

Risk	Rating	Mitigation
<p>A</p> <p>Expectations of the Partnership Parties are not shared or jointly understood leading to misunderstandings and strained relationships.</p>	<p>High</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Partnership Working Group (PWG) holds a dedicated annual discussion following each Partnership Health Check, including reaching a shared understanding of the key principles and concepts. This meeting will be held before the Joint Council meeting each year. 2. The Joint Council sets aside sufficient time to consider the findings and recommendations of the Health Check at its first meeting each year. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An outcome from these meetings should be a shared understanding of how the Parties will work together going forward, including, if necessary, revising relevant Terms of Reference to clarify procedures. b. Another outcome will be a shared understanding of key concepts, principles and structures of the Partnership Agreement. 3. The Drafting Group's role to consider draft papers for the PWG, seeking to iron out any areas of disagreement, is formalised and its formal Terms of Reference developed. 4. Processes and procedures adopted for the National Partnership and National Agreement be adopted as good practice by all jurisdictions in developing their Implementation Plans, noting that individual jurisdictions need due flexibility to take into account different contexts and operating environments. 5. Effective change management involving knowledge-building and strengthened capability to support implementation. For example, ahead of joint development and delivery of Implementation Plans, the Coalition of Peaks and governments will ensure that their representatives are equipped with the necessary information about the Priority Reforms and other National Agreement commitments and understand how to work effectively under the new partnership arrangements.
<p>B</p> <p>The volume, scope and nature of the work going forward is likely to put pressure on resources, timeframes and key individuals. Each of these processes will also involve points of difference and these have the potential to affect relationships within the Partnership</p>	<p>High</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Strategic planning will be enhanced by the development, monitoring and updating of a shared, strategic Forward Work Plan for PWG and Joint Council. This will allow Parties to carefully manage intersecting work agendas to minimise their impact on the delivery of commitments under the National Agreement. This may include looking for ways to share workloads and draw on additional resources from across their agencies or member organisations. 7. Joint Council and PWG meeting dates to be determined in discussions between the Co-chairs and a schedule of meetings for the following year (times, dates and venues) agreed at the last meeting of the previous year. 8. The process for agreeing agendas to be clearly set out in updated terms of reference for Joint Council, PWG and Drafting Group. 9. Papers to be distributed well in advance of meetings so all parties have time to consider their positions and proper consultation with members/line agencies can occur. 10. Examples of good practice to be voluntarily shared among the Parties, including at PWG meetings.

Risk	Rating	Mitigation
<p>C</p> <p>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and their organisations do not 'buy-in' to the Closing the Gap agenda</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>11. The Joint Communication Strategy in the National Agreement should be drafted to help mitigate this risk so that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and organisations are readily able to observe the progress of the arrangements in the changes that are made to improve their life outcomes through better community-controlled service delivery</p> <p>12. Publication of the annual Health Check reports and Risk Registers and the Parties' responses to them on the Closing the Gap website.</p>
<p>D</p> <p>Governments fail to commit the resources or effort required to properly implement the spirit and intent of the National Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peaks do not have resources to properly engage in the implementation planning process –and are swamped by overwhelming demands • Slippage due to lack of resolve and resources • The momentum is not maintained and in five years the focus on implementation and action will have waned • Changes to key personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Government Parties ○ Coalition of Peaks ○ Individual Peaks and community-controlled sector 	<p>Medium</p>	<p>13. Jurisdictions should consider adequacy of funding to National Peaks and the various state/territory coalitions of peaks to engage governments and support their community-controlled sectors in the implementation phase. Resourcing is critical so that Peaks can engage and negotiate as equal partners within the formal Partnership Agreement.</p> <p>14. Jurisdictions acknowledge that delivering on the commitments in the National Agreement will require cultural change within the institutions of government so the new arrangements become the norm and are not reliant on key individuals. Governments will address how they are undertaking this change management process in their annual reports.</p> <p>15. Jurisdictions can mitigate the impact of changes in key personnel by deeply embedding the principles of the National Agreement across the whole-of-government.</p> <p>16. Succession planning by Peaks can ensure essential corporate knowledge is not lost. Governments are encouraged to include succession planning in their implementation plans.</p> <p>17. The Annual Partnership Health Check discussions should specifically test momentum and include activities to maintain shared understanding and resolve, especially given the lessons learned from the Partnership Working Group on Closing the Gap review of the 2008 NIRA which found that loss of momentum over time contributed to aspects of policy and program failure for initiatives linked to the Closing the Gap building blocks.</p> <p>18. Accountability mechanisms within the National Agreement (three yearly Productivity Commission and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander led reviews) will contribute to an assessment as to whether governments have committed the resources and effort required to achieve real change.</p>

Risk	Rating	Mitigation
<p>E</p> <p>Continuity of the Partnership Partners over the life of the Agreement is interrupted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coalition of Peaks does not continue for the life of the National Agreement • Federal intergovernmental arrangements are changed during this period 	<p>Low</p>	<p>19. The Coalition of Peaks has a strong membership base and an effective Secretariat. Although hosted by NACCHO, it has asserted its separate identity through its own website, IT system and naming conventions. Its independence could be strengthened by incorporating as a separate legal entity and having its own office.</p> <p>20. The Commonwealth can review its funding agreement with the Coalition of Peaks, including whether the funding can be better targeted or amended to ensure it meets emerging needs over time. The Peaks will alert the Commonwealth where established funding is not sufficient to meet its purposes in the light of changing circumstances.</p> <p>21. Alignment between the Partnership Agreement and the National Agreement on Closing the Gap is important. An adjustment to the Partnership Agreement is required to reflect the changed arrangements from the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) to the National Federation Reform Council that have occurred since the Partnership Agreement was signed. This (and other minor revisions) will be rectified at the formal Partnership Agreement review in 2022. In the meantime all terms of reference for governance committees to the National Agreement will be updated to reflect these and any other changes agreed by Joint Council</p> <p>22. Governments have committed to the Partnership Agreement until 2029 while the National Agreement is open-ended. This recognises that enduring partnerships will be critical to resetting relationships and achieving the significant outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples committed to under these Agreements.</p> <p>23. The accountability and review mechanisms under the National Agreements provide opportunities to identify and address any weaknesses or opportunities for strengthening the Partnership.</p> <p>24. Peaks can advocate for a bipartisan approach to Closing the Gap agenda in all jurisdictions.</p>
<p>F</p> <p>The interrelation between the Partnership Agreement and the National Agreement is lost in the enthusiasm to implement the National Agreement.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>25. Development and governance of, and reporting on, jurisdictional implementation plans should ensure that all parties understand their implementation responsibilities, including as part of joint actions. Information tools agreed by the Parties will also play a role in maintaining understanding of the links between the Agreements and their relevance to progressing effective implementation, particularly the partnership actions.</p>