

COMMUNITY PLANNING PARTNERSHIP RISK REGISTER

APPENDIX 1
Date: April 2010

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
1. Political risks											
1.1	The vision of the CPP is unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be a lack of understanding about the CPP's purpose and what it is intending to achieve 	4	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOA cube produced CPP group remit defined & some work on defining operational groups 	4	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further work on including vision in communication Define links from operational groups to SOA 	CPUM
1.2	Arrangements need to be in place to update the SOA for 2010-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The updated document may not reflect the key demographic, geographic, social, economic & environmental context of the area 	3	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertaking strategic assessments over the 5 theme groups during the next 18 months. Discussion with the CP Board to raise any issues of emerging priorities 	2	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue work on strategic assessments to ensure updates to SOA are based on comprehensive, reliable and inclusive data. 	CPUM
1.3	Infrastructure is insufficient to allow the work of the CPP to develop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the CP process could be inhibited leading to censure of the council and its partners 	3	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of the Community Support Unit (CSU) Agreement for participatory budgeting project and Citizens Panel 	2	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to development CSU to develop links with the community Participatory budgeting project will be developed Consider the alignment of the CPP and council committee structure Renew Citizens Panel project 	CPDM
1.4	Individual partners do not provide the CPP with details of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity of purpose across all agencies is required to ensure CP 	5	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance arrangements being considered by partners 	4	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal consultation with partners prior to the production of partners' 	CP Stat

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
	their own strategic planning documents	priorities are aligned as far as possible with those of individual partners							corporate/ strategic plans		
2. Financial risks											
2.1	Impact of financial savings from partners individually and collectively on the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners may reduce services for their individual savings but when combined with other partners' savings, the impact on a particular service user or the community may be compounded. 	5	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP stat partners will meet regularly to discuss potential savings. Equality Forum will be consulted on the impact of savings through impact assessments 	5	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open discussion at the CP stat partners meeting to combat the combined impact of any savings proposal Sharing of proposals at an early stage to identify impact to the community 	CP Stat
2.2	There is a lack of clarity about partners' financial contributions to projects emanating from the SOA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance is not available to deliver the outcomes stated in the LDAPs 	4	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement to not accept reports at CPP groups if the resources are not defined 	3	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm funding commitments from all partners when LDAPs revised Financial resource inputs to be determined as part of individual partners' financial planning arrangements and notified to the CPP at the start of the financial year. 	CP Stat
2.3	Insufficient resources are available to support the administration of the CPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CPP is prevented from operating effectively due to lack of resources to fund support activities 	2	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP partners contributions confirmed 2010-11 & results to CP Statutory partners to monitor 	2	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners agree future funding sources for CPP support & administration costs 	CP Stat
2.4	Financial efficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CPP does not 	4	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory budgeting 	3	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms for aligning 	CP Stat

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
	available from working in partnership are not secured	achieve the synergies of working in partnership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource inputs do not have desired outcomes/ impact on community 				project to being to identify budgets across the partnership to support work in Moray				budgets more effectively to be pursued subject to appropriate governance arrangements being developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration to be given to how budgets can be profiled showing links between project finance and outcome to demonstrate value for money in use of resources 	
3. Human Resources (People) Risks											
3.1	Partners are represented at meetings by persons without the status or capacity to effect decisions on behalf of their respective organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making processes are deferred or delayed unnecessarily 	4	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership of strategic groups agreed and appropriate Work is being undertaken on operational groups to ensure appropriate representation in relation to their remit 	3	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure representation on CPP forums is assigned to individuals with appropriate responsibilities for decision making Establish criteria for operational groups Define voting and quorum for CP Board and strategic groups 	CP Stat
3.2	There is adequate consultation with local people and other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This SOA objectives may be based on incomplete information 	3	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement that community engagement strategy to be jointly produced within the CPP Better community 	3	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement framework to be agreed Citizens Panel consultation to be continued 	CPDM

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
						engagement pilot project in place					
4. Regulatory Risks											
4.1	Governance arrangements do not keep pace with developments in the work of the CPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CPP may not operate effectively 	5	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk register complete & remitted to the CP Statutory partners to monitor 	4	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop protocol for identifying risks for CP Board to theme group Risk register to be reviewed semi-annually 	CP Stat
4.2	There needs to be clarity in terms of the decision making powers assigned to the CP Board and its subordinate forums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of a scheme of delegation could lead to uncertainties and delays in decision making 	4	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council scheme of delegation in place CPP agreement in place 	3	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPP members to participate in assessment of current and developing governance arrangements. Scheme of delegation for CPP to be prepared. 	CP stat
4.3	Mechanism for ensuring that the CPP delivers its stated outcomes are required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsibility for outcomes may lack definition 	3	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Delivery Action Plans (LDAPs) assign 'ownership' to named officers of lead partner Quarterly monitoring of theme group progress by the CP Board 	2	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of LDAPs for 2010-11 	CPUM
4.4	New priorities could deflect the partnership from its original stated aims and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New issues may result in agreed priorities not being delivered as agreed 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan review of LDAPs and strategic assessments being undertaken 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protocol developed for introducing new priorities Reports recommending new or changed priorities to clearly identify resource implications 	CP Stat
5. Reputational Risks											

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
5.1	Censure of CPP for failure to secure effective governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embarrassment of one or more partners Adverse media coverage Political intervention 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP Statutory partners meeting on a regular basis 	3	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All partners to commit to sound governance arrangements 	CPUM
5.2	Failure to implement child protection inspection recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National reputation damaged in follow-up audit Potential for children at risk to come to serious harm 	4	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor action plan & report back to CPP 	4	4			COG
5.3	Failure to respond effectively to flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embarrassment of one or more partners 	3	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local emergency planning group in place Emergency planning procedures in place 	2	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to monitoring and respond to weather changes and potential for flooding 	SCG
6. Operational Continuity and Performance Risk											
6.1	Uncertainty re MADP funding streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects cannot be delivered Risk of poor follow-up inspection 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities identified for MADP service 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial support committed to MADP is continued. Ensure that projects are delivered as agreed 	CP Stat
6.2	Joint working arrangements not always brought within the scope of the CPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The benefits of effective inter-dependencies may not be realised 	3	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work undertaken to define operation groups 	3	3			CP Stat
6.3	Delivery of outcomes is not formally monitored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information needed to review service quality effectively and regularly may not be 	2	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDAPs to be developed for 2010-11 Except reports on 	2	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome lead owners to report to CPP on performance on delivery on LDAPs 	CPUM

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of business objective	Scope/ potential consequences of risk	Initial risk			Risk control measures in place	Residual risk			Risk control activity now proposed	Risk Owner
			Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		Likeli- hood	Impact	Risk score		
		available				areas not meeting targets are reported to theme group					
6.4	Performance outcomes are not formally reported to stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust public accountability is not achieved 	2	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPR produced and quarterly monitoring statements compiled 	2	3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance reports showing CPP progress to be published 	CPUM
7. IT risks											
7.1	Ineffective data sharing arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimum decision making is lost Data security breaches may take place 	4	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sharing groups working established 	4	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protocol to be established 	MC-CE
8. Other Risks											
8.1	Downsizing or reduction of one or both RAF bases as a result of the Defence review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of Defence review on the economy, community, partners & services 	5	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of CP Task force 	5	4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trying to influence and manage at an early the potential impact of the defence review 	CP Task group