Conwy & Denbighshire Public Services Board Board Risk Register and Community Risk



This document provides information on the core risks identified by the Conwy and Denbighshire Public Services Board. The risk register also captures broader social and global risks where PSB partner organisations, might be impacted if the risk were to materialise.

| Reference | Risk Description | Potential Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Risk Mitigating Actions | Residual Risk Score | Milestone dates | Action Owner |
|-------------|---|--|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Board Risks | | | | | | | |
| PSB 1 | The risk that the PSB has insufficient funding, resources and capacity to deliver the priorities identified in the Well-being Plan. | Failure to deliver the Wellbeing plan. Fail to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of our population. Not adhering to the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act, leading to possible consequences from the Commissioner. | В3 | PSB grant was removed for 2020/21. We anticipate it will return in 2021/22, however it is prescriptive and insufficient to the existing priorities. Programme management in place to help allocate resource and plan for delivery. Any capacity pressures should be raised with the chair of the PSB. | C3 | | PSB |
| PSB 2 | The risk that partner organisations are not committed to the board. | Low attendance at meetings. Lack of ownership of PSB plan and priorities. PSB work is seen as a separate entity and not embedded into organisations' 'business as usual.' | C2 | Terms of Reference in place setting out the working arrangements for the Board, including purpose, structure and expected membership. Board governed by the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015 | C3 | | PSB |

| | | - Damages effectiveness, leading to reputational consequences. | | Robust evidence and consultation-based rationale for current priorities. Keep agenda strategic. Manage meetings effectively Regular feedback from board members. | | |
|-------|---|---|----|--|----|-----|
| PSB 3 | The risk that the PSB fails to maximise the potential impact it can achieve through a collaborative approach. | - Work undertaken in silos, leading to possible duplication and inefficiency. | В2 | Programme management in place to help allocate partner resources and plan for delivery. Ensure there is a good understanding across the partners of what the board as a whole is seeking to achieve. Ensure board members, services and teams are committed to priorities having been involved in their design and prioritisation. Identify and understand interdependencies between priorities and work streams. | C2 | PSB |
| PSB 4 | The risk that the complex partnership landscape both regionally and subregionally impacts on the delivery of the Well-being Plan. | Potential duplication with other collaborations. Capacity and resource issues. | B3 | Programme management in place to help allocate partner resources and plan for delivery. Involvement of stakeholders in the design of solutions. Establish a strong and relevant vision focused on the future, which is reviewed regularly. Undertake research before and during the development of partnerships/collaboration to ensure key outcomes are relevant to all. | C3 | PSB |

| PSB 5 | The risk that there are | - Unable to fulfil the PSB | B2 | - Defer projects and advise the | В3 | |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-----|
| | further Covid-19 | well-being objectives. | | commissioner accordingly | | |
| | waves, which require | | | | | |
| | PSB members to focus | | | | | PSB |
| | their attention on | | | | | PSD |
| | response. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Risk Matrix

| | Event is almost certain to occur in most circumstances | >70% | Almost Certain | Α | | | | | |
|------------|---|--------|-------------------------|----------|---|--|---|--|---|
| OO | Event likely to occur in most circumstances | 30-70% | Likely | В | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Event will possibly occur at some time | 10-30% | Possible | С | | | | | |
| | Event unlikely and may occur at some time | 1-10% | Unlikely | D | | | | | |
| | Event rare and may occur only in exceptional circumstances | <1% | Rare | ш | | | | | |
| | | | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | | | J J | 4 | J | - | |
| | | | | | Very Low | 4 Low | Medium | High | Very High |
| | | | Service Performa | | | | _ | | |
| | | | Performan Reputation | on | Very Low Minor errors | Low Some disruption to activities/cust | Medium Disruption to core activities/ | High Significant disruption to core activities. Key targets | Very High Unable to delivery core activities. Strategic aims |
| | | | Performa | on al | Very Low Minor errors or disruption Trust recoverable with little | Some disruption to activities/cust omers Trust recoverable at modest cost with resource allocation within | Medium Disruption to core activities/ customers Trust recovery demands cost authorisation beyond existing | High Significant disruption to core activities. Key targets missed Trust recoverable at considerable cost and management | Very High Unable to delivery core activities. Strategic aims compromised Trust severely damaged and full recovery questionable |

The combination of impact and likelihood results in a risk exposure rating of:

| Minor | Risk easily man aged locally – no need to involve man agement |
|----------|--|
| Moderate | Risk containable at service level – senior management and SLT may need to be kept informed |
| Major | Intervention by SLT and / or CET with Cabin et involvement |
| Critical | Significant CET and Cabinet intervention |