

REPORT TO: COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD ON 27 AUGUST 2009

SUBJECT: RISK REGISTER

BY: CORPORATE POLICY UNIT MANAGER

1. REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1** The Community Planning Board considers the risk tool to be used the partnership to manage identified risks.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1** The Community Planning Board approves the risk tool to be used by the partnership to manage identified risks, agrees the suggested list of risks to be explored by the partnership as part of its register.
- 2.2** The Board is also asked to remit the final development of the risk register to the short life working group.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1** At the meeting of the Board on 7 May 2009, it was agreed that the risk register should be sent out to partners for consultation and a report submitted to next meeting of the Board. It was also agreed that the risk matrix be circulated to the group for information.
- 3.2** Within the Best Value 2 audit, it will be expected that the Partnership has considered its risks. The Partnership will be assessed on how well the risks have been assessed and managed. Therefore in order to meet this requirement of the audit, the Partnership should have in place an agreed risk tool and identified risks with their agreed are addressed.
- 3.3** Meetings have been held with Superintendent Sharon Milton; Atholl Scott, Team Leader, Internal Audit, Moray Council; and Bridget Mustard, Corporate Policy Unit Manager, Moray Council to discuss the way forward to developing the Risk Register for the Community Planning Partnership. These discussions also overlapped into potential governance issues surrounding the Partnership. It was agreed that it would be best to develop these issues with staff from all interested partners through a short life working group. This group would look at considering our approach and processes for identifying and managing risk. Due to holiday and other commitments the short life working group remained at the original three people.
- 3.4** Atholl Scott agreed to recommend a risk tool based on the good practice between the tools used by the Council and Police. This tool is based on the existing ones but has been amended to reflect the specific requirements of the partnership. This is attached (**Appendix 1**).

- 3.5 At the meeting, Sharon Milton will give a presentation on the overall use of a risk tool and how to identify and manage those risks .
- 3.6 Bridget Mustard agreed to consider the existing risks and assess what may be the major risks to the partnership. The risks are:
- (i) Potential conflict between national outcomes set down by Scottish Government within their policies and local needs identified by Moray communities. So far this has been easily resolved and do not think is a major risk as the Partnership works well to accommodate all views. This one should not include it at this time.
 - (ii) Cross-cutting issues relating to the achievement of local outcomes in the Single Outcome Agreement not picked up or addressed effectively. The Partnership has put some measures in place to address this. It could be included for monitoring but would not expect a high rating.
 - (iii) Inconsistent and inadequate provision of data by partner organisations, to inform the strategic assessments and monitoring documents produced by the partnership. This is crucial if the Partnership is basing their priorities on the data and must ensure they are accurate. This one should be included.
 - (iv) Community Planning activity and processes are not embedded with the normal work pattern of partner organisations. The Partnership has progressed considerably on this one and not really concerned enough to recommend including it at this time.
 - (v) Inability to demonstrate resources allocated are spent efficiently and effectively on Community Planning priorities. This would be a high priority as it will cover servicing Community Planning groups, aligning budgets for priorities and monitoring outcome delivery. This one should be included this but it may need to be re-worded/separated into a couple of areas.
 - (vi) Inaccurate, unreliable, outdated or difficult to measure statistical data made available to the Community Planning Partnership in the process of monitoring progress against outcomes. The Partnership has addressed this through the development of the local delivery action plans. This one should not be included at this time.
 - (vii) Lack of buy in from the community to local Community Planning structures resulting in low level participation with the Area Forums. This one could be re-worded to address the concerns about ensuring community groups within Community Planning structures are effectively supported and have meaningful roles to enable them to contribute to the process.
- 3.7 In summary the inclusion of the following risks for the revised register are:
- (i) data to inform priorities
 - (ii) resources efficiently used
 - (iii) alignment of budget to support priorities
 - (iv) effective support and meaningful role for local Community Planning structures

- 3.8 It is also recommended to add something about the future budget pressures for partner organisations and its impact on Community Planning resources and delivery priorities.

4. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

(a) Single Outcome Agreement/Service Improvement Plan

It is important in respect of the future development of the Single Outcome Agreement and progress of Community Planning that the Partnership considers and addresses effectively the risks associated with this

(b) Policy and Legal

The compilation of a risk register was one of the key recommendations of the Audit Scotland Initial Assessment of Community Planning and, as such, all Partnerships will be expected to have a register in place for inspection as part of any future audit.

(c) Resources (Financial, Risks, Staffing and Property)

Any such implications are identified within the Risk Register.

(d) Consultations

Sharon Milton and Atholl Scott have been involved in the development of the risk register and have been consulted on the contents of this report.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The development of a risk register for the Partnership is an important process to inform the delivery of the current Single Outcome Agreement and the development of future local priorities.**

Author of Report: Bridget Mustard, Corporate Policy Unit Manager
Background Papers:
Ref: