

Risk Management Implications

Risks included on corporate or directorate risk register? **Yes**

Separate risk register in place? **Yes**

The relevant risks contained in the register are attached/summarised below. **Yes**

The following key risks should be taken onto account when agreeing the recommendations in this report:

Risk Description		Mitigations	RAG Status
<p>Complexities of a collaborative bid The collaborative bid brings together seven boroughs to agree the approach and deployment of £4.78m within a short time</p>	<p>Many local authorities do not have a domestic energy officer resource, therefore the consortium has been built on shared intelligence and contributions from key authorities that do have a resource in place to lead various work packages. Decision making, responsibilities and ultimately the success of the programme depends on clear communication and defined roles and responsibilities</p>	<p>Create governance documents and back to back MOUs with participating authorities to make clear agreements about roles, responsibilities, decision making and resolution of differences</p>	<p>A Significant/ very low</p>
<p>Bid response overwhelms capacity to award within timescales required to deliver bid outcomes An open procurement method is being utilised. There may be a high number of bids, which will add time required for evaluation and award.</p>	<p>In order to be compliant with procurement regulations and ensure small companies have the opportunity to be part of the delivery network, it has been agreed to use an open procurement method Ealing may receive a high number of compliant bid packages to evaluate.</p>	<p>The team will mitigate this risk by setting aside adequate time to complete evaluations and ensure partner boroughs are involved in the process.</p>	<p>A Significant/ Moderate</p>
<p>Poor performance of managing agent or their supply chain The chosen delivery agent and their supply chain may not perform as expected</p>	<p>There will be significant pressure on the building industry to deliver retrofits under challenging conditions including: the required delivery timescales; the ongoing impacts of Covid-19; adverse winter weather; pressure on the labour market; pressure on the supply chain providing products for retrofit The consortium may be unable to deliver the anticipated number of retrofits within the timescales defined in the grant award paperwork.</p>	<p>The managing agent's contract will include provisions to cover the Council in the event of contractor/sub-contractor poor performance. This will include cover for claims from third parties; loss or damage to works, plant, materials and equipment; loss or damage to client property; and death or injury of employees. Ealing will schedule regular meetings with the contract management resources as well as the broader consortium.</p>	<p>A Significant/ very low</p>
<p>Fraudulent claims made for installations The delivery agent may attempt to make claims for works that haven't happened, haven't been completed, or that took place</p>	<p>Lack of clarity or potential misunderstanding of grant conditions or fraudulent behaviour. Works will not be reimbursed unless the evidence complies with the grant conditions</p>	<p>The invitation to tender and the terms and conditions of the managing agent's contract will include clear and consistent information regarding eligibility, data collection and compliance. Regular paperwork checks</p>	<p>Critical/ very low</p>

prior to launch date of the scheme		by both the lead authority and partners will ensure any works put forward for funding include auditable documentation to establish compliance	
Homes may be selected that don't meet the criteria.	Due to the limitation in	Third party screening service will ensure that they meet the criteria	Moderate
Fraudulent conduct -grant beneficiary A household in receipt of grant carries out identity theft or falsely claims low-income status	Potential misunderstanding of criteria or intentional fraudulent behaviour to make financial gain Wasted time resources; if not caught before works, legal action to recover funds.	Ensure a grant agreement, which confirms identity has not be misrepresented, has been signed by the homeowner before scheduling works.	Critical/ very low
Failure of cost controls Installers overinflating costs	Installers may seek to exploit systems to overcharge, possibly due to volume and pace of approvals. The funding may not achieve value for money and may not reach as many eligible homes.	Ensure that robust processes are in place to confirm the paperwork, quotations and installations adhere to the pricing schedule set agreed in the contract	Significant/ very low
Insufficient demand from potential recipients The consortium communications plan and pre-identification of eligible households does not lead to sufficient take up of the grant scheme	Communications plan did not identify the best contact method and/or clear messaging; COVID19 risks are perceived as insurmountable to the audience. Low take up of the grant in the first round of communications/outreach.	Ensure that messaging is clear and well timed; referral network is well-trained; pre-assessment handover to the delivery agent is well-considered	Significant/ very low
Insufficient capacity to match demand The interest in the grant outstrips the consortium's ability to deliver – in regard to labour, supplies or grant funds	The supply network and/or processes to convert leads to retrofits is unable to cope with demand; the deliverable grant value was underestimated by the consortium Long wait-times; reduced number of retrofits completed	Ensure expectations are managed for both the delivery agent and the grant target audience. Ensure robust processes are developed to maximise delivery; apply for additional grant for Phase 1b to extend delivery capability	Significant Low
Failure of systems and/or processes which have been included within the Risk Register. The processes described to address risk across the project are not adhered to or managed/monitored effectively	Lack of resource or attention to detail; poor communication Underperformance of scheme; risk of document non-compliance; risk of not delivering value for money	Programme management board to set aside appropriate time and resource to monitor scheme processes and outcomes; regular communications and reporting	Significant very low