cleansing as well as various ancillary services. The site is dated and in need of investment in order to future proof for an ongoing and improved service delivery model. This will mean investment is required in the short to medium term in order to safeguard this operation and allow for review. Without this necessary investment in the site, there is a significant risk of disruptions to the statutory provision of waste and recycling services.

This became more evident when the new Environment Agency regulatory officer appointed to Manston Road Depot visited on 21 October and raised concerns regarding the site. Failure to adequately address these concerns could result in fines, penalties and service disruption. Work is underway to implement the required improvements and mitigate these risks moving forward.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Director of Finance and Operations

5.10. **Net Zero Strategy (Impact 4 Likelihood 4) Current/Emerging/Future**

Service Delivery, Strategic and Financial risk score 4

The global attention on climate change and its impacts has never been more focused. The risk that climate change presents to the council and the wellbeing of its residents is stark and will potentially impact the council right across the risk spectrum; including financially, reputationally, in terms of service provision and the wellbeing of our staff and residents. For example, climate change presents an increased risk of extreme weather, such as the heat waves seen during the summer of 2022, which had consequent implications for service provision and also the wellbeing and welfare of our staff and residents.

The organisation has responded to these risks and challenges by declaring a climate emergency in 2019 and subsequently developing a Net Zero strategy, which was approved by the Cabinet on Thursday 22 September.

The Net Zero Strategy shows how the council will meet its net zero pledge and is split into:

- addressing emissions in Thanet District Council's core carbon footprint to achieve net zero by 2030;
- addressing the wider council emissions that we have partial control over by 2050 at the very latest;
- supporting Kent County Council, government, business, industry and the community to reduce emissions generated across the district by 2050 at the latest.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Acting Deputy Chief Executive & s151 Officer

6. Reducing Risks

6.1. **Political Stewardship (Impact 4, Likelihood 2) Current/Emerging/Future**

Reputational and Strategic risk score 4

The Council has now been under Conservative control since 3 June 2021. This followed a period of leadership change that resulted in political stewardship being identified as a high scoring corporate risk to the council. Due to a period of continuity in leadership, the success of cross-party working and the proximity to the May 2023 Local Elections this risk has been revised downwards.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Interim Chief Executive

6.2. **Governance (Impact 4, Likelihood 2) Current/Emerging/Future**

Reputational and Strategic risk score 4

Statutory Recommendations were received from the external auditors, Grant Thornton, in relation to governance matters and an extraordinary Council meeting agreed the recommendations.

Following the appointment of an Independent Monitoring Officer in December 2021 to address Grant Thornton's concerns, his recommendations were approved at the May 2022 Council meeting.

A new interim Chief Executive was subsequently appointed on 14 July 2022, whose remit it is to review and implement the recommendations of the Independent Monitoring Officer.

A timetable for delivery of those actions has been drawn up and progress has been made against a number of those actions. Therefore, the risk to Governance has been reduced accordingly.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Interim Chief Executive

6.3. **Coronavirus 8 (Impact 4 (reputational, service delivery and financial), Likelihood 2) Current/Emerging/Future**

In 'normal' emergencies, local authorities and local resilience forums deal first with an emergency and then the Recovery – getting back to 'business as usual' (for example, when the flood waters recede, work takes place to repair any damage and to get people back into their homes). The Recovery from the Covid-19 Pandemic will be unlike any other in our lifetimes. The crisis has gone on for longer, been more extreme and will have more profound consequences than anything we have prepared for before.

However due to the unpredictable nature of Covid the reintroduction of some form of restrictions in the future remains a risk.

Corporate Risk Lead Officer: Director of Neighbourhoods

7. Lower Scoring New Corporate Risks

8. Other risks

- 8.1. G&A meeting members requested to have oversight of all risks as part of the regular reports. This would however substantially increase the size of the report and so all risks scoring 8 or more after mitigation have been included within **Annex 1**.

Contact Officer: Chris Blundell (Director of Finance)

Reporting to: Colin Carmichael (Interim Chief Executive)

