

# APPENDIX 1 – RISK PROFILE

Risk Number & Title: EA01 – Community participation and co-production			
CPP Lead: CPP Executive Officer Group			
<b>Current Risk Rating:</b> (priority 1, 2, 3 or 4)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;">1</div>	<b>Risk Response:</b> (accept, avoid, reduce, transfer, share, enhance, exploit)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;">Share</div>

Inherent Impact (1-5)	Inherent Probability (1-5)	Residual Impact (1-5)	Residual Probability (1-5)
5	4	3	2
<b>Inherent Score:</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Residual Score:</b>	<b>6</b>

Impact	Critical	5	10	15	20	25
	Major	4	8	12	16	20
	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
<b>Probability</b>						

<i>As a Result of</i>	<i>There is a risk that</i>	<i>Which Could Lead to</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of transparency from theory into delivery – results in disengagement</li> <li>Mixed understandings of what is actually meant by participation and co-production – not talking about the same thing. What are communities being asked to participate in and co-produce?</li> <li>Not having a shared understanding of the issues/opportunities/assets in each community</li> <li>Not having sufficient or appropriate third sector organisations around the table</li> <li>Not having community engagement / empowerment embedded across individual partners and the CPP collectively</li> <li>Limited sharing of relevant information and data</li> <li>Limited visibility of services within communities of place and of interest</li> <li>Communities developing ideas/proposals without appropriate professional input and support</li> <li>Lack of capacity (skills and confidence) among communities of place and of interest</li> </ul>	<p><b>Community groups do not have an opportunity to influence the development and delivery of services in Perth and Kinross</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver on key outcomes in the LOIP</li> <li>People’s lives are not improved</li> <li>Socio-economic inequalities are not tackled effectively</li> <li>Disengagement by communities and undermining of relationships – lack of trust in public bodies</li> <li>Solutions that do not meet community needs/requirements/expectations</li> </ul>

<b>Key Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 Local Action Partnerships where community reps, services and elected members meet to discuss local issues</li> <li>Stronger Communities Networks established across communities of place</li> <li>Statutory obligations around community participation and engagement</li> </ul>

<b>Key Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Improve collective understanding of service provision (who/where/when) across communities and how service users can be referred across</b></li> <li><b>Improve partnership offering around collaboration in communities</b></li> <li><b>Develop more coordinated approach to partnership offering in communities</b></li> <li><b>Agreement on where community input can make the best contribution – be clear on parameters</b></li> </ul>

<b>Risk Owner:</b> <b>Risk Actionee:</b>
---

**Risk Number & Title: EA02 – Locality partnership working**

**CPP Lead: CPP Executive Officer Group**

**Current Risk Rating:** (priority 1, 2, 3 or 4)

1

**Risk Response:** (accept, avoid, reduce, transfer, share, enhance, exploit)

Share

Inherent Impact (1-5)	Inherent Probability (1-5)	Residual Impact (1-5)	Residual Probability (1-5)
5	3	3	2
<b>Inherent Score:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>Residual Score:</b>	<b>6</b>

Impact	Critical	5	10	15	20	25
	Major	4	8	12	16	20
Moderate	3	6	9	12	15	
Minor	2	4	6	8	10	
Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5	
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	
<b>Probability</b>						

<i>As a Result of</i>	<i>There is a risk that</i>	<i>Which could lead to</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of joined up working (planning and delivery) and information sharing among service providers</li> <li>Not involving all partners (inc communities)</li> <li>Lack of understanding of current service provision across communities</li> <li>Lack of understanding of different needs/opportunities/assets in communities of place and interest</li> <li>Limited joint resourcing to deliver key outcomes</li> <li>Competing statutory duties, different organisational structures and corporate priorities</li> <li>Different understandings of the localities we are working in</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>Services will continue to be planned centrally and therefore fail to be reflective of local contexts and needs</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lack of preventative action and continued focus on fire fighting</li> <li>Failure to deliver on key outcomes in the LOIP</li> <li>People’s lives are not improved</li> <li>Socio-economic inequalities are not tackled effectively</li> <li>Wasting time and resources – being inefficient</li> </ul>

<b>Key Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piloting locality approaches in Highland Perthshire and Letham (Perth) with a focus on poverty</li> <li>Locality working in Coupar Angus and in Crieff</li> <li>Piloting of Local Council Committee in Kinross-shire</li> <li>A number of individual services already operate at a locality level – differences in terms of what a locality covers</li> </ul>

<b>Key Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Joint resourcing of services and interventions in localities</b></li> <li><b>Decluttering the landscape – prevent duplication of effort and make it easier for service users to access what they need</b></li> <li><b>Sharing learning from locality pilots to agree a collective future approach</b></li> </ul>

<p><b>Risk Owner:</b></p> <p><b>Risk Actionee:</b></p>
--

**Risk Number & Title: EA03 – Data sharing**

**CPP Lead: CPP Executive Officer Group**

**Current Risk Rating:** (priority 1, 2, 3 or 4)

1

**Risk Response:** (accept, avoid, reduce, transfer, share, enhance, exploit)

Share

Inherent Impact (1-5)	Inherent Probability (1-5)	Residual Impact (1-5)	Residual Probability (1-5)
4	4	3	2
<b>Inherent Score:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>Residual Score:</b>	6

Impact	Critical	5	10	15	20	25
	Major	4	8	12	16	20
	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
<b>Probability</b>						

<i>As a Result of</i>	<i>There is a risk that</i>	<i>Which could lead to</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor / limited data sharing protocols between partners</li> <li>Poor / limited joint working between partners</li> <li>Lack of a forum for data gatherers / analysts to share information / data / intelligence</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partners do not share relevant data with each other</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to effectively prioritise and resource CPP work</li> <li>Failure to deliver on key outcomes in the LOIP</li> <li>People’s lives are not improved</li> <li>Socio-economic inequalities are not tackled effectively</li> <li>Wasting time and resources – being inefficient</li> </ul>

<b>Key Controls</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data sharing agreements in place between individual partners, but varied purpose and impact</li> </ul>

<b>Key Actions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Memorandum of Understanding for CPP on the sharing of data – not legal binding but a helpful way of setting out our processes and reasons for doing so</b></li> <li><b>Create and issue a Privacy Notice setting out how the data will be shared and used by partners</b></li> <li><b>Share ward/community profiles</b></li> </ul>

<p><b>Risk Owner:</b> <b>Risk Actionee:</b></p>
---