

**REPORT TO: COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD ON 4 MARCH 2010**

**SUBJECT: RISK REGISTER**

**BY: CORPORATE POLICY UNIT MANAGER**

**1. REASON FOR REPORT**

1.1 The Community Planning Board is asked to consider to remit the implementation of the Risk Register to the Community Planning Statutory Partners.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 **The Community Planning Board is asked to agree to remit the implementation of the Risk Register to the Community Planning Statutory Partners and note that regular reports on progress will be submitted to the meeting to give assurance that risks were being managed.**

**3. BACKGROUND**

3.1 The development of the Risk Register has been considered by the Community Planning Board at a number of meetings. Following a presentation by Sharon Milton, at the August meeting, it was agreed to remit the development to the Risk Register to a small short life Working Group.

3.2 Over the past few months, the Working Group has agreed the contents of the Risk Register. During development consideration was given to the level of detail to list within the Register. If the detail was too vague the Register becomes meaningless. However with very specific detail the Register was at risk of exposing potentially confidential issues across the partnership which should be more sensitively managed on a private basis. Given this it was the view of the Working Group that the Register should become an operational document for the Community Planning Statutory Partners to manage.

3.3 Remitting it to the Statutory Partners was considered the most useful route as the Statutory Partners have the decision making ability to address the risks identified. This is particularly important for sensitive issues which require negotiation by partners to address the risks.

3.4 Nonetheless, it is important that the Community Planning Board are also aware of the major risks which are faced by the partnership and without managing them they could have a detrimental effect on the overall operation of the Community Planning Partnership.

- 3.5 One of the major risks faced by the Community Planning Partnership over the next few years is the financial pressure on all partners. This pressure will impact on resources available to deliver priorities and may result in amending the priorities or the scale of commitment to address them.
- 3.6 Another major risk for the Partnership is the identification of the priorities. Considerable work has been committed to developing strategic assessments to identify the priorities. However, there is a risk that without proper and complete set of statistics priorities may be shown as trends which may not reflect an accurate picture. Resource commitment from all partners is required.
- 3.7 Finally, there are reputational risks to the partnership in areas such as flood alleviation scheme and emergency planning if not co-ordinated to provide the timely protection to the community which can be made available.

#### **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**

The Risk Register has been developed by the small short life working group and agreed by the Community Planning Statutory Partners.

#### **5.0 CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 **The Risk Register is an operational document which informs the partners of potential risks which may hinder the achievement of the**

**agreed priorities, However some of the risks identified are sensitive and require to remain confidential if they are to be meaningfully addressed.**

Author of Report: Bridget Mustard, Corporate Policy Unit Manager  
Background Papers:  
Ref: BM/jg/734598