

Corporate Risk Register

Trust Board Meeting	Item: 9.2
26th November 2014	Enclosure: K
Purpose of the Report: To update the Board on the contents of the Corporate Risk Register as it stands at 20 th November 2014.	
FOR: Information <input type="checkbox"/> Assurance <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision/approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sponsor (Executive Lead):	Charles Bruce, Interim Deputy Chief Executive
Author:	Tam Moorcroft, Corporate Risk Manager
Author Contact Details:	Tammy.moorcroft@kingstonhospital.nhs.uk Ext 2536
Risk Implications – Link to Assurance Framework or Corporate Risk Register:	Risks on the Corporate Risk Register are mapped to the BAF
Legal / Regulatory / Reputation Implications:	Outlines risks to statutory compliances and Indicates any areas of statutory non-compliance
Link to Relevant Corporate Objective:	Identified on the Register
Document Previously Considered By:	Compliance and Risk Committee Working Group Compliance and Risk Committee
Recommendation & Action required by the Trust Board: Consider the contents of the Corporate Risk Register as it stands at 20 th November 2014, and confirm that the register provides assurance that appropriate action is being taken and that there is appropriate identification of key risks.	

RISK REGISTER REPORT

Corporate Risk Register

1. The Corporate Risk Register is regularly reviewed and updated to ensure robust capture of strategic risks, as well as operational risks. It is reviewed monthly at the Compliance and Risk Committee and the Compliance and Risk Working Group. The Clinical Quality Improvement Committee will maintain an oversight of the quality risks. The quality risks are reviewed at the Quality Assurance Committee (bi-monthly), with the whole risk register being reviewed at the Audit Committee.
2. The Corporate Risk Register (appendix 1) is presented to the Trust Board quarterly and was last presented in July 2014. Appendix 2 provides an overview of the Risk Register on one page.
3. The Corporate Risk Register reflects all those risks with a current score of 8 or above contained in the Board Assurance Framework, the Integrated Business Plan (IBP), Corporate Departments and Service Line Risk Registers, as well as those risks identified by the Executive Team and Risk sub committees.
4. The Corporate Risk Register records the actions planned to mitigate each risk and progress in achieving these. It supports a 'bottom up, top down' approach to the treatment of significant risks.

Key points

5. Before any Service Line risk is escalated to, or de-escalated from, the Corporate Risk Register, the escalation/de-escalation is approved by the Service Line Performance Review Meeting and agreed by the Compliance and Risk Committee.
6. Where new or existing risks have been identified within a Service Line that relate to a risk already recorded on the Corporate Risk Register these are not duplicated, but referenced in the Corporate Risk's description, for example risk reference T021, encompasses the various risks identified within Service Lines with regard to incomplete or unavailable health records, the reference numbers of the supporting risks are noted in the description.
7. To help the Board understand the risk scoring parameters the full risk matrix has been included in this report at appendix 3.

Areas of movement in the Corporate Risk Register since July 2014

8. Six risks (shown below) have been escalated to the Corporate Risk Register. Risks are escalated either from Service Line Risk Registers (where risks have scored as 8 and above) or newly identified corporate risks.

Division	Service Line	Ref	Description	Score	Comment
Emergency Services	Cardiology & Haematology	C&H008	System for collecting patient care data for national mandatory audits is not robust and therefore cannot be relied upon to demonstrate quality of care resulting in potential failure to adhere to national guidance. This could	12	This risk was identified and added to the Service Line risk register.

Division	Service Line	Ref	Description	Score	Comment
			affect the Trust's reputation		
Clinical Support Services	Radiology	T_RA D013	Lack of Radiology Department floor space and poor environment leading to adverse patient experience / dignity issues	10	This risk was identified and added to the Service Line risk register.
Corporate	N/A	T042	Some Trust procedural documents are past their review date, which may result in current best practice not being followed, impacting on the Trust's reputation, as well as, resulting in poor patient and staff experience.	6	This is a new corporate risk identified for assessment by the Executive Management Committee and Quality Assurance Committee.
Corporate	N/A	T043	The lack of robust Cancer tracking systems and processes will result in poor reporting against indicators, impacting on the Trust's reputation, compliance with regulators (CQC and Monitor), and poor patient experience.	9	This is a new corporate risk identified for assessment by the Executive Management Committee and Quality Assurance Committee.
Corporate	N/A	T044	Risk of insufficient numbers of nurses and/or with sufficient skills required to meet acuity/dependency and care needs of patients. This could also lead to the Safe Staffing guidance not being met which then has a potential for adverse local and national media coverage which could impact on the Trust's reputation.	8	This is a new corporate risk identified for assessment by the Executive Management Committee and Quality Assurance Committee.
Corporate	N/A	T045	Failure to demonstrate a robust process for Do Not Attempt Resuscitation Orders will result in non-compliance with regulators expectations and impact on the Trust's reputation and may lead to litigation.	9	This is a new corporate risk identified for assessment by the Executive Management Committee and Quality Assurance Committee.

9. One risk (shown below) is a new corporate risk so has been escalated to the Corporate Risk Register, however as it has been scored as below 8 will not form part of the main document which reports risks of 8+.

Division	Service Line	Ref	Description	Score	Comment
Corporate	N/A	T046	Risk to patient-quality due to non-compliance with aspects of a number of NICE guidelines which could lead to substandard patient care and reputational issues for the Trust.	4	This is a new corporate risk identified for assessment by the Executive Management Committee and Quality Assurance Committee.

10. One risk (shown below) has been re-assessed and its score reduced however as it is still above 8 has remained on the Corporate Risk Register.

Division	Service Line	Ref	Description	Comment
Corporate	N/A	T036	Risk to the Trust's reputation if the Friends & Family Test inpatient scores remain nationally in the bottom quartile.	The risk score was reduced from 12 to 9 because the national guidance has changed to move away from hospital to hospital comparisons of FFT scores, preferring internal benchmarking only. There is still a residual risk to be managed.

11. Three risks (shown below) have been re-assessed and rescored at below 8 and therefore have been de-escalated from the Corporate Risk Register.

Division	Service Line	Ref	Description	Comment
Specialist Services	Paediatrics & NNU	T_WCH_P AE003	Reported delays in triage and treatment for children waiting in paed A&E impacting on patient safety and paediatric medical and nursing staff resources	The risk was reviewed and the score reduced from 9 to 6 as the controls in place are currently controlling the risk however it will continue to be treated by Paediatrics in an effort to reduce the score further.
Clinical Support Services	ICU	T_SCC_T CS007	Bed capacity constraints within ICU impacting on the ability to manage acutely unwell patients and resulting in increased non-clinical transfers	The risk was reviewed and the score reduced from 8 to 4 as the controls in place are currently controlling the risk however it will continue to be monitored by the ICU Service Line.
Corporate Services	IM&T	T_IMT010	CRS UPGRADE - PLANNING - deployment might highlight issues with existing processes. Mapping from existing processes to the "to be" state may expose problems.	The risk was closely monitored and the score has now been reduced to 4 from 8 as the plans in place are controlling the risk. The IM&T Department will continue to monitor any residual risk.

Reporting of the Corporate Risk Register

12. The table below shows the timetable for the review of the Corporate Risk Register.

Meeting/Committee	Last reviewed	Next reviewing
Compliance & Risk Working Group	November 2014	December 2014
Compliance & Risk Committee	November 2014	October 2014
Quality Assurance Committee (Quality Risks only)	October 2014	January 2015
Audit Committee (Full CRR but with main focus on Financial, Strategic and Health & Safety Risks)	September 2014	December 2014
Trust Board	July 2014	November 2014

Development and management of Service Line Risk Registers

13. Risk registers have been created for each of the service lines and a lead has been trained to manage them on the electronic system. All old Divisional Risk Registers have been transferred across to a Service Line or closed and archived as appropriate.
14. Service Line Risk Registers and local risk management processes are reviewed by the Compliance & Risk Working Group ahead of being scrutinised and ratified by the Compliance & Risk Committee; this supports the Service Line accreditation process.
15. The Corporate Risk Register will continue to be presented to the Compliance & Risk Committee every month.

Recommendations:

16. The Trust Board is asked to:
- 1) Consider the contents of the Corporate Risk Register as it stands at 20th November 2014, and confirm that the register provides assurance that appropriate action is being taken and that there is appropriate identification of key risks.

Corporate Risk Register - risks on 1 page
Nov-14

Key: ↑ =increased risk ↓ =decreased risk N =new risk NL =new risk linked

Clinical Support Services
Corporate
Corporate Services
Specialist Services
Emergency Services

Consequence	5							
	4	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 40px;">Cluster reconfig T003</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Poor pt outcomes / exp due to C.diff T028</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Failure to meet Monitor requirements. T031</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Insufficient nursing numbers T044 N</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Energy prices T_EST026</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Legionella T_E005</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Elec infrastructre T_E004</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">SLM-Reduction in control T032</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Prod. Plan T002</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Patient monitors T039</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Failure to follow DNAR process T045 N</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Out of Hours risk T018</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Security Measures T038</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Delayed Cancer treatment T043 N</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Esher Wing windows T_EST008</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Risk of ICO fines T_IG005</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Falls MAE003</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">National Mandatory Audits C&H008 N</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">ITF Risk T037</div>	
	3		<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Not able to provide adequate acute capacity T_MAE_AM016</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Sub-optimal care MAE_AM023</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Statutory fire compliance T_EST002</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Lack of progress in SWL SAP plan impacting on staffing in Pathology. T_AC_PAT019</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Sonographer recruitment T_RAD006</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Failure to win tenders T007</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Cultural change T_HR009</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Mand training compliance T025</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Competition T008</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Partnerships do not deliver T012</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Health records T021</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Overdue Procedural Documents T042 N</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">SLM-Lack of staff skills T033</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">QIPP failure T006</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">CIP effect on quality T016</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Reputation -FFT T036 ↓</div>	<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Frankham Review T040</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Lack of org capacity T009</div>
	2					<div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">SLM-Interrelationships (T035)</div> <div style="border:1px solid blue; padding:2px; width: 80px;">Radiology floor space RAD013 N</div>		
	1							
	1	2	3	4	5			
	Likelihood							

Risk Grading/rating

The grading of risk is dependent on 2 factors; the **severity/Consequences** of the hazard and the **likelihood** the hazard will occur.

Table 1 Consequence/Severity scores

Choose the most appropriate domain for the identified risk from the left hand side of the table, then work along the columns in same row to assess the severity of the risk on the scale of 1 to 5 to determine the consequence score, which is the number given at the top of the column.

	Consequence score (severity levels) and examples of descriptors				
	1	2	3	4	5
Domains	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Impact on the safety of patients, staff or public (physical/psychological harm)	<p>Minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment.</p> <p>No time off work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor injury or illness, requiring minor intervention Requiring time off work for >3 days Increase in length of hospital stay by 1-3 days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate injury requiring professional intervention Requiring time off work for 4-14 days Increase in length of hospital stay by 4-15 days RIDDOR/agency reportable incident An event which impacts on a small number of patients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major injury leading to long-term incapacity/disability Requiring time off work for >14 days Increase in length of hospital stay by >15 days Mismanagement of patient care with long-term effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incident leading to death Multiple permanent injuries or irreversible health effects An event which impacts on a large number of patients
Quality/complaints/audit	<p>Peripheral element of treatment or service suboptimal</p> <p>Informal complaint/inquiry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall treatment or service suboptimal Formal complaint (stage 1) Local resolution Single failure to meet internal standards Minor implications for patient safety if unresolved Reduced performance rating if unresolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treatment or service has significantly reduced effectiveness Formal complaint (stage 2) complaint Local resolution (with potential to go to independent review) Repeated failure to meet internal standards Major patient safety implications if findings are not acted on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-compliance with national standards with significant risk to patients if unresolved Multiple complaints/independent review Low performance rating Critical report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Totally unacceptable level or quality of treatment/service Gross failure of patient safety if findings not acted on Inquest/ombudsman inquiry Gross failure to meet national standards
Human resources/organisational development/staffing/ competence	<p>Short-term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (< 1 day)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low staffing level that reduces the service quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff Unsafe staffing level or competence (>1 day) Low staff morale Poor staff attendance for mandatory/key training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertain delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff Unsafe staffing level or competence (>5 days) Loss of key staff Very low staff morale No staff attending mandatory/ key training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff Ongoing unsafe staffing levels or competence Loss of several key staff No staff attending mandatory training /key training on an ongoing basis

Statutory duty/ inspections	No or minimal impact or breach of guidance/ statutory duty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of statutory legislation Reduced performance rating if unresolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single breach in statutory duty Challenging external recommendations/ improvement notice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement action Multiple breaches in statutory duty Improvement notices Low performance rating Critical report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple breaches in statutory duty Prosecution Complete systems change required Zero performance rating Severely critical report
Adverse publicity/ reputation	Rumours Potential for public concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local media coverage – short-term reduction in public confidence Elements of public expectation not being met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local media coverage – long-term reduction in public confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National media coverage with <3 days service well below reasonable public expectation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National media coverage with >3 days service well below reasonable public expectation. MP concerned (questions in the House) Total loss of public confidence
Business objectives/ projects	Insignificant cost increase/ schedule slippage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <5 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5–10 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-compliance with national 10–25 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage Key objectives not met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incident leading >25 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage Key objectives not met
Finance including claims	Small loss Risk of claim remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of 0.1–0.25 per cent of budget Claim less than £10,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of 0.25–0.5 per cent of budget Claim(s) between £10,000 and £100,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertain delivery of key objective/Loss of 0.5–1.0 per cent of budget Claim(s) between £100,000 and £1 million Purchasers failing to pay on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-delivery of key objective/ Loss of >1 per cent of budget Failure to meet specification/ slippage Loss of contract / payment by results Claim(s) >£1 million
Service/business interruption Environmental impact	Loss/interruption of >1 hour Minimal or no impact on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss/interruption of >8 hours Minor impact on environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss/interruption of >1 day Moderate impact on environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss/interruption of >1 week Major impact on environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent loss of service or facility Catastrophic impact on environment

Likelihood score (L)

What is the likelihood of the consequence occurring?

The frequency-based score is appropriate in most circumstances and is easier to identify. It should be used whenever it is possible to identify a frequency.

Likelihood score	1	2	3	4	5
Descriptor	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain

Frequency How often might it/does it happen	This will probably never happen/recur	Do not expect it to happen/recur but it is possible it may do so	Might happen or recur occasionally	Will probably happen/recur but it is not a persisting issue	Will undoubtedly happen/recur, possibly frequently
---	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---	--

Table 3 Risk scoring = consequence x likelihood (C x L)

		Likelihood				
		1	2	3	4	5
Consequence		Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain
5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
1	Negligible	1	2	3	4	5

For grading risk, the scores obtained from the risk matrix are assigned grades as follows

	1 - 3	Low risk
	4 - 6	Moderate risk
	8 - 12	High risk
	15 - 25	Extreme risk