

# Community Resilience Fund Risk Register

## Negative Risks that offer a threat to The Community Resilience Fund and its Aims (Aim - Reduce Level of Risk)

Ref	Risk Description	Key Causes	Key Consequence	Status Open / Closed	Strategic Theme	Risk Category	Risk Owner	Key Mitigations	Direction of travel	Current Risk Level			Monetary Impact of Risk £k	Risk Tolerance			
										Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating		Likelihood	Impact	Risk Rating	Date
1	<b>Limited consultation and engagement</b>	Time/staffing capacity	Priority communities do not benefit from the funding	open	Empowering and caring	Operational	HoS Neighbourhoods & Communities	1. Targetted engagement and consultation sessions in each eligible community, led by VCSE sector 2. VCSE research has equalities at the core and will inform the proposals 3. VCSE working group engaged throughout development of proposal 4. Organisations will have option of support to develop full proposal if selected as a priority 5. There will be a period of co-design and consultation, followed by 1 full year for the community conversations and deliberative process to allow it to be thorough and not rushed.		3	4	12		2	2	4	
2	<b>Delays in implementation of Capital projects</b>	Technical issues and unforeseen delays in operational elements of project. Poor project management. Projects fall through because of lack of resource, inplausibility or unsound technical advice. Insufficient revenue/ expertise in house to project manage and keep project on track	Projects do not complete within timeframes set, which could lead to additional costs and revenue implications. Could also lead to underspend if projects cannot go ahead. BCC Project manager contract ends before projects are complete. Impact on completion of evaluation.	open	Empowering and caring	Operational	HoS Neighbourhoods & Communities	1. Technical input from beginning of proposal development 2. Revenue support to pay for technical assistance and project management to avoid issues with under-resourcing leading to delays. 3. Oversight group to meet regularly and guide programme and provide oversight so that issues are picked up early 4. Dedicated BCC officer to have oversight of programme and close communication with project leads to pick up issues early 5. Shortlisted reserve projects to be funded in the event that any selected projects cannot get to the stage of signing a funding agreement.		4	4	16		2	2	4	

3	<b>Underspend of capital</b>	Projects fall through because of lack of resource, inplausability or unsound technical advice. Insufficient revenue/ expertise in house to project manage and keep project on track. Not enough proposals received	Funding is lost and opportunity for investment wasted	open	Empowering and caring	Operational	HoS Neighbourhoods & Communités	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical input from beginning of proposal development</li> <li>2. Revenue support to pay for technical assistance and project management to avoid issues with under-resourcing leading to delays.</li> <li>3. Oversight group to meet regularly and guide programme and provide oversight so that issues are picked up early</li> <li>4. Dedicated BCC officer to have oversight of programme and close communication with project leads to pick up issues early</li> <li>5. Shortlisted reserve projects to be funded in the event that any selected projects cannot get to the stage of signing a funding agreement.</li> </ol>	2	3	6	1	2	2	
4	<b>Deliberative process is unsuccessful due to fund being oversubscribed</b>	Fund receives many more applications than can be funded, leading to difficulties in deliberating, narrowing down priorities and reaching consensus. Could lead to conflict.	Raised expectations and disappointment from unsuccessful organisations.	open	Empowering and caring	Operational	HoS Neighbourhoods & Communités	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear communication from the outset about level of funding available and process for refining priorities.</li> <li>2. Clear guidance and eligibility criteria for organisations seeking funding.</li> <li>3. Community and VCSE sector participation throughout decision making to ensure priorities are locally driven</li> <li>4. Well designed participative and deliberative process, supported by expertise, to aid decision making.</li> </ol>	4	5	20	2	2	4	

5	<b>Distrust in the process of allocating funding</b>	<p>1. The process of allocating funding proposed is new and unfamiliar to people.</p> <p>2. Organisations involved in programme delivery are also seeking funding</p> <p>3. VCSE organisations themselves are reluctant to support the decision making process</p>	Distrust in the process or accusation of lack of transparency/fairness. Conflict of interests.	Open	Empowering and caring	Operational	HoS Neighbourhoods & Communities	<p>1. Work with trusted organisations who already have strong relationships and buy in from their local community. Early engagement with these organisations</p> <p>2. Lead organisations will be encouraged to link up with others to reach diverse network of people and organisations during community conversations.</p> <p>3. Work with experts in Deliberative Democracy and Participatory Budgeting so we have strong, co-designed processes in place.</p> <p>4. Clear communication about the process to ensure a full understanding.</p> <p>5. Communication and marketing activity to ensure we engage people from all walks of life in the process.</p>	4	5	20	2	4	8			
---	--	--	--	------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------------------------------	--	---	---	----	---	---	---	--	--	--