

CDC PARTNERSHIP RISKS

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	From 1/4/12				Controls	Q2					Comments
			Gross Risk	Gross RAG	Net Risk	Net Rag		Gross risk	Gross RAG	Net risk	Net RAG	Change	
RP04 Cherwell Local Strategic Partnership CDC	Kevin Larner	Failure or reduced effectiveness of the partnership could lead to: Key partners adopting policies or projects inconsistent with each other Opportunities being missed for effective partnership working Existing LSP projects failing to deliver their objectives Any of the above could result in wasted resources and reputational damage to the council and the partnership	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A	RP04a: Annual self assessment of performance RP04b: Annual "Reference Group" conference to report to and guidance from the wider community RP04c: CDC officer time dedicated to servicing the partnership and maintaining links between partners	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A	→	Partnership arrangements have been streamlined to reflect reduced resources
RP05 CDC Safer Communities Partnership CDC	Mike Grant	The partnership doesn't add value to the work of the council. Undertakes projects that don't align with strategic objectives of the council. Council is unable to influence the Partnership's agenda. Leading to failure to achieve corporate objectives and loss of reputation. Duplication of work Less effective/efficient work Less public confidence Failure to achieve partnership's objectives	Medium 9	A	Low 4	G	RP05a: CSCP effective meetings RP05b: Elected member representation at district and county groups RP05c: Continued support of JATAC RP05d: Cusp Strategy RP05e: CUSP action plan compliance	Medium 9	A	Low 4	G	→	Risk reviewed and the Partnership continues to meet with a healthy attendance and contribution

CDC PARTNERSHIP RISKS

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	From 1/4/12				Controls	Q2					Comments
			Gross Risk	Gross RAG	Net Risk	Net Rag		Gross risk	Gross RAG	Net risk	Net RAG	Change	
RP06 Local Enterprise Partnerships Oxford Region CDC	Adrian Colwell	The risk is the failure of the Local Enterprise Partnerships to establish themselves as effective bodies locally and in relations National Government. The consequences may be reduced funding for the local area and failure to fully exploit economic growth, development and infrastructure provision opportunities. A related risk is the ability/inability of Cherwell District council to influence the work of the Partnerships to the benefit of the district	High 16	R	High medium 12	A!	RP06a: Partnerships work programme / forward plan RP06b: Resource provision for partnership work - Senior management and Member involvement	High 16	R	High medium 12	A!	→	controls in place - no change
RP07 Oxfordshire Waste Partnership - financial arrangements CDC	Ed Potter	Financial arrangements exist to regulate funds flowing between the collection authorities in Oxfordshire and the disposal authority (Oxfordshire County Council). These are legally binding. However Oxfordshire county council have indicated that they are not prepared to continue all these payments (landfill diversion payments) in the future , indicating from April 2013. This could threaten the future of the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership.	High 20	R	High medium 12	A!	RP07a: Working with other collection partners. The County Council has one vote - the collection authorities have five RP07b: Full participation in the Partnership to address any moves made by the County Council to reduce payments RP07c: The County council could walk away from the Partnership which would mean the County Council would only pay recycling credits. However this is unlikely. RP07d: The Chair of the OWP has moved from Oxfordshire County Council to South Oxfordshire from May 2012	High 20	R	High medium 12	A!	→	Financial arrangements discussions with Chief Execs and Treasurers since there is a number of issues with the flow of money between Councils

CDC PARTNERSHIP RISKS

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	From 1/4/12				Controls	Q2					Comments
			Gross Risk	Gross RAG	Net Risk	Net Rag		Gross risk	Gross RAG	Net risk	Net RAG	Change	
RP08 Health and Wellbeing Boards CDC	Ian Davies	A new health and well being structure is being set up with county councils being given the responsibility to lead. This includes health, social care and the general well being in the widest context. CDC and SNC have notable contributions to make through their leisure, community safety, housing and health improvement services, regulatory functions such as planning, licensing and environmental health and its services to young people and older people. Unclear with a CC lead how DC services contribute and influence. There is a specific risk that the previous Supporting People budget so crucial to much of the homelessness preventative work will be broken up within this structure.	Medium 9	A	Medium 9	A	RP08a: Engagement with CC structures NB The structures are different in each county. Oxfordshire has a clear structure and acknowledges the need for the DC's direct contribution. However greater Supporting People budget risk exists which is no more reference to CDC. SNC engagement has commenced but there is a reliance on each district to set up its local forum with no clear guidance on the contribution mechanism of that to the county structure	Medium 9	A	Medium 6	A	↓	Health and Well Being county wide structure now in place. Multi agency working underway to provide District's input. Priorities established.
RP09 Local Enterprise Partnership (South East Midlands) Joint	Adrian Colwell	The risk is the failure of the Local Enterprise Partnerships to establish themselves as effective bodies locally and in relations National Government. The consequences may be reduced funding for the local area and failure to fully exploit economic growth, development and infrastructure provision opportunities. A related risk is the ability/inability of Cherwell District Council to influence the work of the partnerships to the benefit of the district	High 16	R	Medium 12	A	RP09a: Partnership Work Programme / Forward Plan RP09b: Resource provision for Partnership work RP09c: Senior management and Member involvement RP09d funding available from CLG /DfT to support growth and infrastructure provision.	High 16	R	Medium 12	A	→	Both Local Enterprise Partnerships are still in the early stage of development. See additional control added RP09 re funding

CDC PARTNERSHIP RISKS

Risk Heading	Owner	Description	From 1/4/12				Controls	Q2					Comments
			Gross Risk	Gross RAG	Net Risk	Net Rag		Gross risk	Gross RAG	Net risk	Net RAG	Change	
RP10 Police and Crime Commissioner and Police Panel (Thames Valley & Northamptonshire) Joint	Chris Rothwell	The Council fails to engage/influence the PCC/PCP Doesn't add value to partnership work of the council PCC commissions projects that don't align with strategic objectives of the council. Loss/reduction of funding to community Safety Becomes isolated from PCC Leading to failure to achieve corporate objectives and loss of reputation. Failure to deliver local priorities Failure to achieve PCC objectives Less effective/efficient work Less public confidence	Medium 9	A	Low 4		RP10a: Effective local community Safety Partnership meetings RP10b:Elected member representation at PCP RP10c:Elected member representation at Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire Board (OSCP) arrangements RP10d: Elected member representation at CSP RP10e: Alignment with PCC policing plan RP10f: Elected membership in accordance with agreed PCP steering group policy	Medium 9	A	Low 4		→	Work progressing in both areas towards election. Panel in place at regular meetings in Thames Valley