

| RISKS REMOVED SINCE MAY 2023 | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|--|--------------------|--|--|
| CRR Risk No | Dept. | Risk Description | Current Risk Score | Reason | Date of Removal |
| B | ALL | If because of the ongoing war in Ukraine, the Homes for Ukraine Scheme continues beyond its original planned duration, increasing numbers of hosts are likely to end their sponsorships and refugees (or guests) are expected to encounter challenges in securing new sponsors or privately-rented accommodation, then the cost and service pressures on the Council and partners are likely to increase, safeguarding issues might increase and there will be a reputation risk if the scheme fails to provide the support guests require. Cost of living pressures are exacerbating this issue through both in relation to hosts and guests. | 9 14/L3 | The impact and likelihood score have been reduced and the risk will be managed within the project team in CFS. | 22-Sep-23 |
| 3.6 | CR | If the updates to the ORACLE Fusion system do not meet the County Council's requirements, then there is a risk of work arounds continuing and efficiencies not being delivered. | 14/L3 | Reduction in likelihood to 3 x 4 and will be managed at department level as Initial issues are resolved. Work continues on existing workstreams and processes. | 26-Jan-24 |
| 4.3 | E&T | If bus operators significantly change services due to wider external or economic pressures then there could be substantial impacts on communities accessing essential services and lead to required intervention under our PT Policy & Strategy. | 14/L3 | Change in likelihood score from 4 to a 3 as more confident in the money from government. Will now be managed at departmental level. •The Government recently announced £150 million of redirected HS2 funding to improve bus services, this is part of the Network North Plan. •In addition, the 'Get Around for £2' cost-of-living support scheme will be extended from 1 November until 31 December 2024. •The department is currently in the process of assessing the ramifications of this announcement and working up a plan forward for Cabinet approval in December. | 26-Jan-24 |
| 7.5 | A&C | If there is continuing increase in demand for assessments (care needs and financial) then it may not be met by existing capacity. | 14/L3 | Change in likelihood score from 4 to a 3 as assessment backlog has been reduced by 50%. Will now be managed at departmental level. • Assessment backlog reduced - now under 400. • Temporary staff recruited to assist in recovery. • Focus on updating and simplification of Adult Social Care Finance practice guidance. | 26/01/2024 Added back to CRR 31 March 2025 |
| 4.2 | E&T | If Arriva is successful in its concessionary travel appeal or the City in its challenge on the methodology of reimbursing operators, then reimbursement costs for the scheme could increase. | 15/L3 | Settlement was reached which was acceptable and within the region of what was anticipated and allowed for. | 20-May-24 |
| 7.4 | A&C | If LCC's Charging Policy is challenged on the principles of the Norfolk Ruling, then there could be judicial review leading to significant financial impact and reputational damage. | 15/L3 | Following consultation, a report was produced for, and approved by, Cabinet 9 Feb 2024. Updated policy to go live 8 April 2024. Likelihood score reduced from 3 to 2. No longer represents a red RAG rating | 20-May-24 |
| C | ALL | If the current cost of living crisis continues and even intensifies, or if UK Government interventions cease, then the people and businesses of Leicestershire as a whole will be significantly impacted, and the County Council will have to take some difficult decisions. | 15/L4 | Inflation has stabilised and whilst there are still wider impacts ingrained within the MTFS and Children's services corporate risks, the day to day management of the cost of living crisis will be managed at department levels. | 16-Sep-24 |
| 7.8 | ALL | If we fail to develop, implement and maintain robust health & safety systems then there is a risk of breach and potential dangerous occurrences | 15/L4 | All RIDDORS are investigated and managed by the Health Safety & Wellbeing Service (H,S&W) and reported to the Health and Safety Executive. Departments are responsible for their own risk management and subject to audits by the H,S&W Service | 16-Sep-24 |
| 7.6 | A&C | If A&C fail to provide robust evidence of good practice for the CQC inspectors, then this will result in a poor inspection outcome and incur reputational risk alongside extra resources and possible external governance to undertake any actions required to make the improvements necessary to fulfil statutory requirements. | 15/L3 | The following actions apply to mitigate against the risk. 1. A review and update of the Self-Assessment is completed and there are plans in place. 2. Progress with the activities identified in our improvement plan are being monitored and reported via agreed governance processes. 3. The documents required for the CQC Information Return are being compiled and updated to ensure any gaps are identified and addressed prior to CQC inspection notification. 4. Communications plan developed and activities | 06-Dec-24 |
| 1.11 | CE | If transition to the operational stage were not finalised, then the County Council would not be fulfilling its role as lead authority and accountable body for the East Midlands Freeport. | 15/L3 | Assurance was provided that the process is sufficiently advanced in the 'transition to operational' that it would be safe to remove the risk, but it will continue to be managed at department level. | 24-Jan-25 |
| 1.7 | CR | If the Council is not compliant with the HMRC IR35 regulations regarding the employment status for tax of self-employed personnel, then there is a risk of backdated underpaid tax and NI, interest and large financial penalties. | 14/L4 | The risk was reviewed in February and there is confidence that with regular reporting requirement established, improvements and declaration of compliance of IR35 are in place and part of BAU but it will continue to be managed at department level. | 31-Mar-25 |
| 9.6 | E&T | If we fail to comply with the Operator's Licence, then the licence could be revoked/curtailed. | 15/L3 | Current Operator Compliance Risk Score (OCRS) is less than 1 and compliance is good overall, if events occur that may increase likelihood following incidents, audits or other events then this will be updated accordingly. The risk will continue to be managed at department level. | 31-Mar-25 |

3.8 CEX If there is a failure to provide appropriate strategic and operational business intelligence then the council's policy and strategy will not be evidence-led and day-to-day service delivery, costs and reputation may be negatively impacted, including meeting statutory requirements.

14/L4 The Business Intelligence team has successfully migrated all data to a new physical server so the risk as originally outlined no longer applies.

19-Sep-25

Risk Impact Measurement Criteria

| Scale | Description | Department Service Plan | Internal Operations | People | Reputation | Impact on | Impact from* ¹ | Financial per annum / per loss * ² |
|-------|---------------------|---|--|--|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | the Environment | | |
| 1 | Negligible | Little impact to objectives in service plan | Limited disruption to operations and service quality satisfactory | Minor injuries | Public concern restricted to local complaints | None or insignificant damage | | <£50k |
| 2 | Minor | Minor impact to service as objectives in service plan are not met | Short term disruption to operations resulting in a minor adverse impact on partnerships and minimal reduction in service quality. | Minor Injury to those in the Council's care | Minor adverse local / public / media attention and complaints | Minor local impact | Minor damage | £50k-£250k Minimal effect on budget/ cost |
| 3 | Moderate | Considerable fall in service as objectives in service plan are not met | Sustained moderate level disruption to operations / Relevant partnership relationships strained / Service quality not satisfactory | Potential for minor physical injuries / Stressful experience | Adverse local media public attention | Moderate local impact | Moderate damage and risk of injury | £250k - £500k Small increase on budget/ cost. Handled within the team/service |
| 4 | Major | Major impact to services as objectives in service plan are not met. | Serious disruption to operations with relationships in major partnerships affected / Service quality not acceptable with adverse impact on front line services. Significant disruption of core activities. Key targets missed. | Exposure to dangerous conditions creating potential for serious physical or mental harm | Serious negative regional criticism, with some national coverage | Major local impact | Major damage and risk to life | £500-£750k. Significant increase in budget/cost. Service budgets exceeded |
| 5 | Very High/ Critical | Significant fall/failure in service as objectives in service plan are not met | Long term serious interruption to operations / Major partnerships under threat / Service quality not acceptable with impact on front line services | Exposure to dangerous conditions leading to potential loss of life or permanent physical/mental damage. Life threatening or multiple | Prolonged regional and national condemnation, with serious damage to the reputation of the organisation <u>i.e.</u> front-page headlines, TV. Possible criminal, or high profile, civil action against the | Major regional or national impact. | Wide scale damage and risk to life | >£750k Large increase on budget/cost. Impact on whole council |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | serious injuries | Council, members or officers | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|

* Note that a different financial rating is used for the pension fund investments

Risk Likelihood Measurement Criteria

| Rating Scale | Likelihood | Example of Loss/Event Frequency | Probability % |
|--------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| 1 | Very rare/unlikely | EXCEPTIONAL event. This will probably never happen/recur. | <20% |
| 2 | Unlikely | Event NOT EXPECTED. Do not expect it to happen/ recur, but it is possible it may do so. | 20-40% |
| 3 | Possible | LITTLE LIKELIHOOD of event occurring. It might happen or recur occasionally. | 40-60% |
| 4 | Probable /Likely | Event is MORE THAN LIKELY to occur. Will probably happen/recur, but it is not a persisting issue. | 60-80% |
| 5 | Almost Certain | Reasonable to expect that the event WILL undoubtedly happen/recur, possibly frequently. | >80% |

Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 5 Very High/Critical | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 Major | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 Moderate | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 Minor | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 Negligible | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 1 Very Rare/Unlikely | 2 Unlikely | 3 Possible/Likely | 4 Probable/Likely | 5 Almost certain |

Likelihood

This page is intentionally left blank