| Finance \& Audit Committee |  | Paper 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date and Time: $9^{\text {th }}$ February 2022 (starting at 2pm) <br> Venue: Via MS Teams |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Item } \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | Item and Brief Description | Lead | Additional Information |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{1} \\ & 5 \mathrm{mins} \end{aligned}$ | Welcome and Introductions <br> - Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest <br> - Matters arising <br> - Actions update | Chair | Paper 0.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2} \\ & 5 \mathrm{mins} \end{aligned}$ | Draft F\&A Minutes <br> - October 2021 - For approval and publication | Chair | Paper 1 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ 20 \mathrm{mins} \end{array}$ | Financial Report <br> - Overview of the Q3 finances for 21/22 | Linsay Hill Pritchard, Accountable Body | Paper 2 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 4 \\ 15 \mathrm{mins} \end{array}$ | Governance <br> - Risk Management Plan - for approval <br> - Risk Register - for approval <br> - Local Assurance Framework - update | Caroline Illingworth LEP | Paper 3 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 5 \\ 15 \mathrm{mins} \end{array}$ | LEP Forward Plan 22/23 <br> - Outline Overview | Ruth Carver - LEP | Verbal |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 6 \\ 10 \mathrm{mins} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | F\&A Committee <br> - New members for F\&A Committee | Ruth Carver - LEP | Verbal |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 7 \\ 20 \mathrm{mins} \end{array}$ | Freeports <br> - Presentation from Halina Davies | Halina Davies - LEP | Verbal |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & 5 \mathrm{mins} \end{aligned}$ | AOB | Chair | Verbal |

Confirmed: Ian Knowles, Rob Griffiths,
Ruth Carver, Linsay HillPritchard, Laura Spittles, Caroline Illingworth

## Apologies: Stephen Deville

Additional Papers:

| Greater <br> Lincolnshire <br> Local Enterprise Partnership | Greater Lincolnshire LEP Finance \& Audit Committee <br> $12^{\text {th }}$ October 2021 <br> MS Teams |
| :---: | :---: |
| Welcome and Apologies |  |
| Present |  |
| lan Knowles (IK) Acting Chair Robert Griffiths (RG) |  |
| Officers - Ruth Carver (RC), Laura Spittles (LS), Louise Higham (LH), Caroline Illingworth (CI) |  |
| Guests - Martin Collison - Agri-food Specialist (MC) |  |
| Apologies: |  |
| Stephen Deville (SD); Linsay Hill Pritchard (LHP) |  |
| No declarations of interest were declared. |  |
| The minutes from the previous minutes were agreed and signed off by the Committee. |  |
| RC stated that a campaign will be actioned to recruit further members of the Finance and Audit Committee. Ideally there should be about $5 / 6$ members to cover the meetings. Then to be quorate there must be at least 1 public and 1 private member present at each meeting. $\mathrm{CI} / \mathrm{LS}$ to take this further. |  |
| A new Chair also needs to be down from the role. CI/LS to | the Committee as the previous Chair has now stepped ard. | down from the role. CI/LS to take this forward.

Matters Arising - the discrepancy, highlighted through the recent audit, has now been clarified and the additional money owed to the LEP will be transferred imminently. This money will be added to the LEP Balance Sheet. The Committee will need to sign off this discrepancy after seeing the revised accounts summary from the Auditors - RC to circulate.

The Auditors for next year will need procuring soon. IK stated that he would like to see this done ASAP. LS/CI/LHP to take this forward and procure for the LEP. Details will be emailed to the Committee in written procedures and will then be discussed at the meeting held early next year. RG stated he is happy to be involved in this process and review the submissions.

## Financial Report

RC presented the Committee with an overview of the financial position of the LEP and summarised the financial income and expenditure for the period 1st April 2021-30 th September 2021.

The LEP are currently showing a spend of roughly $1 / 3$ of the allocated budget. This is slightly behind where it should be, but a piece of work is currently being undertaken to identify areas in the delivery plan that haven't yet been actioned. A revised core operating budget for 2021/22 will be proposed to the LEP board in October identifying expenditure to amount of $£ 1,538 \mathrm{~m}$. This will be funded by a combination of Core funding, earmarked reserves, grant income, fee income, interest and partner contributions.

Most of the projects under the SLGF programme are completed or are near completion. The outputs achieved are also extremely positive. Further Project claims have been submitted for the April to June period and these have now been processed by the team. £393k was released in this quarter.
£2.3 million has been released to projects on the GBF programme following the first claim submissions. The claims process took slightly longer as many of the projects were new to the reporting structure. Full support has been given and we are confident that all projects have been fully trained in preparation for the next claim cycle expected 11th October. The GBF programme is now fully contracted and must be delivered by March 2022 with all grant funding having been drawn down by the 31 March 2022. LH to provide the Committee with a further update once the Q2 claims have been processed.

The Committee approved the contents of the report and recommended that the information is taken to the next Directors Board Meeting.

## LEP Reserves

RC updated the Committee on the reserves held by the LEP and the latest ask from the Directors Board. With the current issues facing the economy the LEP were tasked by the Board with undertaking a piece of work that involved highlighting any available resources in the reserves that could be used to fund projects that use innovative solutions to the labour market shortages. These would need to be new solutions, not something that is already currently available. The second part of this project would be a Net Zero Accelerator Fund to take these proposed solutions forward in our sector areas.

The LEP Core Reserve has been slightly increased due to the recent expansion of the LEP Core Team. A provision needs to be made for redundancy and pension strains.

Another provision has also been made for a Hardship Fund for any projects that may struggle due to the recent issues with the economy.

## Martin

Martin Collison works alongside the GLLEP as an Agri-Food Sector Consultant and presented the Committee with an update on the UK Food Valley.

The UK Food Valley is a key part of the GLLEP Covid Recovery Plan. The aim is to position this cluster as a global top 10 food cluster. The County has the largest fresh produce cluster.

In the recent years there has been a lot of development and investment in this sector in our area. There is a wide breadth and scale with poultry and meat processing, plant proteins and AgriRobotics. There are new centres and facilities opening in various locations to expand this work even further.

Recently the Lincoln Institute for Agri-Food Technology was created and is already the largest one of its kind in Europe.

## Risk Review

The Risk Register has recently been presented to the Directors Board. Overall the Board were happy but did highlight a couple of ratings that they felt could now be lowered with reference to the Covid situation.

Cl will be taking an in-depth look at the register going forward.

## Date of Next Meeting

$9^{\text {th }}$ February 2022
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| Publication | Public Paper (published) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Meeting date: | 9th February 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| Agenda Item: | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Item Subject: | 2021/22 Financial Update Quarter 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Author: | Linsay Hill Pritchard |  |  |  |  |
| For: | Discussion | X | Decision |  |  |

1 Summary
1.1 This report provides an overview of the financial position of the Greater Lincolnshire LEP and summarises the financial income and expenditure covering the period $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2021-31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ December 2021.
1.2 Recommendations: The F and A committee is asked to:

- Note the expected outturn for 21/22
- Note the position in relation to Income and expenditure
- Note the progress on the appointment of Auditors as recommended at the previous Finance and Audit committee to cover the 21/22 accounting period.

2 Summary Budget for Financial Year 2021/2022
2.1 An Interim budget for 2021/22 was proposed to the LEP board in March 21. The overall core budget was estimated at $£ 1.171$ million. This was to be funded by a combination of core funding, earmarked reserves, re-purposed funds, grant income, fee income and interest.
2.2 Following continued reviews by the LEP team the estimated budget use for the year raised to 1.5 Million and this was advised to Board. The budget took account of the proposed increases in the Career Hub model and other activities to support the delivery of the LEP business plan.
2.3 At the December 21 period the expected outturn for $21 / 22$ is $£ 1.316$ Million.

## 3 LEP Finances - Spend overview April - December 2021

3.1 The LEP have received $£ 32.597$ million of funding within the year including its core funding allocation of $£ 500 \mathrm{k}$ and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ tranche of $£ 12.9$ million of Getting Building Fund. The table below shows the income and expenditure from the period to January 2021.

LEP

| Area | Income to December <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | Expenditure to December <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 \| P a g e}$ | Paper2 |  |
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| LEP Operation Core | $£ 533,000$ | $£ 207,114$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEP Core Repurpose | $£ 0$ | $£ 24,219$ |
| Enterprise Co-ordinator | $£ 33,171$ | $£ 51,021$ |
| Career Hub | $£ 64,700$ | $£ 16,549$ |
| Kickstart/capacity | $£ 2,940$ | $£ 30,532$ |
| Skills and Employment |  |  |
| Manager | $£ 0$ | $£ 36,611$ |
| Skills Advisory Panel | $£ 75,000$ | $£ 11,119$ |
| EM Ambassador Network | $£ 13,250$ | $£ 88,758$ |
| Future Proofing Coastal | $£ 0$ | $£ 117,127$ |
| Tourism | $£ 0$ | $£ 183,097$ |
| Business Investment Fund | $£ 95,554$ | $£ 4,594,011$ |
| Invest to Grow Loan Fund | $£ 0$ | $£ 5,418,200$ |
| Single Local Growth Fund | $£ 12,900,000$ |  |
| Getting Building Fund | $£ 13,717,615$ |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |

LCC Partnership

| Area | Budget as at December 2021 | Expenditure to December 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LCC Commissioning | $£ 309,105$ | $£ 280,389$ |
| Research | $£ 25,000$ | $£ 7,800$ |
| Employment and Skills | $£ 10,000$ | $£ 8,536$ |
| TOTAL | $£ 344,105$ | $£ 296,725$ |

Expenditure for the period to December amounts to $£ 5.714 \mathrm{~m}$. The budget has been recently scrutinised, and the revised core budget and expected outturn is $£ 1.318 \mathrm{~m}$. On the capital programme side, the budget has reduced to $£ 25.3 \mathrm{~m}$.

Progress against the expected outturn is:

| AREA | Expected Outturn | Actual to date | \% Spent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Core Revenue Budget | $£ 1,167,783$ | $£ 720,812$ | $61.72 \%$ |
| Revenue Programme Budget | $£ 149,877$ | $£ 99,877$ | $66.64 \%$ |
| Capital Programme Budget | $£ 25,314,058$ | $£ 4,894,235$ | $19.33 \%$ |
| Total | $£ 26,631,718$ | $£ 5,714,924$ | $21.46 \%$ |
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# Core Funding Budget Overview 

21/22


- Actual
- Committed
- To be committed

The revenue budget aligns with previous years in that there are often larger items of spend in the last quarter of the financial year. The capital budget looks low however we are in the process of releasing just over $£ 4.5$ million on the SLGF and GBF programmes following the submission of claims for Quarter 3 in January.

### 3.2 The table below provides a summary on the main LEP finances:

> £533k has been received to Dec 21 . This included the $2^{\text {nd }}$ tranche of 250 K of core funding and 33 k of repayment following resolution of the judicial review on Northern Junction Roundabout has also been received.

Core Operational Budget LEP specific spend to December 2021 is $£ 207 \mathrm{~K}$ with a further £297k expended from partner contributions. Given the nervousness around whether LEPs would receive the full amount of core funding offered in previous years, partner contributions have been maximised first to ensure staff costs were covered.

|  | Enterprise co-ordinator activity ceased under the existing <br> contract in August 21. Final costs are being agreed and to |
| :--- | :--- |
| Core Other | December 21 expenditure has amounted to f58.4k. This has <br> been covered by some additional grant income and earmarked <br> reserve. |
| A new Career Hub contract has been taken forward delivering |  |

the same activity with additional enterprise co-ordinators. The
career hub is now fully staffed following a successful
recruitment exercise. £67.5 has been spent to Dec 21 with 67.6
having been received from the first claim and partner
contributions to run the service.
This work is overseen by the skills manager who has been paid
30.5K to date from an identified LEP reserve under Cash
balance 1.

| The Future Proofing Coastal Tourism work has struggled to |
| :--- |
| deliver fully during the pandemic and only £88.7 has been |
| released this year. The project sought and been granted an |
| extension from central government into 2022 to incorporate |
| three key elements: |
| 1. Strengthening the local and national evidence base |
| 2. |


| 3. Champills Innovation the local coastal community |
| :--- |


| There is currently a huge media campaign in operation to |
| :--- |
| engage sign up and all the courses, champions and details are |

on the Coastal Communities Fund Coastal Communities
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£7.072 million has been released to projects to date on the GBF programme following the first 2 claim submissions. A further £4.057million will be released following completion of the Q3 claims.

See section 5 for a full GBF update.
Long term investment Loans are currently $£ 4,085,228$ as follows:

- $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ - Chestnut Homes - Boston Quadrant
- $£ 585,228 \mathrm{k}$ - The Lincolnshire Bomber Command Memorial.

We received $£ 95.5 \mathrm{~K}$ in interest payments from both projects in quarter 2 and no further interest is expected until Quarter 4 along with the first loan repayment from Boston Quadrant of £700K.

The committee will remember that Boston Quadrant approached the LEP to request changed terms on the loan agreement. This was discussed at the November Investment

## Invest and Grow Loan

 Board. The decision was made to:1. Interest Payments to continue to be invoiced each year at the rates originally agreed until the loan is fully repaid.
2. Repayment of the $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ loan to be postponed and repaid as follows:

By 31 March 2022
By 31 March 2023
By 31 March 2024
£700,000 repayment $£ 1,400,000$ repayment $£ 1,400,000$ repayment

## 4 Reserves

4.1 The LEP holds several reserves to allow a response to operational pressures and deliver their agreed business plan priorities - a few which are required to be accessed in this financial year. The table below shows the amounts of reserve that are currently held in each of the 3 identified classifications:

| Name of Fund | Balance on 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ December 2022 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cash Balance $\mathbf{1}$ - Core Funding, Reserves, and other cash <br> balances (committed) | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 8 6 4 , 2 7 4}$ |
| $\mathbf{5 \| P a g e}$ | $9^{\text {th }}$ February 2022 |
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|  | Cash Balance 2 - Growing Places Fund (Invest to Grow) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cash Balance 3 - Single Local Growth Fund (committed) | $£ 4,889,825$ |
| Total | $£ 8,305,989$ |

4.2 Funds in Cash balance 1 and 3 are committed. Cash balance 2 has a combination of committed funds and uncommitted but as identified above these will change when the next phase of re-purposing is undertaken.

## 5 Getting Building fund

5.1 The LEP were awarded $£ 25.8$ million for six schemes under the Getting Building fund with government expectation that $£ 12.9$ million will be spent by March 2021 and a further $£ 12.9$ spent by March 22. The programme has progressed well and is fully contracted however many of the projects have suffered delays due to the impact of the pandemic.

GBF -Table 1-Quarter 3 Summary Position

|  | Expected | Actual | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spend to Sept 21 | $£ 38.532$ | $£ 22.336$ | $£ 16.196$ |
| Grant to Sept 21 | $£ 21.442$ | $£ 11.130$ | $£ 10.312$ |
| Match to Sept 21 | $£ 17.090$ | $£ 11.206$ | $£ 5.884$ |

5.2 Since the programme's inception there is a $47.25 \%$ underspend on grant forecasts as of the end of Quarter 3. Many projects have been experiencing delays/shortages in supplies and COVID safe working practices are also causing time pressures. Procurement for some schemes has become difficult as projects fight to get fixed prices on contracts.
5.3 The full $£ 25.8$ m allocation from government has been received. As per the grant determination letter we were able to secure $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ in Freedom and flexibility (Offset)in 21/22. No other freedoms and flexibilities have been utilised as projects have been paid on agreed in year intervention rates.
5.4 The table below gives a view of how individual projects are operating against their grant forecasts

5.5 We are continuing to work on a plan for spend moving forward and this will form a major part of our discussions at the Annual conversation on the $8^{\text {th }}$ of February. Q4 sees a forecast of $£ 9$ million grant however I suspect there to be more slippage in this period, and we have gone back to those projects that we are most concerned about. £5million is expected to be released in 22/23. Given the most recent forecasts the bulk of this will be spent in the first quarter of $22 / 23$ and can be covered (if agreed with government) by freedom and flexibility already achieved. Given we have created the $£ 10 \mathrm{Million}$ offset pot we are in a good position to cover any further slippage up to this value.
5.6 The committee should note that this was always going to be a very challenging period for any capital programmes, and we understand that GBF underspend is a national issue. Given experience on previous programmes I would argue that the projects have done incredibly well to spend as much as they have to the quarter 3 period and have been keeping us updated throughout on problems that they have been facing. To achieve the programme grant, spend by June 22 would feel a huge achievement.
5.7 As previously highlighted in reports to the committee and board most of the projects have experienced delays due to supply issues, new working practice limitations and the difficulty in securing fixed costing for certain pieces of work.

## 6 2021/22 External Audit

6.1 The External Audit will look at the financial report that is produced on all funds held by the Accountable body on behalf of the LEP. This report will be agreed in draft by the F and A committee and is recommended to board following the audit.
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6.2 The LEP asked 4 local companies to quote for the Audit for the next 2-3 years. Of these 4 only 2 have sent in quotes. Rob Griffiths will review the quotes and send a recommendation to the rest of the F\&A Committee.


As part of an internal review of LEP governance and assurance processes, a new Risk Management Plan has been created, clarifying risk definitions and scoring, and setting out reporting and escalation procedures.

The LEP Risk Register has been revised to comply with these new definitions, with the addition of inherent and residual risk scoring to enable better targeting of mitigation actions.

Annex A - Risk Management Plan (following pages)
Annex B - Risk Register Q3 FY21/22

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to recommend that the LEP Board approve the new Risk Management Plan.

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to recommend that the LEP Board approve the new revised Risk Register.

## GREATER LINCOLNSHIRE LEP

Reference 21:<br>Risk Management Plan

## Greater

Lincolnshire
Local Enterprise Partnership

| Name of Document | Risk Management Plan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Purpose | To provide a framework for assessing and managing <br> strategic risks and risks associated with the Annual <br> Delivery Plan |
| Author | Operations \& Delivery Executive Manager |
| Version | 0.1 |
| Review date | December 2021 |
| Date approved by <br> Board |  |
| Date of next review | December 2023 |
| Location | Document can be located within Greater Lincolnshire <br> LEP Management system |
| Policy lead officer | LEP Chief Executive |

Version Control
Please note this document is valid until formally revoked or replaced

| Version | Date | Changes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.1 | December 2021 | Initial draft |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Greater

## Lincolnshire

Local Enterprise Partnership

## 1. PURPOSE

1.1. This plan describes the framework for identifying, assessing, and managing risk within the Greater Lincolnshire LEP, covering both strategic risks, and risks associated with the Annual Delivery Plan Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).
2. RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS
2.1.1. The risk management process follows a cyclical approach as defined in Figure 1. This cycle ensures that continual improvement can take place by enabling risks to be regularly reviewed to ensure their definitions, assessment, and associated actions remain relevant and appropriate. The risk management plan will be reviewed every two years to enable lessons learnt to be incorporated as part of the continual improvement process.

Figure 1: The Risk Management Cycle
Source: The Orange Book: Management of Risk - Principles \& Concepts, HM Government; 2021

## 3. REPORTING STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1. Figure 2 describes the reporting structure, and the roles and responsibilities of each person or group within that structure. The upward reporting chain also provides the escalation route, as described in more detail in Section 7.
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Lincolnshire
Local Enterprise Partnership


Figure 2: Risk reporting structure, roles, and responsibilities

## 4. RISK IDENTIFICATION AND DEFINITION

4.1. A combination of horizon scanning, SWOT and PESTLE analysis, and a determination of the risk appetite of the LEP will be utilised to help identify and prioritise relevant risks. Risks may be identified by any member of the LEP Secretariat, any member of the LEP Boards, or any appropriate representative of the Accountable Body.

T 01522550540 | E greaterlincslep@lincolnshire.gov.uk
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4.2. Risks will be defined using the format "If...then...which...". This will ensure that risks are captured consistently, and the impact of each risk is identified. For example:
"If our risk management is not robust...then we will fail to identify or mitigate for risks...which will put the delivery and reputation of the LEP at risk."
4.3. Each risk will have Early Warning Indicators (EWIs) identified. These are occurrences which may indicate that the probability of the risk becoming an issue is increasing, enabling additional mitigation actions to be implemented before the issue arises, or escalation procedures to be initiated. For escalation procedures, see section 7 .
5. RISK ASSESSMENT
5.1. For each risk, two scores will be assessed. Firstly, the inherent risk, defined as the current risk score. Secondly, the residual risk, defined as the target risk score once all mitigation and/or contingent actions have been carried out. The residual risk score should be set at a level at which the LEP is comfortable to accept as part of Business-As-Usual activity.
5.2. Figure 3 defines the scoring matrix which will be used to determine the inherent and residual risk scores. Figure 4 defines the probability levels used in the risk scoring system, whilst figure 5 provides guidance on the impact level definitions.


Impact
Figure 3: Risk scoring matrix
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| Probability | Definition |
| :---: | :---: |
| Almost Certain | $76-100 \%$ probability |
| Likely | $51-75 \%$ probability |
| Possible | $26-50 \%$ probability |
| Unlikely | $1-25 \%$ probability |

Figure 4: Risk probability definitions

## Greater
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| Impact rating | Financial impact | Operational / Delivery impact | Scheduling impact | Reputational impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catastrophic | Overspend or loss equivalent to $>40 \%$ of annual LEP core operating budget | Severe disruption to operations, with key activities unable to be carried out | Delay in key milestones of $>9$ months <br> and <br> delay in key milestones passing from one FY into the next | Long term impact on more than half of stakeholders, resulting in permanent loss of relationship and/or removal of funding access by funding bodies and negative national press coverage |
| Major | Overspend or loss equivalent to 25-39\% of annual LEP core operating budget | External impacts occur which may adversely affect some LEP partners. <br> Key operations are disrupted. | Delay in key milestones of 7-9 months and/or delay in key milestones passing from one FY into the next | Long term impact on some stakeholders, resulting in permanent loss of relationship or negative national press coverage or formal criticism from funding bodies with sanctions imposed or mitigating actions required |
| Moderate | Overspend or loss equivalent to 10-24\% of annual LEP core operating budget | Temporary external impact on delivery with/to LEP partners. Key operations can continue with workarounds in place | Delay in key milestones of 4-6 months, not passing the end of the FY | Temporary impact on up to half of stakeholders, recovery requires targeted effort in relationship rebuilding or negative local press coverage or negative feedback from funding bodies |
| Minor | Overspend or loss equivalent to <10\% of annual LEP core operating budget | No external impact discernible to LEP partners. Some internal impacts may be experienced, but key operations are able to continue uninterrupted | Delay in key milestones of 3 months or less, not passing the end of the FY | Temporary impact on a limited number of stakeholders, easily recovered using standard stakeholder management procedures |

Figure 5: Risk impact definition guidelines

## T $01522550540 \mid$ E greaterlincslep@lincolnshire.gov.uk
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5.3. A treatment type will be assigned to each risk, taking into consideration the actions that need to be assigned, as follows:
5.3.1. Avoid - actions will be assigned to avoid the risk completely
5.3.2. Reduce - actions will be taken to reduce the probability of the risk occurring and/or the impact of the risk
5.3.3. Transfer - actions will be taken to transfer the risk to another responsible partner or body, for example by use of insurance or outsourcing
5.3.4. Share - actions will be taken to share the risk with partners or other responsible bodies
5.3.5. Accept - the impact of taking action is the same or greater than the impact of the risk itself, therefore the risk is accepted without action being taken
5.4. Risks will also be assigned a risk appetite, appropriate to the context of the risk, and the strategic aims and direction of the LEP. Figure 6 provides guidance on typical definitions to be considered when assigning risk appetite.

| Risk appetite <br> rating | Definition |
| :---: | :--- |
| Averse | Avoidance of any action which could cause financial loss, reputational harm, loss <br> of data or other negative operational impact. Defensive actions only to be taken. |
| Minimal | Willing to accept minimal operational, reputational or financial impact from the <br> actions, if it will not affect the overall delivery of the LEP. |
| Cautious | Willing to consider actions where the benefits outweigh the risks. Innovation <br> avoided unless necessary. Limited risks accepted with checks and balances in <br> place. |
| Open | Innovation is supported with a clear demonstration of the benefits. Prepared to <br> invest for benefit, but with controls in place. |
| Eager | Innovation pursued. High risk actions may be taken but exceptional benefits <br> could be realised as a result. Prepared to invest for best possible benefit with the <br> acceptance of the possibility of financial loss (controls must be in place). |

Figure 6: Risk appetite guidance definitions
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5.5. Each risk will be assigned an overall status of either active, accept and monitor, closed, or become an issue. Risk status will be reviewed at each review point. Risk status definitions can be found in figure 7 below.

| Risk status | Definition |
| :---: | :--- |
| Active | Risk is active and regularly reviewed. Mitigation and contingency actions are <br> underway |
| Accept and <br> Monitor | Residual risk score has been reached. No active management of the risk is taking <br> place, but monitoring is being carried out. Risk can be moved back to active if <br> inherent risk score rises again, risk can be closed if no changes to accept and <br> monitor status after 6 months |
| Closed | Risk is no longer relevant and has been closed |
| Become an |  |
| Issue | Risk is now occurring and is being dealt with as an issue. Can be moved to one of <br> the other risk status categories once it has been dealt with |

Figure 7: Risk status definitions

## 6. RISK MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING

6.1. The Risk Register will be reviewed and updated each quarter by the Operations \& Delivery Executive Manager. Risk owners will provide updates as to actions carried out and effectiveness.
6.2. The updated register will be submitted to the Finance \& Audit Committee each quarter for scrutiny. As part of this process, the LEP Secretariat may identify one or more individual risks and request that the committee carry out "deep dive" activity on those risks. The Committee will provide their recommendations to the LEP Board following this scrutiny and may request additional actions to be implemented by the LEP Secretariat.
6.3. Each quarter, the LEP Board will be provided with a summary of overall risk status of the LEP as part of the quarterly reporting dashboard, along with details of any risks which are scored as "red", or which have significantly increased in risk score in the last quarter, or which have become an issue and require immediate attention.
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## 7. ESCALATION PROCEDURES

7.1. There may be occasions when risks require escalation outside of the usual reporting timetable. The escalation route is via the Operations and Delivery Executive Manager to the LEP Chief Executive in the first instance. Escalated risks may then go to Finance $\&$ Audit Committee members directly via email to request their input. If the Committee deem it necessary, the escalated risk may then be passed directly to LEP Directors via email for their views.
7.2. The thresholds for triggering the escalation procedure will be as follows:
7.2.1. A risk already included in the Risk Register becomes an issue
7.2.2. A risk already included in the Risk Register changes to be assessed as a level 4 for either probability (almost certain), or impact (catastrophic)
7.2.3. A new risk not already on the Risk Register comes to light and is assessed as "red" or as "become an issue"


