**SSLEP Proposed New Risk Register**

SSLEP Risk register is an important strategic document to enable Board members to record and actively manage risk. With the production of the recent Delivery Plan and subsequent Delivery Plan Risks, presented an opportune time to review the existing Consolidated Risks and Issues log, to align the two. The Change Manager along with the CEO undertook the review.

The proposed new risk register is attached and in draft form for your consideration. It brings together strategic and programme risks, including those cited in the recent Delivery Plan submitted to BEIS. Some risks have been transferred into the new document and are labelled as ‘Legacy risks’. All closed risks will be maintained within the register for audit purposes. Since the document is in draft form, those columns that remain blank can be agreed in time should the new approach be adopted.

It is important to note that, whilst the proposed risks within Tables 1 & 2, are recommended for *removal* from the existing Consolidated Risks and Issues Log, their importance and content have either been simplified and rewritten or captured under one of the new Delivery Plan Risks. They have been shaded grey within the Consolidated Risks and Issue log to represent the proposal for their removal.

Table 1 Strategic:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk ID** | **Risk** |
| 22 | Lack of consistency regarding reporting, data sharing and retention procedures, |
| 24 | There is a risk regarding the strategic positioning and role of the LEP in the context of a changing local/regional landscape. |
| 25 | There is a risk of the amount of LEP core funding 2022/23 to be received. |
| 26 | 22/23 funding for services that the LEP is accountable for (e.g. Growth Hub, Careers Enterprise Hub). |
| 27 | There is a human capacity risk to maintain existing work programme and profile |
| 28 | There is a risk of loss of key personnel within staff team, given future uncertainties |
| 29 | There is a risk of loss of key personnel within Board, given future uncertainties. |

Table 2 Programmes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk ID** | **Risk** |
| ESIF 11 | The lack of local area programme management information and the fact that the ESIF Committee has not met since November 2019 means there is a risk that progress is not being fully understood. |
| CDGD 27 | There is a risk that the Blythe scheme may be seriously delayed or may fail to progress. |
| GPF 2 | Potential for default or delayed repayment of GPF loans.  |
| GPF 5 | There is a risk that the Blythe scheme may be seriously delayed or may fail to progress. |
| GBF 3 | There is a risk Shire Hall Business Hub business model may not fully deliver, or may not maximise, the full potential of the solution and outputs. |
| Skills 8 | There is a risk that the project will not deliver its spend and/or outputs targets. |
| Skills 9 | There is a risk that the project will not deliver its spend and/or outputs targets. |
| Skills 10 | There is a risk that the project will not deliver its spend and/or outputs targets. |
| Skills 11 | There is a risk that the project will not deliver its spend and/or outputs targets. |
| GBF11 | There is a risk that the Drakelow scheme may be seriously delayed or may fail to progress. |

This paper sets out to seek **feedback and approval** of the proposed new Risk Register.
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