



Item No. 18

Meeting Date Wednesday 10th June 2026

**Glasgow City
Integration Joint Board
Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee**

Report By: Duncan Black, Depute Chief Officer, Finance and Resources

Contact: Craig Cowan, Head of Business Development

Phone: 0141 287 8726

IJB Risk Policy and Strategy Review - Short Life Working Group: Update

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to provide the IJB Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee with an update on the work of the Short Life Working Group (SLWG) established to review and refresh the Integration Joint Board's Risk Management Policy and Strategy.

Background/Engagement:

A Short Life Working Group was established to undertake a refresh of the IJB's Risk Management Policy and Strategy, building on the strengths of the 2020 framework while addressing areas where it no longer provides sufficient support for effective strategic oversight.

Governance Route:

The matters contained within this paper have been previously considered by the following group(s) as part of its development.

- HSCP Senior Management Team
- Council Corporate Management Team
- Health Board Corporate Management Team
- Council Committee
- Update requested by IJB
- Other
- IJB Risk Management Policy & Strategy Short Life Working Group
- Not Applicable

OFFICIAL

Recommendations:	<p>The IJB Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Note the progress made by the Risk Management Policy and Strategy Short Life Working Group;b) Note the risk category options considered and approve the recommendation to adopt Option B (Mapped Alignment Model); andc) Note the key areas of change being developed as part of the revised Risk Management Policy and Strategy.
-------------------------	--

Relevance to Integration Joint Board Strategic Plan:
<p>The work outlined in this report supports delivery of the IJB Strategic Plan by strengthening governance, assurance and risk oversight arrangements across the Partnership. In particular, it supports effective strategic decision-making and oversight of risks that impact delivery of the IJB's priorities.</p>

Implications for Health and Social Care Partnership:

Reference to National Health & Wellbeing Outcome:	<p>The report primarily relates to governance and assurance arrangements. Indirectly, effective risk management supports delivery of all National Health and Wellbeing Outcomes, particularly:</p> <p>Outcome 1 – People are able to look after and improve their own health and wellbeing and live in good health for longer; and</p> <p>Outcome 4 – Health and social care services are centred on helping to maintain or improve the quality of life of people who use those services.</p>
--	---

Personnel:	<p>There are no direct personnel implications arising from this report.</p>
-------------------	---

Carers:	<p>There are no direct implications for carers arising from this report.</p>
----------------	--

Provider Organisations:	<p>There are no direct implications for provider organisations arising from this report.</p>
--------------------------------	--

Equalities:	<p>This report relates to the development of governance and risk management arrangements. It does not propose changes to services or access to services and therefore has no direct equalities implications at this stage. An Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken where required as the revised Policy and Strategy is finalised.</p>
--------------------	---

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Fairer Scotland Compliance:	This report relates to governance arrangements rather than a specific service change or investment decision. There are no direct Fairer Scotland Duty implications arising at this stage.
Financial:	There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.
Legal:	The report raises no new legal implications. The review of the Risk Management Policy and Strategy supports the IJB in meeting its statutory governance and assurance responsibilities.
Economic Impact:	There is no direct economic impact arising from this report.
Sustainability:	Effective risk management supports the long-term sustainability of health and social care services by strengthening governance, planning and resilience. There are no specific environmental sustainability implications arising from this report
Sustainable Procurement and Article 19:	There are no procurement implications arising from this report
Risk Implications:	This report does not introduce new risks. The work described is intended to strengthen the IJB's existing risk management arrangements, including clarity of escalation and assurance. Existing strategic and operational risks will continue to be managed through established risk registers during the review process
Implications for Glasgow City Council:	There are no specific implications for Glasgow City Council arising from this report.
Implications for NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde:	There are no specific implications for NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde arising from this report

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

1. Purpose

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide the IJB Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee with an update on the work of the Short Life Working Group (SLWG) established by this Committee at its meeting on [10 September 2025](#) to review and refresh the Integration Joint Board’s Risk Management Policy and Strategy, last approved in February 2020.
- 1.2. This report sets out progress to date, summarises the risk category options considered by the SLWG, highlights the preferred approach, outlines the key changes being developed as part of the revised Policy and Strategy, and advises on the planned next steps.

2. Background

- 2.1. As required by the Integration Scheme, the IJB’s Risk Management Policy and Strategy was originally approved by the IJB following its formal establishment in 2016, with an update approved in February 2020. It established a proportionate, high-level framework, including a risk matrix (shown below), defined review cycles and a clear distinction between strategic and operational risk.

Likelihood	Consequence/Impact				
	1	2	3	4	5
5	5	10	15	20	25
4	4	8	12	16	20
3	3	6	9	12	15
2	2	4	6	8	10
1	1	2	3	4	5

>16	Very High
10-16	High
4-9	Medium
1-3	Low
Normal Risk Tolerance	

	1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain
Consequence/Impact	Negligible/Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme/fundamental

- 2.2. Since then, the operating environment for the IJB has changed materially. The Partnership continues to experience sustained financial, workforce and demand pressures, alongside increasing interdependency across health, social care and third-sector partners. In parallel, expectations from auditors, regulators and inspection bodies have continued to evolve, particularly in relation to risk appetite, escalation, assurance and transparency. Updated national good practice, most notably the [UK Treasury Orange Book](#) (2023), places increased emphasis on integrated system governance and proportional risk management.

OFFICIAL

- 2.3. In addition to this, in the intervening period the partner bodies have also made substantial changes to their Risk Management Policies and frameworks, notably revisions to risk categories (also referred to as risk domains or taxonomies) and the introduction of risk appetite statements and thresholds, which operational risks managed by the Partnership are required to comply with.
- 2.4. Against this backdrop, this Committee agreed to establish a Short Life Working Group to undertake a refresh of the Risk Management Policy and Strategy, building on the strengths of the 2020 framework while addressing areas where it no longer provides sufficient support for effective strategic oversight.

3. Work of the Short Life Working Group

- 3.1. The SLWG has focused on three main areas of work:
- Reviewing the 2020 Policy and Strategy to identify elements that remain effective and areas where greater clarity or strengthening is required;
 - Developing a revised structure that more clearly distinguishes between governance expectations (Policy) and operational implementation (Strategy);
 - Exploring alternative approaches to IJB risk categorisation to improve consistency of escalation and strengthen Board-level scrutiny of system-wide risks; and
 - Developing a risk appetite statement for inclusion in the revised Policy that is aligned with the revised risk categorisations.
- 3.2. Draft revised content has been developed and is now approaching readiness for wider consultation with the IJB and consideration by this Committee ahead of formal IJB approval.

4. Risk Categories Options – Summary and Recommended Approach

- 4.1. Experience of applying the current framework has highlighted limitations in relying primarily on the broad distinction between strategic and operational risk in the 2020 document. In particular, this has not consistently supported clear escalation from partner operational systems, nor Board-level discussion of cumulative or system-wide risk.
- 4.2. An options paper was therefore developed for consideration by the SLWG, setting out three alternative approaches to refreshed IJB risk categories. Each option was assessed against agreed criteria, including alignment with the Orange Book, compatibility with NHS and local authority risk frameworks, clarity of escalation routes, visibility of integration risk, and audit and assurance robustness.

OFFICIAL

4.3. The three options considered by the SLWG were:

- **Option 1 – IJB-specific strategic risk categories**
The concept of this option is that the IJB uses its own strategic risk category headings, and operational risks in the Partnership are re-framed when they are escalated to the IJB. While this option provides strong strategic framing tailored to the IJB's role, it would require some reinterpretation of risks as they escalate from operational systems.
- **Option 2 – Mapped alignment model**
The concept of this option is that it uses risk categories that more closely align with those already used by partner bodies, applying them only where risks become strategically significant for the IJB. This approach supports continuity of risk language – in other words, this option uses headings that more closely line up with the way the partner bodies and Partnership services already talk about risk.
- **Option 3 – Single shared enterprise taxonomy**
The concept of this option is that the IJB uses a generic “enterprise risk” structure similar to other large organisations, so less emphasis on integration and the specific priorities of the IJB. As this option has more generic category headings, it would rely on risks being sufficiently detailed and described to ensure they articulate their importance and relevance to the IJB.

4.4. The risk categories for each option that was considered by the SLWG are included in Appendix 1.

4.5. Having considered the strengths and limitations of each approach, the SLWG is recommending Option 2 – the Mapped Alignment Model. This option is considered to provide the most appropriate balance between:

- effective strategic oversight by the IJB;
- practical and proportionate escalation from operational risk systems;
- continued alignment with NHS and local authority frameworks; and
- robust audit, assurance and scrutiny arrangements.

5. Key Changes Being Developed Compared with the 2020 Framework

5.1. Alongside refreshed risk categories, the revised Policy and Strategy proposes a number of targeted but important changes when compared with the February 2020 framework:

- **Clear separation of Policy and Strategy**
The 2020 document combines governance principles and operational arrangements within a single framework. The revised approach separates these elements, with a concise Policy setting out principles, roles, responsibilities and risk appetite, supported by a Strategy describing how risk is identified, assessed, escalated and reported in practice.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- **More explicit articulation of risk appetite**
The 2020 Policy defines tolerance largely through the risk matrix, with LOW and MEDIUM risks generally tolerated and HIGH and VERY HIGH risks subject to increased scrutiny. The revised framework will retain the existing matrix but introduces a clearer, category-based risk appetite, recognising that tolerance appropriately varies between areas such as safety, legal compliance, financial sustainability and service transformation.
- **Clearer escalation and movement between registers**
While the 2020 Strategy allows for operational risks to be escalated where they require strategic leadership, the revised framework will provide greater clarity on thresholds and expectations for escalation and de-escalation between operational and IJB risk registers.
- **Strengthened assurance and scrutiny arrangements**
The revised Strategy strengthens alignment with the “three-lines-of-defence” model, which clarifies responsibilities for managing risk, overseeing risk and providing independent assurance. In practical terms, this will improve the quality and transparency of assurance provided to the IJB by clearly showing not only what the key risks are, but also what evidence exists that they are being effectively controlled (e.g. by linking risks to relevant Key Performance Indicators, internal audit and inspection findings etc.). The aim of this change is to support more focussed scrutiny by this Committee and greater confidence for the IJB in overall governance arrangements.
- **Greater emphasis on system and integration risk**
The revised framework will place increased emphasis on risks arising from cumulative pressure, sustainability and partnership dependencies, reflecting the IJB’s role as a system-level integration authority rather than focusing solely on individual service-level issues.
- **Alignment with updated good practice**
The revised Policy and Strategy is explicitly aligned with the UK Treasury Orange Book (2023), strengthening transparency, consistency and audit defensibility.

5.2. These changes are intended to evolve, rather than replace, the existing framework, retaining familiar elements such as the shared risk matrix while strengthening strategic oversight and assurance.

6. Next Steps

6.1. The next stages of work will include:

- incorporating the recommended risk category option into the draft revised Policy and Strategy;
- An update to the IJB on the content of this paper at its development session scheduled for 17 June 2026;

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- wider consultation with the IJB on the proposed revised Policy and Strategy, including risk appetite statement, at the IJB Development Session scheduled for 2 September 2026;
- formal consideration by the Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting scheduled for 9 September 2026 for recommendation to the IJB; and
- final approval by the Integration Joint Board at its meeting scheduled for 23 September 2026.

7. Recommendations

7.1. The IJB Finance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

- a) Note the progress made by the Risk Management Policy and Strategy Short Life Working Group;
- b) Note the risk category options considered and approve the recommendation to adopt Option 2 (Mapped Alignment Model); and
- c) Note the key areas of change being developed as part of the revised Risk Management Policy and Strategy.

OFFICIAL

Appendix 1: Risk Categories – Options

The proposed risk categories and descriptions for all 3 options considered by the Short Life Working Group are shown below.

Option 2 (Mapped Alignment Model) is the model recommended by the Short Life Working Group.

OPTION 1 – IJB-SPECIFIC STRATEGIC RISK CATEGORIES

- **Financial Sustainability**
Risks affecting the IJB's ability to remain financially sustainable over the short, medium and longer term, including funding gaps, cost pressures, delivery of savings and overall financial resilience.
- **Legislative, Regulatory and Governance**
Risks relating to compliance with legislation, statutory duties and regulatory requirements, and to the effectiveness of governance, accountability and decision-making arrangements.
- **Strategic Planning and Transformation**
Risks that may prevent delivery of the IJB Strategic Plan or major transformation activity, including failure to redesign services or respond effectively to policy or system change.
- **Service Capacity, Demand and Market Sustainability**
Risks arising from increasing demand, insufficient service capacity, fragility in the care and support market, or an inability to commission or sustain the services required by the population.
- **Population Health, Safety and Quality**
Risks that could adversely affect population health outcomes, care quality, safety, wellbeing or health inequalities.
- **Information Governance, Digital and Cyber Security**
Risks relating to the protection, availability and reliability of information and digital systems, including data protection, system resilience and cyber security.
- **Workforce Sustainability and Leadership**
Risks associated with workforce capacity, capability and leadership, including recruitment, retention, skills, wellbeing and organisational resilience.
- **Strategic Partnership and Integration**
Risks arising from complex partnership arrangements, including misalignment of priorities, governance or delivery across the Council, NHS and wider partners.
- **Reputation, Public Confidence and Stakeholder Confidence**
Risks that may undermine public trust or stakeholder confidence in the IJB, including adverse scrutiny, complaints or wider reputational harm.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

OPTION 2 – MAPPED ALIGNMENT MODEL (**RECOMMENDED**)

- **Strategy, Planning and Transformation**
Risks that threaten delivery of agreed strategies, priorities and transformation programmes, including failure to plan effectively for future need or system change.
- **Governance, Legal and Compliance**
Risks relating to legal duties, regulatory compliance, ethical standards and the effectiveness of governance and assurance arrangements.
- **Quality, Safety and Population Outcomes**
Risks that could adversely affect care quality, safety, experience or outcomes for service users and communities, including the widening of health inequalities.
- **Service Delivery, Capacity and Continuity**
Risks affecting the reliability and continuity of service delivery, including operational disruption, insufficient capacity or sustained service failure.
- **Workforce and Leadership**
Risks linked to workforce availability, skills, leadership capacity, wellbeing and staff engagement across health and social care services.
- **Finance and Resource Sustainability**
Risks affecting financial balance, affordability and the sustainable use of resources across the system.
- **Information, Digital and Technology**
Risks associated with digital capability, data quality, cyber security, system resilience and the effective use of technology to support service delivery.
- **Partnerships, Market and Dependencies**
Risks arising from reliance on partners, providers or markets, including commissioning arrangements, contracts and system interdependencies.
- **Reputation, Confidence and Engagement**
Risks that could undermine confidence among the public, staff, partners, regulators or elected members.

OPTION 3 – SINGLE SHARED ENTERPRISE TAXONOMY

- **Strategic**
Risks that could affect the achievement of long-term objectives, priorities and strategic direction.
- **Governance and Compliance**
Risks relating to governance arrangements, legal obligations, regulatory compliance and assurance.
- **Operational**
Risks affecting day-to-day delivery of services, including disruption, failure or inefficiency.
- **People**
Risks associated with workforce capacity, capability, wellbeing, leadership and industrial relations.
- **Financial**
Risks relating to budgets, financial control, affordability and long-term sustainability.
- **Technology and Information**
Risks concerning IT systems, data security, information quality and technological resilience.
- **Partnership and Commercial**
Risks arising from contractual arrangements, partnerships and external dependencies.
- **Reputational**
Risks that could damage organisational reputation or public trust.