

PROPOSED CHANGES TO 'FUNDING AND SUPPORT TO AGENCIES' BUDGET – RISK ASSESSMENT						
		5	10	15	20	25
Impact	4 High	4	8	12	16	20
	3 Medium	3	6	9	12	15
	2 Low	2	4	6	8	10
	1 Negligible	1	2	3	4	5
		1 Rare	2 Unlikely	3 Possible	4 Probable	5 Almost certain

#### Likelihood

This risk assessment focusses on key risks identified through the consultation conducted between March and June 2014.

ID	Risk	Outline Evaluation (likelihood and impact)	Proposed Mitigation	Score
001	Rural areas are disadvantaged by the proposals	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	Effective contract management  Ensure that the CCB contract provider has rural and urban experience or is a consortium led by organisations with these specialisms  Include Rural as one of the priority groups for the LECG contract  The funding for the current Rural Advice Service is £35k per year so the proposed contribution of £50k per year for rural communities within the Community Capacity Building contract actually represents an increase in resources for rural areas.	<b>12</b>
002	The contracts do not deliver agreed priorities	<b>Likelihood – 2</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	Effective and consistent contract management, all contracts aligned to LCC priorities and monitored against key outcomes, outputs and milestones	<b>8</b>

003	The proposed changes impact on the diversity of VCS organisations i.e. there will be reduced support for smaller organisations	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact – 3</b>	The proposals directly affect seven organisations but the impact will be wider. The new CCB contract will specifically target support for smaller groups in deprived/vulnerable areas  Monitor the impact of the changes in conjunction with VAL	<b>9</b>
004	The new Community Capacity Building contract does not have an impact due to lack of funding	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	Additional funding is now proposed for this contract which should enable it to reach further. This represents an increase in targeted capacity building support.	<b>12</b>
005	The resources for the LECG are spread too thinly i.e. between too many priority groups	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact - 3</b>	Additional funding (£10,000) is now proposed specifically for capacity building of LECG group members	<b>9</b>
006	The number of groups supported by the CIO has to be 'rationed'	<b>Likelihood – 4</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	This is the reality given the proposed reduction in funding but can be mitigated by a more effective triage approach so that those who can help themselves (using on-line resources) do help themselves  Support will also be provided through the new Shire Community Solutions and Participatory grants and accompanying support	<b>16</b>
007	The reduction in CIO funding reduces the ability of the sector to take on the role envisaged in the Communities Strategy	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	The new Community Capacity building contract and other 'invest to save' funding will support specific service changes and delivery of the priorities in the Communities Strategy	<b>12</b>
008	The reductions in funding for the CIO contract make it harder for organisations to recruit, train and manage volunteers	<b>Likelihood – 4</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	The findings of the survey indicate that VCS organisations value 'Group Support' and 'Volunteering Support' slightly more than 'Policy and Voice'. The contract for 2015-16 and the new contract for 2016-17 will reflect a much more targeted approach  Explore the potential to secure additional transformation resources to support volunteers who take on delivery of public services	<b>16</b>

009	The reductions in funding for the CIO contract make it harder for organisations to identify and secure external funding	<b>Likelihood – 4</b>  <b>Impact – 3</b>	LCC and VAL jointly support the Leicestershire Funding Toolkit. It is likely that groups will receive a more web –based service in the future unless the project for which they are seeking funding addresses one or more of LCC priorities	<b>12</b>
010	The CABs continue to lose experienced staff and volunteers	<b>Likelihood – 2</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	Although the LCC funding for the core contract has not been reduced there have been changes to funding for money advice. The main CAB restructuring is now complete so further impacts should be minimal	<b>8</b>
011	Funded organisations 'retract' and reduce the amount of outreach work	<b>Likelihood – 2</b>  <b>Impact – 4</b>	Effective contract management should ensure that the right balance is achieved between central and outreach services, although it would be unrealistic to say that this will definitely not happen	<b>8</b>
012	VCS organisations can't/won't align to public sector priorities	<b>Likelihood – 3</b>  <b>Impact – 2</b>	Those who receive funding from LCC through a grant or contract will be required to align services to priorities  Effective contract management	<b>6</b>
013	The level of reporting and paperwork impacts on front line delivery	<b>Likelihood – 2</b>  <b>Impact - 4</b>	Efforts will be made to streamline reporting and paperwork – for example the new shared outcome framework developed for Leicestershire and Charnwood CABs and shared outcome framework for the CIO contract	<b>8</b>
014	More and more is expected of volunteers	<b>Likelihood – 5</b>  <b>Impact - 4</b>	This is inevitable. Mitigation would involve putting in place the support needed for both LCC services and communities to be able to recruit, support and train volunteers and to try to secure volunteers from groups who traditionally participate less in volunteering	<b>20</b>

This page is intentionally left blank