

Risk identified		Risk owner	Impact score (1-4)	Likelihood score (1-6)	Current risk score (1 - 24)	Managing the risk: Control / mitigating action	Responsible officer	Deadline
Risk ref	Risk description							
1	If the council does not adopt a commissioning approach there is a risk that it is unable to deliver significant savings and that it will need to look at cutting services in an unstructured way	Mark Sheldon (BtG)	4	3	12	Establish savings as a clear target output from any commissioning exercise.	Mark Sheldon	April 2012
2	If a strategic commissioning approach is not implemented with a clear understanding of the impacts of the commissioner/provider split there is a risk that it could increase the costs to the council or fail to achieve potential savings.	Andrew North	4	3	12	Maintain fidelity to clear and agreed goals as to what is desired from the approach Learn from other authorities who have adopted commissioning Monitor the benefits realized	Andrew North	Goals by Summer 2010 Benefits realization by April 2012
3	If the process of moving towards a commissioning council is not properly programme and project managed there is a risk that it could impact on service delivery in the short term by diverting resources from other work	Andrew North	4	3	12	Resource the programme appropriately using MSP disciplines planning the resource needs so that capacity or skills shortages are addressed in advance	Ken Dale	April 2012
4	If knowledge and skills about commissioning are not developed within the organization, there is a risk that services will not be commissioned or delivered in the right way which may impact on flexibility and/or costs	Amanda Attfield	4	4	16	Knowledge programme for relevant officers/members developed and delivered Skills for business development programme developed and delivered	Jan Bridges	March 2011
5	If the move towards commissioning is not communicated effectively with customers and stakeholders there is a risk that it is perceived to a bureaucratic exercise and impact	Ken Dale (Programme Manager)	3	2	6	Consistent and effective messages related through all existing networks and partnerships and ensure buy-in. Link the process clearly into	Ken Dale	Key messages and stakeholder plan by spring

Risk identified		Risk owner	Impact score (1-4)	Likelihood score (1-6)	Current risk score (1 - 24)	Managing the risk: Control / mitigating action	Responsible officer	Deadline
Risk ref	Risk description							
	on the councils reputation					the wider Glos Conference commissioning process. Evidence and publicise VfM returns.		2010
6	If partner organizations are not sufficiently 'bought into' the process then there is a risk that the commissioning work will be done in isolation and potential savings and effective delivery of outcomes will be reduced	Andrew North	4	4	16	Take opportunities to inform and engage partners throughout Ensure that joint funding is subject to use of proper commissioning disciplines	Richard Gibson	Over period from present to April 2012
7	If the process of moving to a commissioning environment is not handled sensitively then there is a risk that it could impact on employee and member motivation	Amanda Attfield	3	3	9	Change management and HR processes in place Regular employee and member updates	Julie McCarthy	June - December 2010
8	If the commissioning approach does not clearly specify roles, responsibilities and accountabilities then there is a risk that responsibilities and accountabilities could be blurred which would impact on service delivery, costs and customer satisfaction	Amanda Attfield	4	3	12	Define the Commissioning structure and roles Describe new roles – job descriptions and person specifications Make revisions to any existing roles and consult job holder/s	Julie McCarthy	June – December 2010
9	If the Programme does not specify roles and responsibilities, there is the risk that the Programme will not deliver the outcomes required, and benefits will not be realised	Amanda Attfield	4	1	4	Create Programme structure to manage programme Clarify roles and responsibilities of Programme Board members	Ken Dale	All project roles by summer 2010. Programme structure and programme board roles & responsibilities

Risk identified		Risk owner	Impact score (1-4)	Likelihood score (1-6)	Current risk score (1 - 24)	Managing the risk: Control / mitigating action	Responsible officer	Deadline
Risk ref	Risk description							
								already in place
10	There are not many examples of commissioning at district council level, if the council does not adapt best practice from elsewhere to suit a two tier area there is a risk that the commissioning approach may not deliver the outcomes expected	Peter Woolley	3	3	9	Beacons are developed by setting best practice. There are a number of examples where the commissioning approach has been embedded in unitaries and other public agencies – and a number of researched works on the subject at both national and local level that will inform our approach. This coupled to good risk management will significantly reduce this risk.	Peter Woolley	Ongoing to 2012

Residual risk score	Risk Management view
16 – 24	Must be managed down to reduce risk scores as soon as possible, or prepare a contingency plan or action
7 – 15	Seek to improve the risk score in the short/medium term or establish a contingency plan
0 – 6	Tolerate and monitor within the project.