

Risk Register

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Partnership with its quarterly update on SEStran's corporate risk register.
- 2.1 This report was considered by the Performance and Audit Committee at its meeting on the 21 November 2025.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Performance and Audit Committee, at its meeting in November 2021 approved the [SEStran Risk Management Framework Policy](#). This policy supports the management of the overall risk process within the organisation, including its governance arrangements.
- 2.3 The latest version of the risk register can be found at **Appendix 1** of this report.

3. KEY NET RISKS

- 3.1 This report focuses on the 3 main current strategic risks, based on the total risk scores shown in the strategic risk register, which is included as an appendix to the report. These risks have not changed since the report to the P&A Committee meeting on 6 June 2025.
- 3.2 R001 1.1 Transport Governance
 - 3.2.1 Transport governance sets out the roles and responsibilities of Transport Scotland, the seven Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs), 32 local authorities, and other key partners in shaping how transport is managed across Scotland.
 - 3.2.2 RTPs and COSLA have been pushing for a review of transport governance in the belief that the principle of subsidiarity would result in better transport outcomes. Given that transport is a key enabler for economic growth and land use planning, the benefits of such a review are likely to be significant.
 - 3.2.3 A number of previous reviews of transport governance in Scotland have recommended that Transport Scotland should devolve a number of responsibilities to RTPs and local authorities (organisations with a better understanding of regional and local needs). These organisations, with their in-depth knowledge of local transport issues, are often better able to set priorities and deliver projects effectively in their own areas.

- 3.2.4 However, none of the recommendations of these previous reviews have been taken forward.
- 3.2.5 Recently there has been a major push to increase regional delivery of public services by building on the success of the regional growth deals such as the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal. These discussions reinforce the recommendations of the 2019 review of Transport Governance undertaken by Transport Scotland and Jacob's.
- 3.2.6 For SEStran, a review of governance presents both risks and opportunities. On one hand, the recent transfer of People and Place responsibilities highlights Transport Scotland's commitment to a regional approach and shows its trust in Regional Transport Partnerships. The RTPs have been using this momentum to work closely with Transport Scotland and identify further areas where they can add value. However, it is also possible that a review may result in the influence of RTPs being reduced, and this may limit their ability to advance regional transport priorities effectively.
- 3.2.7 At its meeting on 26 September 2025, the Partnership Board requested a paper providing a more detailed explanation transport governance and the various potential outcomes of a review. It had been intended to submit the paper to this meeting of the Performance and Audit Committee for scrutiny ahead of the Partnership Board meeting on 5 December 2025.
- 3.2.8 During November 2025, discussions with Transport Scotland have established that a new Directorate within Transport Scotland will lead a fresh review of regional governance. The Directorate will be formally launched in late November 2025, and it is likely to be some time before the review is commenced. Given that this is a rapidly developing picture, a decision has been taken not to submit the report to the P&A Committee as planned. This will to provide Officers additional time to gather further information prior to submitting the report to the Board.
- 3.2.9 A verbal update will be provided at the meeting, with time for discussion.

3.3 Funding

- 3.3.1 After remaining unchanged for over ten years, Transport Scotland's annual grant was cut by 5% in 2024/25 due to government budget reductions. This lower funding continues in 2025/26, with further cuts possible.
- 3.3.2 SEStran and the broader RTP community continue to work with Transport Scotland to highlight the value of a regional approach and the broader impact it could deliver with increased funding. This is further explored in paragraph 3.2.
- 3.3.3 Council requisitions have declined by 10% over the past decade and, in response, Transport Scotland has encouraged RTPs to seek increases. Discussions have been held between SEStran and its partner authorities with a view to seeking an increase in requisitions for 2026/27, but these have been postponed for the time being.

- 3.3.4 Ad hoc project funding, usually from Transport Scotland, has historically accounted for up to 50% of SEStran's total income. However, since the advent of the People and Place programme in 2024/25, this source of income has become very scarce.
- 3.3.5 European Union funding ceased entirely in 2023/24 following the UK's exit from the EU. However, UK organisations remain eligible to bid for Horizon Europe funding. SEStran continues to actively collaborate with UK and EU partners to explore these opportunities.
- 3.3.6 The net effect of all of the above is an increasingly uncertain future for delivery of the Regional Transport Strategy, although the emerging SEStran project may address much of this uncertainty if the business case is accepted by Transport Scotland at the end of the current financial year.
- 3.2.7 Future funding risks are presented in more detail in the Indicative Financial Plan for future years that has been presented to this meeting of the P&A Committee.

3.4 Cyber Security

- 3.4.1 SEStran continues to face significant cyber threats that could compromise sensitive information and disrupt essential services.
- 3.4.2 To protect against these threats, SEStran's IT service provider manages all aspects of IT support and cyber security. This includes:
- Installing and maintaining up-to-date security systems to block attacks.
 - Providing regular training for staff to help them recognise and avoid common scams, such as suspicious emails, text messages, and phone calls.
 - Carrying out an annual Cyber Essentials Plus audit to ensure high standards are met, with full accreditation maintained.
 - Receiving daily updates on new threats and weekly checks for vulnerabilities from national cyber security agencies.
 - Arranging monthly in-person meetings with IT experts to review and improve security measures.
- 3.4.3 These measures benefit SEStran and its stakeholders by:
- **Protecting Sensitive Data:** Robust cyber security safeguards personal and organisational information, reducing the risk of data breaches that could harm individuals or the organisation's reputation
 - **Ensuring Service Continuity:** By preventing and responding quickly to cyber threats, SEStran can maintain reliable services for the public and partner organisations
 - **Building Trust:** Demonstrating strong cyber security practices reassures stakeholders—including staff, partner councils, and the public—that SEStran takes its responsibilities seriously
 - **Meeting Legal and Regulatory Standards:** Regular audits and compliance with national standards help SEStran meet its legal obligations and avoid penalties
 - **Supporting Staff Confidence:** Ongoing training and support empower staff to act as the first line of defence, making the whole organisation more resilient

4. RISK APPETITE – FINANCIAL SCORING

- 4.1 The Risk Register shown at Appendix 1 includes tabs detailing the approach to Risk Appetite and Risk Appetite Target Scores.
- 4.2 The Target Scores show the range of Risk Scores (i.e. Low, Medium and High) that SEStran is prepared to accept for each group of risks (e.g. Financial, Reputational, Operational).
- 4.3 This way of grouping risks may result in the appetite for certain risks being misrepresented.
- 4.4 It is felt that, given the statutory imperative to achieve a balanced budget, the appetite for the specific Financial risk relating to a significant budgetary overspend (R002) should be 'low' rather than the 'low to medium' for the wider group of Financial risks,
- 4.5 It is also felt that, given the increasing prevalence of, and damage caused by, cyber attacks, the appetite relating to Cyber Security should be 'low' rather than 'low to medium' as per the target score for System and Technology.
- 4.6 It is therefore suggested that the Risk Appetite Target Scores tab be amended to show the risks outlined in 4.4 and 4.5 separately, with the targets for each set to 'low'

5 CHANGES TO RISK REGISTER

- 5.1 A number of updates have been made to the Risk Register, and these are highlighted in red on the Register itself.
- 5.2 Primary among these are that responsibility for resolution of 'Financial' risks has been changed from Partnership Director to Treasurer, although the Finance and operational teams will continue to work closely together to mitigate all risks.
- 5.3 The working relationship between SEStran and the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region is such that R002 can be closed because R001 now captures any risks arising from reorganisation of any form.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS




- 6.1 The Partnership is asked to note the contents of the report.

Angela Chambers
Business Manager

Appendix 1: SEStran Risk Register

Policy Implications	Policies have been reviewed and updated.
---------------------	--

Financial Implications	As highlighted in the register.
Equalities Implications	None
Climate Change Implications	None




APPENDIX 1																				
Risk Number	Risk Category	Risk Detail	Gross Risk Assessment			Planned Response/Mitigation	Net Risk Assessment			Risk After Mitigation	Date and Owner	Risk Appetite		Action Required						
			Probability	Impact	Risk Score		Probability	Impact	Risk Score											
R001 1.1	Strategic	Regional Governance Transport Scotland review of regional transport governance arrangements could result in changes to functions of RTPs. This could present either a risk or an opportunity to SEStran.	4	Probable	4	Major	16	High	The joint RTPs have submitted a refreshed Develop to Deliver report to TS and COSLA in 2024. TS currently are looking for resource to restart the review of regional governance. Discussions being held with TS on review of regional governance. Response to consultation on Regional Economic Partnerships provides another opportunity to shape debate on RTP roles going forward. Continue to input as SEStran as well as through Joint RTPs A new Directorate within TS has been created and an officer has been appointed to lead the transport governance review.	4	Probable	4	Major	16	High	High Treat	Review at end of March 2026 Partnership Director	Low	Med	
RO01 1.2	Strategic	Pandemic / Epidemic: Interruption of normal service/inability to deliver functions. Financial impact of crisis on sources of funding.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Adhere to Government restrictions, rules or guidance. Regular communication with Transport Scotland and constituent councils officials to guide any operational changes. Ensure that all staff are trained on the Business Continuity Plan, and that it is reviewed regularly. Maintain current functions that can be delivered within working guidance. Working from home arrangements now tried, tested and effective.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	Review at end of March 2026 Partnership Director	Low	Med	
RO01 1.3	Strategic	Political/Govt Change There is a risk that a change in government could lead to changes to RTPs/Regional Governance	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Continued engagement with all political parties and agencies. Partnership Director is currently hosting meetings with MSP Transport Spokesperson from each scottish political party. A SEStran Manifesto will launched at the SEStran Summit on 4 December and will be followed by a comms campaign to target MSPs.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	Review at end of March 2026 Partnership Director	Low	Med	

Update on summit, manifesto, meetings and comms

	Financial	Financial: Significant deviation from budgeted spend	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	The Financial Rules do not permit spending (whether revenue or capital) to exceed available budget. Budget and spend is monitored on a monthly basis by SEStran officers, using financial information provided by CEC through the Partnership's Financial Services Service Level Agreement with CEC and supported by qualified accounting staff of CEC. Action is taken by Partnership officers to develop alternative savings measures, including options for development of contingency arrangements, if required and subject to approval by the Partnership. The Partnership's Financial Rules require reporting of financial performances to the Partnership Board on a quarterly basis. Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 includes section on RTPs carrying reserves.	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low	Low Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low	Med	↔
R002 2.1	Financial	The approved budget for 2025/26 makes provision for a pay award of up to 3%.	5	Highly Probable	3	Moderate	15	High	Prudent planning assumption with ongoing monitoring of public sector pay negotiations. Ongoing monitoring and review of all costs and forecasts during 2025/26. As the 2025/26 pay award of 4% is higher than the 3% budgeted provision, forecasts for 2025/26 have been reviewed to identify measures to mitigate the additional cost of £7,600.	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low	Med	↔
R002 2.2	Financial	Staff recharges - externally funded projects: The approved budget assumes that £149,000 of staff time can be recharged to Projects. There is a risk this may not be achievable.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Any shortfall in employee cost recharges will be offset by a corresponding reduction in Projects Budget expenditure. Other funding sources will continue to be pursued.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low	Med	↔
R002 2.3	Financial	Inflation: There is a risk that the indicative budget does not adequately cover price inflation and increasing demand for services.	4	Probable	4	Major	16	High	When setting the revenue budget, allowance was made for specific known price inflation. Budgets adjusted in line with current cost forecasts. Ongoing monitoring and review of all costs and forecasts during 2025/26. In preparing estimates for 2026/27 and beyond, the Partnership will review all cost estimates to determine if it will be necessary to make a case to increase council contributions.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low	Med	↔

R002 2.4	Financial	Delays in payment of external grants results in additional short-term borrowing costs.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	SEStran grant claims for projects are submitted in compliance with grant funding requirements to ensure minimal delay in payment. Ongoing monitoring of cash flow is undertaken to manage exposure to additional short-term borrowing costs. Grant submission procedures in place, along with financial planning.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	
R002 2.5	Financial	Sources of additional income to the Partnership may become constrained in the current economic climate and/or due to changes in operating arrangements.	4	Probable	4	Major	16	High Continue to explore alternative funding options Lobby/bid for additional funds	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Medium Treat	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	
R002 2.6	Financial	Funding reductions: Future reductions in core funding from Scottish Government and/or council requisitions. This could result in difficulty in delivering statutory obligations/duties.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	The Partnership will continue to source and develop external funding. Manage organisation in accordance with available funding but ability of organisation to deliver RTS objectives will inevitably be dictated by available funding. Engagement/advocating with SG/TS/constituent councils to maintain/increase funding Working with other RTPs to influence SG review of allocation of funding	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	
R002 2.7	Financial	The funding position of the staff pension fund could lead to increases in the employers pension contribution	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Following Lothian Pension Fund's Triennial Actuarial Review in 2023, Partnership employer pension fund contribution rates are now confirmed at 26.8% until 31 March 2027. Financial planning assumptions have been updated and included in the revenue budget for 2025/26 and indicative budget for 2026/27 approved by the Partnership Board on 14th March 2025.	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	

R002 2.8	Financial	Current staffing levels cannot be maintained due to funding constraints and the Partnership incurs staff release costs	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	The Partnership continues to seek additional sources of funding for activities aligned to the Partnership's objectives to supplement resources. Recruitment control measures in place. Additional resources can be managed through consultancy as required. People and Place Programme has increased financial flexibility.	2	Unlikely	4	Major	8	Medium	Medium Tolerate	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	↔
R002 2.9	Financial	Funding/Grant Awards: The timing of some funding applications and grant awards do not align with the financial year, resulting in an inability to spend allocated funding within prescribed timescales	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium	As part of the ongoing business planning process the Partnership will continue to develop and introduce where appropriate a number of suitable on the shelf schemes. All potential schemes will be subject to detailed impact assessments to ensure impacts on the Partnership's core activities are minimised or mitigated. Regular budget monitoring and reports to the Partnership Board.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Treat	December 2025 Partnership Director	Low Med	↓
R003 3.0	Reputational	Project Management: Project incomplete or of poor quality Late Delivery	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	All project progress reported to the Projects Team monthly and the Project and Strategy Delivery Oversight Subgroup quarterly. Minutes of PaSDOS and the full project report are also taken to P&A Committee quarterly for additional oversight. Management action taken as required.	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	Low Tolerate	Review at end March 2026 Programme Manager	Low Med	↔

<div>R003</div> <div>3.1</div>	Reputational	<div>Reputation:</div> <div>Regard by the public and stakeholders.</div> <div>Negative or inaccurate media coverage leading to misrepresentation of SEStran position</div>	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	<div>Quick response to negative or inaccurate coverage managed by Communications & Marketing Officer,</div> <div>Proactive profile and reputation management via social media, website and press releases.</div> <div>Partnership staff and Board Members continue to promote and advocate activities via speaking, writing or wider networking</div> <div>Continue to work closely with regional partners</div> <div>Board members regulary updated on SEStran work successes and issues.</div> <div>Agreed approach to media position set out in Standing Orders.</div>	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	<div>Low</div> <div>Tolerate</div>	<div>Review end of March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director</div>	Low	Med	
<div>R003</div> <div>3.2</div>	Reputational	<div>Project Management:</div> <div>Potential insolvency of 3rd party supplier</div>	3	Possible	3	Major	9	Medium	<div>Improved supplier viability checks before award, renewal or modification of contracts or grants now in place.</div> <div>Individual risks and mitigations to be developed for any contract or grant over an agreed threshold.</div> <div>Where appropriate, Government frameworks will be utilised.</div> <div>Full review of procurement procedures is nearing completion by Legal Advisers. Staff training on new procedures to be developed.</div>	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	<div>Medium</div> <div>Treat</div>	<div>Review at end of March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director</div>	Low	Med	
<div>R005</div> <div>5.0</div>	External	<div>Third party Service Level Agreements:</div> <div>Failure or inadequacy of service</div>	2	Unlikely	2	Minor	4	Low	<div>Service Level Agreements in place for Financial Services, HR and Insurance services. Reviewed annually by senior officers. Subject to independent audit scrutiny.</div>	2	Unlikely	2	Minor	4	Low	<div>Low</div> <div>Tolerate</div>	<div>Review March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director</div>	Low	Med	

R005 5.1	External	Contract Management: Failure to manage contracts leads to under performance and failure to obtain best value and delivery from contractual relationship.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Conditions of contract reviewed, including Contract Standing Orders. This work will shape a new Procurement Strategy and Manual which is being developed by Anderson Strathern. Ensure contract documentation sound and up to date. Ensure contracts are adequately managed. Business propriety/credit/analytic criteria to be written in to documentation. Contract management process to be included as part of full procurement review.	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	Low Tolerate	Review at end of March 2026 Partnership Director	Low Med	↔
R005 5.2	External	Grants: Failure to adhere to grant conditions could result in grants being withheld or reclaimed, impacting the SEStran budget	4	Probable	4	Major	16	High	Ensure that grant conditions are understood before application is submitted, that relevant team members are briefed on grant conditions, and that adequate controls are in place to ensure that all steps and approvals are documented. Grant standing orders Also refer to risk 2.9. Successful management of risk 5.2, reduces likelihood of risk 2.9	2	Unlikely	4	Major	8	Medium	Medium Treat	Review at end of March 2026 Partnership Director	Low Med	↓
R006 6.0	Legal and Regulatory	Statutory Duties: Failure to adhere to duties described in legislation and related documentation	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Regular monitoring and programming of statutory duties is undertaken by the Partnership Director, Senior Partnership Manager and Business Manager. Audited by third parties. Officers to carry out a review of compliance with Public Sector Equality Duty. Horizon scanning of consultations which may lead to new statutory responsibilities.	2	Unlikely	4	Major	8	Medium	Treat	Review at end March 2026 Partnership Director	Low Low	↔
R007 7.0	Specific Operational	People and Place Plan: Funding changes result in programme not continuing regionally beyond 2026/27	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Engage regularly with Transport Scotland. Ensure outcomes and outputs from the programme delivery are captured to evidence efficacy of regional approach. With the election in early 2026, the impact of this on P&P is unknown and so likelihood of this has been upgraded to possible despite the mitigations.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Low Tolerate	March 2026 Programme Manager	Low Med	↔

<div>R008</div> <div>8.0</div>	System and Technology	Digital/IT: Server failure Comms failure Website breach Resulting in loss of service to business operations	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Regular review of the Management Plan for Business Continuity. IT/Website maintained under contract. Both proactively managed by third parties. IT hardware/software/licences upgraded at regular intervals. Contracted IT consultants deliver IT services. Website contract includes security updates. Robust Information Security Policy in place with regular monitoring reports. GDPR compliant and Cyber Essentials Plus Accreditation maintained.	1	Remote	4	Major	4	Low	Low Tolerate	Ongoing Business Manager	Low Med	↔
<div>R008</div> <div>8.1</div>	System and Technology	Cyber Security: Public sector entities are prime targets for cyberattacks and data breaches, which can compromise sensitive information and disrupt services.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Annual Cyber Essentials Plus audit and accreditation awarded. In receipt of daily threats and weekly vulnerability emails from the Scottish/National Cyber Security Centre. Regular Staff training and exercises. Monthly in person visit by IT Consultant/Engineer under contracted services provision.	2	Unlikely	4	Major	8	Medium	Medium Treat	Review is ongoing Business Manager	Low Med	↓
<div>R009</div> <div>9.0</div>	People	HR: Non-compliance with employment and/or data privacy laws may result in poor reputation as an employer, difficulty in attracting skilled resource and greater probability of litigation and / or financial penalties	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	SLA in place until May 2026 with Falkirk Council to provide specialist HR advice as required and is under regular review. Legal advice is provided, when required, through a framework contract, which is in place until August 2027	1	Remote	3	Moderate	3	Low	Low Tolerate	Review at end March 2026 Partnership Director	Low Low	↔
<div>R009</div> <div>9.1</div>	People	Inadequate measures in place to facilitate staff health, safety and well-being during contingency arrangements or future office arrangements.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	Regular review of appropriate policies. Carry out appropriate assessments of office equipment and working arrangements, following landlords guidance in relation to access to the office. Risk Management Framework approved by P&A Committee. Liaise with HR Adviser, SG facilities team. Hybrid Working Policy implemented to facilitate transition arrangements to normal working arrangements. An ongoing risk remains for future pandemics and future widespread disease or other outbreaks. Measures will be adjusted in accordance with government advice.	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	Low Tolerate	Review at end March 2026 Partnership Director (Subject to SG advice)	Low Low	↔

<div>R009</div> <div>9.2</div>	People	Inadequate measures in place to facilitate staff health, safety and well-being during working from home arrangements.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium	<div>Appropriate policies are reviewed and updated. Risk assessments of staff personal home working arrangements have been completed and will be subject to regular review. Risk Management Framework approved-by P&A Committee. Business Continuity Plan reviewed.</div> <div>Liaise with HR Adviser. Review transition arrangements to normal working arrangements at appropriate time. Hybrid Working Policy implemented and working well.</div> <div>An ongoing risk remains for future pandemics and future widespread disease or other outbreaks. Measures will be adjusted in accordance with government advice and legislation.</div>	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low	<div>Low</div> <div>Tolerate</div>	<div>Review at end March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director (Subject to SG advice)</div>	Low	Low	↔
<div>R009</div> <div>9.3</div>	People	Loss of key personnel may lead to inability to deliver strategy, projects and/or operations	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	<div>Recruitment Policy in place. Development of existing staff through performance appraisal. Staff training</div> <div>Work programme will be monitored and redistributed as necessary.</div>	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low	<div>Low</div> <div>Tolerate</div>	<div>Review at end March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director</div>	Low	Low	↔
<div>R009</div> <div>9.4</div>	People	<div>Climate Change</div> <div>Staff are unable to access the office more frequently due to increase in adverse weather events.</div>	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	<div>Home working policy in place and procedures for inability to access the office outlined in the SEStran Business Continuity Plan (Jan 2024). Train team in BCP, and review regularly.</div>	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low	<div>Low</div> <div>Tolerate</div>	<div>Review at end March 2026</div> <div>Partnership Director</div>	Low	Low	↔

Risk Number	Risk Detail	Risk Category	Gross Risk Assessment			Planned Response/Mitigation	Net Risk Assessment			Risk After Mitigation/Appetite for Risk	Date and Owner									
			Probabilit	Impact	Risk Score		Probabilit	Impact	Risk Score											
	Restricted ability to undertake RTS re-write: inadequate senior staff resourcing available due to continued absence of Partnership Director	Strategic	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium	Resolve absence as soon as possible and appoint external resources as required.	2	Utility	2	Minor	4	Low	Partnership Director appointed May 2019. Funds identified for RTS re-write	June 2019 CLOSED			
	Accommodation, Occupancy Agreement with SG due for renewal February 2019. SG may not renew and alternative premises required at market rates.	Financial	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	A notice period of 12 months must be served by each party under the current occupancy agreement. Occupancy Agreement renewed until February 2022.	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium		June 2019 CLOSED			
	ECOMM: Agreement to commit to ECOMM on the basis of being cost neutral. Income depends on number of delegates attending conference	Financial	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	SEStran withdrew offer to host ECOMM due to uncertainty over Brexit and subsequent impact on attendance at the conference.	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low		June 2019 CLOSED			
	Following the outcome of the EU Referendum, the Partnership is unable to access EU funding.	Financial	4	Highly Probable	3	Moderate	15	High	The Partnership continues to seek alternative funding sources to progress knowledge exchange/transfer.	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium	Medium Tolerate: Adapt expenditure accordingly. Currently involved in 5 EU projects, the completion of which are underwritten by the UK Treasury.	June 2021 CLOSED			
	Governance: Succession Planning Business Continuity	Governance	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Governance Scheme contains adequate provision to deal with senior officer absence. Staff structure and Business Continuity Plan in place. Senior Partnership Manager appointed.	2	Utility	2	Minor	4	Low	Low Tolerate	CLOSED Partnership Director			
	Policy Appraisal: Poor Quality Lack of consultation	Strategic	1	Remote	3	Moderate	3	Low	Advised by Government of relevant policy changes and Partnership Director and Officers regularly looking out for further policies and responding accordingly. Consultative forums also enable greater visibility and integration of local policies into regional strategy. Make full use of online consultancy options.	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low	Low. Partnership staff also continue to monitor their networks for relevant policy discussions. Draft RTS approved for statutory consultation. Tolerate	CLOSED Partnership Director	Low	Med	↔
	Regional Transport Strategy: Introduction of new RTS. Delay in approval by ministers. Delayed introduction of the new strategy.	Strategic	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low	Regular comms with Transport Scotland at all stages in the development of the RTS.	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low	Low Tolerate	28 March 2023 Jim Stewart CLOSED	Low	Med	↔
	Newly Appointed Board. Risk of lack of continuity and loss of expertise due to high turnover in members for the new term of office.	Governance	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Ensure that full training and support is provided to the new Board in 2022 to enable strategic decisions to be made. A Regular schedule of meetings of the Succession Planning Committee.	2	Utility	2	Minor	4	Low	Low Skills audit will identify future training requirements. Option to appoint Board Observers to supplement areas of expertise. Partnership Director 1:1 meetings with Board Members Tolerate.	Ongoing Partnership Director CLOSED	Low	Med	↔
	Other Funding Sources: Reduced access to EU project funding and lack of replacement funding from UK Government	Financial	4	Highly Probable	3	Moderate	15	High	The Partnership has sought to engage in as many relevant EU projects and funds as it can whilst UK authorities are allowed to access these funds. This should mitigate the short-term impact of any EU Exit negotiated and implemented. The Partnership has a proven track record in securing funding for relevant projects from the UK and other partners. It is anticipated that this will continue. Horizon projects being pursued.	4	Highly Probable	2	Minor	10	Medium	Medium: The risk remains as there is significant uncertainty around the immediate and medium (3-5 year) horizon for access to funds. Other funding applications will be made when available. There has been no confirmation from UK Government on participation in EU funded programmes, like Horizon. Advocate for access to UK replacement funds. Explore further ongoing calls for Horizon programme when available. Treat	CLOSED Partnership Director	Low	Med	↓
	Regional Governance Lack of clarity on role of non statutory REP/ESCS City Region Deal groupings	Strategic	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium	A Concordat has been established and is functioning effectively between SEStran and the ESESCRD. This agreement commits both parties to collaborate openly and transparently to support land use planning and economic growth across the region. The benefits of this partnership are already evident, with the regional electric vehicle charging strategy and the RTS Delivery Plan development being two key examples. The Partnership will continue to work with partners and stakeholders at Scottish and UK government levels to promote the benefits of regional partnership delivery. Response to REP consultation (see above) will assist building partnerships at regional level.	2	Utility	3	Moderate	9	Medium	Medium Tolerate	CLOSED Partnership Director	Low	Med	

Risk Description and Impacts Table

Ref	Type of Risk	Description	Impact
R001	Strategic	Inability to design and / or implement a strategic plan or strategy for SEStran.	Lack of clarity regarding future direction and structure of SEStran impacting quality and alignment of strategic decisions
R002	Financial	Inability to perform financial planning; deliver an annual balanced budget; manage cash flows; and confirm ongoing adequacy of reserves	SEStran is unable to continue to deliver in line with strategic objectives; inability to meet financial targets; adverse external audit opinion; adverse reputational consequences
R003	Reputational	Adverse publicity because of decisions taken and / or inappropriate provision of sensitive strategic, commercial and / or operational information to external parties	Significant adverse impact to SEStran’s reputation in the public domain
R004	Governance	Inability of management and members to effectively manage and scrutinise performance, and take appropriate strategic, financial and operational decisions	Poor performance is not identified, and decisions are not aligned with strategic direction
R005	External	Inability to effectively manage SEStran’s most significant supplier and partnership relationships	Inability to deliver strategy and major projects within budget and achieve best value
R006	Legal / regulatory	Delivery of services and decisions are not aligned with applicable legal and regulatory requirements	Regulatory censure and penalties; legal claims; financial consequences
R007	Specific Operational	Inability to deliver projects and programmes effectively, on time and within budget	Inability to deliver projects; achieve service improvements; and deliver savings targets
R008	System and technology	Potential failure of cyber defences; network security; application security; and physical security and operational arrangements	Inability to use systems to support services; loss of data and information; regulatory and legislative breaches; and reputational consequences
R009	People	Employees and / or citizens suffer unnecessary injury and / or harm	Legal; financial; and reputational consequences
R010	New Project Income	Inability to attract new projects to fill the funding gap left by diminishing EU projects/Brexit	Inadequate funding streams and lack of innovation.

Risk Impact

Likelihood		Severity		Risk Score	
1	Remote	1	Insignificant	1	Low Risk
2	Unlikely	2	Minor	2	
3	Possible	3	Moderate	3	
4	Probable	4	Major	4	
5	Highly Probable	5	Catastrophic	5	
				6	Medium Risk
				8	
				9	
				10	
				12	High Risk
				15	
				16	
				20	
				25	

At Risk
Strategic
Financial
Reputational
System and Technology
Governance
Specific Operational
External
Legal and Regulatory
People
New Project Income

Impact				
Descriptor	Score	Health and Safety Impact	Impact on Service and Reputation	Financial Impact
Insignificant	1	No injury or no apparent injury.	No impact on service or reputation. Complaint unlikely, litigation risk remote.	Loss/costs up to £5000.
Minor	2	Minor injury (First Aid on Site)	Slight impact on service and/or reputation. Complaint possible. Litigation possible.	Loss/costs between £5000 and £50,000.
Moderate	3	Reportable injury	Some service distruprtion. Potential for adverse publicity, avoidable with careful handling. Complaint expected. Litigation probable.	Loss/costs between £50,000 and £500,000
Major	4	Major injury (reportable) or permanent incapacity	Service disrupted. Adverse publicity not avoidable (local media). Complaint expected. Litigation expected.	Loss/costs between £500,000 and £5,000,000.
Catastrophic	5	Death	Service interrupted for significant time. Adverse publicity not avoidable (national media interest.) Major litigation expected. Resignation of senior management/directors.	Theft/loss over £5,000,000

Likelihood		
Descriptor	Score	Example
Remote	1	May only occur in exeptional circumstances.
Unlikely	2	Expected to occur in a few circumstances.
Possible	3	Expected to occur in some circumstances.
Probable	4	Expected to occur in many circumstances.
Highly Probable	5	Expected to occur frequently and in most circumstances.

Impact					
Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25
Major	4	8	12	16	20
Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
Minor	2	4	6	8	10
Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	Remote	Unlikely	Possible	Probable	Highly Probable

Risk Appetite

Risk Rating	Net Risk Assessment	Risk Appetite Response
High	15-25	Unacceptable level of risk exposure which requires action to be taken urgently.
Medium	7-14	Acceptable level of risk but one which requires action and active monitoring to ensure risk exposure is reduced
Low	1-6	Acceptable level of risk based on the operation of normal controls. In some cases, it may be acceptable for no mitigating action to be taken.

Risk Response

There are four categories of risk response:

- Terminate:* risk avoidance – where the proposed activity is outwith the current risk appetite level;
- Treat:* risk reduction – where proactive action is taken to reduce the likelihood or impact of an event occurring or limiting the consequences should it occur
- Transfer:* risk transfer – where the liability for the consequences is transferred to an external organisation in full or part (e.g. insurance cover)
- Tolerate:* where certain risks are accepted

Risk Appetite Target Scores

Risk Description	From	To	Commentary
Strategic	Low	Medium	SEStran has a low to medium appetite in relation to its strategic risks and aims to ensure effective delivery of its commitments in line with agreed timescales. Strategic delivery is monitored through ongoing reporting processes and governance processes.
Financial	Low	Medium	SEStran has a low to medium appetite in relation to financial risk and may be prepared to accept some risk, subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">· setting and achieving an annual balanced revenue budget, in line with legislative requirements· maintaining an unallocated general reserve fund, in line with legislative requirements Financial risk is set out in SEStran’s Governance Scheme.
Reputational	Low	Medium	SEStran is prepared to tolerate a low to medium level of occasional isolated reputational damage. Media response protocols are set out in the Governance Scheme.
System and Technology	Low	Medium	SEStran has a low to medium appetite in relation to system and technology risk. The risk appetite will vary depending on the nature, significance and criticality of systems used, and the services they support. Risks are managed through ongoing use of inbuilt technology, security controls, encryption, data loss prevention, firewalls and vulnerability scanning, plus a range of security protocols and procedures. SEStran has achieved Cyber Essentials Plus accreditation.
Governance	Low	Low	SEStran has a low appetite in relation to governance and decision making. The partnership’s governance arrangements are detailed in the Governance Scheme. No officer or member may knowingly take or recommend decisions or actions which breach legislation.
Specific Operational	Low	Medium	SEStran has a low to medium appetite in relation to specific operational risks. The Partnership Director and Management Team are expected to design, implement and maintain appropriate programme, project management and governance controls to manage these risks.
External (Suppliers/contractors/partnerships)	Low	Medium	SEStran has a low to medium appetite in relation to external risks. The appetite will vary depending on the criticality of the service or third-party support. SEStran has an established procurement process, supported by the Contract Standing Orders and use of Public Contract Scotland frameworks.
Legal and Regulatory	Low	Low	SEStran aims to fully comply with all applicable regulatory and legislative requirements. No officer or member may knowingly take or recommend decisions or actions which breach the law.
People	Low	Low	SEStran recognises that accidents can occur because of unknown and/or unplanned events and has an appetite to fully comply with all relevant health and safety requirements to minimise any health and safety risks that could potentially result in loss of life or injury.
New Project Income	Medium	High	SEStran has a medium to high appetite in relation to attracting new projects to enable innovation and attract new funding streams. SEStran has an established procurement process, supported by the Contract Standing Orders and use of Public Contract Scotland frameworks. Financial risk is set out in SEStran’s Governance Scheme.