BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Audit, Governance and Standards Committee 13th July 2026

Corporate Risk Update Quarter 1, 2026/27

Relevant Portfolio Holder		Councillor Simon Nock
Portfolio Holder Consulted		Yes
Relevant Head of Service		Debra Goodall
Report Author: James Walton	Job Title: Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer. Contact email: James.walton@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk Contact Tel: 07990 840078	
Wards Affected		All
Ward Councillor(s) consulted		N/A
Relevant Strategic Purpose(s)		Aspiration, work and financial independence
Non-Key Decision		
If you have any questions about this report, please contact the report author in advance of the meeting.		

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Audit, Standards and Governance Committee is asked to RESOLVE to:

1.1 Consider, with appropriate comment, the strategic risks and mitigations detailed in the Corporate Risk Register.

1.2 Consider, with appropriate comment, the changes to risk scores, owners, leads and the removal or addition of risks over the period.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Opportunity Risk Management is the Council's approach to making informed decisions that both manage uncertainty and maximise positive outcomes for our communities, services and organisation.

2.2 The Corporate Risk Register collates, and helps officers manage, monitor and report on, the Council's most significant strategic risks in relation to achievement of corporate priorities. The Council is seeking to improve risk management activities will continue to review all corporate risks and the wider systems of internal governance.

2.3 An officer-led Strategic Risk Management Group is in place and initial meetings with Member Risk Champions are being diarised. Regular consideration of corporate risks at a Cabinet level will be instigated on a more formal basis over the coming months. The Strategic Risk Management Group provides strategic, cross-organisational oversight of the Corporate Risk Register, providing support and appropriate challenge to risk owners. The aim is to improve awareness of interdependencies between corporate and service-level risks, and to ensure that strategic risks effectively inform reporting to SLT, Cabinet, and the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee**.**

2.4 An audit of the Council's improved risk management arrangements is expected in January 2027.

Corporate Risks

2.5 Corporate Risks represent those issues that are likely to require consideration on a cross-organisational basis. The following definition of how risks move from being "departmental" to being "corporate" in nature has been adopted:

"*For a Risk to move from being 'departmental' in nature to being 'corporate' in nature it must have significant impact on Council's finances, be cross departmental in nature, and/or result in serious reputational damage. The Officer Risk Board will vet departmental risks using this definition to move them to Corporate Risks at their quarterly meetings."*

2.6 Corporate Risks identified in the risk register are summarised below in table 1.

Table 1: Corporate Risk Register

Corporate Risk Ref	Risk	Owner	Risk Lead	Inherent	Residual	Last Updated (Type/Date)
COR001	Non-Compliance with Health and Safety Legislation	Guy Revans	Hannah Corredor	20	9	Scores changed 02/02/26
COR002	Financial Resilience of the Council and ability to manage financial shocks	James Walton	Debra Goodall	16	6	None
COR006	Protection from Cyber Attack	John Leach	Mark Hanwell	25	16	Scores changed 03/02/26
COR007	Adequate Workforce Planning	Hannah Corredor	Becky Talbot	12	9	Scores changed 03/07/25
COR008	Resolution of Section 24 Notice	James Walton	Debra Goodall	6	6	None
COR009	Bromsgrove DC being placed into special measures due to quality of planning application decisions	Ruth Bamford	Dale Birch	9	9	Risk review & Scores changed 10/06/26

COR010	Bromsgrove DC: Delivery of Levelling Up Programme	Rachel Egan	Rebecca McElliott	12	8	Scores changed 12/12/25
COR011	Cost of Living Crisis	Judith Willis	Lisa Devey	12	9	Risk review 25/03/26
COR013	Failure to meet waste requirements of the Environment Act 2021	Simon Parry	Matthew Austin	16	9	Scores changed 25/03/26
COR014	Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) prevents the Council from delivering business as usual and work associated with LGR is also ineffective	John Leach	Hannah Corredor	20	12	Scores changed 21/01/26
COR017	Bromsgrove DC being placed in Special Measures for Speed of Plan Making	Ruth Bamford	Michael Dunphy	12	8	Scores changed 03/02/26
COR019	Risk of Terrorist Attack	Judith Willis	Bev Houghton	8	8	Scores changed 11/12/25
COR022	Compliance with the Procurement Act 2023	Claire Felton	Claire Green	9	4	Scores changed 03/02/26
COR024	Non-Implementation of the Renters Rights Act 2025	Judith Willis	Matthew Bough	6	4	Scores changed 11/12/25
COR026	Risk of Cash Flow Strain	Debra Goodall	—	16	12	Scores changed 27/02/26
COR028	LGR ICT changes increase the risk of successful Cyber Attacks	Mark Hanwell	Mark Hanwell	16	12	New Risk

2.7 A new Opportunity Risk Strategy (ORMS) is being developed in conjunction with Risk Champions and will be considered for approval at a future Audit, Standards and Governance Meeting. A review of all corporate risks will be completed over the coming months aligned to the new ORMS and in consideration of prevailing local, national and global risk environment.

2.8 To help inform this review at an early stage, a narrative of each risk and current understanding of the risk score has been completed and summarised in table 2 below.

Table 2: Corporate Risk Narrative and Detailed Scoring

<table>
<tr><th>Corporate Risk Ref</th><th>Risk</th><th>Narrative</th></tr>
<tr><td>COR001</td><td>Non-Compliance with Health and Safety Legislation</td><td>The risk relates to health and safety which is overseen through a formally established Health and Safety Committee, where key areas of concern are discussed. Risk assessments are now in place, and the area is being managed. As health and safety spans the whole council, it remains a significant area of risk and requires regular review. At the point when the risk was last assessed, not all risk assessments were readily available for review, and the current scoring will continue to be updated.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr></table>
The inherent risk score reflects the position if no controls were in place. A high inherent risk for health and safety is appropriate due to the nature of the subject area. The residual risk score reflects the risk after controls have been applied. Various controls are in place across several areas, reducing the risk to a residual score of 9. It was further observed that, given the nature of some council services, there will always be an inherent level of health and safety risk, and it unlikely that the residual risk could be reduced significantly below its current level.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR002</td><td>Financial Resilience of the Council and ability to manage financial shocks</td><td>This risk relates to the ability of the Council to set a legal and sustainable budget over the life of the medium term financial plan (3 years). To manage this risk, the s151 Officer must ensure the budget is robust and the reserves are adequate.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>6</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>The impact and likelihood score for the inherent risk reflect underlying fragility in the current planning process, linked to turnover within the senior management and within the finance team. A revised s25 statement (the s151 Officers assessment of the Robustness of Estimates and Adequacy of Reserves) will be completed in February 2027 ahead of the 2027/28 budget and, alongside the budget, will be the culmination of the work completed to manage this risk.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR006</td><td>Protection from Cyber Attack</td><td>Work has been underway for some time to identify and implement automated cyber security monitoring tools, specifically a Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) solution. The proposed solution would analyse the large volume of security logs generated each day, which would be impractical to review manually. Next steps are due to be discussed by the Cyber Security Group, to finalise requirements, develop a business case, secure funding and implement the solution. This work is expected to help reduce the residual risk over time, although implementation and embedding of the controls will take time and the risk will not reduce immediately.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr></table>
The risk remains high because cyber attacks are occurring continually and represent an ongoing threat. Although many attacks may have little or no impact because existing controls prevent them from succeeding, there remains a risk that a successful attack could have a significant impact. Cyber security is a risk that is unlikely ever to be eliminated entirely. Large organisations with substantial investment in cyber security, continue to experience successful attacks and while additional controls are being implemented to improve the current position, this is expected to remain a high risk area.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR007</td><td>Adequate Workforce Planning</td><td>Workforce planning remains a Corporate Risk due to its fundamental importance in ensuring the Council can deliver its statutory functions and services effectively. The availability of a suitably skilled and</td></tr>
</table>

appropriately resourced workforce underpins service continuity, operational resilience, and the quality of decision-making across the organisation. As this risk impacts multiple service areas and is directly linked to several departmental risks, it continues to be appropriately managed at a corporate level.

SCORING

	Impact	Likelihood	Priority
Inherent	4	3	12
Residual	3	3	9

The risk is primarily associated with the need to ensure sufficient capacity, capability, and resilience within the workforce to meet current and future service demands. Where workforce planning is not effectively managed, there is a potential impact on service delivery, increased financial pressures through reliance on temporary staffing, and risks associated with loss of organisational knowledge and insufficient succession planning.

It is important to note, however, that current workforce indicators do not suggest a systemic issue in relation to recruitment or retention. Staff turnover remains low and stable at 8.2% for 2025/26, which is significantly below the national local government average of 13.4%. This demonstrates strong organisational retention and stability, particularly following a period of increased labour market movement after the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, recruitment activity has been positive, with 166 vacancies advertised over the past 12 months, of which 153 roles were successfully filled, representing a 92% success rate. A total of 4,081 applications were received, indicating strong market interest in roles. This level of success suggests that roles are appropriately designed, and that the organisation remains attractive to candidates.

Several key controls and mitigating actions are in place to manage this risk and provide assurance. Establishment control arrangements are now embedded within management processes, with regular review of workforce data including vacancies and agency usage. Managers have clear and consistent access to establishment information on a monthly basis, enabling informed workforce decisions and improved oversight. Workforce planning has also

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>been embedded within the Service Business Planning process, ensuring that staffing requirements are considered as part of wider service delivery planning and financial management.

In addition, organisational development processes further support workforce sustainability. A strengthened, mandatory appraisal framework has been introduced, including defined appraisal windows and a clear focus on individual training and development requirements. This ensures that workforce capability is actively managed, supports succession planning, and enables the organisation to build internal capacity over time.

Collectively, these controls demonstrate that workforce planning is being actively managed and embedded within core organisational processes. Whilst the risk remains on the Corporate Risk Register due to its strategic importance and cross-cutting nature, the current evidence indicates a stable workforce position, effective recruitment outcomes, and improving maturity in workforce planning arrangements. Ongoing monitoring through corporate governance frameworks will ensure that the effectiveness of these controls continues to be reviewed and strengthened over time.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR008</td><td>Resolution of Section 24 Notice</td><td>This risk relates to the statutory recommendation presented to Council from external audit relating to the 2020/21 end of year accounts, carried forwards through to 2022/23 and impacting on later years.

SCORING<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>6</td></tr></table>
This risk is now substantially managed through the current closedown procedures, the disclaimed opinion provided for the 2023/24 and 2024/25 statement of accounts and the production of the 2025/26 Draft Statement of Accounts, published by the statutory deadline of 30 June 2026.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>COR009</td>
<td>BROMSGROVE DC Being placed into special measures due to quality of planning application decisions</td>
<td>The residual risk had increased from green to amber following the loss of a planning appeal. It was reported that published figures for the quality of decision-making had increased from 6.7% to 7.1%, and officers estimated that a recent appeal decision relating to a care home proposal could result in the figure exceeding the 10% threshold when the statistics are next updated.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr></table>
The current risk score reported shows that if the published figure reaches 10% or above, this represents a risk of designation and placement into special measures. The increase in the reported figure, together with the expected impact of a recent appeal decision, was identified as the reason for the likelihood score being increased and the risk moving to amber. Performance is monitored over a rolling two-year period and future scores can be affected by both new appeal decisions and older data dropping out of the calculation. This is being regularly assessed to ensure the risk scoring is appropriate. While there is an estimated future increase in the published percentage, the precise future position is uncertain because of the way the measurement operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR010</td>
<td>BROMSGROVE: Delivery of Levelling Up Programme</td>
<td>This risk relates to the delivery of the Levelling Up Programme which consists of:
• Town Centre Public Realm works
• Windsor Street – demolition and remediation of the site (the development of the site is not part of Levelling Up funded programme)
• Nailers Yard – development of new community facility, commercial building and associated public realm (construction only)

The Town Centre Public Realm works are now complete.

For Windor Street the demolition works are complete, and the remediation works are entering their final phase. Given the extensive investigation and phase 1 remediation works undertaken we expect this phase</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>of remediation to be successful though there remains a residual risk as this cannot be confirmed until 12 months of monitoring has been completed.

Nailers Yard has experienced several issues and delays to programme due to the culvert works and S278 external works. Work is now progressing with completion expected early autumn 2026.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>4</td></tr></table>
The inherent impact risk is rated as 4 because failure to deliver the programme could result in funds being clawed back by government and high reputational risk both in terms of the public and government perspective. The inherent likelihood risk is 3 because without the necessary measures in place, failure to deliver is likely. This is mitigated through dedicated project management resource and governance and oversight through the Levelling Up Fund Board, Capital Programme Board, quarterly reports to Overview & Scrutiny Board and ad hoc reports to the Senior Leadership Team as required. The residual impact remains at 4 because the impact of non-delivery remains the same. The residual likelihood is now 1 as at this stage of the programme it is very unlikely that the programme will not be delivered.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR011</td><td>Cost of Living Crisis</td><td>Risk COR011 relates to the impact on the Council and residents from the cost of living crisis which has been inherent since the end of the Covid pandemic. It continues to affect the nation with more recent impacts following wars across the world. The residual risk scores a 3 for impact with likelihood at 3 and this reflects the ongoing demand and use of support services that residents continue to call up, including food banks, the new Crisis Resilience Fund and take up of advisory services such as Citizens Advice.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>
SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr>
</table>
The score is mitigated by the availability of Council services including the Financial Inclusion Team and Housing Sustainability Team alongside partner services such as DWP and the voluntary sector. The work is co-ordinated via the COL Partnership Group.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR013</td>
<td>Failure to meet waste requirements of the Environment Act 2021</td>
<td>
Risk COR0013 relates to the Council’s ability to meet our statutory duties for waste and recycling requirements arising from the Environment Act 2021 and the Government’s Simpler Recycling reforms. Whilst the Council's dry recycling service is compliant with our responsibilities, neither Council is currently compliant with the requirement to operate weekly household food waste collections from April 2026 as a result of delays in government funding, and the decision to not supply promised on-going revenue funding to support this as a new burden.

SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr>
</table>
The residual risk is currently scored as Impact 3 and Likelihood 3. This reflects the ongoing reputational and financial consequences of the Council's current position and potential risk of judicial review for non-compliance with a statutory service. The score is mitigated by the scale of non-compliance with this statutory duty nationally, and mobilisation activity to implement a partial service within the 2026/27 financial year across both Council areas.
A report is planned for Members in July 2026 setting out the planned partial implementation of this service utilising funding already approved within the MTFP, and the additional budget required to support expansion of the service to all households and achieve full compliance with this statutory duty.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>COR014</td>
<td>Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) prevents the Council from delivering business as usual and work associated with LGR is also ineffective</td>
<td>This is a significant organisational risk due to capacity presenting a considerable challenge, particularly in certain services (such as ICT), with escalation routes to senior management. Officers are working on solutions to address these resource pressures. The risk forms part of the wider context for much of the Council’s current work and that its implications extend to staff resources and the organisation’s ability to deliver services during the transition process. Government ministers had indicated that the established LGR timetable remains unchanged, and that understanding the implications of future decisions remains important.

SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr>
</table>

The Council has assessed thar there to be a considerable risk associated with LGR in terms of delivery, transition and the impact on staff resources. The Annual Governance Statement identified that LGR represents a significant risk but is being well managed and coordinated and is not considered to represent a governance issue at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR017</td>
<td>Bromsgrove District Council being Placed in Special Measure for Speed of Plan Making</td>
<td>The Local Plan is a statutory requirement, but more than this it will shape the future of the District for years to come. Local Plans historically have taken many years to produce, under a recently introduced system Councils now only have 30 months to produce a local plan once they pass through a first gateway assessment. The Bromsgrove local plan has already made significant progress under a previous system, and we are now transitioning into this new system. The development of the Local plan relies on the interpretation of national policies, collection of technical information and the views gain from widespread public consultation, these are very often at odds with each other.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

The Local Plan is a corporate risk due to theses completing elements creating a complex and often controversial environment. The Local Plan is being managed by the Local Plan Cross Party Working Group, this will ensure that all risks associated with the development of the plan are considered in detail by key members and senior officers. Due to this level of governance to risk of meeting the agreed timetables is currently only a moderate risk, although will likely to remain so, as there are always going to be unknown and uncontrollable factors such as a change in national policy or government or decision taken by the courts etc which may increase the risk associated with the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR019</td>
<td>Risk of Terrorist Attack</td>
<td>Risk COR019 relates to the impact on the Council and communities from the risk of a terrorist attack.

SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

The residual risk scores a 4, with likelihood at 2, this reflects the seriousness that an attack would have to the community whilst reflecting that local areas are not considered to be high target. This assessment is based on annual and ongoing national and local intelligence and data shared by the police. The score is mitigated by the development and implementation of the Action Counters Terrorism Plan, attendance at NPSA Public Authority Information Briefings and the roll out of Prevent training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR022</td>
<td>Compliance with the Procurement Act 2023</td>
<td>This risk is being managed through a programme of officer training and ongoing implementation activity. Three sets of training sessions have been delivered to officers, with further sessions scheduled in the coming weeks and additional training planned for the autumn. Training for Members is also planned. In addition, a</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decision has been taken regarding a "no contract, no order" deadline, and extensive communications have been issued advising that from 30 September any order submitted without an associated contract will not be able to be raised. Work is progressing as planned and compliance activity is being embedded as part of ongoing day-to-day business.

SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr>
</table>

The scoring of the risk reflects that it is an area of compliance that requires continual attention and will not disappear entirely. The risk will remain because the legislation must be complied with on an ongoing basis, but the controls being implemented, including training, communication and contractual controls, are intended to mitigate the risk and keep it at a manageable level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR024</td>
<td>Non-implementation of the Renters Rights Act 2025 (New)</td>
<td>This has been implemented, all paperwork has been updated, staff have been trained, the necessary committee processes had been completed, delegations had been amended and the Housing Enforcement Policy had been updated. Officers have not experienced a significant increase in workload following implementation of the Act. The main increase in activity occurred before the abolition of Section 21 notices. Rather than receiving specific complaints about non-compliance with the Act, officers are identifying instances where landlords have not implemented requirements correctly through enquiries and complaints received from residents.

SCORING
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr>
<tr><td>Inherent</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Residual</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr>
</table>

The inherent and residual scores are within the low category because the Act has been implemented and procedures are now in place. Given the legislation is still relatively new the risk will remain under review for</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>a period before being considered for removal from the corporate risk register.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR026</td><td>BROMSGROVE - Risk of Cash Flow Strain</td><td>The risk relates to the financing of the capital programme and the potential for increased borrowing requirements to manage cash flow.

SCORING<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>12</td></tr></table>
The impact of this risk can be managed through a review of the capital programme and funding in the first half of the 2026/27 financial year.</td></tr>
<tr><td>COR028</td><td>LGR ICT changes increase the risk of successful Cyber Attacks</td><td>This is a new risk relating to the cyber security implications of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). ICT managers and technical specialists had recently met with a supplier that specialises in the integration of organisations and networks. During those discussions, it was highlighted that the process of bringing multiple council networks together presents cyber security challenges. Cyber attackers are likely to be aware of the published timetable for LGR and may seek to exploit any weaknesses in cyber defences during the transition. It is noted that integrating multiple networks could result in a reduced degree of control compared to the current position, and that managing cyber security across several organisations is complex.

SCORING<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>12</td></tr></table>
There is a real risk associated with the integration of multiple council networks because an issue affecting one authority’s network could potentially impact others once systems are connected. This risk is receiving active management throughout the LGR process and although similar transitions have been completed successfully elsewhere and the risks are manageable,</td></tr>
</table>

		the complexity of network integration means the threat remains significant.

2.9 As part of the quarterly review of Corporate Risks, updates from previous reporting (most recently Quarter 4 2025/26) and collated and included in table 3 below.

Table 3: Corporate Risk Changes Q4 2025/26 to Q1 2026/27

Risk	**Change and reason**	**Residual Risk Score**	**Last Updated**
Bromsgrove DC being placed into special measures due to quality of planning application decisions	Published figures for quality of decision making are 6.7% (The next quarterly update is due in June). If/when the current figure of 6.7% rises to 10% or above, this represents a risk of designation. A recent appeal decision (24/01225/FUL Care Home in May Lane, Wythall) leads officers to estimate that the council will exceed the 10% threshold when the published figures are next updated in September 2026 (11%). Consequently, risk likelihood has increased to LIKELY resulting in an AMBER risk. Additional controls have been added.	9 – Medium (increase from 6- Low)	Risk review & Scores Changed 10/06/26
LGR ICT changes increase the risk of successful Cyber Attacks	This is a new risk relating to the cyber security implications of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). The changes required to the ICT Infrastructure of all the councils to bring them together for LGR, can increase the risk of a security measure no longer working or being valid at a time when changes introduce risk.	12 – Medium	New risk added 25/06/26

2.10 In addition to Corporate Risks, the council's '4Risk' system also holds details of service risks. These risks are held at a departmental level and reviewed regularly. Where necessary, service risks can be escalated to corporate risks when meeting the agreed criteria. There are currently 47 service risks identified on the system with no increase in total number since the last period. These are summarised in table 4 below.

Table 4: Service Risks

Service Area	Last period	Red following mitigation	Last period	Amber following mitigation	Last period	Green following mitigation	Total number of risks last period	Total number of risks
Customer Services			1	1			1	1
Benefits			1	1	3	3	4	4
Revenues	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	4
Finance			1	1	2	2	3	3
Environmental Services			4	4	3	3	7	7
Leisure & Culture Services			1	1	1		2	1
Regen. & Property Services			4	4	2	2	6	6
ICT			1	1			1	1
Housing			9	9	7	7	16	16
Community Services					3	3	3	3
HR					1	1	1	1
Total departmental risks	1	**1**	24	**24**	23	**22**	48	**47**

2.11 There is currently one service risk that appears in the high category. This risk is in the Revenues service and a narrative of the risk and current understanding of the risk score has been completed and summarised in table 5 below.

Table 5: Service Risk Narrative and Detailed Scoring

<table>
<tr><th>Service Risk Ref</th><th>Risk</th><th>Narrative</th></tr>
<tr><td>REV007</td><td>Data Compliance and security of data</td><td>In March 2025 two incidents of disclosure of personal data were logged, including one disclosure where a customer was logged under safeguarding as a MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) case. Information Management requested that Data Compliance and Security was logged as a risk within the service risk register.

SCORING
<table><tr><th></th><th>Impact</th><th>Likelihood</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>Inherent</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>Residual</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>16</td></tr></table>
Actions to control the risk of disclosure include:</td></tr>
</table>

		• Provide updates to team members on processes for adding address information to core person records. • Update the process for inclusion of MARAC indicators on account • Cleanse vulnerability and MARAC code data. • Develop process for removal of MARAC codes when status changes. • Use of indicators to identify MARAC and Vulnerability cases. Actions are being developed and completed to mitigate this risk in future.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Effective risk identification, and management of those risks, is integral to the delivery of effective and efficient services to residents and businesses. Risk impacts can be both financial and reputational. Future risk reporting will increasingly align to a financial risk framework covering revenue, capital, cash flow and wider corporate dependencies.

3.2 The Council spends significant sums insuring itself and must also hold reserves to mitigate the costs of risks should they happen. A comprehensive Risk Management approach ensures risk and its consequences, including financial ones, are minimised.

3.3 A review of the Council's General Fund Balance, aligned to a revision of the Council's corporate risks, is expected to be completed for inclusion in the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

4 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 No Legal implications have been identified.

5 OTHER – IMPLICATIONS

Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)

5.1 A comprehensive Risk Management approach ensures risk and its consequences is minimised for the Council. A corporate risk and associated governance process and other mitigations are in place to help manage the transition through LGR to vesting day 1 April 2028.

Climate Change Implications

5.2 The green thread runs through the Council Plan This includes risks linked to activities and actions that link to our climate.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

5.3 If risks are not mitigated it can lead to events that could have Customer/Equalities and Diversity implications for the Council.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The Corporate Risk Register includes high level risks. Each risk is rated between 1 and 5 as to how likely it is to occur and between 1 and 5 as to the potential financial and/or reputational impact. The product of these two numbers gives the initial rating. Mitigation is then put in place to help reduce the risk rating.

7 APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix 1 – Risk Scoring Matrix.

Appendix 1

Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact \ Likelihood	1. Very Unlikely	2. Unlikely	3. Likely	4. Very Likely	5. Almost Certain
5. Major	5 Medium e	10 Medium e	15 Medium e	20 High	25 High
4. Serious	4 Low	8 Medium e	12 Medium e	16 High	20 High
3. Significant	3 Low	6 Low	9 Medium e	12 Medium e	15 Medium e
2. Minor	2 Low	4 Low	6 Low	8 Medium e	10 Medium e
1. Insignificant	1 Low	2 Low	3 Low	4 Low	5 Medium e

IMPACT VALUES (INDICATIVE)

	Service Disruption.	Reputation	H&S - Injury	Environmental and Social Impact	Cost
INSIGNIFICANT	Brief disruption of important service area	No interest to local media. Insignificant	No injury	Localised environmental or social impact. Insignificant	Costing less than £1000. 0 - 1 (% of Budget)
MINOR	Significant effect to non-crucial service area; 1 - 2 (Days)	Minor adverse publicity in the local media, no damage to reputation.	Minor injury or discomfort to individual(s).	Short term effect on the environment i.e. noise, fumes etc. no lasting detrimental impact. Minor	Costing less than £5,000 Up to 10% of Budget. 1 - 10 (% of Budget)
SIGNIFICANT	Major effect to an important service area for a short period - Service Disruption 2-3 Days	Some adverse publicity, legal implications. Significant	Severe injury to an individual (s); Severe injury Short term environmental or social impact requiring remedial action. Significant		Costing between £5,000 and £50,000 Up to 25% of Budget. 10 - 25 (% of Budget)
SERIOUS	Loss of an important service area for a period up to 5 days; 3 - 5 (Days)	Long term local reputation damage - National adverse publicity	Major injury to an individual (s)	Long term environmental or social impact. Serious	Costing between £50,000 and £500,000 Up to 50% of Budget. 25 - 50 (% of Budget)
MAJOR	Major loss of services, Unable to function - Service Disruption 5+ Days 5 - 365 (Days).	Adverse and persistent national media coverage - Severe loss of public confidence. Major	Fatality(s)	Long term detrimental impact on the environment/or community. Major	Costing over £500,000 Up to 75% of Budget. 50 - 75 (% of Budget)

LIKELIHOOD VALUES

	Occurrence %:	Probability:
VERY UNLIKELY	0 - 5 (%)	Very low probability / never before.
UNLIKELY	Less than 5-10% chance of occurrence	Has happened rarely/Every 10 years.
LIKELY	10% - 40% chance of occurrence	Only likely to happen 3 or more years.
VERY LIKELY	40% - 75% chance of occurrence	Likely to happen at some point within the next 1-2 years Circumstances occasionally encountered (few times a year).
ALMOST CERTAIN	More than 75% chance of occurrence	Regular occurrence Circumstances frequently encountered –daily/weekly/monthly.