

# Primary Care Commissioning Committee

25 January 2017

<b>Details</b>	Part 1	✓	Part 2		Agenda Item No.	8
Title of Paper:	Risk Report					
Board Member:	Margaret O'Dwyer, Director of Commissioning and Business Delivery					
Author:	Danny Lansley, Corporate Governance Manager Lynne Byers, Risk and Compliance Manager GM Shared Service					
Presenter:	Margaret O'Dwyer, Director of Commissioning and Business Delivery					
Please indicate:	For Decision		For Information		For Discussion	X

## Executive Summary

<b>Summary</b>	<p>Risk management provides a systematic and consistent integrated framework through which the CCG's strategic objectives are pursued. This involves the identification of risks, threats and opportunities to achieving those objectives and taking steps to mitigate, manage and control the associated risks to delivery.</p> <p>This paper includes those risks assigned to the Primary Care Commissioning Committee in line with the Risk Management Strategy.</p> <p>The report provides narrative on those risks which have been reviewed in the reporting period and specifically includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• risks which have increased in score;</li> <li>• risks which have decreased in score;</li> <li>• risks that are proposed for closure or have been closed;</li> <li>• risks that have reached their target level; and</li> <li>• new risks included on the register for the first time.</li> </ul>					
<b>Risk</b>	<b>High</b>		<b>Medium</b>	X	<b>Low</b>	
	As the processes for embedding risk reporting and recording are being refreshed, there is the potential that not all risks are captured through the risk register.					
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>The Primary Care Commissioning Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• receive the risk report;</li> <li>• note the risks on the risk register as reflected in Appendix A;</li> <li>• note the update provided; and</li> <li>• note the summary position.</li> </ul>					

## Strategic themes

To deliver improved outcomes and reduce health inequalities for patients through better preventative strategies			
To deliver service re-design in priority areas through innovation			
To develop primary care to become excellent and high performing commissioners			
To develop the CCG leadership to work with the Local Authority to be excellent integrated commissioners			
To develop robust and effective working relationships with all stakeholders and partners to drive integrated commissioning			
To deliver long term financial sustainability through effective commissioning and innovative investment across the wider system			
To develop and influence the provider landscape through development of a Locality Care Organisation (LCO)			
Equality Analysis Assessed?	N/A	Supports NHS Bury CCG Governance arrangements	✓

# Primary Care Commissioning Risk Register

## 1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report provides an updated position in respect to those risks that have been identified, assessed and categorised as having a potential impact on the CCG. The report presents the risk position and status as at **31 December 2016**.

## 2.0 Background

2.1 The Risk Register (see **Appendix A**) captures all risk, irrespective of risk level, that have been categorised by the risk owner with the potential to impact on the CCG's financial position. The risk matrix is also provided at **Appendix B** for ease of reference.

2.2 An assessment of each risk is undertaken between the Risk Owner and Risk Manager, on a schedule specific and appropriate to each risk, with any changes or progress being recorded and outlined within the report.

2.3 This report includes all open risks, irrespective of risk score and it is the Committee's responsibility to oversee these risks, seek assurance that appropriate controls are in place to manage the risks and that actions are being implemented to further reduce the risk and achieve the target risk score.

2.4 The Committee is able to request that further risks are added to the register through the course of its work.

## 3.0 Risk Review

3.1 Since the last report to the Primary Care Commissioning Committee there have been no risks scheduled for review. Although the Capita risk was reviewed in December, it was also reported to the Committee meeting in the same month.

### Risks that have increased in score

3.2 No risks have increased in score.

### Closed Risks

3.3 There have been no risks closed since the last meeting of the Committee.

### New Risks added to the register

3.4 There have been no new risks added to the risk register, although two new primary care risks have been identified. They will be reported to the primary care workstream meeting.

### Risk that have reached the target score

3.5 There have been no risks which have reached target score.

## Risks that will be reported through the Corporate Risk Register

- 3.6 There is one primary care risk identified at 15 or above which is included on the Corporate Risk Register (CRR).
- 3.7 For information there are currently six risks on the Corporate Risk Register.

## Risk Summary

- 3.8 The following summary is provided of the risk of the Primary Care Commissioning Committee Risk Register:

	Dec	Dec %
Total Risks on Report	1	
New Risks	0	
Risks reduced since last report	0	
Risks increased since last report	0	
Risks that have been closed since last report	0	
Risk that have reached target level	0	
Low Risks (1-3)	0	
Medium Risks (4-6)	0	
High Risks (8-12)	0	
Significant Risks (15-25)	1	100%
Risks reviewed in this period (December )	0	
Risks yet to be reviewed in (December)	0	
Risks to be reviewed for next report (risk review due date January 2017)	1	100%

## 4.0 Recommendations


The Committee is asked to:

- receive the risk report;
- note the risks on the risk register as reflected in Appendix A;
- note the update provided; and
- note the summary position;

**Danny Lansley**  
**Corporate Governance Manager**  
January 2017

**Lynne Byers**  
**Risk & Compliance Manager**  
**Greater Manchester Shared Services**  
January 2017

**Appendix A: Primary Care Commissioning Committee Risk Register: Summary**

Risk Id	Risk Description	Date Risk Identified	Original Risk Score	Risk Last Reviewed	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Direction of Travel	Next Review Date
RR_S_C_50	Capita - Primary Care Support Services	07-Nov-2016	16	07-Dec-2016	16	8		25-Jan-2017

## Appendix B: Risk Matrix

### Quantitative Measure of Risk – Consequence Score

	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)	Minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment.	Minor injury or illness, requiring minor intervention	Moderate injury requiring professional intervention  RIDDOR/agency reportable incident  An event which impacts on a small number of patients	Major injury leading to long-term incapacity/disability   Mismanagement of patient care with long-term effects	Incident leading to death   An event which impacts on a large number of patients
Complaints/audit	Informal complaint/inquiry	Formal complaint (stage 1)  Local resolution  Single failure to meet internal standards  Reduced performance rating if unresolved	Formal complaint (stage 2) complaint  Local resolution (with potential to go to independent review)  Repeated failure to meet internal standards	Multiple complaints/independent review    Low performance rating  Critical report	Inquest/ombudsman inquiry    Gross failure to meet national standards  Severely critical report
Human resources/organisational development/staffing/competence	Short-term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (< 1 day)	Low staffing level that reduces the service quality	Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff  Low staff morale  Poor staff attendance for mandatory/key training	Uncertain delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff  Very low staff morale  No staff attending mandatory/ key training	Non-delivery of key objective/service due to lack of 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	Breach of statutory legislation   Reduced performance rating if unresolved	Single breach in statutory duty  Challenging external recommendations/ improvement notice	Multiple breaches in statutory duty  Enforcement action  Low performance rating  Critical report	Multiple breaches in statutory duty  Prosecution  Zero performance rating  Severely critical report
Adverse publicity/ reputation	Rumours  Potential for public concern	Local media coverage  short-term reduction in public confidence  Elements of public expectation not being met	Local media coverage  Long-term reduction in public confidence	National media coverage <3 days  service well below reasonable public expectation	National media coverage h >3 days  MP concerned (questions in the House)  Total loss of public confidence

	Consequence score (severity levels) and examples of descriptors				
	1	2	3	4	5
Domains	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Business objectives/ projects	<p>Insignificant cost increase</p> <p>No impact on objectives</p>	<p>&lt;5 per cent over project budget</p> <p>Minor impact on delivery of objectives</p>	<p>5–10 per cent over project budget</p>	<p>Non-compliance with national 10–25 per cent over project budget</p> <p>Major impact on delivery of strategic objectives</p>	<p>Incident leading &gt;25 per cent over project budget</p> <p>Failure of strategic objectives impacting on delivery of business plan</p>
Finance including claims	<p>Small loss Risk of claim remote</p>	<p>Loss of 0.1–0.25 per cent of budget</p> <p>Claim less than £10,000</p>	<p>Loss of 0.25–0.5 per cent of budget</p> <p>Claim(s) between £10,000 and £100,000</p>	<p>Loss of 0.5–1.0 per cent of budget</p> <p>Claim(s) between £100,000 and £1 million</p>	<p>Loss of &gt;1 per cent of budget</p> <p>Claim(s) &gt;£1 million</p>
Service/business interruption Environmental impact	<p>Loss/interruption of &gt;1 hour</p> <p>Minimal or no impact on the environment</p>	<p>Loss/interruption of &gt;8 hours</p> <p>Minor impact on environment</p>	<p>Loss/interruption of &gt;1 day</p> <p>Moderate impact on environment</p>	<p>Loss/interruption of &gt;1 week</p> <p>Major impact on environment</p>	<p>Permanent loss of service or facility</p> <p>Catastrophic impact on environment</p>

### Qualitative measure of risk – Likelihood score

	1	2	3	4	5
Descriptor	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost certain
Frequency How often might it/does it happen	Not expected to occur for years	Expected to occur annually	Expected to occur monthly	Expected to occur weekly	Expected to occur daily
Probability	<1%	1-5%	6-20%	21-50%	>50%
	Will only occur in exceptional circumstances	Unlikely to occur	Reasonable chance of occurring	Likely to occur	More likely to occur than not occur

### Quantification of the Risk – Risk Rating Matrix

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