

# Committee



Report of Head of Finance

Author: Yvonne Cutler Greaves

Telephone: 07917 088357

E-mail: [yvonne.cutlergreaves@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:yvonne.cutlergreaves@southandvale.gov.uk)

South cabinet member responsible: Councillor

Pieter-Paul Baker

E-mail: [Pieter-Paul.Barker@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:Pieter-Paul.Barker@southoxon.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01844 212438

To: Joint Audit and Governance Committee

DATE: 25 November 2024

Vale cabinet member responsible: Councillor Andrew

Crawford

E-mail: [Andy.Crawford@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:Andy.Crawford@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

Telephone: 07427 880274

To: Joint Audit and Governance Committee

DATE: 25 November 2024

## Corporate Risk Review

### Recommendation

(a) That the Committee undertakes a half yearly progress review of the corporate risk registers as outlined in the risk management strategy.

Implications (further detail within the report)	Financial	Legal	Climate and Ecological	Equality and diversity
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Signing off officer	Simon Hewings	Nick Bennet	Jessie Fieth	Lorne Grove

### Purpose of Report

1. This is the half yearly progress review of the corporate risk registers for South Oxfordshire District Council (South) and Vale of White Horse District Council (Vale). This review follows on from the joint audit and governance committee report in April 2024.
2. The contact officer for this report is Yvonne Cutler Greaves, Risk and Insurance Team Leader for South and Vale, email: [Yvonne.cutlergreaves@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:Yvonne.cutlergreaves@southandvale.gov.uk)

## Strategic Objectives

3. Openness and accountability in South Oxfordshire.
4. Working in an open and inclusive way in the Vale of White Horse.

## Background

5. The corporate risk registers attached have been compiled using the five-step risk management process as outlined in the risk management framework whereby service team and corporate objectives are validated, risks identified, evaluated and prioritised using the 3x3 matrix to develop service team and project risk registers. Mitigation actions are identified, and progress monitored with individual Heads of Service, Service Managers and Risk Champions at the risk forum, which is held half yearly to develop a risk management culture by focusing on external risks that may impact the councils going forward alongside service, project and corporate risks. Senior Management Team have the final review before reporting to Joint Audit and Governance Committee. This enables a thorough review across all the council service teams.
6. There are a total of 30 risks (32 last report) on the South corporate risk register and 31 risks (32 last report) on the Vale corporate risk register.
7. One risk has an increased net risk score in South and has stayed the same in Vale.

Risk ref South/Vale	Description	Risk score Gross/Net
74/76	Failure to plan for the potential long term impact on council finances due to ongoing financial pressures and failure of all funding increases to keep pace with increased council expenditure, results in the councils being unable to undertake their statutory duties including the legal requirement to set a balanced budget.	6/6

8. Two risks have been mitigated and removed from the corporate risk register:

Risk ref South/Vale	Description	Risk score Gross/Net
67/69	Failure to estimate the impact of hybrid working and changes in ways of working through transformation as well as external economic factors on the staff morale result in increased absence and stress cultural disconnect with the council and staff working in isolation poor customer service and loss of reputation.	5/2
84/86	Failure to have an effective recruitment and retention strategy in place which ensures the councils can attract, recruit and retain staff	7/3

9. Three risks have been reworded as a result of merging with other risks on the register

Risk ref South/Vale	Description	Risk score Gross/Net
85/87 merged with 25/23	<p>Failure to deliver the new corporate plan within the timeframe set with clear realistic and measurable objectives that are resilient to reflect the everchanging policy landscape and priorities may impact BAU and strategic project delivery. Objectives results in reputational damage.</p> <p><i>Merged with: Failure to deliver the new corporate plan within the timeframe set with clear realistic and measurable objectives that are resilient to reflect the everchanging policy landscape and priorities may impact BAU and strategic project delivery. Objectives results in reputational damage.</i></p>	7/4
91/93 merged with 76/78	<p>A number of key third party contracts are up for review/renewal within a similar time period, a failure to plan and resource each project may result in council failing in its statutory duties provide poor service to residents, loss of reputation and increased costs.</p> <p><i>Merged with: Failure to Plan for 5CP exit and ensure seamless transition, will impact IT and services revs and bens/land charges/ new staff payroll system and result in loss of reputation etc</i></p>	8/5
93/95 merged with 87/89	<p>Failure to implement a replacement for Ocella for South and Vale impacts the delivery of planning services, land charges (who rely on a number of different data sources(solaps/GIS) other than Ocella) and environmental health services in the short to medium term and leads to poor service resulting in loss of income, reputational damage and potentially fines resulting from failure to deliver statutory services.</p> <p><i>Merged with: Failure to implement Ocella option on Azure impacts the delivery of planning, land charges and environmental health services in the short to medium term and will impact delivery of these statutory functions and create poor service in the long term resulting in loss of income, reputation and may result in statutory fines.</i></p>	8/8

10. One risk has reduced it's net risk score in both South and Vale registers since last reported, due to mitigation.

Risk ref South/Vale	Description	Risk score Gross/Net
38/38	<p>Failure to deliver a major election in accordance with our statutory requirements including the Elections Act results in reputational damage and costs to re - run an election</p>	8/3

11. There are two new risks of which one is relevant to South and one relevant to both South and Vale :

<b>Risk ref South/Vale</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Risk score Gross/Net</b>
96/98	Failure to anticipate future office rental market and its impact on the economic viability of the Gateway offices and may result in the business case for the new Gateway office no longer being commercially viable limiting council office accommodation to the existing arrangement at Abbey House at increased cost to Vale as it limits the ability to rent/sell Abbey house or to move to and alternative rental site Increased cost to both SAV.	5/5
97 Vale only	Failure to maximise the potential uses for Abbey House for rental/development/office in the short to medium term impacts council finances and reputation.	5/5

12. The top ten risks for South and Vale are shown below:

<b>Risk ref South/Vale</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Risk score Gross/Net</b>
77/79	Failing to deliver a statutory waste service due the inability to secure options for future new waste vehicle depot. Results in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fines</li> <li>• No collection services / build-up of waste</li> <li>• Poor publicity/reputational damage</li> <li>• Health risk</li> <li>• Increased complaints</li> </ul>	8/8
93/ 95	Failure to implement a replacement for Ocella for South and Vale impacts the delivery of planning services, land charges (who rely on a number of different data sources(solaps/GIS) other than Ocella) and environmental health services in the short to medium term and leads to poor service resulting in loss of income, reputational damage and potentially fines resulting from failure to deliver statutory services	8/8
81/83	Third party supplier suffers a cyber attack and data breach resulting in personal data of residents and staff being leaked ICO reports, fines and loss of council reputation.	8/8
11/11	Failure to fulfil the Data Protection legislative requirements may result in fines, insurance claims and reputational damage if data is breached or a challenge is made	8/8
9/9	Failing to have an effective health and safety management system in place and lack of resource to support, may result in a fatality, illness or injury to staff or anyone else affected by our business; damage to property; legal action by HSE; civil claims and increased costs.	8/6

58/62	IT and data security compromised due to remote working and naive user behaviour including use of AI tools for report writing and data research, which may result in data breach and fines/loss of reputation	8/6
91/93	A number of key third party contracts are up for review/renewal within similar time period. A failure to plan and resource each project may result in the council failing in its statutory duties, provide poor service to residents, loss of reputation and increased costs.	8/6
92/94	Failure to anticipate the costs of contract exits and service re-procurement/insourcing may result in increased financial burden on the council in the short to medium term, poor service delivery to residents, low staff retention and loss of reputation.	8/5
78/80	Increased approaches of homelessness that are unmanageable by the council exacerbated by national shortage of rented accommodation. This may result in use of unsuitable temporary accommodation, such as B&B and hotel, beyond acceptable timescale	8/5
88/ 90	Failure to recruit and retain staff of the right experience and calibre at the right time may result in key projects not being delivered or delayed, increased agency staff costs, poor staff wellbeing.	7/5

### Climate and Ecological Impact Implications

13. There are no direct climate or ecological implications arising from this report. The corporate risk review supports the councils in achieving their corporate objectives in this area.

### Financial Implications

14. There are financial implications attached to managing the risks outlined in the corporate risk registers, and risk owners are responsible for ensuring costs of mitigation are proportionate to the risk exposure.

### Legal Implications

15. None.

### Risk Implications

16. Risk identification is an integral part of this progress review.

### Other Implications

17. None

### Attached:

- South Corporate Risk Register November 2024

- Vale Corporate Risk Register November 2024