

CPP risk register – review September 2009

The risks described below are the risks and assessed level of risk as described in the SOA. The right hand column in the table details recommended changes to the assessment based on changes since the last review in June 2009.

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R01	Impact of recession on funding for public services	Longer term effects of the recession reduce funding available for public services leading to cuts in services and increased risk on other factors as resources are stretched to meet demand	All	<p>Likelihood assessed as Almost certain (5) because we are in a recession and government finances are already stretched with commitments to mitigate the effects of the credit crunch and banking failures</p> <p>Impact assessed as Major (4) because significant cuts in funding will impact on public services</p>	High	No change
CPP-R02	Lack of suitable employment and housing	Lack of suitable employment and housing within local communities requires people to work at a distance from their home.	2, 10	<p>Likelihood assessed as Possible (3)</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3)</p> <p>This is a recognised issue - especially where service providers are serving smaller or more remote communities</p>	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R03	Violence against people providing services	Violence and anti-social behaviour against personnel undertaking duties within the community	9, 11	Likelihood assessed as Unlikely (2) because of low incidence of violence Impact assessed as Minor (2) because of low levels of violent crime	Low	No change
CPP-R04	Impact of geography on outcomes for individuals	Geography of islands and remote mainland with dispersed population creates difficulty for people to access all emergency service provision and emergency health and social care response with possibility of more severe outcomes than would be expected in other areas	9, 10, 15	Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of impact on people located at greater distances or in more remote locations from main service centres	Medium	No change
CPP-R05	Environmental pollution/contamination	Pollution and contamination of the environment as a result of dealing with operational incidents in an effort to save life or saveable property	12	Likelihood assessed as Unlikely (2) because of the historic pattern of incidents Impact assessed as Minor (2) because expected to be confined to a specific location	Low	No change
CPP-R06	Increase in drugs misuse	Potential increase in drugs misuse due to perception that Community Safety Partnership do not have this as high priority	8, 9, 11	Likelihood assessed as Possible (3) Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of possible impact on individuals	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R07	Lack of investment in transport infrastructure	Key schemes unable to progress due to insufficient investment in transport infrastructure	1, 2, 10, 11	<p>Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of investment backlog and expected future financial pressures keeping investment at similar levels to current</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of economic and service impact</p>	Medium	No change
CPP-R08	Economic downturn – impact on regeneration projects	Focus on city regions and economic downturn draws investment away from rural areas; potential impact on CHORD town centre regeneration	1, 2, 10, 12	<p>Likelihood assessed as Almost certain (5) because of the current economic situation in the UK and globally</p> <p>Impact assessed as Major (4) because of high reliance of waterfront regeneration projects on external investment</p>	High	No change
CPP-R09	Shortage of affordable housing – limiting economic investment	Shortages of good quality, affordable housing preventing economic investment in rural areas	1, 2, 7, 10, 11	<p>Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of expected cuts in investment in social housing in Argyll and Bute by the Government</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because the ability to find a house is a continuing issue for people wanting to work in Argyll and Bute</p>	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R10	Renewables investment dries up	Investment in renewables dries up, no job creation, no community financial benefits and government misses renewable energy target	1, 2, 12, 14	<p>Likelihood assessed as Unlikely (2) because of the significant commitment to invest in Campbelltown by Welcon</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of significant potential benefits of renewables to support local communities and the economy more generally</p>	Medium	No change
CPP-R11	Decline of remote and island communities	Continued decline of remote and island communities due to low or no economic growth and demographic change	2, 10, 11	<p>Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of projected population trends</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of impact on objectives for remote and fragile communities</p>	Medium	No change
CPP-R12	Low net inward migration of people of working age	Poor career opportunities discouraging inward migration	2, 3	<p>Likelihood assessed as Possible (3) because of current economic conditions</p> <p>Impact assessed as Major (4) because of impact of poor career opportunities on sustainability of communities where economic growth is essential for their survival</p>	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R13	Continued net out migration of young people	Continued out migration due to lack of further education, higher education and training opportunities	3, 4	<p>Likelihood assessed as Possible (3) because of current migration trends and continued need/desire of most young people to access university education outside the area</p> <p>Impact assessed as Major (4) because loss of young people will impact on sustainability of rural communities</p>	Medium	No change
CPP-R14	Demographic changes impacting on service demand and resources	Demographic / societal changes which increase demand for services beyond existing / planned budget levels	6, 11, 15	<p>Likelihood assessed as Possible (3) because of projected population changes, moderated by the current review of service provision in key areas like elderly care</p> <p>Impact assessed as Major (4) because a higher proportion of the population living to an old age and more people living longer will increase demand on a range of services including, health, social care, housing and transport</p>	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R15	Changing Government policy impacting on service demand	Changes to Scottish Government policy which increase demand for services beyond existing / planned budget levels	6, 11, 15	Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of changing financial position of Government and changes that are expected as the current position tightens	Medium	No change
CPP-R16	Lack of affordable housing - impact on families	Lack of affordable housing impacting on families in remote and rural areas and areas of urban deprivation, making it difficult for people to stay and/or settle in Argyll and Bute	6, 7, 8, 11	Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of impact of economic downturn on construction sector and possible lower future investment in social Impact assessed as Major (4) because of expected reduction in investment in social housing in Argyll and Bute by the Government (down from £22M to £11M for 2009/10)	High	No change
CPP-R17	Reduced attractiveness of Argyll and Bute for investors	Argyll and Bute is not seen as an attractive place to relocate to because of reduced investment in facilities and services for public and businesses	10, 11, 15	Likelihood assessed as Unlikely (2) because possible change from current position is low Impact assessed as Minor (2) because of difficulty attracting investors, but this has been the case for many years and so impact less (concern is more about lost potential)	Low	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R18	Delay to redesign of services for older people and impact on delayed discharges	Joint redesign of older peoples' services with the re-provision of NHS continuing care resources into the community (i.e. closure of NHS beds). Risk that lack of public and political acceptance of the solution will delay or prevent changes with consequent impact on delayed discharges.	6, 7, 10, 11, 15	<p>Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of public and political sensitivities to this as a topic</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of possible public reaction to proposals and financial impact if change is delayed</p>	Medium	No change
CPP-R19	Delay to redesign of mental health services	Mental health service redesign with re-provision of services into localities and community services – risk that lack of public and political acceptance of the solution will delay or prevent changes.	6, 7, 10, 11, 15	<p>Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of public and political sensitivities to this as a topic</p> <p>Impact assessed as Moderate (3) because of possible public reaction to proposals and financial impact if change is delayed</p>	Medium	No change

Ref	Risk name	Risk description	National outcome links	Risk assessment (March 09)	Risk rating	Recommended changes to assessment
CPP-R20	Delay to modernisation of NHS services	Modernisation of NHS services – moving from unscheduled care (emergency provision) to preventative/anticipatory care relating to achievement of HEAT targets. Issues include reducing hospital beds, providing more care in the community, sustainable out of hours emergency services in remote and island communities e.g. for a GP opting out, Scottish Ambulance Service response etc. Risk that lack of public and political acceptance of the solution will delay or prevent changes.	6, 7, 8, 10, 15	Likelihood assessed as Likely (4) because of public and political sensitivities to this as a topic Impact assessed as Major (4) because of possible public reaction to proposals and financial impact if change is delayed	High	No change

Are there any strategic risks that have been identified since the SOA was agreed that now need to be included in the CPP risk register?

Risks are assessed using a combination of impact and likelihood using the criteria below. All risks are then classified as high, medium or low using a simple matrix to generate an overall assessment.

Likelihood

Likelihood of occurrence	Score	Description
Almost certain	5	Will undoubtedly happen, possibly frequently
Likely	4	Will probably happen, but not a persistent issue
Possible	3	May happen occasionally
Unlikely	2	Not expected to happen, but is possible
Remote	1	Very unlikely this will ever happen

Impact

Impact of occurrence	Score	Description				
		Impact on service delivery	Financial impact	Impact on people	Impact on time	Impact on reputation
Catastrophic	5	Unable to function, inability to fulfil obligations	Severe loss	Death	Serious – more than 2 years to recover pre-event position	Highly damaging, severe loss of public confidence
Major	4	Significant impact on service provision	Major loss	Extensive injury, major permanent harm	Major – 1-2 years to recover pre-event position	Major adverse publicity, major loss of confidence
Moderate	3	Service objectives partially achievable	Significant loss	Medical treatment required, semi permanent harm up to 1 year	Considerable – 6-12 months to recover pre-event position	Some adverse publicity, legal implications
Minor	2	Minor impact on service objectives	Moderate loss	First aid treatment non-permanent harm up to 1 month	Some – 2-6 months to recover	Some public embarrassment, no damage to reputation
None	1	Minimal impact, no service disruption	Minimal loss	No obvious harm/ injury	Minimal – up to 2 months to recover	No interest to the press, internal only

Overall assessment

	Impact				
Likelihood	None	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Almost certain	Low	Medium	High	High	High
Likely	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Remote	low	Low	low	Low	Low