

TRUST BOARD: RISK MANAGEMENT INFORMATION PACK

Author: Corporate Risk Team

Sponsor: Medical Director

Trust Board Date: Thursday 7th April 2016

Executive Summary

Context

It is important that the Trust Board (TB) is sighted to the significant risks within the organisation and their mitigating controls. This information is provided on a monthly basis via the Board Assurance Framework (BAF) and an excerpt from the UHL risk register showing all risks rated extreme and high. The BAF is the key source of evidence that links strategic objectives to principal risks, controls and assurances, and the main tool that will be used in seeking assurance that those internal control mechanisms are effective. The risk register captures operational risks from CMGs and Corporate directorates to provide the bottom-up section of the process. The BAF and risk register discussion is captured in the Chief Executive's TB paper, along with summary documents for the reporting period. This paper includes the full detail of the BAF (appendix 1) and the risk register (appendix 2) as part of an information pack.

Questions

1. Does the BAF provide an accurate reflection of the principal risks to our strategic objectives?
2. Is sufficient assurance provided that the principal risks are being effectively controlled?
3. Does the TB have knowledge of all risks on the organisational risk register scoring 15 and above including new risks entered during this reporting period?
4. What are the key themes in relation to the extreme and high risks on the UHL risk register?

Conclusion

1. Executive leads of each strategic objective have provided an accurate picture of our principal risks which may affect the achievement of our Trust plan.
2. 'Reasonable assurance' ratings flagged amber or red may benefit from more quantitative KPIs and /or further external scrutiny (e.g. via internal audit) to provide additional assurance that control measures are effective.
3. The TB is sighted to all extreme and high risks on the UHL risk register by reference to the extract in the Chief Executive's Trust Board paper and the detail included in appendix two of this paper.
4. Analysis reveals that the majority of organisational risks with a rating of 15 and above have a cause related to workforce capacity and capability which, should they occur, could impact on patient safety, quality of services and ability to meet performance targets.

Input Sought

We would welcome the Trust Board's input to receive and note this information pack (and consider and challenge any areas where they feel risks are not being adequately controlled).

For Reference

1. The following objectives were considered when preparing this report:

Safe, high quality, patient centred healthcare	[Yes]
Effective, integrated emergency care	[Yes]
Consistently meeting national access standards	[Yes]
Integrated care in partnership with others	[Yes]
Enhanced delivery in research, innovation & ed'	[Yes]
A caring, professional, engaged workforce	[Yes]
Clinically sustainable services with excellent facilities	[Yes]
Financially sustainable NHS organisation	[Yes]
Enabled by excellent IM&T	[Yes]

2. This matter relates to the following governance initiatives:

Organisational Risk Register	[Yes]
Board Assurance Framework	[Yes]

3. Related Patient and Public Involvement actions taken, or to be taken: [None]

4. Results of any Equality Impact Assessment, relating to this matter: [None]

5. Scheduled date for the next paper on this topic: [05/05/16]

6. Executive Summaries should not exceed [1 page](#). [My paper does comply]

7. Papers should not exceed [7 pages](#). [My paper does not comply]

Board Assurance Dashboard:		February 2016							
Objective	Risk No.	Risk Description	Owner	Current Risk Rating	Target Risk Rating	Risk Movement	Reasonable Assurance Rating	Board Committee for Assurance	
								Comm	Date
Safe, high quality, patient centred healthcare	1	Lack of progress in implementing UHL Quality Commitment (QC).	CN	9	6	↔	G	EQB	
An effective and integrated emergency care system	2	Emergency attendance/ admissions increase	COO	25	6	↔	A	EPB	
Services which consistently meet national access standards	3	Failure to transfer elective activity to the community , develop referral pathways, and key changes to the cancer providers in the local health economy may adversely affect our ability to consistently meet national access standards	COO	16	6	↔	G	EPB	
Integrated care in partnership with others	4	Existing and new tertiary flows of patients not secured compromising UHL's future more specialised status.	DS	12	8	↔	A	ESB	
	5	Failure to deliver integrated care in partnership with others including failure to: Deliver the Better Care Together year 2 programme of work Participate in BCT formal public consultation with risk of challenge and judicial review Develop and formalise partnerships with a range of providers (tertiary and local services) Explore and pioneer new models of care. Failure to deliver integrated care.	DS	16	10	↔	R	ESB	
Enhanced delivery in research, innovation and clinical education	6	Failure to retain BRU status.	MD	9	6	↔	A	ESB	
	7	Clinical service pressures and too few trainers meeting GMC criteria may mean we fail to provide consistently high standards of medical education.	MD	12	4	↔	A	EWB	
	8	Insufficient engagement of clinical services, investment and governance may cause failure to deliver the Genomic Medicine Centre project at UHL	MD	16	6	↔	A	ESB	
A caring, professional and engaged workforce	10	Gaps in inclusive and effective leadership capacity and capability , lack of support for workforce well- being, and lack of effective team working across local teams may lead to deteriorating staff engagement and difficulties in recruiting and retaining medical and non-medical staff	DWOD	16	8	↔	G	EWB	
A clinically sustainable configuration of services, operating from excellent facilities	11	Insufficient estates infrastructure capacity and the lack of capacity of the Estates team may adversely affect major estate transformation programme	DS	20	10	↔	A	ESB	
	12	Limited capital envelope to deliver the reconfigured estate which is required to meet the Trust's revenue obligations	DS	20	8	↔	G	ESB	
	13	Lack of robust assurance in relation to statutory compliance of the estate	DS	16	8	↔	A	ESB	
	14	Failure to deliver clinically sustainable configuration of services	DS	16	8	↔	A	ESB	
A financially sustainable NHS Organisation	15	Failure to deliver the 2015/16 programme of services reviews, a key component of service-line management (SLM)	DS	9	6	↔	G	EPB	
	16	Failure to deliver UHL's deficit control total in 2015/16	CFO	12	10	↓	G	EPB	
	17	Failure to achieve a revised and approved 5 year financial strategy	CFO	15	10	↔	G	EPB	
Enabled by excellent IM&T	18	Delay to the approvals for the EPR programme	CIO	16	6	↔	A	EIM&T	
	19	Perception of IM&T delivery by IBM leads to a lack of confidence in the service	CIO	12	6	↔	G	EIM&T	

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 1:	Lack of progress in implementing UHL Quality Commitment									Risk owner:	Chief Nurse (CN)	
Strategic objective:	Safe, high quality, patient centred healthcare									Objective owner:	CN	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls					Internal		External			Gaps in Control / Assurance	
<p>Directive Controls 'National guidance for Friends and family test' Clinical pathways of care Corporate leads agreed for work streams of the Quality Commitment (QC).</p> <p>Detective Controls Quarterly patient safety report highlighting number of 'harms' moderate and above Work programme of Mortality Review Committee to identify SHMI (=/ 100 by Mar 2016). Reported to Mortality and Morbidity Committee and TB, QAC via Q&P report. Friends and Family score (target 97% by March 2016) reported monthly via Q&P report to TB and QAC Quarterly QC report to EQB to monitor achievement of key milestones</p>	<p>UHL SHMI Jul14 - Jun 15 reduced to 95 (from 98)</p> <p>Achievement of 5% reduction in moderate and above 'harms' in Quarter 2 2015/16</p> <p>Inpatient (inc D/C) 'friends and family' score for January ('caring' KPI C1) = 97% (1% up on previous reporting period)</p> <p>Achievement of key milestones within QC work plans monitored by relevant trust level committee.</p>					<p>Delivery against CQUIN schedule as per contract</p> <p>Internal Audit mortality and morbidity review due Q3 2015/16</p> <p>Internal audit review in relation to outpatient patient experience due Q4 2015/16.</p>			<p>(a) Currently not all deaths are screened and there is a requirement to move to 100%. (1.2) (1.3), (1.5) (1.6)</p>			
Assurance rating:	G		Comments on assurance	Good range of assurance sources. Performance against KPIs within thresholds.								
Action tracker:					Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status	
Roll out plan to be developed (1.2)					Sep 15	MD	Complete. Process drafted and incorporated into policy. Being launched at M&M Lead's forum in May.				5	

Audit support to be provided (1.3)	Oct-15 Nov-15 Jan-16	MD	Complete. All posts successfully recruited to. All staff will be in post by end of March 16	5
Mortality database to be developed (1.5)	Oct-15 Review Nov-15 Jan-16 Mar 2016	MD	Database was due to go live early Jan 16 however there are further changes to be made before going live following recent national guidance received from NHS England and the requirement to classify deaths in terms of avoidability. Therefore database will not be live until end of February. Due date extended to reflect this.	3
Pilot Copelands Risk adjusted Barometer (CRAB)	Mar-16	MD	Pilot delayed due to long term sickness impacting of staffing capacity. Revised approach to pilot being undertaken by HOE and DMD in March	3
Scoping of Medical Examiners as Mortality Screeners (1.6)	Mar-16	MD	Proposal submitted and approved by MRC, EQB and M&M Leads forum. Next steps are to confirmed details of ME post and invite expressions of interest.	4

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 2:	Emergency attendance/ admissions increase									Risk owner:	Chief Operating Officer		
Strategic objective:	An effective and integrated emergency care system									Objective owner:	COO		
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5 = 20	5x5=25	5x5=25	5x5=25	5x5=25	5x5=25		
Target risk rating (I x L):	3x2=6												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance
Directive / Preventative Controls NHS '111' helpline GP referrals Local/ National communication campaigns Winter surge plan Triage by Lakeside Health (from 3/11/15) for all walk-in patients to ED. Urgent Care Centre (UCC) now managed by UHL from 31/10/15 Admissions avoidance directory Reworking of LLR urgent care RAP- as detailed in COO report	ED 4 hour wait performance (threshold 95%) 80.4% (A further deterioration since previous report). Poor performance continues to be primarily driven by record ED attendances and emergency admissions but has also been contributed to by staffing issues. Total attendances and admissions (compared to previous year) Attendance + 7% Admissions + 4.5% Ambulance handover (threshold 0 delays over 30 mins) There has been a recent improvement in ambulance handover times as detailed in the COO emergency care TB report.						National benchmarking of emergency care data Urgent Care Board fortnightly dashboard.			(c) Lack of effectiveness of admissions avoidance plan (2.1) (c) Lack of effectiveness of attendance avoidance plan Lack of winter surge capacity (2.1)			
Detective Controls Q&P report monitoring ED 4-hour waits, ambulance handover >30 mins and >60 mins, total attendances / admissions. Comparative ED performance summaries showing total attendances and admissions.	Difficulties continue in accessing beds from ED leading to congestion in the assessment area and delayed ambulance handover. >30 - <60 mins delay 13% , >60mins 10% Bed Occupancy. Monitored daily but not formally reported												
Assurance rating:	A		Comments on assurance	Acceptable number of internal assurance sources. Limited number of external assurance sources identified at present. Performance against a number of the KPIs is below threshold.									
Action tracker:					Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status		
LLR plan to reduce admissions (including access to Primary Care) (2.1)					01/11/2015 Review Apr - 16	COO	Admissions and attendance continue to increase.				2		

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16												
Principal risk 3	Failure to transfer elective activity into community, develop referral pathways, and changes to cancer providers may affect ability to meet access standards									Risk owner:	COO				
Strategic objective:	Services which consistently meet national access standards									Objective owner:	COO				
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March			
	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16				
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6														
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance		
Detective Controls RTT incomplete waiting times, cancer access and diagnostic standards reported via Q&P report to TB	RTT Incomplete waiting times (threshold 92%). Currently 93.2% (predicted) RTT backlog currently 3400 (up from 3000) Cancer Access Standards (reported quarterly). Current performance based on Dec data						Internal audit review on breast screening and cancer performance standards due Q2 2015/16. Report received and actions implemented						(c) Volume of elective cancellations associated with emergency pressure. (c) Volume of cancellation for cancer treatment due to emergency pressure.		
Corrective controls Medinet providing w/e lists for endoscopy. Patients transferred to Circle and Nuffield Additional lists by UHL consultants Gastro position improving through use of corrective controls.	2 ww for urgent GP referral (Threshold 93%). 94% 2 ww for symptomatic breast patients (threshold 93%). 96.2% 31 day wait for 1st treatment (threshold 96%). 91.4% 31 day wait for 2nd or subsequent treatments (Drugs - threshold 98%). 100% (Surgery - threshold 94%). 77.5% (Radiotherapy - threshold 94%). 96.4% 62 day wait for 1st treatment (threshold 85%). 75.2% 62 day wait for 1st treatment (CSS referral-threshold 90%). 77.3% Cancer wait 104 days (threshold TBC). 24 Diagnostics 1.8%						Internal audit review in relation to waiting times for elective care due in quarter 4 2015/16; initiated end January 2016			NHS IQ to externally review endoscopy; now implementing agreed changes				(c) Failure of diagnostic 6 week standard due to endoscopy overdue planned patients (3.5)	
							Cancer and RTT Board monthly meetings with CCGs and NTDA. Recovery action plan in place			Monthly performance call with NTDA			(c) Emerging gap in ability to meet Gastro outpatient demand (3.4)		
							NHS Intensive Support team visit Aug 2015 and additional advice re cancer management January 2016						(c) Lack of progress on 62 day backlog reduction due to ITU/HDU capacity and gaps in clinical capacity in key specialties (3.6)		
Assurance rating:	G		Comments on assurance	Acceptable number of assurance sources however 3 out of 11 KPIs are below threshold											
Action tracker:						Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status			

Diagnostics / endoscopy recovery of <1% Threshold over 6 weeks (3.5)	Mar-16	DPI	Reduction of number over 6 weeks progressing as planned, confident of meeting target date	4
Sustained achievement of 85% 62 day standard (3.6)	Sep-16	DPI	62 day backlog reduction currently off trajectory. Implementation of 'Next Steps' for cancer patients in key tumour sites to start end February 2016. The extension to deadline comes as part of our submission to the TDA for our sustainable transformation plans.	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 4:	Existing and new tertiary flows of patients not secured compromising UHL's future more specialised status									Risk owner:		Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	Integrated care in partnership with others									Objective owner:		DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	4x3 = 12	4x3=12	4x3=12		
Target risk rating (I x L):	4 x 2 = 8												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Gaps in Control / Assurance						
	Internal			External									
Directive Controls NHS England Five Year Forward View sets out the national strategic direction. UHL Business Decision Process. UHL/NUH Children's Services Collaborative Group. Partnership Board for Specialised Services established in Northamptonshire. Membership includes Northants CCGs; NHS England; KGH; NGH and UHL. Bipartite Partnership Working Group UHL/NUH. Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between NUH and UHL Tripartite Working Group UHL/NUH/ULHT. SLAs in place for all partnerships Detective/Corrective Controls UHL Tertiary Partnerships Board.	UHL Tertiary Partnerships Board reporting to ESB Monthly on achievements in the last month, looking forward and new partnership areas.			Inclusion in acute services contract. Compliance with national service specifications. Strategic Clinical Network/Senate reviews.			(c) Absence of Tertiary Partnerships Strategy (4.1). (c): Lack of MoU for a number of work-streams. (4.4) (a) Detailed work plan required for major areas (4.2). (a) Lack of reporting on return on investment e.g. income (4.3).						
Assurance rating:	A		Comments on assurance	Few 'hard KPIs' (i.e. quantitative assurances) identified. Number of gaps assurance may present some challenges to the effective management of this risk									
Action tracker:				Due date	Owner	Progress update:					Status		
Tertiary Partnerships Strategy to ESB (4.1)				Dec 15	DS	Complete. Approved by Trust Board 7 January 2015.					5		
Detailed work plan to Partnership Board.(4.2)				Dec 2015 Jan 16	DS	Complete. Paper to ESB 12 January 2015					5		

Begin reporting on return on investment (4.3)	Jan-2016 Apr-16	DS	ROI for specific areas identified but reporting mechanism not established. Partnership Board 18 Jan identified following measures to be considered: Numbers of joint posts and “partnership” clinical sessions; balance sheet; business case objectives. Unintended consequences could also be considered.	3
Develop MoUs for work streams (4.4)	01/12/2015 6 Apr-16	JC	1st MoU to ESB in December 2015. MOU for SEMOC due ESB April 2015. Currently with SEMOC Board. Deadline extended to reflect this.	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 5:	Failure to deliver integrated care in partnership with others including failure to: Deliver the Better Care Together year 2 programme of work Participate in BCT formal public consultation with risk of challenge and judicial review Develop and formalise partnerships with a range of providers (tertiary and local services) Explore and pioneer new models of care. Failure to deliver integrated care.									Risk owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	Integrated care in partnership with others									Objective owner:	DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	3x5=15	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	
Target risk rating (I x L):	2x5=10											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Gaps in Control / Assurance					
	Internal			External								
Directive Controls Robust - BCT and UHL/BCT project governance structure including programme management arrangements BCT Programme five year directional plan Two-year operational plan LLR BCT Strategic Outline Case LLR BCT Partnership Board UHL/BCT Reconfiguration Programme Board System wide project delivery structure and organisational specific delivery mechanisms LLR project delivery through revised LLR Delivery Board LLR Service Reconfiguration Board	Assurance in respect of the PCBC is secured via the Board Av length of stay (10% improvement in 15/16) Reduction in emergency admissions with a length of stay of 0-6 hours. Rapid access HF clinic attendances from ED and CDU (by March 2016). Integrated medicine (elderly) av length of stay 3day + emergency patients. Respiratory av length of stay 3day + emergency patients. Cardiology av length of stay 3day + emergency patients. Patient experience Satisfaction of people who use services with their care and support.			Internal audit review in relation to governance structures around hosted services i.e. Elective Care Alliance due Q2 2015/16. Head of Local Partnerships sits on BCT Delivery Board - escalates as required. PCBC is considered through CCG Boards, Delivery Board and Partnership Board. Ultimate decision to go to consultation sits with Commissioners			(a)Lack of LLR wide BCT outcome dashboard required so that performance can be monitored (5.1) (c) No detailed plans for overall change management/organisational development .These will form the basis for the narrative for formal consultation. (5.3 &5.5) (c) Project plan for Frail Older Person Service not yet developed (5.4) (c) LLR Board requires stronger clinical leadership and Commissioner engagement (5.6) (a)Draft LLR BCT Dashboard prepared for use in UHL					
Detective Controls Progress updates to LLR BCT Partnership Board Monthly UHL/BCT Programme Board progress reports to ESB LLR wide performance monitoring report presented to Trust Board Monthly BCT progress report to Trust Board Monthly project specific highlight reports	Increase in virtual appointments. ED unplanned re-attendance rate. SHMI reduced to 95 . Increased treatments in community setting. Enhanced out of hospital ICS bed capacity (130 beds by the end of March 2016). 90 in place											

<p>considered at UHL/BCT Programme Board Draft LLR wide performance dashboard presented to Trust Board for use by UHL. BCT Implementation Board has completed triangulation and assurance process across the 8 clinical work streams</p>	<p>WB 7/3/16. Capacity will increase by between 12-14 for the rest of March hitting the 130 total by the end of March 2016. Target bed occupancy 90%. Current 84%. Av length of stay (10 days). Current < 10 days. Emergency admissions Delayed Transfer of Care</p>	<p>however further detail has been requested by the Board (5.7)</p> <p>(c) The scope of services requiring consultation in the revised PCBC is greater than expected in particular specialised services e.g. congenital, vascular (5.8)</p>
--	---	---

Assurance rating:	R	Comments on assurance	Large number of internal assurances now with thresholds identified, however currently not all have the current performance listed. Without this detail it is unclear as to whether we are on track with our objective
-------------------	---	-----------------------	---

Action tracker:	Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
A BCT Programme Dashboard to be established and agreed with the BCT PMO. (5.1)	Nov 15 Dec 15 Mar - 16	DS	Initial draft presented to Partnership Board November 2015. Further development required including agreement on KPI's and thresholds. BCT PMO advise that It is unlikely that thresholds will be agreed before March 2016. Deadline extended to reflect this	3
BCT PMO to facilitate triangulation process (5.2)	Review Nov 15	DS	Complete. Assurance process for each work stream being progressed via the BCT Implementation Group. Action on-going	5
Plan for consultation including a governance roadmap to be completed. (5.3)	Oct 15 Review Nov 15 Dec 15 Feb 2016	DS	Complete. Further work completed on PCBC following NHS England feedback. PCBC went through CCG Board in February 2016 and to UHL Trust Board in March have supported the direction of travel described but noted the need for capacity and demand assumptions to be regularly revisited given levels of prevailing demand being experienced.	5
Integrated Frail Older Person Service project plan to be developed (5.4)	Oct 15 Review Nov 15 Dec 15 Feb 2016	DS	Discussion on-going between UHL/LPT at chief executive level. Date for completion TBC Update will be chased.	3

OD and change plan - For inclusion in revised PCBC narrative and project plans (5.3)	Dec 2015 Feb 2016	DS	Revised narrative agreed through the LLR HR &OD group. Head of Local Partnerships and Assistant Director of OD have met and discussed how OD and the 'UHL way' can be embedded into current and future reconfiguration projects and/or BCT projects. This will be reflected in the development and management of project plans. Due Feb 16 and deadline amended to reflect this	4
Membership and terms of reference of the LLR Service Reconfiguration Board are currently under review	Mar-16	DS		4
Incorporate LLR BCT dashboard with UHL reconfiguration dashboard (5.7)	Mar-16		Complete.	5

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 6:	Failure to attain BRC status									Risk owner:	Medical Director (MD)		
Strategic objective:	Enhanced delivery in research, innovation and clinical education									Objective owner:	MD		
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	5x3=15	5x3=15	3x3=9	3x3=9		
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance
<p>Directive Controls Each BRU has a strategy document</p> <p>Preventive Controls UHL R&I supportive role to BRUs by meeting with Universities (Joint Strategic Meeting) Good working relationships between UHL and University partners Good track record of attracting subjects into studies Contracting and innovation team. Work with Medipex to commercialise our projects/ ideas.</p> <p>Detective Controls Financial monitoring of BRUs via Annual Report</p> <p>Corrective controls UHL to provide funding from external sources for targeted posts if necessary</p>	<p>Financial performance and academic output reported to UHL Joint Strategic meetings for assurance. In addition financial performance reported to each BRU Executive Board. Financial performance currently on plan.</p> <p>Highest recruiting Trust in the East Midlands and 7th nationally</p>						<p>NIHR monitor BRU performance University analysis of data</p>			<p>(c) NIHR national strategy not under UHL control (6.3) (c) Weak support from academic partners (6.1)</p>			
Assurance rating:	A		Comments on assurance	Few 'hard KPIs' (i.e. quantitative assurances) identified to monitor the effectiveness of controls									
Action tracker:						Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status	

Closer joint working with Universities to provide successful Athena Swan application.(6.2)	Review Jan 2016 Mar 2016	MD	Complete. Both Respiratory and Cardiovascular BRUs have successfully attained Athena Swan Silver status.	5
Develop new 4-way strategy meeting with UHL, UoL, LU and DMU (6.1)	Mar-16	MD		4
Closer joint working with Universities to develop application (6.3)	Review Feb 2016 Review Apr 16	MD	Director and theme leads agreed, academic partners agreed. Pre qualifying questionnaire submitted - outcome expected April 16. Work underway towards full application. Progress discussed at Joint BRU Board and R&I Exec - application process very competitive and final decision making external to UHL.	4

Ensure engagement with CMGs to embed Medical Education Dashboard to ensure more robust data (7.1)	Jun-16	S Carr	On-going engagement with CMG Med ED leads. Extra provision of online supervisor training in place to improve accreditation rates among supervisors. Triangulation of internal and external data sources to improve database accuracy.	4
Medical Director to 'champion' scrutiny of Medical Education Committee minutes at EWB (7.2)	Mar-16	MD		4

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 8:	Insufficient engagement of clinical services, investment and governance may cause failure to deliver the Genomic Medicine Centre project at UHL									Risk owner:	Medical Director (MD)	
Strategic objective:	Enhanced delivery in research, innovation and clinical education									Objective owner:	MD	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April 3x3=9	May 3x3=9	June 3x3=9	July 3x3=9	August 3x3=9	Sept 3x3=9	Oct 4x3=12	Nov 4x4=16	Dec 4x4=16	Jan 4x4=16	Feb 4x4=16	March
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls									Gaps in Control / Assurance		
	Internal			External								
<p>Directive Controls Director of R&I meets with key CMG managers to ensure engagement. Genomic Medicine Centre (GMC) CMG leads for Cancer and rare diseases New pathway for samples initiated with Genomic Medicine Centre at Cambridge (previously Nottingham).</p> <p>Preventive Controls Engagement with CMGs via comms strategy including weekly national and local (i.e. UHL) news letters Contracting and innovation team Work with Medplex to help commercialise our projects ideas</p> <p>Detective Controls Research study subject recruitment trajectory (sufficient income depends upon meeting recruitment thresholds). Monitored by GMC Steering Committee and UHL Exec Team</p>	Monthly and annual trajectory for recruitment into this project. Currently we are slightly below trajectory for rare diseases but this is improving . New pathway for samples initiated with Genomic Medicine Centre at Cambridge to resolve issues			Eastern England Genomic Centre monitoring against recruitment trajectory.			(c) Ineffective recruitment into studies attributable to lack of research staff (8.1)					
Assurance rating:	A		Comments on assurance	Consideration should be given as to whether the current assurance sources are adequate to monitor the effectiveness of controls								

Action tracker:	Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Lead nurse and team of Clinical Research Assistants to be appointed. (8.1)	Dec-15	DRI	Complete - research Nurse and CRAs in post	5
Additional Research Nurse to be appointed (8.1)	Feb-16	DRI	Complete	5
Engagement of CMGs with process (8.1)	Jun-16	MD DRI	DRI and MD leading on engagement programme. Meeting with Clinical Genetics and W&C CMG Management to discuss Clinical Genetics workforce plan.	4
Appoint nurse to cover maternity leave in May	Jun-16	MD CRI	Out to advert	4
Appoint Project Manager (replacement post) (8.1)	Mar-16	DRI	Out to advert	4
Recruitment against trajectories (8.1)	Jun-16	DRI	Rare Diseases: currently exceeding trajectory – catching up with ground lost previously Cancer: start recruitment - sample pathways through labs needs full engagement and buy in from pathology and theatres – this is underway	4
Finalise IT plans	Jun-16	DRI	Ensure UoL team deliver CiVi CRM to timelines	4

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		CLOSED IN OCT 2015										
Principal risk 9:	Changes in senior management/ leaders in partner organisations may adversely affect relationships / partnerships with universities.									Risk owner:	Medical Director (MD)		
Strategic objective:	Enhanced delivery in research, innovation and clinical education									Objective owner:	MD		
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	3x2=6	3x2=6	3x2=6	3x2=6	3x2=6	3x2=6	3x2=6						
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Gaps in Control / Assurance						
	Internal			External									
Maintaining relationships with key academic partners. Developing relationships with key academic partners. Existing well established partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of Leicester Loughborough University Developing partnerships; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> De Montfort University University of Nottingham University College London (Life Study) Cambridge University (100k project) Nigel/ David - Upon further discussion we wonder whether this is a 'stand alone' risk or whether it is in fact a 'cause' (ie weak support from academic partners) that would impact on the achievement of retention of BRUs? yes - I think thats a good way of looking at it (Nigel Brunskill)	Minutes of joint UHL/UoL Strategy meetings Minutes of Joint BRU Board Minutes of NCSEM Management Board Meetings of Joint UHL/UoL research office Life steering group meets monthly EM CLAHRC Management Board reports via R&D Exec to ESB						(c) Contacts with Universities could be developed more closely (9.1)						
Assurance rating:	TBA	Comments on assurance											
Action tracker:					Due date	Owner	Progress update:			Status			
Develop new 4 way strategy meeting with UHL, UoL, LU and DMU (9.1)					Mar-16	MD							

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 10:	Gaps in inclusive and effective leadership capacity and capability , lack of support for workforce well- being, and lack of effective team working across local teams may lead to deteriorating staff engagement and difficulties in recruiting and retaining medical and non-medical staff									Risk owner:		Director of Workforce and Organisational Development (DWOD)
Strategic objective:	A caring, professional and engaged workforce									Objective owner:		DWOD
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	4x4=15	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	
Target risk rating (I x L):	4 x 2 = 8											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls					Internal		External			Gaps in Control / Assurance	
Directive Controls Organisational development (OD) Plan Listening into Action (LiA) Workforce planning Leadership into Action Strategy Equality Action plan 'Freedom to Speak' standard Strategy Medical Workforce strategy	Organisational health dashboard and Q&P report including: Friends and family staff survey (% of staff who would recommend UHL as a place to work). Jul - Sept = 55.7% (qtrly report. Note Q3 not completed as national survey carried out) therefore 54% ytd Turnover rate 10.1% (monthly report - threshold =/< 11).					Internal audit review of medical staffing due Q3 2015/16. Internal audit review of recruitment and retention of staff due Q2 2015/16.			(a) No threshold in place for F&F staff survey (10.1) (c) BCT Workforce Strategy Delivery Plan (10.2) (c) Workforce Plan (10.3)			
Detective Controls Organisational health dashboard Q&P report 3636 concerns hotline Junior Dr 'gripe tool' Patients Safety walkabouts UHL intranet 'staff room' Clinical Senate Monthly 'Breakfast with the Boss' forums	Sickness absence rate = 4.1% for Dec 2015 (Jan data not available) (monthly report- threshold 3%) Annual appraisal rate = 91.5% (monthly report - threshold 95%) Stat/ Man training = 93% (monthly report - threshold 95%) Corporate induction attendance for Jan = 96% (monthly report - threshold 95%)											

Assurance rating:	G	Comments on assurance	No threshold currently in place for F&F staff survey for UHL to monitor performance		
Action tracker:		Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Develop threshold for F&F staff survey. (10.1)		Dec-15 Mar 2016	DWOD	Organisation now to adopt new Pulse Check which incorporates staff F&F as agreed with CEO, UHL Way Steering Group and CCG colleagues (in meeting staff governance/ satisfaction criteria). New Pulse Check thresholds to be discussed with EWB in March 2016 on presentation of first data set	4
Development of Workforce Plan aligned to BCT (10.2)		Mar-16	DWOD	Addressing priorities workshop held in March 16. Work progressing in collaboration with BCT partners on development of an LLR workforce plan. Work to be undertaken by Whole Systems Partnership which will link activity changes to workforce changes at a macro level.	4
Development of BCT Workforce Strategy (10.3)		Dec-15 Mar 2016	DWOD	Submission delayed to March 16. Document produced as part of BCT Pre-consultation Business Case (on BCT Delivery Board Agenda for approval in Feb 16 with the plan to submit to NHS England in March 16). BCT plan issued to Trust Board in Feb 2016	4

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 11:	Insufficient estates infrastructure capacity and the lack of capacity of the Estates team may adversely affect major estate transformation programme									Risk owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	A clinically sustainable configuration of services, operating from excellent facilities									Objective owner:	DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	5x4=20	
Target risk rating (I x L):	5 x 2 = 10											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls									Gaps in Control / Assurance		
	Internal			External								
<p>Directive Controls UHL reconfiguration programme governance structure aligned to BCT Reconfiguration investment programme demands linked to current infrastructure. Estates work stream to support reconfiguration established Five year capital plan and individual capital business cases identified to support reconfiguration</p> <p>Detective Controls Survey to identify high risk elements of engineering and building infrastructure. Monthly report to Capital Investment Monitoring committee to track progress against capital backlog and capital projects Regular reports to Executive Performance Board (EPB). Highlight reports developed monthly and reported to the UHL Reconfiguration Programme Board.</p> <p>Corrective Control Revised programme timescale approved by IFPIC</p>	<p>Capital expenditure and progress against reconfiguration programme monitored via Capital Investment committee. Major Capital - On track against revised schedule Annual programme - On track against revised schedule Space Management - Behind schedule Property Management - Behind schedule</p>						<p>(c) A programme of infrastructure improvements is yet to be identified (11.1) (c) Overall programme of works not yet identified and quantified in relation to risk (11.2) c) Currently no identified capital funding within 2015/16 programme and future years (11.3) (c) Conflicting responsibilities/roles of the estates and facilities team between UHL and the LLR estate and Facilities Management Collaborative. (11.4)</p>					

Assurance rating:	A	Comments on assurance	There may be benefit in considering whether a summary of performance via a RAG rating could be developed in order to provide an overall level of assurance to the Board via the BAF.		
Action tracker:		Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Assessment of current capacity being established (11.1)		Jan 2016 Feb 2016	DEF	In progress - delays due to additional surveys being required to be undertaken, no direct impact on capital programme due to general slow down in Capital funding. Action still on-going	3
Develop a programme of works (11.2)		Mar-16	DEF	In Progress - detailed following output of 11.1	4
Identification of investment required and allocation of capital funding 11.3)		Mar-16	DEF/CFO	In Progress	4
Define resource and skills gaps and agree an enhanced team structure to support the significant reconfiguration programme (11.4)		Review Nov 15 Feb 2016 May 16	DEF	PMO light support engaged and additional project managers recruited (fixed term) in relation to transformation projects however clarity is still required around the future enhanced status of Estates/ IFM teams. We are continuing to gather data which has required the installation of various metering devices. As a result of this the Capita Infrastructure Report will not be available until the end of May 2016	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 12:	Limited capital envelope to deliver the reconfigured estate which is required to meet the Trust's revenue obligations									Risk owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	A clinically sustainable configuration of services, operating from excellent facilities									Objective owner:	DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5=20	4x5=20	
Target risk rating (I x L):	4 x 2 = 8											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls									Gaps in Control / Assurance		
	Internal			External								
<p>Directive Controls/Preventive Controls Five year capital plan and individual capital business cases identified to support reconfiguration Business case development is overseen by the strategy directorate and business case project boards manage and monitor individual schemes. Capital plan and overarching programme for reconfiguration is regularly reviewed by the executive team.</p> <p>Detective Controls Capital Investment Monitoring Committee to monitor the programme of capital expenditure and early warning to issues. Monthly reports to ESB and IFPIC on progress of reconfiguration capital programme. Highlight reports produced for each project board.</p> <p>Corrective Control Revised programme timescale approved by IFPIC</p>	<p>Timescales for business case development - there is some delay to original timescales for three business cases due to internal delay and also BTC consultation. Revised programme timescale taken to ESB and approved - will go to IFPIC</p> <p>Resource expenditure for development of business cases - on track/ monitored on a monthly basis</p> <p>Affordability of business cases (i.e. schemes within allocated budget envelope) - on track against revised programme.</p> <p>Individual projects monitored via highlight report including project timelines which are reviewed by the Major Business Case meeting and Reconfiguration Board.</p>			<p>Regular meetings with NDTA ITFF NHS England BCT Programme Board</p>			<p>(c) Uncertain availability of external capital funding. (12.1)</p> <p>(c) 'road map' requires development to provide the full picture and deliverability of the programme of change (12.2)</p>					

Assurance rating:	G	Comments on assurance	Range of assurance sources in place		
Action tracker:		Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
On-going discussions between Exec team and NTDA (12.1)		Review Nov 15 Dec 16 Feb 2016 Mar 2016	DEF/DS/ CFO	National announcements indicate a slowing of available capital which may impact on the current delivery plan, so have rephased and approved through ESB. Capital threshold has been set as £327m P. Traynor continues discussions with TDA regarding cash flow. Will know more for 16/17 in March16 and due date extended to reflect this	3
Consideration given to other sources of funding (12.1)		Review Nov 15 Feb 16 Apr-16	DEF/DS/ CFO	Piece of work underway led by CFO to explore other sources. This is an on-going action and will be reviewed again in February 2016. Action still on-going	3
PMO holding estates workshop and followed by joint Estates and Strategy workshop to provide the full picture and deliverability of the programme of change (12.2)		Nov 15 Feb 16 Apr 16	DEF/DS	Workshops held and. LGH work stream established to progress activities to refresh the 'route map' - outputs expected in Feb16. Draft roadmap presented to ESB with further detail to be added now service reconfiguration plans have been firmed up	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 13:	Lack of robust assurance in relation to statutory compliance of the estate								Risk owner:	Director of Estates			
Strategic objective:	A clinically sustainable configuration of services, operating from excellent facilities								Objective owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)			
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16		
Target risk rating (I x L):	4x2=8												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Gaps in Control / Assurance						
	Internal			External									
Directive Controls LLR FMC Board Outsourced facilities management contract performance managed by the Estates and Facilities Management Collaborative	In excess of 70 KPIs across 14 services to monitor the IFM contract. UHL are reporting major concerns around performance and delivery of the IFM contract			PLACE inspection performed in March 2015 and PLACE inspections planned for March - June 2016 3rd party independent auditing.			a) Lack of electronic evidence by IFM on compliance (a) Limited contractual KPI's in certain areas of compliance. (a) Uncertainty around adequacy of IFM response to critical failures of service (13.2)						
Preventive/ Corrective Controls On-going major incident scenarios developed and played out to identify any deficiencies in data, process and systems	Current IFM senior management and operational structures will be assimilated into the Estates and Facilities Directorate												
Detective controls Monthly defined KPI's which monitor Interserve FM (IFM) are reported to Contract Management Panel Assurance on IFM performance monitored via ad-hoc spot checks and deep dive analysis and reported to Contract Management Panel													
Assurance rating:	A	Comments on assurance	Inadequacies in IFM data collection via electronic means and appropriateness of KPIs may present a challenge to providing effective assurance of IFM performance.										
Action tracker:				Due date	Owner	Progress update:					Status		
To increase the number of manual audits (13.1)					DEF	Complete. Manual audits being carried out including deep dive spot checks					5		
Major failure scenarios being set with IFM (13.2)					DEF	Complete. Annual programme of testing failure scenarios being implemented with IFM. From the 1st May a period of review will take place to identify gaps in compliance and identification of a programme for correction					5		
Terminate the IFM Contract as of 30th April 2016 and to transfer all FM services back in-house hosted by UHL to deliver services to UHL and across LLR to LPT and NHS PS Transfer services on the 1st May 2016 (13.1/13.2)				May-16	DEF	FM Repatriation Board formed with inaugural meeting on the 4th March. Work streams reporting to Board with progress and risk registers					4		

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 14:	Failure to deliver clinically sustainable configuration of services									Risk owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	A clinically sustainable configuration of services, operating from excellent facilities									Objective owner:	DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x3=x12	4x3=12	4x3=12	4x4= 16	4x4=16	4x4=16	
Target risk rating (I x L):	4x2=8											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls									Gaps in Control / Assurance		
	Internal						External					
<p>Directive Controls</p> <p>UHL reconfiguration programme governance structure aligned to BCT</p> <p>Strategic capital business case work streams aligned to BCT</p> <p>Monthly meetings with the NTDA to identify new business cases coming up for approval</p> <p>Detailed programme plan identifying key milestones for delivery of the capital plan.</p> <p>Project plans and resources identified against each project.</p> <p>A future operating model at speciality level which supports a two acute site footprint:</p> <p>Out of hospital contract approved and project established to shift appropriate activity into the community.</p> <p>Detective Controls</p> <p>Gateway / Assurance review</p> <p>A monthly highlight report to indicate RAG rating of reconfiguration programme submitted to the UHL Reconfiguration Programme Delivery Board.</p> <p>Monthly aggregate reporting to ESB, IFPIC and Trust Board.</p>	<p>Progress of all reconfiguration programme work streams is monitored via aggregated reporting to ESB/ IFPIC/ TB.</p> <p>Monthly updates via aggregated reporting (highlight reports) to ESB/ IFPIC/ TB.</p> <p>Overall reconfiguration programme is RAG rated. Currently reported as 'amber 'due to complexity of programme and risks associated with delivery.</p>						<p>Regular meetings with NTDA</p> <p>NHS England</p> <p>BCT Programme Board</p> <p>Gateway / Assurance review carried out Feb - 16</p>			<p>(c) Lack of capacity within the NTDA to resource each of the business cases</p> <p>c) changes to capacity and demand management / left shift assumptions will determine future size and configuration of services. If this differs from current plan it may have significant cost implications (14.1)</p> <p>(a) Further work required, as part of future operating model, to look at the remaining acute services at the LGH to determine the gap in the current capital plan (14.1)</p> <p>(c) Delay in BCT public consultation (14.2)</p> <p>(a)No thresholds in place to provide an objective view of the RAG rating in relation to reconfiguration programme progress (14.3)</p>		

<p>Monthly meetings with the NTDA to discuss the programme of delivery</p> <p>Monitoring of progress towards UHL two acute site model</p> <p>Monitoring of business case timescales for delivery.</p> <p>Requirements identified to deliver key projects overseen by PMO</p> <p>Monitor spend against agreed budgets.</p>			<p>(c) ITU interim configuration has been delayed due to capital availability, this will not be confirmed until Q1 2016/17. In addition to capital there are risks to Trust capacity that may delay move further. Interim measures have been put in place to manage risks in short-term, these arrangements need to be reviewed if any further delays (14.4)</p>
---	--	--	--

Assurance rating:	A	Comments on assurance	Currently no thresholds identified to provide objective RAG rating for reconfiguration programme progress
--------------------------	---	------------------------------	---

Action tracker:	Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Completed site survey at LGH to be used to further develop route map/ sequencing of moves. Will overlay future operating model outputs to enable refresh of DCP by estates (14.1)	Nov 15 Feb 16 Jun - 16	DS	First iteration of road-map shared in February 16 as planned. Further version to reflect all sites, inter-dependencies and sequencing now underway. Due to present back to ESB in June 16 as it will be impacted upon by overall programme timeframes. Action still on-going.	3
Develop a contingency address the delay (14.2)	Jan 16	DS	Complete Impact of external influences (capital/consultation etc) is being considered with exec led actions to consider scenarios for review. Programme rephased to reflect current known and approved by ESB.	5
Develop clear thresholds to enable a more objective RAG rating for overall progress of reconfiguration programme (14.3)	Jan 2016 Mar 16	DS	Programme reporting processes being reviewed as part of Gateway review action plan - this will include development of KPIs and RAG parameters. Due date extended to reflect this process.	3
Review interim arrangements to manage risk if further delays to ITU reconfiguration	Jun-16	DS	Action only required if further delays are introduced.	4

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 15:	Failure to deliver the 2015/16 programme of services reviews, a key component of service-line management (SLM)									Risk owner:	Director of Strategy (DS)	
Strategic objective:	A financially sustainable NHS Organisation									Objective owner:	DS	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	3x3=9	
Target risk rating (I x L):	3x2=6											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Gaps in Control / Assurance					
	Internal			External								
Directive Controls Governance arrangements established Overarching project plan for service reviews developed New structure / methodology agreed for capturing outputs in a consistent way, aligned to the IHI Triple Aim. New virtual team structure to support the intensive service reviews. New Project Steering Group to be set up using the 'virtual team' membership	Regular updates (and reports) to ESB Regular updates to EPB and IFPIC as part of CIP paper (where schemes have a financial benefit) KPIs as agreed during each service review. Service Review Roll Out / Project Plan milestones monitored via the above governance structure - Currently slightly behind plan due to operational pressures impacting on clinical engagement.			Internal Audit (PWC) October 2015 - Service Line Reporting			(c) BI capacity is (at times) limited which impacts on Data Pack production (15.1) (c) Clinical engagement can be variable (as is clinical capacity to get involved) (c) Improvement tools / change management techniques are under development (15.2)					
Detective Controls Monthly reporting to IFPIC and EPB as part of CIP report. SLM / Service Review Data Packs now to include a range of metrics, beyond finance Monthly updates required from services against pre-determined work programme. <i>Measurable outcomes now embedded into</i>												
Assurance rating:	G		Comments on assurance	Appropriate assurance sources available for each service review to measure against KPIs which are reported into Exec Team identifying any deteriorating trends e.g. clinical engagement, operational pressures, etc.								
Action tracker:					Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status	

Revised Data Pack being scoped for discussion with BI leads. (15.1)	Dec 2015 Jan 2016 Mar 2016	DS	The plan involves: 1) the development of a Stratification Dashboard to summarise how specialities are performing across a range of indicators. This is work in progress. Now due end of Feb. 2) the allocation of specialities to standard, enhanced and intensive service reviews depending on what level of support is required. This is work in progress. Now due end of Feb. 3) the development of a new data pack. This is work in progress. Now due end of Feb. 4) the roll out of the new approach in line with the UHL Way (Better Change Methodology). The intention is to pilot this new approach in March. Due date extended to reflect this	3
Improvement tools (for use by clinical services) to be finalised (15.2)	Dec 15 Jan 2016 Mar 2016 Apr- 16	DS	Approach agreed. An Intensive Service Review will be piloted in 3 services have been identified and need to be agreed with operational teams , commencing in March 2016. Due date extended to reflect this	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 16:	Failure to deliver UHL deficit control total in 2015/16										Risk owner:	CFO	
Strategic objective:	A financially sustainable NHS organisation										Objective owner:	CFO	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	4x3=12		
Target risk rating (I x L):	5x2=10												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance
<p>Directive Controls Agreed Financial Plan for 2015/16 Standing Financial Instructions UHL Service and Financial strategy as per SOC and LTFM.</p> <p>Preventative Controls Sign-off and agreement of contracts with CCGs and NHS England CIP delivery plan for 2015/16</p> <p>Detective Controls Monthly finance reporting in relation to income and expenditure and CIP</p> <p>Corrective Controls Identification and mitigation of excess cost pressures Production of financial recovery plan submitted to NTDA</p>	<p>Variance to plan of £1.5m at M11 with a year end forecast in-line with the revised I&E plan of a deficit of £34.1m.</p> <p>Month 11 showed a favourable variance to plan of £0.7m.</p> <p>CIP over-performance within the month by £0.2m has reduced the year to date under-performance to £0.9m.</p> <p>The detailed position will be reviewed by the Executive Performance Board in March, Integrated Finance, Performance & Investment Committee and Trust Board in April 2016.</p> <p>Run rates to achieve £34.1m in each area (pay, non-pay, CIP and income) updated for months 11 & 12 and reported to Committees/Trust Board.</p>						<p>Internal audit annual review of financial systems and processes completed within quarter 3 of 2015/16. External audit annual review of financial systems and processes due to be completed as part of the interim audit work within quarter 4 of 2015/16.</p> <p>TDA scrutiny monthly and quarterly with regional team</p>			<p>(c) Certain aspects of contract review in 2015/16 require negotiation with NHS England and CCGs.</p> <p>(c) Further actions are required to reduce premium medical pay spend in 2015/16 in line with recent national guidance. (16.1)</p>			
Assurance rating:	A	Comments on assurance		Good number of assurance sources									
Reasonable assurance rating that risk is being managed:						Due date	Owner	Progress update:			Status		
Review national guidance in relation to premium medical pay and develop strategy for reduction (16.1)						Review March 2016	CFO	Complete for nursing staff. Strategy in relation to medical and other staff still requires further development through the premium pay cross-cutting work stream.			3		

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16									
Principal risk 17:	Failure to achieve a revised and approved 5 year financial strategy									Risk owner:	Chief Finance Officer (CFO)	
Strategic objective:	A financially sustainable NHS organisation									Objective owner:	CFO	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	5x3=15	
Target risk rating (I x L):	5x2=10											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls					Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance
<p>Directive Controls Overall strategic direction of travel defined through Better Care Together. Financial Strategy fully modelled and understood by all parties locally and nationally. UHL's working capital strategy in place. 2015/16 financial plan in place and monitored appropriately</p> <p>Detective Controls Monthly monitoring of performance against financial plan. IFPIC and TB receive half yearly updates in relation to financial strategy and LTFM</p> <p>Corrective controls Explore options for other (non-NHS) sources of capital funding</p>	<p>Monthly reporting against 2015/16 plan - As at M10, the Trust is £1.5m adverse to plan. Half yearly review of LTFM to ensure fitness for purpose i.e. checking consistency with UHL's strategy and ensuring we have a deliverable recovery plan over the medium term.</p> <p>Strong links to overall BCT 5 year strategy and the financial consequences (revenue and capital) of the transformational business cases</p>					<p>Internal audit annual review of financial systems and processes completed within quarter 3 of 2015/16. External audit annual review of financial systems and processes due to be completed as part of the interim audit work within quarter 4 of 2015/16.</p> <p>Internal audit review of service line reporting processes completed within Q3 2015/16.</p> <p>NHS England and NTDA review of: BCT SOC BCT PCBC Financial strategy LTFM System-wide five-year 'place-based' sustainability and transformation plan (STP) Individual business cases above a certain level</p>			<p>(c)LTFM not yet formally approved (17.1)</p> <p>(c)SOC not yet formally approved (17.2)</p>			
Assurance rating:	G		Comments on assurance	Good range of internal and external assurances								
Action tracker:					Due date	Owner	Progress update:				Status	

Liaise with TDA to agree process for LTFM submission and sign-off (17.1)	Review Nov 15 March 16	CFO	Still awaiting NDTA feedback.	3
Liaise with TDA to agree process for SOC submission and sign-off (17.2)	Review Nov 15 March 16	CFO	Still awaiting NDTA feedback.	3

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Feb-16										
Principal risk 18:	Delay to the approvals for the EPR programme									Risk owner:	Chief Information Officer (CIO)		
Strategic objective:	Enabled by excellent IM&T									Objective owner:	CIO		
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	
	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16		
Target risk rating (I x L):	2 x 3 = 6												
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls						Internal			External			Gaps in Control / Assurance
<p>Directive Controls Weekly communications with key contacts throughout the external approvals chain. EPR project plan. IM&T transformation Board EPR programme Board and the joint Governance Board</p> <p>Detective Controls Weekly meeting to discuss progress and issues - Milestones that relate to the EPR early works are monitored to ensure that all work, that can be, is progressing to time.</p> <p>Corrective controls We have a contingency plan in place for the provision of services to the new ED department if the plan has no realistic chance of meeting their timelines. Works that support the EPR project but could be used for an alternative, if approval was not forthcoming, have continued.</p>	<p>Internal and external meetings about the FBC are being undertaken.</p> <p>Until National TDA approval is given we can't engage with our key partners to implement the system, however we continue to work to mitigate the impact of the delay</p> <p>Upgrades are now taking place on our major IT systems including Clinicom, ORMIS and planning for EDIS to ensure they can be supported for a longer period prior to replacement by EPR or alternative.</p>						<p>Internal audit review of implementation of gateway actions following review of EPR implementation due Q3 2015/16</p> <p>HSCIC are undertaking a health check review on the EPR Project during March 2016.</p>			<p>(c)The NTDA have been unable to meet their timetable. This is due to the nationally deteriorating position around capital and is outside of the control of UHL.</p>			
Assurance rating:	A		Comments on assurance	Sole internal assurance source relates to the achievement of the key milestone leading to national approval for which there is currently no date set by NTDA.									

Action tracker:	Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Progress work with NTDA/DoH to progress a firm timetable (18.1)	Dec -15 Review Jun-16	CIO	<p>The business case was not added to the NTDA National Investment Committee for approval on the 10/03/16 due to issues with the capital resource limit (CRL). Further work is required on the financial model.</p> <p>The NTDA are supportive of the business case for EPR however due to financial constraints and capital limits the case currently exceeds the acceptable CRL and has not been forwarded onto the National Investment Committee for approval. Deadline extended to reflect this.</p> <p>Plans to upgrade our core systems to ensure services can be maintained are underway. This is likely to cost around £1m in the short term for software & hardware plus IT and organisational time and effort to implement over the next 6 months.</p>	2

Board Assurance Framework:	Updated version as at:		Jan-16									
Principal risk 19:	Perception of IM&T delivery by IBM leads to a lack of confidence in the service									Risk owner:	Officer (CIO)	
Strategic objective:	Enabled by excellent IM&T									Objective owner:	CIO	
Current risk rating (I x L):	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March
	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x4=16	4x3=12	4x3=12	
Target risk rating (I x L):	3 x 2 = 6											
Controls: (preventive, corrective, directive, detective)	Assurance on effectiveness of controls					Internal		External			Gaps in Control / Assurance	
<p>Directive Controls IM&T monthly news letter Monthly service delivery board</p> <p>Preventive Controls UHL IM&T governance structure Service credit regime which seeks to incentivise delivery and has an escalating failure regime for repeat monthly failures</p> <p>Detective Controls Monitoring of contract deliverables and quality of service i.e. number of LANDesk incidents and requests, and the number of telephone calls to the IT service desk. Monitoring of performance via customer satisfaction surveys. Liaison with the CMGs to ensure we are meeting their requirements.</p> <p>Corrective controls LIA event to improve perception and staged improvement plan to be fully developed</p>	<p>There are 148 performance indicators in total. 4 KPIs were failed in February</p> <p>Customer satisfaction (trajectory of 95%) is at 84.% February data)</p> <p>Additional resourcing from IBM and NTT has now arrived at UHL to better deliver the services</p>					<p>Internal audit review in relation to IT general controls and systems due Q3 2015/16</p> <p>ISO 27001:2013 Audit in 2015, which was passed. We believe we are the first NHS trust to achieve this standard of service delivery</p> <p>The digital maturity index, published by the Department of Health in Jan 16, puts UHL in the upper quartile in terms of performance against the delivery areas.</p> <p>Audit work by PwC on the service delivery metrics found no substantial issues with the reporting of the delivery services.</p>			<p>(a) Lack of an effective communications strategy (19.1)</p> <p>(c) No formal process, post the contract award, to test the delivery principles - (in the transfer of staff to IBM we extensively tested the gateways before we transferred services, now these are live with IBM we have limited contractual cover to test new processes other than good will) (19.2)</p>			
Assurance rating:	G		Comments on assurance	Good range of internal and external assurances								

Action tracker:	Due date	Owner	Progress update:	Status
Review of the new communications strategy and deliverables (19.1)	Dec-15	CIO	Complete. Strategy has been created and is being internally reviewed. We are now producing a detailed plan and we will be recruiting (through IBM) a communications specialist in Jan 16	5
To monitor the performance indicators in the improvement plan and communicate results to end users (19.2)	Mar-16	CIO	Further meetings have taken place with staff groups to look at individual items of concern. Plan has been created and now has staged delivery until March 16	4

Reasonable assurance rating:

Green	G	Effective controls in place and appropriate assurances are available
Amber	A	Effective controls thought to be in place but assurances are uncertain / insufficient
Red	R	Effective controls may not be in place and assurances are not available to the Board

Risk rating criteria:

Impact / Consequence			Likelihood	
5	Extreme	Catastrophic effect upon the objective, making it unachievable	5	Almost Certain (81%+)
4	Major	Significant effect upon the objective, thus making it extremely difficult/ costly to achieve	4	Likely (61% - 80%)
3	Moderate	Evident and material effect upon the objective, thus making it achievable only with some moderate difficulty/cost.	3	Possible (41% - 60%)
2	Minor	Small, but noticeable effect upon the objective, thus making it achievable with some minor difficulty/ cost.	2	Unlikely (20% - 40%)
1	Insignificant	Negligible effect upon the achievement of the objective.	1	Rare (Less than 20%)

Action tracker status:

5	Complete
4	On-track
3	Some delay. Expected to be completed as planned
2	Significant delay. Unlikely to be completed as planned.
1	Not yet commenced.
0	Objective revised.

BAF Risk Rating Matrix:

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
Z236	ED Emergency and Specialist Medicine	There is a risk of overcrowding due to the design and size of the ED footprint	30/06/2016 10/04/2013	<p>Design and size of footprint in resus causes delay in definitive treatment, delay in obtaining critical care, risk of serious incidents, increased crowding in majors, risk to four hour target. Poorer quality care. Risk of rule 43. Lack of privacy and dignity. Increased staff stress.</p> <p>Design and size of majors causes delay in definitive treatment and medical care. Poor quality care. Lack of privacy and dignity. High number of patient complaints. Risk of deterioration. Difficulty in responding to unwell patient in majors. Risk of adverse media interest. Staff stress. Risk of serious incident. Inability to meet four hour target resulting in patient safety and financial consequences. High number of incidents. Increased staff stress. Infection control risk. Risk of rule 43.</p> <p>Design and size of footprint in paediatrics causes delay in being seen by clinician. Risk of deterioration. Risk of four hour target and local CQUINS. Lack of patient confidentiality. Increased violence and aggression.</p> <p>Design and size of assessment bay causes delay in time to assessment. Paramedics unable to reach turnaround targets. Inability to meet CQUIN targets. Risk of patient deterioration. Delay in diagnosis and treatment. Increased staff stress. Patient complaints. Increased risk of patients being in the corridor on trolleys. Lack of dignity and privacy. Serious incident risk.</p> <p>Design and size of minors results in delay in receiving medical assessment and treatment. Patient complaints. Four hour target. Increased violence and aggression.</p>	Patients	<p>The Emergency Care Action Team, which was established in spring 2013 aims to improve emergency flow and therefore reduce the ED crowding.</p> <p>The Emergency department is actively engaging in plans to increase the ED footprint via the 'hot floor' initiative, but in the shorter term to increase the capacity of assessment bay and resus.</p> <p>The Resus Bed area is being created.</p> <p>Increase in Clinical Education staff, to assist with upskilling of Nursing Staff.</p> <p>Majors Floor has been marked out and numbered to prevent to many trolleys from blocking Majors and assessment Bay.</p> <p>Improving quality of care in the ED sessions open to staff, led by ED Consultant.</p> <p>Direct referrals from assessment bay to ambulatory clinic.</p> <p>CAD system went live highlighting number of ambulance patients on route to ED.</p> <p>SOP's completed for all areas, including SOP's for specifically managing assessment bay at full capacity & for supporting an escalation area when the main ED is full.</p> <p>Actions in place from EQSG Emergency Floor actions.</p> <p>New ED floor working stream.</p> <p>Quality metric audits. - These are now daily rather than monthly. (15/12/2015)</p> <p>Escalation plans.</p> <p>Cohorting of ED patients in Escalation Area (TIA Clinic) and ED corridor as per agreed protocols.</p>	Extreme	25	Almost certain	<p>New ED plus associated hot floor rebuild approved by the trust and OBC (Outline Business Case) submitted and first phase of construction of new ED due 31/05/16. Update - Full business case signed by trust board and approved by NTDA. NEW BUILD ON PLAN</p> <p>Patients in ED referred to any service should be reviewed by respective services in ED - (update - surgeons & ACB review resus pts, ongoing work with ortho) - Completed (Update from KA - this was completed following the Sturgess report).</p> <p>Creation of "single front door" (UCC handed over to UHL in Nov 2015) - Completed.</p> <p>Resus space to be increased to 8 bays - Completed.</p> <p>Bays to be allocated and staffed appropriately in majors to act as resus step-down bays for when space in resus is at a premium and some patients are well enough to be moved to majors with the appropriate level of observation - Completed.</p> <p>Hourly Intentional Rounds by Area Nurse - Completed.</p> <p>Traffic light system to ED doors awaiting commissioning following a visit to Addenbrookes - completed.</p> <p>Creation of SOP for resus crowding - due 31/05/2016.</p> <p>Assessment Bay SOP - Completed.</p> <p>Majors operational policy to be reviewed - Completed.</p>	16	JDX

Risk ID	Specialty	CMG	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2762	Corporate Nursing		Ability to provide safe, appropriate and timely care to all patients attending the Emergency Department at all times.	28/04/2016 21/12/2015	<p>Causes</p> <p>Failure to consistently undertake and record initial assessment by appropriately trained clinical staff within 15 minutes of presentation and document in real time.</p> <p>Failure to consistently ensure that all patients receive adequate care and treatment in accordance with Trust sepsis clinical pathway.</p> <p>Lack of ability to demonstrate we have an appropriate staffing skill mix in place on a shift by shift basis.</p> <p>Lack of recording of induction for temporary staff.</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>Significant risk of patient harm</p> <p>Conditions placed on licence to practice</p> <p>Risk of CQC placing the Trust in Special Measures</p> <p>Risk of CQC imposing unlimited financial penalties</p> <p>Adverse media attention affecting reputation of the Trust</p> <p>Breaches in Statutory duty with subsequent criminal prosecution</p>	Quality	<p>CEO and executive leadership with clear responsibility and oversight in place.</p> <p>Programme management arrangements in place supported by trio of nursing, medical and operational leads with allocated time and objectives. This is supported by four oversight meetings per week.</p> <p>Internal reporting in relation to quality metrics (sepsis compliance, staffing, initial assessment within 15 mins)</p> <p>Weekly reporting to CQC on required metrics in place</p>	Extreme	25	<p>Overarching action plan to address all 3 of the CQC areas of non-compliance - complete</p> <p>Governance and PMO arrangements to be agreed - paper to Quality Assurance Committee - complete</p> <p>On-going assurance monitoring that controls and completed actions are effective - Reviewed weekly via CQC steering group - monthly reviews - next due 28/4/16</p>	15	JSMI

Speciality	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Controls in place	Action summary
CMG Risk ID	Review Date	Risk subtype	Current Risk Score	Target Risk Score
2354	31/03/2016	Patients	20	3
RRCV	28/05/2014		Almost certain	SM
	There is a risk of overcrowding in the Clinical Decisions Unit	<p>CONSEQUENCES</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Significant delays in patients being assessed and treated due to inadequate workforce resource to meet demand. This compounds the space issue as patients are not being assessed and treated in an efficient manner. This is evidenced by the current triage times;</p> <p>% triaged within 15 minutes - 60%</p> <p>% seen by doctor within 60 minutes - 40%</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Overcrowded department leads to inefficiencies ie no physical space to review or examine patients; therefore there are delays in them being assessed and receiving treatment.</p> <p>3. Facilities and environment of cdu has limited additional space to accommodate friends and family who may accompany the patient.</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Patients dissatisfied with their experience: CDU patient survey results/Friends and Families Score reflect the long waits patients are experiencing. Current FFT figure is 92%. The detractors all relate to wait times, overcrowding whilst waiting and inappropriate conditions ie waiting in a chair, with patients reporting waiting 8-10 hours. This is particularly exacerbated when patients have already waited some considerable time in the Emergency Department.</p> <p>5. Increasing delays to ambulance attendees and emergency transfer patients from LRI, ED and AMU wards</p> <p>6. When on the level 1 and 2 divert patients who would be best served under geriatricians at the LRI are admitted into beds at GH and as a consequence the in -patient beds become occupied with these patients and the reduced bed capacity on the wards leads to reduced flow out of CDU and potentially leading the stopping of the cardio respiratory take. As a consequence patients who require cardio respiratory care are admitted to LRI.</p>	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Respiratory Consultant on CDU 5 days/week 0800-20 00 hrs</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Respiratory Consultant on CDU at weekends and bank holidays 0800-1200 hrs and on call thereafter</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Cardio Respiratory Streaming flow, including referral criteria and acceptance</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Short stay ward adjacent to CDU</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Discharge Lounge utilised</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> GH duty Manager present 24/7</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Bed Coordinator and Flow Coordinator 7 days/week daytime</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> CDU dash board - performance indicators</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> UHL bed state and triage times includes CDU data</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Daily nurse staffing review with plan to ensure safe staffing levels on CDU</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> EDIS operational on CDU</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Daily patient discharge conference calls for all wards</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Daily board rounds across all wards</p> <p>14: Cardiology Consultant assigned on CDU 5 days a week (shared rota)</p> <p>15: Matron of the Day - rota covers 7 day working</p> <p>16: Primary Care co ordinators and increase community support</p> <p>17 Escalation Plans</p> <p>18 Implementation of triage audit</p> <p>19 CDU operations meeting</p>	<p>Introduction of patient flow coordinator role on CDU - complete</p> <p>Catherine Free is supporting further work on the staffing model for CDU - 30/3/2016</p> <p>Appoint Respiratory CDU Consultant - 30/04/16</p> <p>Ambulatory Care Area supported by Cardiac and Respiratory Nurse and utilising the AMBS score - 30/04/16</p> <p>Monitoring of patient triage times and other quality performance indicators at monthly CDU ops meeting with appropriate representation from all staff groups - 30/04/16</p>

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
Z234	ED Emergency and Specialist Medicine	There is a medical staffing shortfall resulting in a risk of an understaffed Emergency Department impacting on patient care	30/04/2016 10/04/2013	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Consultant vacancies and non ED medical consultants. □ Middle grade vacancies. Due to a National Shortage of available trainees. Trainee attrition. Trainees not wanting to apply for consultant positions. Reduced cohesiveness as a trainee group.</p> <p>Junior grade vacancies. Juniors defecting to other specialties.</p> <p>Paediatric medical staffing.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Poor quality care. Lack of retention. Stress, poor morale and staff burnout. Increased sickness absence. Increased clinical incidents (SUI's), claims and complaints. Inability to do the general work of the department, including breaches of 4 hour target. Financial impacts from fines. Reduced ability to maintain CPD commitments for consultants/medical staff with subspeciality interest. Reduced ability to train and supervise junior doctors. Deskilling of consultants without subspeciality interest. Suboptimal training.</p>	Patients	<p>The chief executive and medical director have met with senior trainees in Leicester ED to invite them to apply for consultant positions.</p> <p>The East Midlands Local Education and training board has recognised middle grade shortages as a workforce issue and has set up several projects aiming to attract and retain emergency medicine trainees and consultants.</p> <p>Advanced nurse practitioners and non-training CT1 grades have been employed in order to backfill the shortage of SHO grade junior doctors.</p> <p>There has been shared teaching sessions in which non ED consultants and ED consultants have shared skills, (i.e. ED consultants learning about collapse in the elderly and elderly medicine consultants doing ALS). The non ED consultants have been set up on a specific mailing list so that new developments and departmental 'mini-teaches' (= learning cases from incidents) can be shared.</p> <p>Only approved locum agencies are used for ED internal locums and their CVs are checked for suitability prior to appointing them.</p> <p>Locums receive a brief shop floor induction on arrival and also must sign the green locum induction book, which introduces trust policies such as hand hygiene.</p> <p>Locums work only in a supervised environment (either by an ED consultant or a substantive middle grade). There is a specific consultant who is concerned with locum issues as per their job plan (Ashok Kumar). Poorly performing locums are not permitted to continue working and this is fed back to their agencies.</p>	Major	Almost certain	20	<p>Deanery report actions, completed.</p> <p>Guidelines to be created governing minimum standards of locum doctor approval completed.</p> <p>An internal induction document to be produced for locum grade doctors, completed.</p> <p>Review of shift vs rota and the required number of juniors per shift, completed.</p> <p>Doctor 'In Induction' badges have now been ordered to distinguish staff who cannot yet make decisions, completed.</p> <p>New rota for August 2014 juniors with higher number of doctors at CT3 level. Although there are still gaps at the Senior Registrar levels ST4 and above, completed.</p> <p>R & R Package to be relaunched, completed.</p> <p>Increase Locum Rates of pay - update, refused by trust board, completed.</p> <p>Continue recruitment to pillar strategy - due 31/03/2016.</p> <p>Continuation of International Recruitment - due 31/03/2016.</p> <p>R & R for ST3 staff with a 2yr contract until July 15 with review Completed CESR programme in house to attract staff - due 31/03/2016 Update on 29th Dec, new advert just gone out.</p> <p>(update on 13/10/2015 from RW. CESR Interviews on 03/11/15)</p>	6	RW

Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
CMG TAPS Risk ID 2333	Anaesthesia Lack of paediatric cardiac anaesthetists to maintain a WTD compliant rota leading to interruptions in service provision	30/06/2016 17/04/2014	Causes: Retirement of previous consultants Ill health of consultant Lack of applicants to replace substantively Consequences: Need for remaining paed anaesthetists to work a 1:2 rota on-call Lack of resilience puts cardiac workload at risk May adversely affect the national reputation of GGH as a centre of excellence Current rota non complaint Working Time Directive (WTD) Patients requiring urgent paed surgery may be at risk of having to be transferred to other centres Income stream relating to paed cardiac surgery may be subsequently affected Risk of suboptimal patient treatment resulting in harm.	Quality	1:2 rota covered by experience colleagues 12 month locum appointed	Major	Almost certain	20	Due to no suitable applicatns for substantive or locum Consultant posts which have been advertised twice a Specialist post is to be advertsied and converted to locum Consulntant for appropriate candidate - 30/06/16	8	DTR
CMG TAPS Risk ID 2763	Critical Care Risk of patient deterioration due to the cancellation of elective surgery as a result of lack of ICU capacity	31/03/2016 22/01/2016	Causes: Lack of capacity (beds) within ICU cross-site. Lack of base ward bed for ICU patients to be discharged. Lack of nursing staff to manage ICU patients. Delays with discharging ICU patients to Wards. Consequences: Deterioration in condition with the potential for patients to become too unwell to have surgery when re-booked or worse case scenario patient dies waiting for surgery. Impacts to quality of service through failure to meet treatment targets. Also, potential for increase in complaints from patients/family. Breach in contract. Reputation amongst other CMGs as an inability to provide a service. Potential to attract media interest. Potential for financial penalties due to inability to meet national targets.	Patients	Identify patients ready for discharge from ICU in previous 24 hours Highlight potential cancellations to consultant on call Electronic bed booking system to identify potential issues with electives Highlight to General Managers potential cancellations	Extreme	Likely	20	Increase capacity (6 beds) - 25/05/16 Use of agency staff - 25/05/16 Regular discussions cross-site with Consultants to balance the elective lists - 31/03/16	10	AGE

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
510	Blood Transfusion Clinical Support and Imaging	There is a risk of staff shortages impacting on the Blood Transfusion Service at UHL	15/03/2016 05/10/2006	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Staffing issues caused by turnover of staff (retirements / leavers).</p> <p>Post planning process poor - local and national shortages of qualified staff (BMS).</p> <p>Internal recruitment processes causing significant delay.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Possibility of temporary closure of satellite blood banks (LGH).</p> <p>Adverse impact on patient experience for patients requiring urgent transfusion (out of hours).</p> <p>Non-delivery of key acute services.</p> <p>Increased risk of claim /complaint.</p> <p>Adverse media attention / loss of reputation.</p> <p>Staff working extra shifts and more hours - fatigue;stress; non compliance with EWTD</p>	HR	<p>Full 24/7 rota implemented. Voluntary rota for spare sessions - sickness leave etc.</p> <p>Full rota has created additional sessions as satellite laboratories to comply with 24/7 working.</p> <p>Associate practitioners included in early and late roster sessions</p> <p>Associate practitioners to cover entire night at LRI</p> <p>Phased extended contractual hours 8 to 8 B.S & B.Transfusion</p> <p>Phased extended day B Transfusion to 23:00</p> <p>Employed Bank/Locum BMS staff to cover short term deficiencies in rota</p> <p>Investigate additional lean working options to reduce pressure on laboratory staff.</p> <p>Introduced a forced rota</p> <p>Multi discipline staff to assist cover overnight B.S(24/7) at LRI</p> <p>Retrained Lab Manager</p> <p>One-off training</p> <p>Risk assessed the process of a "Plan B"</p> <p>24/7 Rotas with voluntary sessions in place from May 2012</p> <p>2 new BMS band 5 staff recruited 24/09/2012 - to complete local competency training Feb 2013</p> <p>Introduction of cross cover form NUH to support UHL</p> <p>BT Roster - limited cover at present (Oct 2013)</p> <p>Numerous meetings taken place with empathy management team to raise acute risk of service failure (August 2013 to Jan 2014 & ongoing).</p> <p>Approval in principle agreed to replace vacancies and also create 12 month secondment role to band 8a for additional managerial support. Also to consolidate 3 x band 5 bank staff into fixed term contracts.</p>	Extreme	Likely	20	<p>Arrange full trial of Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP) - 31/03/16;Recruitment of replacement and additional staff to maintain Service 01/06/2016</p> <p>To review and re-asses capacity within depts, to move staff for multi disciplinary training - 31/03/16</p>	15	AEE

Speciality CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact Likelihood Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2787	Medical Records Clinical Support and Imaging Failure of medical records service delivery due to delay in electronic document and records management (EDRM) implementation	30/03/2016 17/02/2016	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Insufficient staffing to manage current levels of activity. Since 2013 all vacancies have been filled with fixed term contracts due to EDRM project. Paediatric EDRM rollout with failure of UHL staff to follow correct new business change processes - has not resulted in the expected reduction in activity. Delay in Adult EDRM rollout.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Potential for large-scale cancellation of requests, late availability of case notes and subsequent impact to patients including cancellation of procedures and appointments. Insufficient staffing to support the Access to Health records service leading to breaches of statutory compliance to government targets in relation to access requests. Also breaches or internal and external timescale for litigation and inquest cases which could result in financial penalties. Insufficient staffing leading to non-compliance with health & safety requirements due to overcrowded library storage areas. Also this increases the potential for increased staff long-term sickness due to musculoskeletal injuries as a result of working environment. Potential for increase in complaints about the service.</p>	Patients	<p>Use of A&C bank staff where possible, though very limited in supply.</p> <p>Use of overtime from remaining substantive staff (though dwindling due to duration of the EDRM project and subsequent delays); staff are tired and under pressure.</p> <p>Cancellation of non-clinical requests for case notes daily (e.g. audit) to minimise disruption to front line clinical need (though with clear consequent impact on other areas of service delivery).</p> <p>On going urgent recruitment to existing vacancies. A waiting list of suitable applicants has been created to minimise the risk of the current staffing levels reoccurring in the future. Medical records management supporting HRSS by chasing references and other checks.</p> <p>Daily review of staffing levels and management of requests with concentration of staffing in areas of greatest demand and clinical priority.</p>	Major Almost certain 20	Review current activity and staffing levels with a view to increasing staffing short term until adult EDRM go live accepting financial pressures - 31/03/16. Escalate issues and chase for full rollout of EDRM to adults - 31/03/16.	4	DWAT
2667	Maternity Women's and Children's Emergency Buzzer & Call Bell not audible clearly on Delivery Suite which could result in MDT being delayed to an emergency	31/03/2016 10/01/2015	<p>Cause:</p> <p>System not able to be repaired as now obsolete - so parts are no longer available.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>When an emergency arises the team may not be aware, causing a delay in the response. This could result in a delay in Medical & Midwifery staff responding to such emergency situations as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fetal Distress Post Partum Haemorrhage Maternal and/or Neonatal collapse Shoulder Dystocia Eclamptic Fits etc. <p>Such delays could potentially lead to a catastrophic outcome with regards to mother and baby.</p>	Quality	All staff are aware and reminded at the commencement of each shift to be extra vigilant.	Extreme Likely 20	Installation of new bell system Due 31/03/2016	5	ABUC

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2553	Neonatology Women's and Children's	There is a risk of spread of infection due to inadequate levels of cleaning on the Neonatal Unit (NNU) at LRI.	18/03/2016 06/09/2015	<p>Causes</p> <p>Reduction in the number of domestic (cleaning) hours by 4 hours PER DAY provided for the NNU, a very high risk area.</p> <p>Consequences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Unable to maintain an acceptable standard of cleanliness on NNU affecting quality and safety of babies care. 2.Breach of national specifications for cleanliness in the NHS. 3.Risk of infection outbreak on NNU resulting in increased mortality and morbidity of babies. 4.Risk of damage to NNU and Trust reputation and possible litigation. 	Patients	Daily meetings with Interserve from May 18th to review standards of cleanliness. Weekly ServiceTrack audits to be undertaken with Facilities and Infection prevention team.	Major	20	Reinstate cleaning hours to level to meet National Cleaning Standards - 18/03/2016	6	JFC
2562	Paediatrics Women's and Children's	There is a risk that 2 vacant consultant paediatric neurology vacancies could impact sustainability of the service	28/04/2016 18/06/2015	<p>Causes:</p> <p>National shortage of suitable candidates to fill vacant posts Substantive Consultant Staffing levels inadequate for continuity of service</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Delayed access to Consultant Paediatric Neurologist for inpatient & outpatient consultations. Loss of continuity for patients, families and Consultants as a result of changing workforce. Potential for a negative reputation of the service.</p>	Quality	We have 1 substantive appointment, 1 locum for 6 months and 1 Consultant General Paediatrician with an interest in Neurology on a 12 month NHS contract covered by Locum Agency and NHS fixed term contracts.	Major	20	Actively recruit to vacant posts - Due 16/05/2016 To work with NUH on a regional solution to service delivery - Due 31/08/2016	4	JVI

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2403	FE&C Corporate Nursing	There is a risk changes in the organisational structure will adversely affect water management arrangements in UHL	14/03/2016 19/08/2014	<p>Causes</p> <p>National guidance from the Health and Safety Executive advise that water management should fall under the auspices of hospital infection Prevention (IP) teams. Resources are not available within the UHL IP team to facilitate the above.</p> <p>Lack of clarity in UHL water management policy/plan. Since the award of the Facilities Management contract to Interserve the previous assurance structure for water management has been removed and a suitable replacement has not yet been implemented.</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>Resources not identified at local (i.e. ward/ CMG) or corporate (e.g. Interserve /IPC) level to perform flushing of water outlets leading to infection risks, including legionella pneumophila and pseudomonas aeruginosa to patients, staff and visitors from contaminated water.</p> <p>Non-compliance with national standards and breeches in statutory duty including financial penalty and/or prosecution of the Chief Executive by the HSE</p> <p>Adverse publicity and damage to reputation of the Trust and loss of public confidence</p> <p>Loss/interruption to service due to water contamination</p> <p>Potential for increase in complaints and litigation cases</p>	Quality	<p>Instruction re: the flushing of infrequently used outlets is incorporated into the Mandatory Infection Prevention training package for all clinical staff.</p> <p>Infection Prevention inbox receives all positive water microbiological test results and an IPN daily reviews this inbox and informs affected areas. This is to communicate/enable affected wards/depts to ensure Interserve is taking necessary corrective actions.</p> <p>Flushing of infrequently used outlets is part of the Interserve contract with UHL and this should be immediately reviewed to ensure this is being delivered by Interserve</p> <p>All Heads of Nursing have been advised through the Nursing Executive Team and via the widely communicated National Trust Development Action Plan (following their IP inspection visit in Dec 2013) that they must ensure that their wards and depts are keeping records of all flushing undertaken and this must be widely communicated</p> <p>Monitoring of flushing records has been incorporated into the CMG Infection Prevention Toolkit (reviewed monthly) and the Ward Review Tool (reviewed quarterly)</p>	Major	20	Almost certain	<p>Submit business case for additional funding to provide sufficient resource to either the IP team or NHS Horizons to enable the trust to carry out the requirements of the statutory and regulatory documents, with potential for full introduction and management of the "compass" system. - Funding for additional IPN agreed with FMS. Job description to be finally agreed and recruitment to commence during September 2015 - 14/3/16</p> <p>Review procedures and practices in other Trusts to ensure that UHL is reaching normative standards of practice - 14/3/16</p> <p>Review & agree Water Safety Plan - Water Safety Plan agreed and will be submitted to the Trust Infection Prevention Committee with the Implementation Plan on the 23rd Sept 2015 - 14/3/16</p>	4	LOOL

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2404	IE&C Corporate Nursing	There is a risk that inadequate management of Vascular Access Devices could result in increased morbidity and mortality	14/03/2016 19/08/2014	<p>Causes:</p> <p>There is currently no process for identifying patients with a centrally placed vascular access (CVAD) device within the trust.</p> <p>Lack of compliance with evidence based care bundles identified in areas where staff are not experienced in the management of CVAD's.</p> <p>There are no processes in place to assess staff competency during insertion and ongoing care of vascular access devices.</p> <p>Inconsistent compliance with existing policies.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Increased morbidity, mortality, length of stay, cost of additional treatment non-compliance with epic-3 guidelines 2014, non-compliance with criteria 1, 6 and 9 of the Health and Social Care Act 2010 and non-compliance with UHL policy B13/2010 revised Sept 2013, and UHL Guideline B33/2010 2010, non-compliance with MRSA action plan report on outcomes of root cause analyses submitted to commissioners twice yearly</p>	Quality	Policies are in place to minimise the risk to patients.	Major	20	Almost certain	<p>CVAD's identified on Nerve Centre - This is not possible so there remains no method of centrally identifying patients with these devices. For further discussion by the Vascular Access Committee - 14/03/2016</p> <p>Development of an education programme relating to on-going care of CVAD's - 14/03/2016</p> <p>Targeted surveillance in areas where low compliance identified via trust CVC audit - Yet to be established due to lack of staff required. For further review by the Vascular Access Committee - 14/03/2016</p> <p>Support the recommendations of the Vascular Access Committee action plans to increase the Vascular Access Team within the Trust in line with other organisations. Business Case to be submitted Sept by the CSI CMG 14/03/2016</p>	16	LOOL

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
1149	CHUGS	There is a risk to patient diagnosis and treatment due to a failure to deliver the cancer waiting time targets	<p>Causes: Competing priorities between RTT and Cancer targets, patient compliance, capacity and administration processes.</p> <p>Consequence: Delays in patient diagnosis and treatment due to the non delivery of 2ww, 62 day and 31 day cancer targets</p>	Statutory	<p>Attendance at the weekly Cancer Action Board meeting by tumour site representatives to review PTL and review cross speciality and department barriers to delivering the patient pathways.</p> <p>Attendance of the CMG at the monthly CMG Cancer Action Board to review and refine the cancer action plans for the tumour sites and review performance.</p> <p>Local PTL meetings within the individual tumour sites with Cancer tracking staff and General Managers/Service Managers to ensure that at an individual patient level, they are receiving care and treatment in line with the Cancer pathway timelines</p> <p>Review overall performance at the CMG Board Meeting and review local action plans;</p> <p>Attendance of Clinicians and Managers at the monthly Cancer Board to review patient pathways.</p> <p>Attendance at Weekly Access Meeting (WAM) to manage RTT admitted and non admitted performance.</p>	Major	16	<p>General Managers to highlight delays and issues to the senior CMG Management Team - 31/03/16;</p> <p>Review of local tumour site action plans monthly;</p> <p>Ensure continued attendance at CAB; Performance to be monitored at CMG Board</p>	6	MNA

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2471	CHUGS	There is a risk of poor quality imaging due to age of equipment resulting in suboptimal radiotherapy treatment.	<p>Causes: Using equipment beyond the recommended replacement age. Bosworth was 10 years old in November 2015, national guidance as well as the radiotherapy service specification recommends that LinearAccelerators are replaced after 10 years.</p> <p>Consequences: In the event of a major breakdown patients would need to be transferred to another radiotherapy centre resulting in inconvenience to the patient with the nearest centre over 30 miles away, and loss of income in the region of £1 million per annum to the trust. Loss of reputation with patients and commissioners using equipment over 10 years old Increased risk of CQC reportable incident due to poor imaging capabilities of the machine. Arrangement to be made with other radiotherapy centres to transfer patients Inability to develop new techniques which have the potential to bring in extra income Dependent upon dose and fractionation this could result in a significant amount of the intended dose being delivered to the wrong area with significant damage to the patient resulting in a reportable incident. Repeated high dose imaging due to deteriorating MV imaging panel increases the risk of exceeding current dose limits.</p>	Quality	<p>Increase in imaging dose (up to 10 MU) to produce a usable image. This however restricts the number of times an image may be repeated (due to dose limits). N.B imaging dose of 1MU is used on the Varian treatment machines.</p> <p>Pre-selection of patients with a reduced imaging requirement are booked on Bosworth. However this list is getting fewer and fewer due to best practice and national guidelines.</p> <p>We have introduced long day working on Varian machines to absorb patients that cannot be treated on Bosworth due to imaging limitations</p> <p>Clear Set-Up instructions plus photographs are provided to treatment staff to aid set-up. These do not fully eliminate the risk due to variable patient stability and condition hence the need for on-treatment imaging.</p>	Major	16	<p>Develop business plan for replacement of treatment machine. Briefing paper to be submitted to the Investment Committee Meeting.</p> <p>Replacement of Imaging panel to improve image quality and reduce imaging dose. However this does not solve the lack of online correction capability - This action is no longer going ahead as the Linac machine itself will be eventually replaced</p> <p>Restriction of patient numbers to be treated on Bosworth. - Complete</p> <p>Replacement of Linac - 31/3/17; Monitor progress of the replacement Linac on a quarterly basis through to the CMG Board</p>	4	LWI	

Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Risk Owner
CMG		Opened				Likelihood		Target Risk Score
Risk ID						Impact		
CHUGS 2565	There is a risk of delays in patient treatment due to failure to deliver non admitted and admitted RTT targets	31/03/2016 06/03/2015	<p>There are delays in patient treatment due to the failure to deliver national targets in General Surgery, Gastro and Urology; due to increased referrals and lack of capacity to deliver the targets.</p> <p>Patient safety implications including some appointments being cancelled at short notice. This means that some patients in these specialties are waiting longer for surgery, particularly those requiring an inpatient stay.</p> <p>Potential for non-compliance with national standards with significant risk to patients if unresolved.</p> <p>Potential for adverse media coverage (local/national) with an effect on public expectation.</p>	Targets	<p>Regular monitoring of the PTLs and activity levels by the speciality management teams. Review of position on a weekly basis within the services as well as at a corporate level.</p> <p>All services are putting on extra sessions as well as utilising independent sector partners to ensure patients are treated as soon as possible.</p> <p>While General Surgery continues to have a high backlog of patients waiting for surgery, their non-admitted performance is improving and is now at 40% of the level it was at the end of October.</p>	16 Likely Major	<p>RTT Position to be monitored by speciality teams on a daily basis and corrective actions put in place.</p> <p>Ensure validation is on-going and completed timely.</p> <p>Ensure issues are raised with corrective actions within the CMG. Review of RTT Position weekly with corporate team - due 31/3/16. Ongoing issues relating to RTT to be escalated to CMG Senior Management Team</p>	JFA 6

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2671	Gastroenterology	There is a risk of potential harm to patients due to delays in diagnostic and treatment procedures in the Endoscopy Unit	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Increase in referrals and workload through to Endoscopy; Inexperienced staff that have not had appropriate training and supervision; Vacancies in nursing and administration; Poor administration processes and unorganised working environment within the administration area (LGH); Backlog of patients on the Endoscopy Unit.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Referrals could go missing which may mean patients do not receive their procedure in a timely manner and a risk of harm due to delayed diagnosis; Lack of training and supervision means that staff are not following correct procedures to ensure that the waiting list is not an accurate reflection of numbers of patients waiting; Not meeting the RTT and Cancer targets; Vacancies within the nursing establishment mean that the staff are over stretched which means processes are not followed correctly and could result in staff psychological harm.</p>	Patients	<p>Matron appointed specifically to focus on nursing recruitment and management in Endoscopy only; Staffing model developed in line with neighbouring private & NHS providers and monitored by Matron. Waiting list management - patients now transferred to the active diagnostic waiting list 6 weeks after their due date (grace period as advised by TDA). Vacancies filled within the administration teams (either permanent or through bank). Weekly scheduling meetings with Sister/Deputy, Service Manager and A&C supervisor to ensure all lists are appropriately filled and to plan staffing levels for following week to reduce cancelled ops. 2WW patients offered an appointment by phone. Currently all other patients are sent an appointment with appropriate lead in time of three weeks. Endoscopy Manager has been appointed to review and change the clinical and administration processes within department; The administration area at the LGH has been cleared and there is senior presence on each of the three sites to supervise the staff; Administration SOP's developed to support the administration processes. Admin team time out afternoon to resolve problems and potential solutions and increase engagement. All staff to be reminded of their individual responsibility to follow Trust policy on incident reporting where they consider harm has occurred due to delay to patient treatment.</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>Training to be given to all staff re revised processes and new SOPs developed.</p> <p>Explore joint appointments with Alliance and UHL for nursing post, endoscopists and endoscopy nurses.</p> <p>Production of electronic referrals internal - 31/03/16.</p> <p>Additional CT Colon capacity to be introduced - 31/03/16.</p> <p>To improve Pathology turnaround times in Bowel Screening which needs to be done within 7 working days - 31/03/16.</p> <p>Clarify arrangements for reporting the outputs from clinical review of long waiters to ensure there is clear governance and oversight of issues and themes - 31/03/16.</p> <p>Consider offering appropriate patients the opportunity to administer their own enema at home prior to flexible sigmoidoscopy - 28/02/16.</p> <p>Implement formal monitoring and reporting of capacity utilisation including dropped lists and start/finish times as part of a suite of KPIs - 30/06/16.</p> <p>Investigate the possibility of moving to electronic requesting for endoscopy to speed up the process and remove reliance on paper forms, which need to be transferred between sites - 31/03/16.</p> <p>Monitor the time from the request form being completed to the patient being added to the waiting list to provide assurance this is within the Trust standard - 30/06/16.</p>	6	MNA

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2621	General Surgery CHUGGS	There is a risk to patient safety & quality due to poor skill mix on Ward 22, LRI	31/03/2016 20/10/2015	<p>Causes:</p> <p>During the last 12 months 10 nurses have left and 3 nurses have reduced their hours.</p> <p>Due to the high level of acuity of the patients and the number of daily ITU discharges at least 2-3 per day, it is difficult to get staff to work on the area from the nursing bank and agency.</p> <p>The levels of vacancies are 8 wte band 5. The continuous high acuity of patients also means that we have difficulty recruiting high caliber, experienced nurses to that ward.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>There is a risk to patient safety and quality due to the numbers of inexperienced trained nurses on ward 22 at LRI and an increase in acuity due to the high levels of ITU discharges.</p> <p>Further impacts could include staff injury (stress), inexperienced agency nurses and expense due to agency shifts.</p> <p>Inconsistent skill mix and continuity for patients on a shift by shift basis which may result in higher staff movement across CHUGGS wards.</p>	Patients	<p>Shifts escalated to bank and agency at an early stage;</p> <p>Increased the numbers of band 6's to provide leadership support.</p> <p>Agency contract in place for one nurse on day shift and night shift to increase nursing numbers.</p> <p>Staffing is reviewed on a day by day basis and staff are moved across the CMG to support the ward as required.</p> <p>Matron to work clinically on the ward for 2 days a week to provide support and increase nursing numbers.</p> <p>Matron to ensure daily matron ward rounds for leadership/ increased monitoring of care standards/accessibility to patients/relatives to discuss any concerns.</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>Implement rotational shifts for staff across other surgical/GI med wards to increase attractiveness to staff - completed</p> <p>Ongoing recruitment of international nurses - 31/03/16;</p> <p>Daily mitigation of staffing skill mix by matron and ward sister - 31/3/16; Training needs analysis of all registered nurses and action plan developed - 30/4/16.</p>	6	KJO
2623	Urology CHUGGS	There is a risk of potential harm due to scopes not being appropriately decontaminated.	31/03/2016 21/09/2015	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Failure of an RO machine to appropriately process the water supply.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>The risk is that we could cause harm to a patient if scopes are not properly decontaminated. If we remove the washers from service we will heavily impact patient outcomes, cancer and non-admitted pathways.</p> <p>There is a danger of causing infection and thus harm/cause death to a patient by using infected scopes.</p> <p>We continue to run a risk - as above - the problem remains unresolved.</p>	Patients	<p>UHL/IP policy (the Red Flag system)</p> <p>TVC Count is being checked regularly and discussions with theatres/endoscopy re use of their washers; medical staff informed prior to use.</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>UHL Exec to agree long-term solution and funding thereof as appropriate - 28/02/16; Paper to be presented to Capital Investment Committee as to the way forward for decontamination across the Trust;</p> <p>Final solution to be worked-up through the decontamination group - 30/4/16</p> <p>SOP also to be agreed - 31/03/16</p> <p>Emergency medical capital bid to be completed - complete.</p>	2	LDAL

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
Z591	Emergency and Specialist Medicine	Risk of increased demand in diabetes outpatient foot clinic leading to overbooked clinics which over run	31/06/2016 24/08/2015	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Increased volume of patients referred in from primary care needing MDT assessment.</p> <p>Majority of referrals are urgent due to high risk nature of patients.</p> <p>No increase in staffing capacity, therefore clinics are overbooked and over run.</p> <p>Inability to urgently transfer systemically unwell patients to be admitted to ESM due lack of transport.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Risk of patient harm (ulceration/amputation/sepsis) due to lack of capacity to see high risk patients urgently.</p> <p>Risk of delays in clinics.</p> <p>Risk of breaching national guidelines.</p> <p>Increasing workload of MDT foot team leading to stress and risk of mistakes.</p> <p>Risk to patients and staff when patients have to wait for transport to LRI when being admitted.</p>	Patients	The diabetes foot team follow NICE/FDUK Guidance for treating high risk foot patients Patients are triaged in accordance with LLR Diabetes Foot care Pathway. CCGs aware of increase in referrals from primary care Clinics are consistently over booked to attempt to accommodate increased demand Service review of Foot care undertaken including review of Podiatry SLA	Major	Likely	16	Review of Capacity and Demand following implementation of new foot clinic - 30/06/16. Urgent access to ambulances to transport patients in a timely manner explored - unable to offer dedicated service at present - complete.	8	JSPI

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2388	ED Emergency and Specialist Medicine	There is risk of delivering a poor and potentially unsafe service to patients presenting in ED with mental health conditions	30/03/2016 29/10/2014	<p>Causes:</p> <p>An increase of over 20% in ED attendances relating to mental health conditions in the past 5yrs.</p> <p>Inappropriate referrals into the ED of patients with mental health conditions.</p> <p>Limited resources and experience of staff in the ED to manage mental health conditions.</p> <p>The number of security staff has not increased with the increase in patient numbers (and are unable to restrain patients currently- see associated risk).</p> <p>The facilities in which to manage this patient group are inadequate for this patient group as not currently staffed.</p> <p>Poor systems in place between UHL, LPT, Police, CAHMS & EMAS to manage this patient group.</p> <p>High workload issues in the ED overall and overcapacity.</p> <p>National shortage of mental health beds, leading to placement delays for patients requiring in patient mental health beds.</p> <p>CAMHS service is limited. (11/02/2015, several recent SI's highlighted)</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Potentially vulnerable patients are able to leave the ED and are therefore at risk of coming to harm.</p> <p>There have been incidents reported where patients have been able to self harm whilst in the ED.</p> <p>Patients receive sub optimal care in terms of their mental health needs.</p> <p>Increased and serious incidents reported regarding various aspects of care of mental health patients.</p> <p>Patients' privacy and dignity is adversely affected.</p> <p>Risk of staff physical and mental injury/harm.</p>	Patients	<p>Security staff allocated to ED via SLA agreement (can intervene if staff become at risk).</p> <p>Violence & Aggression policy.</p> <p>Staff in ED undergo training with regard to mental health.</p> <p>Staff attend personal awareness training.</p> <p>Mental health pathway and assessment process in place in ED.</p> <p>Mental health triage nurse based in MH assessment area of ED, covering UCC and ED.</p> <p>ED Mental Health Nurse Practitioner employed in ED.</p> <p>Medical lead for mental health identified in ED from Consultant body.</p> <p>10/02/2015 update -</p> <p>Recent SI's related to CAHMS have been raised on the agenda of the Urgent Care Board.</p> <p>LLR System Urgent Care Board has agreed that they will commission an external independent investigation into the 3 recent Patient Safety Serious Incidents (SIs) relating to vulnerable children under the care of the CAMHS services. This process will follow the methodology set out for NHS organisations. Terms of reference agreed by John Adler.</p> <p>Urgent review across all agencies regarding people being detained in place of safety. Protocol being developed for management of younger people.</p> <p>Recent reports have been shared with the TDA UHL representation (JE) on the Health Economy Partnership Group</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>Task & Finish group to review security arrangements in terms of Control & Restraint practice in ED - complete</p> <p>Missing persons process for ED to append to UHL Missing Patients Policy - complete</p> <p>Agreement of role of security staff in ED and agree service level agreement to reflect this - 31/05/16</p> <p>Training to be available for ED staff with regard to management of aggressive patients, to include breakaway techniques - Completed, conflict resolution training now completed via E learning</p> <p>Roll out of Mental Health Study Day for ED staff - Complete.</p> <p>Develop plans in line with Government's "Mandate" to ensure no one in crisis will be turned away by - Completed. UHL are signed up to the crisis care concordat. No patients are turned away.</p> <p>Partnership working group set up to include UHL, LPT, EMAS & Police to look at improving response times and access to assessment for people with MH issues. Local area will have its own crisis care declaration including a joint statement which demonstrates the Concordat principles - completed.</p>	6	RW

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2193	Theatres	There is a risk that the ageing theatre estate and ventilation systems could result in an unplanned loss of capacity at the LRI	30/06/2016 28/06/2013	<p>Causes:</p> <p>The Theatre and Recovery estate and supporting plant(s) are old, unsupported from a maintenance perspective and not fit for purpose. There is recent history of unplanned loss of surgical functionality at the LRI site due to plant failure, problems with sluice plumbing and ventilation.</p> <p>In addition, the poor quality of the floors, walls, doors, fittings and ceilings mean an unfit working environment from a working life, infection prevention and patient experience perspectives.</p> <p>There is insufficient electricity and medical gas outlets per bed.</p> <p>Aged electrical sockets resulting in actual and potential electrical faults - fire in theatres at LRI (Theatre 4) in July 2013.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Periodic failure of the theatre estate (ventilation etc) so elective operating has to cease.</p> <p>Risk of complete failure of the theatre estate so elective and emergency operating has to stop.</p> <p>Increase risk of patient infections.</p> <p>Poor staff morale working in an aged and difficult working environment.</p> <p>Difficulty in recruiting and retaining specialised staff (theatre and anaesthetic) due to poor working environment.</p> <p>Poor patient experience - our most vulnerable patients arrive and are recovered in a dated environment, which does not promote confidence in the service, a sense of professionalism or safety.</p> <p>May impair delivery of life support technologies.</p>	Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regular contact with plant manufacturers to ensure any possible maintenance is carried out 2. Use of limited charitable funds available to purchase improvements such as new staff room chairs and anaesthetic stools - improve staff morale. 3. TAA building work completed. 4. Plan to develop full business case for new recovery build 2013 - start 2014 - Completed 5. Compliance with all IP&C recommendations where estate allows 7. Purchase of new disposable curtains for recovery area, reducing infection risk and improving look of environment - Completed 	16	<p>Recovery re-build - complete</p> <p>Capital investment and refurbishment of LRI theatres - 30/06/16.</p> <p>Ventilation audit actions to be undertaken as per Trust wide working party - 28/02/17. Staged approach - short, medium and long term actions to be monitored.</p>	4	PWA

Speciality CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact Likelihood	Current Risk Score Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2505 Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery	There is a risk of medical patients being outlied into the day surgical unit due to lack of beds within the trust.	31/03/2016 13/03/2015	Allocating Medical, Oncology or Haematology inpatients to the day surgery unit at the LRI when there is a shortage of inpatient beds for patients will result in additional risk for patients: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> The Day surgery unit is a purpose built area for patients undergoing a variety of day case surgical procedures. It currently has a mixture of adults, and community dentals patients on a daily basis. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Day surgery unit is currently open and staffed as follows: 07:30 am Monday (24hrs) until Saturday 8pm 3. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not suitable for inpatient care with dependant patients staying overnight due to the lack of basic facilities 4. <input type="checkbox"/> The inability to operate day case surgery and then patients being cancelled when the environment is occupied with in patients, and the risk of same sex breaches due to mixing inpatients/day case patients in the same ward environment 5. <input type="checkbox"/> The day case unit is currently not open on a Saturday and Sunday, and due to the high level of vacancies we would therefore need to rely on temporary staff to cover the outstanding shifts. Education and support would be required for the existing staff on the ward as they are not used to looking after this group of patients.	Patients	The day surgery unit to be used only when the trust has exhausted all other options available within UHL to accommodate the additional emergency patients. Senior decision makers within medicine are able to assess which patients are most suitable to be outlied to the day surgery unit based on the following nursing and medical criteria: Patients who are the most medically stable and meet the following criteria: <input type="checkbox"/> Ambulant patients <input type="checkbox"/> Do not score on EWS <input type="checkbox"/> Low falls risk <input type="checkbox"/> No Dementia or confusion <input type="checkbox"/> Patients near to discharge awaiting results <input type="checkbox"/> No high risk mental health patients	Major Likely	16	Matron/NIC to ensure that all patients meet the agreed criteria to be outlied. Medical matron to visit the area whilst inpatients remain on the day surgical unit to offer support and advice - 31/3/16 Safe staffing levels to be monitored and escalated by the NIC/Matron to ensure there is adequate staff to care for the extra patients on the day case unit - 31/3/16 Levels of privacy and dignity should be monitored at all times by the allocated staff - 31/3/16 NIC/Matron should ensure that patients and relatives are kept fully informed - 31/3/16 General Manager /CMG manager to explore the possibility of patient having their day case procedures on inpatient wards within the CMG prior to being cancelled <input type="checkbox"/> - On-going <input type="checkbox"/> Daily review of elective patients to proactively manage flow or cancel - 31/3/16	6	MAT
2541 Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery	There is a risk of reduced theatre & bed capacity at LRI due to increased spinal activity	31/03/2016 27/04/2015	Causes: Increased spinal activity Workload exceeds capacity Insufficient theatre capacity Reduced bed capacity Insufficient consultant numbers to operate spinal on call rota Inadequate junior doctor numbers Increased activity from out of areas in line with proposal to be regional spinal service Consequences: Financial loss though increased LoS Adverse effect on other trauma theatre and bed capacity Inability to take advantage of increased tariff from #NOF BPT due to knock on effect on capacity Increased morbidity Risk to reputation Risk to CT training programme Claims risk Decreased efficiency from increased split site working Insufficient Orthogeriatric cover for increased activity	Patients	Weekly Monitoring of performance against BPT criteria Monitoring of morbidity at M&M meetings Trauma Coordinator role implemented Cross organisational meetings with commissioners Trauma business case accepted for increased staffing across wards/departments and theatres Trauma unit meeting reinstated	Major Likely	16	Agree way forward for regional spinal service - Business case to be presented to R&I Committee - due March 2016. Protocol developed with NUH - complete Employment of further staff to support the spinal on call rota - completed. Employment and training of further TNPs to bolster junior doctor gaps and facilitate more stable CT training - Kate Machin/Nicola Grant - due May 2018	8	CSK

Specialty CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
ENT Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery 2/58	There is a risk that patients have not been treated / informed of test results in a timely manner in ENT	31/03/2016 13/04/2015	<p>Causes:-</p> <p>Increased number of virtual appointments for managing the results process in ENT.</p> <p>Admin staffing levels not adequate after previous A&C review to manage the core elements required - prepping and sitting clinics, making appointments.</p> <p>Virtual appointments not managed on a weekly basis.</p> <p>Consequences:-</p> <p>Backlog of virtual appointments - circa 800. Dating back to November 2014.</p> <p>Patients not informed of test result.</p> <p>GP's not informed of test results.</p> <p>Delays in patient's treatment.</p> <p>Delays in next appointments.</p> <p>Poor recording of 18 week pathways and virtual appointments.</p> <p>Increased number of complaints.</p>	Patients	Use of staff from other departments to deal with the backlog of virtuals. Radiology made aware weekly of results required. Hearing centre made aware weekly of balance test and hearing tests required. Secretaries prioritising typing of virtuals.	Major	16 Likely	<p>Business case describing investment required to increase admin support across key areas in ENT - Complete & approved</p> <p>Begin recruitment once all approvals in place - recruitment underway - still have 1.0wte vacancy - 31/03/16</p> <p>Induction programme for all new starters - programme in place - under review - 30/04/16</p> <p>Introduce new structure - 31/03/16</p> <p>Balance virtuals managed within the balance centre - Complete</p> <p>Identify 1 member of ENT team to take on virtuals until new structure implemented - Complete</p>	2	ARA
ENT Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery 2/59	There is a risk that performance targets are not met due to a capacity gap within the ENT department	31/03/2016 18/11/2015	<p>Causes:-</p> <p>Increasing referral rate - both routine and 2ww</p> <p>Increasing sub-specialisation</p> <p>Vacancies at consultant and fellow level - no suitable applicants for posts</p> <p>Changing complexity of casemix - particularly in head and neck non cancer workload</p> <p>Physical space constraints in theatres and ENT OPD</p> <p>Paediatric bed pressures</p> <p>Process issues within theatres reducing numbers of patients through lists</p> <p>Consequences:-</p> <p>Delays in patient's treatment.</p> <p>Not achieving cancer or RTT performance Delays in next appointments.</p> <p>Repeated cancellation of appointments.</p> <p>Increased number of complaints.</p> <p>Not achieving activity plan</p>	Patients	WLI for both IP and OPD work Use of independent sector Individual tracking of cancer patients to ensure prioritisation of most urgent cases	Major	16 Likely	<p>Recruitment plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H&N consultant - 30/04/16 - H&N fellow - 31/03/16 - Research fellows - Complete <p>OPD actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement tinnitus pathway - 30/04/16 Implement audiology grommet led FU's - 30/04/16 Develop business case for nurse practitioners - 31/03/16 <p>IP actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in week theatre sessions - 30/04/16 Designate paed only theatres - 31/03/16 Designate service only lists - 31/03/16 <p>Full capacity and demand review across ENT. To clearly show capacity gaps in terms of manpower, theatre and OPD space - Complete</p>	2	ARA

Specialty CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score Likelihood Impact	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2504	Trauma Orthopaedics Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery	31/03/2016 03/12/2015	<p>There is a risk that patients will wait for an unacceptable length of time for trauma surgery resulting in poor patient outcomes</p> <p>Causes: Increased spinal activity; workload exceeds capacity; under utilised theatre capacity; insufficient capacity at the weekend; inadequate junior doctor numbers; insufficient Orthogeriatrician input across 7 days; absence / under-provision of senior anaesthetic ward pre-assessment.</p> <p>Consequences: Patient safety and patient experience; financial loss through increased LoS; inability to take advantage of increased tariff from #NOF BPT; increased morbidity; risk to reputation; risk to CT training programme; litigation risk.</p>	Patients	<p>Weekly monitoring of performance against BPT criteria</p> <p>Monitoring of morbidity at M&M meetings</p> <p>LiA Event taken place to identify problem areas and potential solutions</p> <p>Action plan in place and monitored monthly</p> <p>Trauma Coordinator role implemented</p> <p>Increased Orthogeriatrician Input</p> <p>Mandatory reporting to CQRG</p> <p>Trauma unit meeting reinstated</p>	16 Likely Major	<p>Employment of further staff to support the service across 7 days as per the recent business case - 31/03/16.</p> <p>Employment and training of further TNPs to bolster junior doctor gaps and facilitate more stable CT training - 30/04/18.</p>	8	CSK
607	Blood Transfusion Clinical Support and Imaging	15/03/2016 22/12/2006	<p>Failure of UHL BT to fully comply with BCSH guidance and BSQR in relation to traceability and positive patient identification</p> <p>Causes: Failure to implement electronic tracking for blood and blood products to provide full traceability from donor to recipient</p> <p>Consequences: Potential loss of blood bank licence (via MHRA) with severe impact on surgery and transfusion dependent patients served by UHL. Financial penalty for non-compliance due to increased number of inspections Delay in timely supply of blood and blood components for new surgical and transfusion clinic patients. Increased potential for 'Never event' (i.e. wrong transfusion) leading to increased morbidity /mortality. Potential loss of Trust's good reputation via publication of critical reports.</p>	Quality	<p>Policies and procedures in place for correct patient identification and blood/ blood product identification to reduce risk of wrong transfusion.</p> <p>Paper system provides a degree of compliance with the regulations.</p> <p>Training and competency assessment for UHL staff involved in the transfusion process including e-learning and induction training with competency assessment for key staff groups.</p> <p>Regular monitoring and reporting system in relation to blood/ blood product traceability performance within department, to clinical areas and Transfusion Committee.</p>	16 Likely Major	<p>Staff training required to extract data from 'Winpath Path Manager' March-2016</p>	4	AFF

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Impact	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
1206	CT/MRI Clinical Support and Imaging	There is a risk that a backlog of unreported images in CT/MRI could result in a clinical incident	30/03/2016 28/07/2009	<p>Causes</p> <p>Backlog of unreported images on PAC'S (Plain Film, CT, MRI) which could lead to a major clinical risk incident and a potential for litigation and adverse media publicity.</p> <p>Royal College Radiologists guidelines state that all images should be reported</p> <p>IRMER require all images involving ionising radiation to be clinically evaluated</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>Risk of suboptimal treatment</p> <p>Potential for patient dissatisfaction / complaint</p> <p>Potential for litigation</p>	Patients	<p>Ongoing reporting by radiologists and reporting radiographers</p> <p>Allocation of CT/MRI examinations to a intended radiologist or specialty group</p> <p>House keeping done by clerical and superintendents to ensure images are visible on PACS.</p> <p>Outsourcing overdue reporting to medica.</p>	16	Likely	Major	Train more reporting radiographers - due 30/11/2016	6	ARI

Risk ID	Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
182	General Pathology Clinical Support and Imaging	POCT- Inappropriate patient Management due to inaccurate diagnostic results from Point Of Care Testing (POCT) equipment	15/04/2016 13/05/2005	<p>Incorrect diagnostic results from POCT equipment due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of Standard Operating Procedures (Sop's) and Competency documentation for POCT devices/analysers, Risk assessment and COSHH documentation (requires a POCT Team to achieve compliance) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate initial and on going training and competency assessment for users (requires a POCT Team to achieve compliance) 3. <input type="checkbox"/> POCT analysers/devices not being subject to the appropriate quality checks including: Internal quality control (IQC), External Quality Assurance (EQA), Maintenance and Calibration (requires a POCT Team to achieve compliance). 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of standardisation of POCT equipment (particularly blood gas analysers) with associated lack of consistency of POCT results. 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of standardisation regarding staff groups maintaining POCT equipment (particularly blood gas analysers). 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Limited POCT staff resources-exacerbated by the failure of the POCT Business Case to gain approval by the Trust Investment and Revenue Committee and POCT Manager post due to be vacant from October 2015. 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of POCT IT Connectivity 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Some duties will not be performed during the interim period between current POCT Manager retiring and post being filled eg. Glucose and ketone EQA, contact with manufacturers / engineers or ward areas for POCT issues, reports to Trust committees, equipment audits to check maintenance and quality checks are being performed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Unreliable diagnostic results potentially leading to mismanagement of patients leading to long term effects or death 	Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Committee for overseeing POCT trust wide is in place , 2. UHL Management of Point of Care Testing (POCT) Devices Policy 	Major	16	High	<p>Explore options for secondment post to replace POCT Manager vacancy - April.2016; Update business case to include Medical devices training Apr 2016; Resource funding for POCT team April 2016; UHL Blood gas standardisation programme 02/06/2016; To review interim arrangements for POCT provision April2016</p>	2	LEI

Speciality CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score Likelihood	Action summary	Risk Owner Target Risk Score
2487	Medical Physics Clinical Support and Imaging	31/03/2016 01/06/2015	<p>Causes: The lead clinician in Nuclear Medicine is on long term sick leave. He is the only PET ARSAC certificate holder in the Trust and the clinical lead for the service. The locum covering cardiac MPI is the only other experienced ARSAC certificate holder for MPI studies. His contract ends in Jan 2015. There are other ARSAC certificate holders who cover general Nuclear Medicine and paediatric work. Their time commitment to Nuclear Medicine is severely limited. There is only one Consultant Radiologist currently entitled to report PET images under the national contract. A second is experienced and has retained competence but requires some training and revalidation. There are a number of Consultant Radiologists who report MPI's and general Nuclear Medicine but none eligible or interested in gaining ARSAC certification</p> <p>Consequences: An ARSAC certificate holder for PET can be "borrowed" under the existing contract but the new contract will require a certificate holder within the Trust. This puts the plans for fixed PETCT at risk. Loss of MPI expertise will have a major impact on the service and on Imaging and MR throughput. Pressures on the consultant body to provide a comprehensive imaging service are high. The risks are that PET and MPI scanning are suspended, impacting on patients and business.</p>	Quality	<p>Imaging rotas re-arranged to increase reporting sessions from other Radiologists Consultants nominated as interim clinical leads - Carol Newland and Yvonne Rees Take action to provide clinician cover for ARSAC, reporting and clinical supervision - 30/12/14 completed Undertake clinical review - 30/12/14 completed Produce business case - 1/3/15 - completed</p>	Major	16	Appoint new clinician - 31/03/16	DPE 6
2378	Pharmacy Clinical Support and Imaging	31/03/2016 19/06/2014	<p>Causes: High levels of vacancies and sickness High levels of activity Training requirements for newly recruited staff</p> <p>Consequences: There is a risk that arises because of pharmacy workforce capacity across multiple teams which will result in reduced staff presence on wards or clinics, as well as capacity for core functions. This will result in reduced prescription screening capacity and the ability to intervene to prevent prescribing errors and other medicines governance issues in a number of areas including some high risk.</p>	HR	<p>extra hours being worked by part time staff team leaders involved in increased 'hands' on delivery staff time focused on patient care delivery (project time, meeting attendance reduced) Prioritisation of specific delivery issues e.g. high risk areas and discharge prescriptions, chemo suite</p>	Major	16	recruitment of senior pharmacist vacancies - 31/3/2016	CELL 8

Specialty CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score Likelihood Impact	Action summary	Risk Owner Target Risk Score
1926 Ultrasound Clinical Support and Imaging	There is a risk that insufficient staffing to manage ultrasound referrals could impact Trust operations and patient safety	30/03/2016 04/10/2012	Causes: Unfilled vacancies, out of hours inpatient lists and an increase in scanning time for nuchal screening Consequences: Patients waiting much longer for Imaging tests May affect ED 4 hour targets Negative effect on internal standard turnaround times for inpatients Further effect is to contribute towards Trust bed pressures; increased patient stays and breaches of targets (ED targets.) Radiology staff over stretched due to covering extra overtime continuously to meet targets and internal wait. Unsustainable service. Cost pressure from the use of agency staff and overtime payments	Patients	Staff volunteer to do overtime/extra duties . Agency and bank staff are being used to cover sessions	16 Likely Major	Recruit to vacancies - 30/03/2016	CLA 6
2384 Maternity Women's and Children's	There is an increased risk in the incidence of babies being born with HIE (moderate & severe) within UHL	09/03/2016 24/06/2014	Causes: Increased incidence of Hypoxic Ischemic Encephalopathy (HIE) within UHL 2012 2.3/1000 (2013 - further increase - incidence not defined). Compared to Trent & Yorkshire incidence 1.4/1000 births. Decision-making/capacity /CTG interpretation Midwifery staffing levels/Capacity Medical staffing levels overnight @LGH Consequences: Mismanagement of patient care Litigation risk Adverse publicity	Patients	Interim solution to increase capacity Monthly figures of HIE to be included in W&C dashboard Mandatory training for CTG/CTG Masterclass Weekly session to discuss CTG interpretation with junior doctors Active recruitment process for midwifery staff	16 Likely Major	Development of a decision education package focusing on the management of the 2nd stage of labour due - 08/03/16	ACURR 8

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2153	Paediatrics Women's and Children's	Shortfall in the number of all qualified nurses working in the Children's Hospital.	05/12/2016 03/05/2013	<p>Causes</p> <p>The Children's Hospital is currently experiencing a shortfall in the number of Children's registered nurses. This is due to high numbers of vacancies and staff on maternity leave and long term sickness.</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>There is a short fall in the number of appropriately qualified children's nurses in the Children's Hospital which could impact on the quality of patient care.</p>	HR	<p>Where possible the bed base is flexed on a daily bases to ensure we are maintaining our nurse to bed ratios</p> <p>There is an active campaign to recruit nurses locally, national and internationally</p> <p>Additional health care assistance have been employed to support the shortfall of qualified nurses. Specialise Nurses are helping to cover ward clinical shifts.</p> <p>Cardiac Liaison Team cover Outpatient clinics</p> <p>Overtime, bank & agency staff requested</p> <p>Head of Nursing, Lead Nurse, Matron and ECMO Co-ordinator cover clinical shifts</p> <p>Adult ICU staff cover shifts where possible</p> <p>Recruitment and retention premium in place to reduce turn-off of staff</p> <p>Part time staff being paid overtime</p> <p>Program in place for international nurses in the HDU and Intensive Care Environment</p> <p>Second Registration for Adult nurses in place</p>	Major	16	<p>Weekly metrics related to staffing shortages reported to CMG team and action taken where identified - due 11/01/17</p> <p>Complete staff safe levels daily and take action where required. Clear escalation process - Due 11/01/17</p> <p>Matrons daily ward rounds - due 11/1/17</p> <p>Second registration course to commence September 2015 and be evaluated - due 11/01/17</p> <p>Completion of a period of perceptorship for new international qualified nurses - due 30/01/2017</p> <p>Continue to recruit to remaining vacancies - due 30/01/17</p>	8	HKI
2394	Communications	No IT support for the clinical photography database (IMAN)	31/03/2016 07/04/2014	<p>Cause:</p> <p>IMAN stores the clinical photographs taken by the clinical photographers on behalf of clinical staff requesting them and form part of the patient's medical record. It contains >60,000 images of >9,000 patients since 2009. The hardware is supported by IM&T but is now out of warranty. The application software is no longer supported by its creator SEARCH Technologies (since April 2014).</p> <p>Consequence:</p> <p>If a fault were to occur with the database we cannot fix it. Clinicians would not be able to view the photographs of their patients. Patient safety will be jeopardised.</p>	Patients	<p>IM&T hardware support; IM&T Integration & Development team best endeavours to support the application software; separate backup of images on Apple server in Medical Illustration.</p> <p>Project brief published Nov 2014 for new database. Funding from IM&T agreed April 2015. Functional Specification for new system published Sep 2015.</p> <p>IM&T project support Oct 2015. IM&T project manager appointed Nov 2015. IM&T Functional Spec complete Dec 2015. Tender issued Feb 2016.</p>	Major	16	Seek Supplier responses to tender - 31/03/16	1	SAN

Risk ID	Speciality	CMG	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2338	Medical Directorate		There is a risk of patients not receiving medication and patients receiving the incorrect medication due to an unstable homecare	31/03/2016 05/01/2014	<p>Causes: A major homecare company has left the Homecare market requiring remaining companies to take on large numbers of patients. These companies are now experiencing difficulties in maintaining their current levels of service.</p> <p>Consequences: Existing providers of homecare services are having difficulties achieving satisfactory level of deliveries UHL patients are now being affected and poor patient experience. Patients receiving incorrect medication or not receiving any medication via homecare Patients having difficulties in contacting homecare telephone helplines. Potential interruption in supply of chemotherapy agents from Bath ASU. Deliveries not arriving leading to missed doses and also issues with patients having to take time of work to accept the deliveries There are a significant number of patients, clinicians and pharmacy staff who have lost confidence in the homecare services provided on behalf of UHL. As UHL have had to purchase these drugs, there is a loss of the VAT benefits that were originally gained by the health community. Adverse impact on Trust reputation Potential breaches of patient confidentiality</p>	Patients	<p>UHL Homecare team liaising with homecare companies to try and resolve issues of which they are made aware.</p> <p>H@H high risk patients currently being repatriated to UHL.</p> <p>UHL procurement pharmacist in discussion with NHS England (statement due out soon - timeframe unsure), and with the CMU. Patient groups and peer group discussions also been had to support patient education and support during this uncertain period. Reviewing which medicines can be done through UHL out-patient provider or through UHL Discussions with Medical Director and CMG (CSI) and clinical speciality teams to ensure that any necessary clinical pathway changes are supported Repatriation of urgent drugs back to UHL out-patient provider Self - assessment against Hackett criteria against all homecare schemes</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>Recruit to vacant homecare pharmacist post - March 2016 Agree income to support pharmacy homecare team with NHSE/CCGs - March 2016 Set up insourced subsidiary to allow repatriation of high risk patients - April 2016 Review of internal processes with rheumatology - March 2016</p>	9	CELL

Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Risk Owner
CMG	Opened	Target Risk Score			Impact	Likelihood		
Risk ID								
Medical Directorate 2237	There is a risk of results of outpatient diagnostic tests not being reviewed or acted upon resulting in patient harm	30/06/2016 10/07/2013	<p>Causes</p> <p>Outpatients use paper based requesting system and results come back on paper and electronically.</p> <p>Results not being reviewed acknowledged on IT results systems</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>Potential for mismanagement of patients to include:</p> <p>Severe harm or death to patient.</p> <p>Suboptimal treatment.</p> <p>Delayed diagnosis.</p> <p>Increased potential for incidents, complaints, inquests and claims.</p> <p>Risk of adverse publicity to UHL leading to loss of good reputation.</p> <p>Financial consequences to include:</p> <p>Potential increase in NHSLA contributions.</p> <p>Potential increased LOS.</p>	Patients	Abnormal pathology results escalation process Suspicious imaging findings escalated to MDTs Trust plan to replace iCM (to include mandatory fields requiring clinicians to acknowledge results).	16 Likely	<p>Implementation of Diagnostic testing policy across Trust - to ensure agreed specialty processes for outpatient management of diagnostic tests results - complete.</p> <p>Development IT work with IBM to improve results system for clinicians and Trust to develop EPR with fit for purpose results management system. - 30/06/16</p>	ADOS

Risk ID	Specialty	CMG	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
R325	Medical Directorate		There is a risk that security staff not assisting with restraint could impact on patient/staff safety	31/03/2016 04/03/2014	<p>Causes</p> <p>Interserve refusal to provide trained staff to carry out non-harmful physical intervention, holding and restraint skills, where patient control is necessary to deliver essential critical care to patients lacking capacity to consent to treatment. Insufficient UHL staff trained in use of non-harmful physical intervention and restraint skills to carry out patient control. Termination of Physical skills training contract with LPT provider in January 2014.</p> <p>Consequence</p> <p>Inability to deliver safe clinical interventions for patients lacking capacity who resist treatment and/or examination.</p> <p>Increased risk of Life threatening or serious harm to patients resisting clinical intervention</p> <p>Increased risk of injuries to patients due to physical interventions by inexperienced/untrained staff.</p> <p>Increased risk of injuries to untrained staff carrying out physical interventions.</p> <p>Increased risk of injuries to staff carrying out clinical procedures</p> <p>Requirement for increased staffing presence to carry out safe procedures</p> <p>Reduced quality of service due to diverted staff resources</p> <p>Increased risk of sick absence due to staff injury.</p> <p>Increased risk of complaints from patients and visitors</p> <p>Increased risk of failure to meet targets</p> <p>Adverse publicity</p>	Patients	<p>UHL Nursing and Horizons colleagues have met with Interserve and have agreed to issue a temporary indemnity notice that will provide vicarious liability cover for Interserve staff in these situations (supported by our legal team). This was rejected by Interserve Management.</p> <p>Cover with more UHL employed staff where there may be patients requiring this type of restraint.</p> <p>Staff must take risk assessed decisions about the use of restraint and ensure incidents are reported using the Trust's incident reporting database. In extreme cases staff should be aware that the police should be called</p> <p>Continue to communicate with all staff about the current position.</p>	Major	Likely	16	<p>Violence, abuse and unacceptable behaviour risk assessment complete and training needs analysis carried out for most of the CMG's. We have developed and implemented training packages to meet all three levels of conflict management training. A prioritised training programme is being worked through with ED and other higher risk areas being scheduled for the earliest training sessions - due review 31/03/16</p> <p>Additional generic CRT (Personal Safety) sessions scheduled and accessible for other depts/wards in addition to the prioritised ones. Other lower risk wards and depts are being systematically assessed. A paper has been submitted to the TED group identifying and requesting that the Personal Safety (CRT) course is made a mandatory requirement for front line staff to replace the half hour e learning - due review 31/03/16.</p>	6	DLO

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
Z093	R&I Medical Directorate	Athena Swan - potential Biomedical Research Unit funding issues.	31/03/2016 08/08/2014	The Athena SWAN Charter is a recognition scheme for UK universities and celebrates good employment practice for women working in science, engineering and technology (SET) departments. Standards required for next round of Biomedical Research Unit (BRU) submissions. Academic partners required to be at least Silver Status. Failure for the University to achieve this will result in UHL being unable to bid successfully for repeat funding of the BRUs. There is a very real possibility that UHL will loose ALL BRUs if this is not adequately addressed.	Economic	Every meeting with the University, Athena Swan is on the Agenda. Out of UHL control directly, but every avenue is being used to keep the emphasis high at the University. New high level process has been introduced at University of Leicester to drive and supervise the application.	Major	Likely	16	Medical school has submitted bid for Athena Swan Silver. Individual medical school departments are preparing separate bids for Athena Swan Silver if medical school bid unsuccessful - 31/03/16	4	CMAL

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
R318	EMUC	There is a risk of blocked drains causing leaks and localized flooding of sewage impacting on service provision	31/03/2016 17/03/2014	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Aging infrastructure unable to cope with the volume of sewage due to restrictions and narrowing of the pipes</p> <p>Staff, visitors and patients placing materials other than toilet paper into the drainage system including wipes, sanitary towels and nappies.</p> <p>Back flow sink drains are unprotected resulting in foreign bodies</p> <p>Consequence:</p> <p>Blockages build up easier and the older pipes cannot cope with the additional pressure causing leaks of raw sewage into occupied areas.</p> <p>Pipes cannot cope with the non-degradable materials and flooding occurs</p> <p>Localised flooding of clinical areas often involving areas on the floors below</p> <p>Foreign bodies block the drains and cause back fill and overspill of sinks and other facilities</p> <p>Clinical areas and staff areas become contaminated with raw sewage.</p> <p>Patients contaminated with sewage from leaks in the ceilings above their bays/beds.</p> <p>Whilst repairs are underway it may become necessary to isolate and turn off showers, toilets and washing facilities elsewhere in the building.</p> <p>Potential media coverage</p> <p>Quality and safe delivery of care compromised in areas of sewage leaks resulting in disruption to service</p> <p>Risk to health and safety of staff from an unsafe working environment resulting in contamination, slips and falls</p> <p>Increased risk of infections</p>	Quality	<p>CCTV surveys of drains completed as far as possible in Balmoral, Windsor, Victoria and Modular Wards. Remedial works carried out in priority areas. 14/01/16</p> <p>- Initial CCTV surveys carried out in 2015 this has lead to further remedial works including : improved access for rodding and cctv to stack in area 2 Balmoral COMPLETE. Installation of a new main drain to area 4 Balmoral (service Level) used to divert stacks from level 3 and above to external manhole. COMPLETION 31/03/16</p> <p>New main drain being installed in Service level 2 to divert 19 drain stacks to external drain, this reduces pressure on drains below level 3.</p> <p>Business Continuity Plans for all CMGs</p> <p>Single choice patient wipes agreed at NET.</p> <p>Reporting of the number of blockages monitored by NHS Horizons and by Trust.</p>	Major	High	16	<p>Initial CCTV surveys carried out in 2015 has lead to further remedial works including: improved access for rodding and cctv to stack in area 2 Balmoral COMPLETE.</p> <p>Installation of a new main drain to area 4 Balmoral (service Level) used to divert stacks from level 3 and above to external manhole - Due 31/03/16</p>	2	GLA

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2247	Corporate Nursing	There is a risk that a significant number of RN vacancies in UHL could affect patient safety	31/03/2016 30/10/2013	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Shortage of available Registered Nurses (RN) in Leicestershire.</p> <p>Nursing establishment review undertaken resulting in significant vacancies due to investment.</p> <p>Insufficient HRSS Capacity leading to delays in recruitment.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Potential increased clinical risk in areas.</p> <p>Increase in occurrence of pressure damage and patient falls.</p> <p>Increase in patient complaints.</p> <p>Reduced morale of staff, affecting retention of new starters.</p> <p>Risk to Trust reputation.</p> <p>Impact on Trust financial position due to premium rate staffing being utilised to maintain safety.</p> <p>Increased vacancies across UHL.</p> <p>Increased pay bill in terms of cover for establishment rotas prior to permanent appointments.</p> <p>HRSS capacity has not increased to coincide and support the increase in vacancies across the Trust.</p> <p>Delays in processing of pre employment checks due to increased recruitment activity.</p> <p>Delayed start dates for business critical posts.</p> <p>Benefits of bulk and other recruitment campaigns not being realised as effectively as anticipated and expected.</p> <p>Service areas outside of nursing being impacted upon due to emphasis on nursing roles.</p>	Patients	<p>HRSS structure review.</p> <p>A temporary Band 5 HRSS Team Leader appointed.</p> <p>A Nursing lead identified.</p> <p>Recruitment plan developed with fortnightly meetings to review progress.</p> <p>Vacancy monitoring.</p> <p>Bank/agency utilisation.</p> <p>Shift moves of staff.</p> <p>Ward Manager/Matron return to wards full time.</p>	16	<p>Over recruit HCAs. - 30/10/16</p> <p>Utilise other roles to liberate nursing time - 30/04/17</p>	12	MMC

Speciality	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Risk Owner
CMG		Opened				Likelihood		Target Risk Score
Risk ID						Impact		
Operations 1693	There is a risk of inaccuracies in clinical coding resulting in loss of income	31/03/2016 08/02/2011	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Casenote availability and casenote documentation.</p> <p>HISS/PatientCentre constraints (HRG codes not generated due to old version of Patient Administration System)</p> <p>High workload (coding per person above national average).</p> <p>Unable to recruit to trained coder posts (band 4/5)</p> <p>Inaccuracies / omissions in source documentation (e.g. case notes and discharge summaries may not include co-morbidities, high cost drugs may not be listed). Coding proformas/ ticklists designed (LiA scheme and previously) but not widely used.</p> <p>Electronic coding (Medicode Encoder) implemented February 2012 but not updated since (old versions of HRG). The system has no support model with IM&T, so errors are difficult to resolve.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Loss of income (PbR).</p> <p>Non- optimisation of HRG.</p> <p>Loss of Trust reputation.</p>	Economic	<p>As at Feb 2016 -4 newly trained Coders are in place. An audit cycle is established and coding backlog is being maintained at approximately 1 week (7000 spells uncoded). A Coding Workstream has commenced with CMG Head of Ops involvement to maximise availability of casenotes and quality documentation for Coding</p> <p>When notes are required urgently for other purposes, coding is undertaken with a "same day" turnaround. Reduced backlog minimises inefficiencies of multiple casenote transfers. An apprentice Coding runner has been employed to help with transfer of casenotes to the Coders for specific wards.</p> <p>Further trainees will commence in 2016.</p> <p>Dec15 - Currently attempting recruitment of Band 4,5 and 6 Coders in the wake of capped agency rates. A band 6 trainee Trainer has been appointed and is expected to commence in mid March 2016. Appointment of trained Coders continues to be challenging.</p> <p>Agency Coders are being used to backfill some of our vacant posts. An enhanced sessional weekend rate for our own trained Coders was introduced from May 2015 which encourages additional weekend working.</p>	16	<p>Work with CMGs / ward clerks to maximise transfer of casenotes to Clinical Coding - 31/03/16</p> <p>Appoint Coding trainer (Band 5/6) - 31/03/16</p> <p>Establish comprehensive IT support model for Medicode - 31/03/16</p> <p>Appoint replacement coding site lead (Band 6) - 30/04/16</p>	JFO

Speciality CMG Risk ID	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score Likelihood Impact	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2316 Business Continuity Operations	There is a risk of flooding from fluvial and pluvial sources resulting in interruption to Services	31/03/2016 03/06/2014	<p>Causes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pluvial flooding (all sites) external and internally Fluvial flooding (at LRI) from the River Soar Heavy, prolonged rain fall Winter snow/ice melt Blocked drains <p>Consequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of service areas/buildings/site To the full extent of the river soar flood plain the majority of the LRI would be flooded Sewage ingress Contamination of infrastructure Patient safety Loss of electrical supplies Loss of mains water and drainage Disruption to supply lines Staff difficulties getting in Staff difficulties getting home - staff car parks and vehicles flooded Reputation and publicity on the impact of flooding, the development of a site at risk from flooding, the response and recovery 	Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood Plan - LRF and UHL Response teams IPC Policy Local Business Continuity Plans UHL Major Incident Plan UHL/Multi-agency communications plan Insurance Policy Cooperate with LRF partners to test the LRF plans 	16 Likely Major	Update UHL flood plan to identify services and equipment at risk and identify control measures - 31/03/2016	12	PWA
2769 Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery	There is a risk of cross infection of MRSA as a result of unscreened emergency patients being cared for in the same ward bays	31/03/2016 02/01/2016	<p>Cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency patients being admitted to the wards and a lack of capacity to segregate screened and unscreened patients. Cross infection due to MRSA. <p>Consequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patient could acquire MRSA infection/bacteraemia. 	Patients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Screening on admission for all emergency surgical admissions. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Topical MRSA suppression treatment for all patients (antibacterial daily wash and antibacterial nasal ointment). 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Standard UHL precautions - hand hygiene/decontamination of equipment. 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Prompt identification of known MRSA carriers to initiate isolation precautions 	15 Possible Extreme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review screening processes for emergency patients/elective patients - 31/03/16 2. Education of staff on expected processes - 31/03/16 3. Review hand hygiene and servistrack audits and improve compliance where necessary - 31/03/16 4. Work with Microbiology on business case for PCR faster MRSA screening results for emergency patients - 31/03/16 5. Prompt screening and support IP processes across wards - 31/03/16 6. Process in place for nursing screening and unscreened patients separately - 31/03/16. <input type="checkbox"/> 	5	KWR

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2549	Orthodontics & Restorative Dentistry Musculoskeletal and Specialist Surgery	There is a known risk of excessive waiting times in the departments of Orthodontics and Restorative Dentistry	31/01/2016 10/01/2015	<p>Causes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Orthodontics - Treatment capacity reduced over the years (3 wte to 1.6 wte). No junior support (SpR, SAS grades) Poor OPD waiting list management with planned patients not being placed onto active waiting list when they are ready for treatment to begin. We are therefore not sighted to the true waiting time of the patients. - Restorative Dentistry - Increasing requirement for specialist work - particularly endodontic Capacity cannot keep up with the demand <p>Consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Orthodontics - 336 patients on the waiting list. Longest wait of 5.5 years - RTT start March 2010 Increasing number of complaints. Not able to provide an indication as to when they might start treatment. Psychological impact for the patient. - Restorative Dentistry - Closed to endodontic referrals - significantly reduced provision for this on the NHS within Leicester and Leicestershire. 20, 52 week breaches within August and September 2014. Affected the Trusts bottom line non-admitted performance. Increased complaints. 	Patients	<p>Endodontic waiting list closed to new referrals (Restorative Dentistry).</p> <p>Revised endodontic guidelines agreed and in place from 1.4.15.</p> <p>Managing the orthodontic patients in order by longest wait.</p>	Moderate	15	<p>Business case approved describing investment required to increase capacity - completed.</p> <p>Clinical and admin validation of orthodontic waiting list required. Public health to be involved - completed.</p> <p>Record all patients waiting times correctly on HISS - completed.</p> <p>Transfer patients to Nottingham - commissioner approval in place - completed.</p> <p>Transfer patients to Northampton - On progress, Northants are now only able to take 4 patients per month from dec 2015 - due 31/03/16.</p> <p>Recruitment of 2 locum consultant orthodontists (first advert did not elicit suitable candidates - re-advertised - due to lose mid October 15) - 31/01/16.</p> <p>□□</p> <p>TDA to agree with NHSE for the IPT of patients - completed.□□</p>	1	ARA

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2673	Cytogenetics Clinical Support and Imaging	Decommissioning of the cytogenetics laboratory service at UHL through the NHS England Review	<p>Causes: NHS England has a requirement to save 20% of the national specialised service commissioning budget. Genetic laboratory service provision, which is part specialist commissioned and part of the E01 Medical Genetics specification, is to be reconfigured through a procurement process overseen by NHS England in autumn 2014.</p> <p>Consequences: The cytogenetics laboratory at UHL will be unable to respond to the procurement specification as a stand alone laboratory on the basis of the outline specification. This is due to there being no molecular genetics laboratory within UHL that undertakes routine diagnostic clinical sequencing. Decommissioning of part of the cytogenetics laboratory repertoire within the remit of the procurement could destabilise the elements of the service that are out with of the specification which in turn could destabilise other services within UHL for example the HMDL service. Loss of a local laboratory would result in all samples being sent to other laboratories for analysis and may adversely affect patient care. Reduction in repertoire may result in loss of highly specialised clinical scientists and other technical staff.</p>	Targets	<p>Empath procurement specification utilising exiting services within UHL and NUH pathology services. This includes Molecular genetics at NUH and Empath molecular diagnostics to ensure that all elements of the procurement be addressed.</p> <p>Public consultation period clarifying the scope and service specification requirements in autumn 2014. Plans to form a single genetic laboratory service for the east midlands under Empath which would be able to cover the expected requirements of the service specification</p> <p>There is a verbal agreement to submit a joint response to the tender between UHL and NUH incorporating Empath services and genetics at NUH.</p>	Extreme	15	Possible	Submit successful tender for provision of genetic laboratory services to the East Midlands. Empath response to procurement (with NUH) - 15 April 2016	10	LOR

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2501	GY Women's and Children's	There is a risk of delay in gynaecology patient correspondence due to a backlog in typing	<p>Causes:</p> <p>An increase in the number of referrals to gynaecology services.</p> <p>1.0 wte vacancy of an audio typist.</p> <p>Bank and Agency staff being used to reduce typing backlog are not consistent especially during holiday periods.</p> <p>In addition delays can occur due to Consultants working cross-site and not accessing results promptly in order for the letters to be completed.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Delay in timely appointment letters to patients</p> <p>Delay in patients receiving results</p> <p>Delay in patients receiving follow up appointments</p> <p>Breach in the Trust standard for typing and sending out of patients letters (48 hours maximum time from date of dictation)</p> <p>As at 21/08/15 - there is a delay in gynaecology correspondence to the patient of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 weeks following a general gynaecology appointment at LRI - 8 weeks for 1st appointment letters for Colposcopy at LRI - 1 week and 5 days for colposcopy result letters at LRI - 10 days for communication to GP with regards to the patient. 	Quality	<p>2 week wait clinics or any letters highlighted on Windscribe in red are typed as urgent.</p> <p>Weekly admin management meeting standing agenda item: typing backlog by site also by Colposcopy and general gynaecology.</p> <p>Using Bank & Agency Staff.</p> <p>Protected typing for a limited number of staff.</p>	15	<p>Clearance of backlog of letters - due 30/04/2016</p> <p>Weekly admin management meeting standing agenda item: typing backlog by site also by Colposcopy and general gynaecology.</p> <p>Using Bank & Agency Staff.</p>	6	DMAR

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2402	IE&C Corporate Nursing	There is a risk that inappropriate decontamination practise may result in harm to patients and staff	14/03/2016 19/08/2014	<p>Causes: Endoscope Washer Disinfector (EWD) reprocessing is undertaken in multiple locations within UHL other than the Endoscopy Units.</p> <p>Consequences: Lack of oversight of Decontamination practice across the Trust Equipment purchased may not be capable of adequate decontamination if not approved by Infection Prevention Current Endoscope Washer Disinfectors (EWD) re-processing locations (other than endoscopy units) are unsatisfactory. All of the above having the potential for inadequately decontaminated equipment to be used Patient harm due to increased risk of infection Risk to staff health either by infection or chemical exposure Reputational damage to the organisation Financial penalty Risk of litigation Additional cost to the organisation when further equipment must be purchased</p>	Patients	<p>Surgical instrument decontamination outsourced to third party provider. Joint management board and operational group oversee this contract.</p> <p>The endoscopy units undergo Joint Advisory Group on GI endoscopy (JAG) accreditation. This is an external review that includes compliance with decontamination standards. All units are currently compliant.</p> <p>Current policy in place for decontamination of equipment at ward level. Equipment cleanliness at ward level is audited as part of monthly environmental audits and an annual Trust wide audit is carried out.</p> <p>Benchtop sterilisers are serviced by a third party Endoscope washer disinfectors are serviced as part of a maintenance contract</p> <p>Infection prevention team are auditing current decontamination practice within UHL.</p> <p>Position paper sent to Trust Infection Prevention Assurance Committee in November 2013</p> <p>Infection prevention team provide advice and support to service users if requested</p> <p>Endoscopy water test results monitored by IP team. Failed results sent to the team by Food and Water laboratory and these are followed up with relevant teams to ensure actions have been taken.</p>	Moderate	15	Almost certain	<p>Complete full review of decontamination practice within UHL and make recommendations for future practice - 14/03/2016</p> <p>Review all education and training for staff involved in reprocessing reusable medical equipment - 14/03/2016</p> <p>Review the use of equipment and the appropriateness of their current placement according to national guidance - 14/03/2016</p>	3	LOOL

Risk ID	Specialty	CMG	Risk Title	Review Date Opened	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Likelihood	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
1551	Quality	Corporate Nursing	Failure to manage Category C documents on UHL Document Management system (Insite)	31/03/2016 14/03/2011	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Lack of resource at CMG/directorate level to check review dates and enter local guidance onto the system in a timely manner.</p> <p>Lack of resource in CASE team effectively 'police' cat C documents</p> <p>Clinical guidelines very difficult to locate due to difficulties in navigating on InSite</p> <p>During migration from Sharepoint 2007 to Sharepoint 2010 searched documents displayed the titles of the files rather than the titles of documents.</p> <p>Consequences</p> <p>InSite may not contain the most recent versions of all category C documents.</p> <p>There may be duplication of documents with older versions being able to be accessed in addition to the most recent version.</p> <p>Staff may be following incorrect guidance (clinical or non-clinical) which could adversely impact on patient care.</p>	Quality	Reports run from Sharepoint to show review dates of guidelines for each CMG A review date and author have now been assigned to each Cat C where this is possible.	Moderate	15	Almost certain	<p>Make contact with lead authors in relation to out of review date documents - complete</p> <p>Compile a list of local guidelines requiring review and send to CMGs for action - complete</p> <p>CMGs to advise 'CRESPO' of any guidelines requiring urgent revision/ attention or that need to be removed from InSite - 31/03/16</p> <p>Provide a message on InSite to inform staff that work to improve the system is ongoing and if necessary advise can be sought from Rebecca Broughton/ Claire Stanley - complete</p> <p>Implement shared mailbox to receive responses from CMGs - complete</p> <p>Ensure input from IM&T to make InSite more effective as a document library - complete</p> <p>Continue work to assign review dates and authors to all CAT C documents 31/03/16</p> <p>Recruitment approved for Band 3 P&G Administrator - interviews set for 8/02/16.</p> <p>Appoint temporary staff to help address backlog of documents requiring review - complete.</p>	9	RBR/UG

Risk ID	Specialty	Risk Title	Review Date	Description of Risk	Risk subtype	Controls in place	Impact	Current Risk Score	Action summary	Target Risk Score	Risk Owner
2774	Operations	Delay in sending outpatient letters following consultations is resulting in a significant risk to patient safety & experience .	31/03/2016 25/01/2016	<p>Causes:</p> <p>Variability in the systems and processes for generating and sending letters.</p> <p>Lack of monitoring processes and oversight when performance falls below standard expectations.</p> <p>Problems with access to equipment in clinics making it more challenging for clinicians to dictate and e-approve letters in a timely way.</p> <p>Insufficient administrative and clerical staffing to support outpatient letter processes.</p> <p>Sub-optimal training for medical and administrative staff on how to use Dictate/Winscribe.</p> <p>Consequences:</p> <p>Backlog and potential lost letters i.e. in Winscribe. A sustained backlog will create a delay in patient prognosis. Affects the continuity of care of patients in a primary healthcare setting.</p> <p>Information about new/changed medication and patient results not getting to GPs.</p> <p>Prevents patients from having an insight into their condition and could also cause their condition to deteriorate.</p>	Patients	Third party electronic systems i.e. Dictate IT, Winscribe. Upgrading electronic system versions i.e. Dictate IT in order to help support improved outcomes. Differing performance monitoring mechanisms by managers and administrative teams within each CMG.	Moderate	15	<p>Review the current state of electronic systems used for generating outpatient letters within the Trust.</p> <p>Identify opportunities to implement a coordinated approach to systems within CMGs in order to improve turnaround times and reduce backlogs - due 31/03/16</p> <p>Investigate processes currently used for monitoring electronic systems, turnaround times and the adherence to the UHL policy of 'letters within 10 days' within CMGs with the view to implement a standardised monitoring process for all - due 31/03/16</p> <p>Ensuring for each CMG the most appropriate electronic system is chosen which is sufficient to meet the needs of its services; includes having the ability to outsource if required - due 30/06/16</p> <p>Once decisions have been made on which electronic system will be used within CMG's, ensuring there is sufficient training processes for medical and administrative staff in place - due 30/06/16</p>	6	WMONAG