

## **KCP Risk Management workshop**

14.05.2008

Don McBean  
Michael Bach  
Melanie Smith  
Celia Reese-Jenkins  
Tim Chidgey  
Stephen Weil  
Helen Leech  
Juliet Rawlings

### Risk 1

There is no formal induction process. Clarity around the roles and requirements of individual members is unclear. The roles and responsibilities of the partnership are unclear. There needs to be a joint understanding of what the Steering Group exists to do.

### Risk 2

There is no consistent approach to the sub group structure and some members are therefore unclear about accountability and ownership. Members felt this risk was better captured by focussing on the confidence of performance at sub group level.

### Risk 3

Members felt that LAA targets are not always achievable, realistic and shared.

### Risk 4

Members felt this risk was split into two, 4a concerned the degree to which members felt that the Community Strategy would not link to other plans, strategies and targets and agreed this was moderate. 4b concerned the degree to which LAA targets reflected other plans, strategies and targets and members agreed that was high.

### Risk 5

There is patchy understanding of how individual partner engage with the LSP and what their pressures and organisational positions are within the partnership.

### Risk 6

Members agreed that the KCP is not well recognised locally and regionally and that its identity is kept to a low profile.

#### Risk 7

Members struggled to agree on the degree to which the partnership was or was not innovation and aspirational with an overall agreement that this was an important element of the role of the partnership but would remain something to continuously work towards.

#### Risk 8

Members agreed that performing lower than expected within the CAA framework would be a real risk if each of the previous risks were not identified and mitigated.