**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
AUDIT COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2010**

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

Report of: Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)

Title: Thriving Neighbourhoods Board - Risk Register

Ward: Citywide

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee notes the risk register which has been prepared for consideration by the Thriving Neighbourhoods Board at its meeting on 20th January 2010.

Summary

The risk register which is attached as Appendix A represents an initial assessment of risks to be managed by the Board, and whilst it has already been circulated to Board members for comment, the final version, complete with a timed action plan, will not be produced until it has been fully considered at the next meeting on 20th January 2009.

Policy

1. The Council's Corporate Plan states: "Working in Partnership: Our City's priorities cannot be delivered by the council alone ... major issues need to be tackled in partnership with other agencies and stakeholders."

Consultation

2. None necessary.

Background

3. The preparation and adoption of a risk register was identified though the completion of the partnership checklist, and although it was originally intended to produce and review this at the Board's meeting on 25th March (to coincide with the commencement of its annual review), this timetable was brought forward and consequently a first draft was presented at the last meeting on 15th December.

4. Unfortunately, it was not possible at that meeting to discuss the register in any detail because of the weight of the agenda. However, it was agreed that it be circulated to the membership for comment in order that it could be fully considered at the following meeting on 20th January 2010.

5. The intention is not only to adopt a revised risk register at that meeting but to agree on a timed action plan where mitigating actions are identified.

Appendices: Appendix A - Thriving Neighbourhoods Board Risk Register

ACCESS TO INFORMATION
Background Papers
(list)

					Residual Risk (Impact/Probability) (Red/Yellow/Green)		
Rank No.	Risk No.	Risk/Hazard	Inherent Risk (Impact / Probability) (Red/Yellow/ Green)	Current Mitigation Evaluation	Residual Risk to be reported to Executive Board on 25th March 2010	Current Residual Risk at November 2009	Direction of Travel
1	1	Failure to deliver joint tasking arrangements in support of Neighbourhood Committees thus undermining their credibility and viability	H/H	• Work towards the alignment of patch boundaries wherever possible to simplify joint working (Statutory Agencies) • area coordinators to facilitate the effective involvement of those services not yet capable of alignment (BCC) • there is already evidence of commitment on the part of various agencies, e.g. Police and Fire Service to effective joint working through redefinition of their boundaries (Other Agencies) • closer liaison with agencies such as NHS Bristol and the education/youth work structures is a challenge for 2010(Relevant Agencies) • the TNB to receive regular reports on the operation of Neighbourhood Partnerships and the Neighbourhood Delivery Teams (BCC)	N/A	M/L	NEW RISK

**THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS PARTNERSHIP - EXECUTIVE BOARD
KEY RISKS SUMMARY**

THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS PARTNERSHIP - EXECUTIVE BOARD KEY RISKS SUMMARY							
					Residual Risk (Impact/Probability) (Red/Yellow/Green)		
1	2	Failure to engage with other Bristol Partnership Boards	M/M	• An observer at the TNB meetings is the Bristol Partnership Manager who provides feedback to the Board on developments in other Partnerships (BP Manager) • A wide range of organisations are represented on the Board, which provides opportunity for contact with other partnerships. Need to evaluate the actual effectiveness of this as part of the annual review (All) • The Bristol Partnership to facilitate regular meetings between the Chairs of the Partnership Boards (BP staff) • Joint Partnership Board meetings to be considered on selected issues (BP staff)	N/A	M/L	**NEW RISK**
1	3	Failure to promote equalities and community cohesion	H/M	• As part of the TNB's annual review steps to be taken to recruit additional members to the Board who will be able to champion equality of access and engagement (BCC?) • A variety of community engagement mechanisms to be used (All) • marketing and communication approaches, informed by relevant statistical data to be used (All) • Need to monitor equalities and community cohesion at the NP level also and ensure support (BCC)	N/A	M/L	**NEW RISK**

2

					Residual Risk (Impact/Probability) (Red/Yellow/Green)		
1	4	Failure to manage negative impacts of recession	H/M	• Significant service gaps which could compound the impact of recession to be fed back to the Board as part of the regular reports on the operation of Neighbourhood Partnerships (All) • review the membership of the Board as part of its annual review in Spring 2010 to ensure that its skills/knowledge base is fit to meet the economic/social challenges which may emerge (All) • monitor good practice at NP level and spread the word, e.g. Via Pride of Place process (All)	N/A	M/M	**NEW RISK**
1	5	Failure of the Board to operate effectively and thus reduce its ability to positively influence Devolution to Neighbourhoods programme	H/M	• High quality direction and leadership from the Chair of the Board • the Board's terms of reference (including minimum levels of attendance) governance arrangements and overall strategy to be reviewed in Spring 2010 • receive feedback from the structured learning built into the devolution programme		M/L	**NEW RISK**
1	6	Failure to effectively monitor LAA targets	M/M	• Specific focus on progress against LAA targets, which is regularly reported on by the Performance Management Sub Group • Board meeting agenda is structured to focus on items relevant to the achievement of targets		M/L	**NEW RISK**

THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS PARTNERSHIP - EXECUTIVE BOARD
KEY RISKS SUMMARY

3

					Residual Risk (Impact/Probability) (Red/Yellow/Green)		
1	7	Failure to effectively deliver against the Bristol Partnership's 20:20 Plan	M/M	• Full consideration of the Plan and its implications for the TNB • Specific tasks identified and managed utilising project management methods where appropriate		M/L	**NEW RISK**
1	8	Failure of NPs to form as independent effective and sustainable bodies	M/M	• Guidance notes distributed (BCC) • training for councillors in hand (BCC) • community engagement team available for support (BCC) • close monitoring of development with regular health checks (BCC/BP staff)		M/L	

THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS PARTNERSHIP - EXECUTIVE BOARD
KEY RISKS SUMMARY

NEIGHBOURHOODS DEPARTMENT – MEASURING OF RISKS GUIDANCE (TAKEN FROM "GUIDANCE FOR OFFICERS ON RISK ASSESSMENT IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS")

How do we rate risks?

The methodology for assessing risk is simple and easy to use. It looks at each risk and assesses the probability and potential impact of the risk, rating them as either HIGH, MEDIUM or LOW. It is important again that this stage looks at the inherent risk (ie the risk before any mitigating factors such as controls, insurance coverage etc. are taken into account).

The grid below shows how this methodology works.

I M P A C T	HIGH	4	7	9
	MED	2	5	8
	LOW	1	3	6
		LOW	MED	HIGH
PROBABILITY				

The line between the red and the yellow defines what we describe as Bristol City Council's appetite for risk (i.e. the level of risk we are prepared to accept). The red area is outside of our risk appetite and is where the highest impact and probability risks fall and will require some action to manage the negative risks. The green area is where risks are very well managed.

Positive risks that fall within the red area could represent opportunities to improve services. These opportunities need to be maximised by identification of critical success factors and mitigation to ensure these are achieved.

The ultimate intention is to reduce risk to an acceptable and cost effective level, and to maximise the opportunity benefit. By cost effective we mean that there must be some consideration of the cost of the risk mitigation action to determine whether the risk justifies the cost.

In measuring the probability and impact of risks, the following guidance over page will be applied:

6

Severity of Impact Parameters

Nature of Impact	Severity of Impact		
	Low	**Medium**	**High**
Effect on Service Provision	Little or no effect (positive or negative) on service provision. Impact can be managed within normal working arrangements.	Noticeable and significant effect (positive or negative) on service provision, a corporate plan priority area or on more than one service. Effect may require additional resource and will impact on key target achievement. However effect will be managed within a reasonable timeframe and will not require a major strategy change.	Catastrophic effect on service provision or a Corporate Plan priority area; or significant enhancement of service provision/strategy change. Effect could not be managed within a reasonable timeframe or by a short term allocation of resources or may require major strategy changes.
Financial/Business Effect/ Fraud Risk	Likely loss or benefit of less than £50K Fraudulent loss of less than £5k	Likely loss or benefit of between £50K and £500K Fraudulent loss of between £5K and £25K	Likely loss or benefit of more than £500K Fraudulent loss of more than £25K.
Reputation	Little public interest and limited opportunity to enhance reputation. Matter contained within section or department.	Some potential for enhancement of or damage to image. Local or national interest. Local MP involvement.	Significant potential for enhancement to image. Intense media attention. Public enquiry or poor external assessor report. Officer member forced to resign.
Legal	Claim or fine up to £50K for non compliance	Claim or fine £51K - £250K for non compliance	Claim or fine - > £250K for non compliance
Environmental	No lasting effect (positive or negative) on the environment and community.	Serious local discharge of pollutant or source of community annoyance that requires remedial action.	Long term effect (positive or negative) on the environment and community.

	Severity of Impact		
Personal Safety	Minor Injury to service users or staff may result or can be prevented. No significant long-term effects and no significant absence from work	Significant Injury/ill heath of service users or staff may result or can be prevented. Short-term disability/absence from work (over three days)	Major Injury, death or ill health of service users or staff may result or can be prevented. Long-term disability/absence from work.

Probability

	Probability
High	Likely (occurring once or more in 3 years)
Medium	Possible (occurring once in 4 - 10 years)
Low	Unlikely (occurring once in 10 years or more)