

To:	Trust Board
From:	Medical Director
Date:	4 August 2011
CQC	Outcome 16 – Assessing and
regulation:	Monitoring the Quality of Service
	Provision

Title: UHL STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AND THE BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK (SRR/BAF) 2011/12

Author/Responsible Director: Risk and Assurance Manager/ Medical Director

Purpose of the Report: To provide the Board with an updated SRR/BAF for assurance and scrutiny.

The Report is provided to the Board for:

Decision		Discussion	Х
Assurance	Х	Endorsement	Х

Summary / Key Points:

- The 2011/12 SRR/BAF has been updated to reflect changes made by the risk owners.
- Business continuity risk added to 2011/12 SRR/BAF at the request of the Board.
- Exercise undertaken to map 2010/11 strategic risks to the 2011/12 SRR/BAF.
- Further development of the SRR/BAF will take place at the Board development session scheduled for 4 August 2011.

Recommendations:

The Trust Board is invited to:

- (a) review and comment upon this iteration of the 2011/12 SRR/BAF, as it deems appropriate, with particular reference to risks 7 and 9.
- (b) note the actions identified within the framework to address any gaps in either controls or assurances (or both);
- (c) identify any areas in respect of which it feels that the Trust's controls are inadequate and do not, therefore, effectively manage the principal risks to the organisation meeting its objectives;
- (d) identify any gaps in assurances about the effectiveness of the controls in place to manage the principal risks; and consider the nature of, and timescale for, any further assurances to be obtained, in consequence;
- (e) identify any other actions which it feels need to be taken to address any 'significant control issues' to provide assurance that the Trust is meeting its principal objectives.

Paper J

Previously considered at ano	ther corporate UHL Committee ? No
Strategic Risk Register Yes	Performance KPIs year to date No
Resource Implications (eg Fir N/A	nancial, HR)
Assurance Implications Yes	
Patient and Public Involvement No	nt (PPI) Implications
Equality Impact N/A	
Information exempt from Disc No	closure
Requirement for further review Yes. Monthly at Board meeting	

UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS OF LEICESTER NHS TRUST

REPORT TO: TRUST BOARD

DATE: 4 AUGUST 2011

REPORT BY: MEDICAL DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: UHL STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AND BOARD ASSURANCE

FRAMEWORK (SRR/BAF) 2011/12

1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides the Board with:-

a) A copy of the SRR / BAF as of 27 July 2011 (attached at appendix 1).

- b) Risks from the 2010/11 SRR/BAF mapped to risks on the 2011/12 version (attached at appendix 2).
- c) Suggested areas for scrutiny of the SRR/BAF (attached at appendix 3).

2. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER/ BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2011/12: POSITION AS OF 27 JULY 2011

- 2.1 The 2011/12 Strategic Risk Register / Board Assurance Framework (SRR/BAF) has been developed using the risks set out by the Director of Finance and Procurement and progressed and extended by members of the Executive Team as the foundation of the document. A copy of the most recent iteration is attached at appendix 1.
- 2.2 Risk owners have been asked to update each entry to reflect an accurate picture of risks, controls, assurances etc. New entries to the SRR/BAF are highlighted in red on appendix 1.
- 2.3 As requested at the previous Board meeting a 'business continuity' risk (risk no. 18) has been carried forward from the 2010/11 SRR/BAF to this most recent version. A mapping exercise has also been undertaken to identify whether all previous risks have been captured within the new risks. The results of this exercise are illustrated at appendix 2. All but two risks appear to have been captured, these being;

'Clinical Coding'

'Failure to comply with the Health and Social care Act 2008 (hygiene code)'

Both of the above are recognised as being 'operational' in nature and will be transferred to the operational risk register under the ownership of the Chief Operating Officer who will maintain an overview of progress in implementing any associated mitigating actions.

2.4 At the previous Board meeting is was recognised that it was essential for the Audit Committee to gain a fundamental understanding of the risks, assurances and controls and that more robust descriptions and definitions of issues and objectives were required, including details of the measurable outcomes. The SRR/BAF will therefore be further developed during a Board development session scheduled for 4 August 2011 prior to submission to the September Audit Committee for scrutiny.

- 2.5 To enable detailed and regular scrutiny of risks on a cyclical basis a small number of risks will be selected at each meeting for Board members to review against the parameters listed in appendix 3. The following risks are proposed for review:
 - Risk No. 7 'Estates issues' (Risk Score 16 high risk).
 - Risk No. 9 'Loss making services' (Risk score 25 extreme risk).
- 3. Taking into account the contents of this report and its appendices, and the presentation by the Director of Strategy and Director of Finance and Procurement in relation to risk No's 7 and 9:
 - (a) review and comment upon this iteration of the SRR/BAF, as it deems appropriate, with particular reference to the risks above.
 - (b) note the actions identified within the framework to address any gaps in either controls or assurances (or both);
 - (c) identify any areas in respect of which it feels that the Trust's controls are inadequate and do not, therefore, effectively manage the principal risks to the organisation meeting its objectives;
 - (d) identify any gaps in assurances about the effectiveness of the controls in place to manage the principal risks; and consider the nature of, and timescale for, any further assurances to be obtained, in consequence;
 - (e) identify any other actions which it feels need to be taken to address any identified 'significant control issues' to provide assurance on the Trust meeting its principal objectives.

P Cleaver **Risk and Assurance Manager** 28 July 2011

PERIOD: 1 JULY - 27 JULY 2011



STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

- Centre of a local acute emergency network a.
- The regional hospital of choice for planned care b.
- C.
- Nationally recognised for teaching, clinical and support services
 Internationally recognised specialist services supported by Research and Development d.

	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls L	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for		Due	Risk /
	NISK	Cause /Consequence	Controls	On Controls	Assuran	Assurance /	Further	Tar	Date	Action
<u>6</u>			L Ri		се	Control	Control	ge		Owner
Objective			<u> </u>					Target Risk		
Š.								İSK		
æ										
	1. Continued	Causes:	LLR ECN Project	Task Force			Will require additional support		20/12/12	Chief
a	overheating of	Lack of middle	LEIN LOINT TOJECT	minutes			to turn around	4x3	20/12/12	Executive
C	emergency care	grade/senior decision	Monthly Trust Board reporting					3 =12		
	system	makers	I	Increased			LLR emergency plan to be	2		
		Small footprint	Increased recruitment of revised workforce	workforce			implemented			
		Smail tootprint	WOINIOICE	Improving 4°			Need to agree common			
		Delays in discharge	Agreed footprint for capital	Performance			metrics for reporting across			
		efficiency					all stakeholders			
		Re-beds		Trust Board ECN Report			Absence of agreed action			
		TO DOUG		Корон			plan at present to:			
		Delays in discharge to		Trust Board UHL			Divert attendances			
		community beds		report			 Reduce admissions 			
		Consequences		Improvements of			Fund in a sustainable			
		Clinical risk within ED		targets			manner			
				90.10						
		Major operational								
		distraction to whole of UHL								
		Financial loss (30%								
		marginal rate)								
		Poor winter planning – inefficient/sub-optimal care								
		inemcient/sub-optimal care								
а	2. New entrants	Cause	Appointment of Head of Service to	GP Temperature	Divisiona	Quarterly	Identify opportunities to	3	January	Director of
b	to market (AWP/TCS	TCS agenda. Re- tendering of services	GPs to help secure referrals and	Check.	I/CBU business	monitoring market	create new markets and be the new entrants to the	3x2=6	2012	Strategy
	(AWF/1C3	(elective care	improve service quality.	Market share	plans.	gain/loss at	market wherever possible.	6		
		bundle/UCC).	Executive links to GPs.	analysis.	p.a.ioi	Trust Board	mamer imereve: pecciaici			
		Impact of Health and			Market	level.	Implement Quarterly market			
		Social Care Bill. Financial climate.	Review of market analysis. Clinical involvement in	Tendering	share	Further	share reporting and impact			
		i manda diinale.	Commissioning.	meetings.	analysis.	development	analysis on Strategy.			
		Consequence		Commissioning	Divisiona	of market				
		Downside:	Tendering process for services	meetings.	l and	share vs				
		Loss of business, services and revenue.	(elective care bundle & UCC).	Attendance at	CBU market	quality vs profitability				
		Increased competition from	Market share analysis and quarterly	Consortia	assessm	analysis.				
		competitors	report, linked to SLR / PLICs.	meetings.	ents and	, , , , ,				
					competit					
		Upside: Opportunities to develop			or					
		partnerships and grow			analysis.					
		income streams.	<u> </u>							

Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Rick	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
a b c	commissioning	Lack of certainty/ continuity of commissioning Loss of revenue Damage to organisational reputation	GP Head of Service now appointed Agreed alignment of senior clinicians and executive directors to Commissioning consortia	3v4=12	Account management structure with DDs and Exec's Development of 'LLR Clinical Senate' Improving our customer care, (letters / GP interface	Opening dialogue with GPs / consortia through GP break through event		To orientate the business around the needs of our customers To work with commissioners and partners to redesign selected pathways and models Identify capacity to support Divisions to undertake service redesign Identify what 'best in class' looks like	2x3=6	Nov 2011	Director of Strategy/ Director of Comms

UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS OF LEICESTER NHS TRUST – STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER/ BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2011/12											
Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Risk	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
cd	4. Specialist services centralisation and designation (e.g.: ECMO, Paediatric Cardiac Services, NUH as a level 1 major trauma centre)	Cause Safety & sustainability of services. National Policy. National Service Reviews. National enquiries. Cost Effectiveness. Consequence Downside: Significant loss of income, potential loss of other core services, increased exposure for loss making services cross subsidised by specialist services. Upside: Retain local, regional and national profile, potential to grow services, improved recruitment and retention, increased R&D potential.	Risks identified through business plans. EMCHC Strategy and Programme Boards. Campaign to support paediatric cardiac services/repatriate services. Commissioner support and engagement. Major Trauma Network group. ECMO NCG/Board engagement. Review by Exec Team & Trust Board.	3x4-12	EMCHC reports & minutes. Response numbers. Feedback from public consultation. Major Trauma Network minutes & actions. Trust and Exec Team papers. ECMO costing analysis	Divisiona I and CBU Business Plans. ECMO contract in place. Lead co-coordinat ing centre/na tional training for ECMO. Safe & Sustaina ble option for Leicester shortliste d/best fit option. Dialogue with NUH to maximise retention of trauma pts at UHL.	Do not yet have a clear strategy regarding those specialised services we want to provide, and those that we will support others to provide. Needs to be addressed through rigorous SLR analysis and business planning	Closer links required with NUH and other tertiary centres. Understand services which should be in our portfolio. Develop business plans for each service.	3×2=6	January 2012	Director of Strategy

	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Ĭ	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for		Due	Risk /
Objective				Net Risk	On Controls	Assuran	Assurance / Control	Further Control	Target Risk	Date	Action Owner
ab	5. Loss making services	Causes: Inefficient services Poor use of clinical capacity Poor controls on pay resources Lack of innovation Poor SLR/PLICS position Consequence: Risk of 'cherry-picking' of profitable services by commissioners Disinvestment of clinical services Poor clinical outcomes Recruitment challenges Missed efficiency opportunity – money wasted on inefficient services Impact on Trust's ability to deliver statutory targets (i.e. breakeven).	High level SLR analysis of service profitability Criteria for loss making services to be formally endorsed (no negative contribution post 2011/12, all services making 10% contribution to central overheads by end 2012/13) Review of each service line to identify position External benchmarking Clinical Effectiveness group Targeted turnaround support introduced to focus on main loss making CBUs (Medicine, Cardiothoracic Surgery)	⊼y⊼=2 7	Monthly SLR/PLICS data Clinical Effectiveness minutes Monthly pay expenditure reports Contract meeting notes SLR/PLICS presentations Internal audit review of RCI (PLICS) cost attribution methodology		SLR coverage actively in place across all specialities Still some underlying issues in data quality Major deterioration in 2011/12 forecast outturn due to losses in key CBUs.	Use market and internal intelligence to identify services that make money, don't make money and have the potential to make money Ensure business plans for each service demonstrate how the loss making service will make a contribution and then deliver a surplus. Develop business plans for each loss making service to transform or exit. Incentivise services that make a profit using a balanced scorecard approach	3x3=9	Recovery plans in place by end Sept 2011. Run rates to be positive by end 2011/12.	Director of Finance
a b c d	6. Loss of liquidity	Unable to invest in core services or develop new services Failure to deliver EFL statutory target	Updated internal liquidity plan Daily cash monitoring 12 month cash forecast SHA assistance in securing loan from NHS partners	545-25				Internal liquidity plan to be developed and implemented Restrictions to the UHL Capital Plan to generate cash	3x3=9		Director of Finance and Procureme nt

Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Risk	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
a b	7. Estates issues Under utilisation and investment in Estates	Sub-optimum configuration of services. The efficient provision of services in many areas is restricted by the physical limitations of the buildings and by less than optimum clinical adjacencies.	Service Reconfiguration Board established, with representation from all Divisions.	4x4-16	Service activity and efficiency performance monitoring.	LLR Space Utilisatio n Review	Continued development Estates strategy	Develop and implement a targeted Estates Strategy in support of the clinical strategy	3x3=9	Dec 2011	Director of Strategy
		Significant backlog maintenance	Planned Preventative Maintenance (PPM) schedules in place £6 million per year allocated to reducing backlog maintenance Integrated Planning & LLR Asset information		PPM performance recorded as KPI Capital meeting notes & Capital Bids & well	Maintaini ng estates and equipme nt		Target backlog to high risk elements, where there are greater consequences from a failure Develop LLR service strategy		Ongoing	Director of Strategy
		Over provision of assets across LLR Downside scenario example – failure of	PPM, Emergency contingency plans, switching options		developed UHL risk based replacement programme in place. LLR Space Utilisation	UHL agreed & TB approved	Introduction of UHL Space Management Committee to allocate and control space accordingly.	and support by most efficient use of estate Introduction of UHL Space Management Committee to allocate and control space accordingly.		Dec 2011	Director of Strategy
		electrical infrastructure			integrated into UHL Estate Strategy. PPM schedules Emergency Planning Board Service & estates	capital funding		Develop downsizing plans as part of Asset Steering Group. Identify potential disposal targets and risk assess disposal impacts		April 2012 April 2012	Director of Strategy Director of Strategy
		Upside – Potential for asset disposal in medium to long term	Integrated Planning through LLR Asset Steering Group		strategy	LLR Space Utilisatio n integrate d into UHL Estate Strategy.					
						Emergen cy					

C	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Not	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran	Gaps in Assurance /	Actions for Further		Due Date	Risk / Action
Objective				Risk		ce	Control	Control	Target Risk		Owner
b	8.Deteriorating patient experience	Causes: Cancelled operations Poor communications Increased waiting times Poor clinical outcomes Lack of patient information Poor customer service Lack of engagement or consultation Consequences Patients not recommending or choosing UHL leading to reduced activity Contract penalties Reduced income from CQUIN monies Increased complaints Reputation impact	Monthly patient polling Patient Experience projects Caring at its Best Divisional projects Hourly ward rounds 10 point plan Delivery of waiting times Theatre and out-patient transformation project Monitoring of cancellations National Patient Survey Engagement of Age UK, LINKS Patient Stories Clinical quality metrics Real time patient feedback From specific patient groups: Outpatients Emergency Department Maternity facilities Message to Matron	4x3=12	Patient experience minutes Monthly Trust Board report Divisional reports Increasing patient experience results Complaints reduction Clinical Effectiveness minutes GRMC minutes Clinical Metric results Q&P and Heatmap report Quarterly theatre reports			Streamlined and focussed Divisional activity on key patient experience indicators to improve patient experience survey results local and national Patient experience feedback presented in 'dashboard' format improving access and understanding by the Trust Development of Caring at its Best dashboard – Patient Experience data presented with patient safety and outcome measures Improved data analysis illustrating trends and prediction of key risk areas Patient experience plan to steer Trust improvements Raise awareness of patient experience feedback in all staff groups Celebrate successes and promote across the organisation. Trust Implementation of Message to Matron	3x2=6	June 2011 and ongoing July 2011	Chief Operating Officer
b	9. CIP requirement (driven by tariff)	Quality compromised, increased clinical risk Failure to achieve statutory breakeven duties Risk of delay/failure of FT project with uncertain consequences thereafter	CIP plan for 2011/12 Agree pan-LLR QIPP plan Appointment of Head of Transformation and project managers for pan-Trust CIP schemes	4x5-20	Internal audit review of sample of schemes			Quality assess all CIPS for impact on quality of care Develop and invest in a UHL wide approach to 'lean'	4x4=16		Director of Finance and Procureme nt

	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Ť	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for		Due	Risk /
Objective	Nisk	Cause / Consequence	Controls	Net Rick	On Controls	Assuran ce	Assurance / Control	Further Control	Target Risk	Date	Action Owner
a b	10. Readmission rates don't reduce	Contract penalties Leakage of money from NHS to LAs if no agreement on reablement Opportunity cost of readmissions e.g. less capacity Continuing risk of suboptimal patient care	Readmission action plans across all specialties Project manager now appointed Regular reporting of readmission trajectory Target is to reduce admissions by 75% by the end of 2011/12 (net cost of £3.4m)	4x4-16				A project board with representation from each division	4x3=12		Medical Director
a b	11. IM&T Lack of IT strategy and exploitation	Current systems complicated and disjointed leading to significant performance risk Majority of systems become obsolete or no longer supported by 2013/14 Major disruption to service if changeover not managed well Communications with partners is compromised	New CIO appointed KPI reporting pack review by senior IM&T team, to look at performance trending. Communications with internal and external stakeholders New structure and operating model for IM&T Draft new IT strategy developed	3×4-12	John Clarke in post Monthly management information pack Various communications and events and events MOC in place and posts being recruited too.	LLR IM&T Delivery Board Minutes Appointm ent letters issued	Business related KPIs	Business case to be developed for future systems Finalise and implement an IM&T strategy including an improvement programme for the short, medium and long-term Further address IT service performance issues and PACS risks	3x3=9	Oct 2011 Sept 2011 Ongoing	Director of Strategy

Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Rick	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
ab	12. Failure to deliver access targets	Causes: External factors i.e. Pandemic Poor system management Demand greater than supply ability Inefficient procedures Lack of clinician availability Consequences Patient care at risk Reduced choice – reduced activity Risk of Contract penalties Reduced income stream Poor patient experience Increased waiting times Failure to achieve FT Failure to meet MONITOR and CQC targets	Agreed referral guidance is in place Identified clinician capacity Increased provision of capacity Backlog plan in place Review of bed allocation Transformational theatre project Transformational Outpatient project Staff recruited to support activity	3x4-12	Monthly 18/52 minutes Monthly Q&P report Monthly heatmap report Staff recruited to deliver activity RTT performance reports Theatre Board progress report Monthly contract minutes Winter Plan		Delivery of backlog plan Undertake trust wide capacity review	Continue to monitor access targets as CIP's are implemented to ensure no impact. Use inefficient theatre capacity within normalised working Review Out-patient management to support deliver of backlog plan	3x2=6	End July 2011	Chief Operating Officer

	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	J	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for		Due	Risk /
Objective	KISK	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Risk	On Controls	Assuran ce	Assurance / Control	Further Control	Target Risk	Date	Action Owner
a b c d	13. Skill shortages	Cause Certain nursing grades scarce Inability to recruit and retain appropriately skilled staff Consequence Lack of sustainability of middle grade rotas Quality compromised, increased clinical risk Inadequate skills to deliver good quality patient care Additional expenditure on agency staff and the consequential reduction in quality this can result in Compliance with external standards may be affected	Monthly Trust Board reporting on turnover rates Specific reports on area of particular shortage for example, reports on position on trainee doctors recruitment leading up to August intake Reporting on ability to recruit and research on reasons for leaving and coming to UHL analysed and actions developed Completion of appraisals for all staff Adherence to Divisional and Corporate Training Plans and continued development of alternatives models of training Monitoring of expenditure on temporary staff	3v4-12	Improved turnover rates Improved ability to recruit to areas of shortage Higher compliance with appraisal rates Trust Board reports Organisational Development and Workforce Committee Reports Improving Local Staff Polling Results Improving national staff attitude and opinion results		Need to ensure that the detail underneath the organisational figures are understood	Continue to build strategic relationships with training partners Work with partners to address gaps in training plans, over recruit where required and take steps to make middle grade rotas more attractive Link workforce redesign to the development of effective patient pathways, to reduce requirement on difficult to recruit posts and / or make the posts more attractive Continue to ensure compliance with both mandatory and statutory training requirements	2x2=4	On-going through the LLR Workforc e Board	Director of HR
b c	14. Clinical Leadership	Inability to responsively change service model to meet changing healthcare needs	Appointment of Assistant Medical Director with responsibility for medical engagement Development of Medical Engagement strategy Re-establish effective Trust wide MSC	4x3-12	Improvement in Medical Engagement survey (Warwick University)			Need to be clear what is expected in terms of performance Ensure we have the right people in the right post with the right level of support Ensure our clinical leaders have the right training to fulfil their roles Improve communication with our consultant body Review the Divisional structures 1 year on to see whether there are any further areas for development / improvement	4x2=8		Medical Director

Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Risk	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
a b c d	15. Management Capability / stretch	Causes Consequences Inability to support changes to service model Lack of focus on key metrics and service delivery Gaps in middle management leadership	Provision of leadership development and interventions Development and building of organisational capacity and capability on processes to support service redesign IMT strategy to support clinical service redesign Appraisal and setting of stretching objectives aligned to the UHL Strategy 8 point Staff Engagement action plan	4×4-16	Organisational Development and Workforce Committee Papers and reports Trust Board reports Improving Local Staff Poling results	Improvin g trends on staff polling results	Areas that are not improving based on survey results	Supplement internal resource with external capability where required e.g. Corporate CIP Projects) Need to be clear about what is expected in terms of performance. Ensure we have the right people in the right post with the right level of support Ensure our managers have the right training to fulfil their roles. Review the Divisional structures 1 year on to see whether there are any further areas for development / improvement.	3x2=6	August 2011 On-going Six monthly results Completed May 2011	Director of HR

			LEICESTER NAS TRUST - S					110		
	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for	\exists	Due	Risk /
0			<u>P</u>	On Controls	Assuran	Assurance /	Further	Target Risk	Date	Action
Objective			<u>.</u>		ce	Control	Control	ge		Owner
<u> </u>								Ť		
요.								₹is		
€								×		
b	16. Lack of	Cause	Nominated Board level lead for	R&D Strategy.	Commer	Lack of a clear	Understand the factors that	3	Dec	Director of
С	innovation	Lack an innovation culture.	innovation working with the SHA to		cial	base line of	currently block innovation and	2	2012	Strategy
_	culture	Innovation seen as	further develop the NHS East	CBU & Divisional	Executiv	current culture	implement action plan to	3x2=6		
d		optional 'if we have time to	Midlands Innovation Strategy	Business Plans.	е	and future	address.			
		spare'.			establish	desired state.				
			Regional Innovation Fund to	UHL projects	ed.					
		Consequence	increase the quantity, spread and	funded through the		Unclear	Develop a systematic			
			speed of innovation, improve quality	Regional	Success	uptake on	process for sharing, diffusion			
1		Downside	and increase productivity.	Innovation Fund.	in last	others	and adoption.			
1		Outmoded models of			round of	innovation.				
		delivery increasingly	East Midlands Quality Observatory	Minutes of	2010/11					
		expensive and vulnerable	agreeing key data sets to enable	Commercial	Regional	Innovation not	Establish clear mechanisms			
		expensive and valificiable	benchmarking of outcomes and	Executive.	Innovatio	incentivised.	for incentivising innovation.			
		Upside	improvements.	Excodiivo.	n Fund	moontivioca.	for meentivising innovation.			
		A health system that	improvements.	Trans-formation	III uliu					
		supports the spread and	UHL Transformation Programme	Programme project	Success					
			starting to stimulate and drive an		in The					
		adoption of evidence-		plans and highlight						
		based innovative systems,	innovation culture within the	reports	Health					
		products, practices and	organisation		Foundati					
		technologies.			on Shine					
					Award					
					Da Vinci					
					Health					
					Technolo					
					gy Award					
					3 BRUS					
					Shortliste					
					d					
1										
1					Ideas					
1					forum					
1					impleme					
1					nted on					
1					insite.					
1					monto.					
1										
1										

Objective	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	Net Risk	Assurance On Controls	Positive Assuran ce	Gaps in Assurance / Control	Actions for Further Control	Target Risk	Due Date	Risk / Action Owner
a b c d	17. Failure to acquire and failure to retain critical clinical services	Loss of key 30 services Potential "snowball" effect Loss of key clinicians and academics Inability to attract best quality clinical staff Inability to achieve academic expectations	Creation of strong academic recognition e.g. NIHR Use of market share analysis Use of PLICS data					Creation of upgraded NIHR status Creation of partnership replacements – Pharmacy and Medical Technology Brand creation Estates strategy for Neurology space			Chief Executive

			LEICESTER NHS TRUST -	3					WO		
	Risk	Cause /Consequence	Controls	z	Assurance	Positive	Gaps in	Actions for	H	Due	Risk /
0				Not Ric	On Controls	Assuran	Assurance /	Further	Target Risk	Date	Action
Objective				P.		ce	Control	Control	get		Owner
ec				sk					Z		
∌									Š		
ē											
	18.	Cause	Local Resilience Forum		External review of	Complian	(a)Plans not	Continue work to develop	(1)	Jun 2011	COO/
	Organisation	Lack of sufficient capacity		SY2	plans and	ce with	fully tested in	UHL MIP and appendices via	3x3=9		Emergency
	may be	to deal with incidents	Corporate Policy.	î o	capabilities by East	C24	real situations.	the Emergency Planning	ii (C		Planning /
	overwhelmed	causing a significant			Mids SHA, LLR			Committee	_		Business
	by unplanned	increase in admissions	Multi agency working across		resilience forum,	CBRNE	(a)The UHL				Continuity
	events	(e.g. major disaster,	Leicestershire.		Leics City PCT,	audit	Major Incident				Lead
		pandemic, etc)			local clinical	results	Plan not fully				
			Silver/gold command training for		networks. National	by SHA	tested.				
		Industrial action	managers and clinicians.		Capabilities Survey	in Mar					
					August 2010.	2010.					
		Business continuity /	Major incident and Pandemic plans								
		disaster recovery plans not	for UHL and the wider health		UHL self-						
		robust	community.		assessment						
					against core						
		Failure of business critical	UHL Pandemic Working Group		standard C24						
		systems (e.g. PACS)			(emergency						
			Counter Terrorist Awareness		preparedness)						
		UHL Major Incident Plan	training								
		becomes outdated and is			Internal Audit						
		not tested annually	Daily Sitrep		assessment of						
					Business						
		Consequences	Dedicated project managers/leads		Continuity						
		Poor patient experience.	for major incident planning.		arrangements						
		Tours and the office of	Ladouelitation Communication		(2009/10)						
		Trust reputation affected	Industrial action contingency		CLIA Ositical Casa						
		Look like to stalk consequenting of	planning		SHA Critical Care						
		Inability to deliver required level of service	LILII Business Centinuity Croup		surge plan review						
		level of service	UHL Business Continuity Group		June 2010						
		Patient safety may be	Business continuity/ disaster		SHA BCM review						
		compromised	recovery plans.		in 2010/11.						
		compromised	recovery plans.		111 20 10/11.						
		Loss of income	UHL Winter fuel lead		Major incident						
		Loss of income	OHE Willer Ider lead		exercises						
		Failure to meet duties	LLR Winter resilience plan		CVC1019G2						
		under the Civil	LLIX WITHER TESHIETICE Plan		Emergency						
		Contingencies Act	Road Fuel Shortage Plan		planning and						
		Continguition Aut	1.caa i doi onortago i ian		Business						
		Delays to treatment of	Staff capacity plan		Continuity						
		patients	oakaon, kran		committee meeting						
		F	Regular systems maintenance		,						
		Loss of income	programmes		reports to G&RMC						
			· ~		and Board						
		Breaches of national	IT systems redundancies and								
		targets	multiple backup servers		SHA review of						
			•		Major Incident						
			Support from manufacturers of		Plans (MIPs) in						
			equipment		2010/11.						

U	NIVERSITY HOSPI	TALS OF LEICESTE	R NHS TRUST – STR	ATEGIC RISK REGIS	TER/ BOARD ASSURA	NCE FRAMEWORK 20	11/12

UHL STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER / BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK MAPPING EXERCISE 2011/12

Previous Risk Title (2010/11)	Map to Current Risk Number (2011/12)
Patient safety significantly compromised	1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13
Poor outcomes of clinical care	1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13
Deteriorating patient experience	8
Failure to offer staff suitable development opportunities	4, 5,
Inability to recruit and retain appropriately skilled staff	4, 5, 13,17
Inability to achieve academic expectations and integrate R&D into the work of the Trust	17
Non-human resource not fit for purpose	7, 11
Failure to meet financial obligations	6, 9,
Compliance with external standards	12, 13
Inability to maintain productive relationships with commissioners / other stakeholders	2, 3
External threat to portfolio of services from external market	2, 3, 4
Failure to achieve FT	6, 9
Organisation overwhelmed by unplanned events	18
Inability to maintain competence of staff	13
Inadequate organisational development	13, 14, 15
Instability during organisational change	15
Clinical coding	No mapping. To be placed on operational register
Failure to comply with the Health and	No mapping. To be placed on
Social care Act 2008 (Hygiene Code)	operational register

University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust

AREAS OF SCRUTINY FOR THE UHL INTEGRATED STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AND BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

- 1) Are the Trust's strategic objectives S.M.A.R.T? i.e. are they :-
 - Specific
 - Measurable
 - Achievable
 - Realistic
 - Timescaled
- 2) Have the main risks to the achievement of the objectives been adequately identified?
- Have the risk owners (i.e. Executive Directors) been actively involved in populating the SRR/BAF?
- 4) Are there any omissions or inaccuracies in the list of key controls?
- Have all relevant data sources been used to demonstrate assurance on controls and positive assurances?
- 6) Is the SRR/BAF dynamic? Is there evidence of regular updates to the content?
- 7) Has the correct 'action owner' been identified?
- **8)** Are the assigned risk scores realistic?
- **9)** Are the timescales for implementation of further actions to control risks realistic?