Oxford University Hospitals NHS
NHS Trust

Trust Board Meeting: Wednesday 12 November 2014

TB2014.133

Title	**Mid-Year Review of Board Assurance Framework and Corporate Risk Register**

Status	For discussion
History	Previous version of the Board Assurance was considered by: • Board in May 2014 • TME in May 2014 • Quality Committee June 2014 • Finance & Performance Committee June 2014 The latest version of the full BAF and CRR was considered by the Audit Committee on 17 September 2014 and by Trust Management Executive on 23 October 2014. Extracts of relevant risks from the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) were reported to: • Quality Committee June 2014 and October 2014 • Finance & Performance Committee June 2014 and October 2014

Board Lead(s)	**Eileen Walsh, Director of Assurance**			
Key purpose	Strategy	**Assurance**	Policy	Performance

Executive Summary

1. This paper presents the mid-year review of the Board Assurance Framework (BAF) and Corporate Risk Register (CRR) to the Board. Both documents are subject to regular review by the Board sub-committees and the Trust Management Executive.
2. This report highlights the changes made to the BAF and CRR as a result of this review.

Recommendation

3. The Board is asked to:
    - Note the changes made to the BAF and highlight any further changes that may be required;
    - Review the changes to the CRR and consider if these changes are reasonable;
    - Note the emerging issues identified from horizon scanning and make any suggestions as to how to take these forward; and
    - Discuss the information presented in the risk register dashboard views.

1. Introduction

1.1. This report provides an opportunity for the Trust Board to review the Board Assurance Framework (BAF) and Corporate Risk Register (CRR).

1.2. The report provides a summary of changes to the BAF and CRR since the previous version presented to the Board Sub-Committees in October 2014 and to the Trust Management Executive in October 2014.

2. Changes to the BAF

2.1. As with the previous reports, all changes to the BAF (Appendix 1) have been highlighted in red and italics. A few minor changes have been made to the main body of the document as a result of the review but these have not been listed separately.

2.2. The Board is asked to review the BAF and note the changes made to it and highlight any further changes that may be required.

3. Changes to the CRR

3.1. The Corporate Risk Register (CRR) was reviewed in detail by the Trust Management Executive (TME) during August. The changes as a result of the discussions were formally ratified by TME on 11 September 2014 and discussed and accepted at the Quality Committee and Finance and Performance Committee held in October 2014. As a result of this extensive review, the mid-year review did not identify any changes to risk score.

3.2. As with previous reports all changes to the CRR (Appendix 2) have been highlighted in red and italics.

Risks escalated from Divisions and Corporate Directorates

3.3. Since the last review and following consultations with the five Divisions and Corporate Directorates, a number of risks were presented to TME for potential escalation to the CRR. Table 1 provides a summary of the decisions made at TME.

Table 1: Summary of escalated risk review decision

Source	Risk Description	Decision
C&W	Changes in Park and Ride arrangements may have a potential impact upon staff	Accepted on to CRR – further work to adequately describe and score the risk
S&O	Failure to fully comply with NICE Quality Standard 13 End of Life Care for Adults	Accepted on to CRR – further work to adequately describe and score the risk
S&O	Failure to comply with standard 4 of the NICE QS3 that Patients are re-assessed within 24 hours of admission for risk of VTE and bleeding.	Now resolved at Divisional Level so not added to CRR.
Medical Director Office	Potential failure to maintain medical revalidation processes due to a lack of sufficient appraisers.	Deferred: To be risk assessed at Divisional Level and monitored for a 3 month period for further consideration of escalation to CRR.

3.4. In October 2014, the Foundation Trust Programme Board was presented with a financial downside paper outlining key risks in the Integrated Business Plan with a risk score of 9 or above, and an approach to evaluating their impact on the downside model. As a result of this paper, a number of risks, not currently on the CRR were proposed to be considered for inclusion due to the potential financial impact upon the Trust. The table below was provided to the TME for consideration for inclusion into the CRR. It was agreed by TME, that these risks were component parts of the current risks included on the CRR are did not then need to be identified as separate risks in the CRR.

Ref	Downside Risk Description
1a	Loss of income from CQUIN targets
2b	Pension cost pressures not funded in tariff
2c	Adverse impact on balance sheet from calls on R&D
2d	Negative impact of changes to specialist services tariffs
4a	Over-performance on contract against non-elective and A&E activity

4. Horizon Scanning / Emerging Issues

4.1. The following emerging issues have been identified from horizon scanning within the Trust:

- The potential impact of the Better Care Fund in terms of financial allocations, this is currently being kept as a watching brief due to the changing national picture and local developments in this area.
- The potential impact of regulatory changes in relation to the **fit and proper person test** and how this might apply to the Trust's current recruitment processes for the relevant staff. Whilst it is acknowledged that these regulations, once published, will apply to new appointments, the Board may wish to discuss whether this might be applied to existing directors.
- The Trust's approach to changes in relation to the **Duty of Candour** in terms of the current reporting of moderate harm incidents (i.e. those incidents where the impact score is over 3 or greater) or the reporting of moderately scored incidents (i.e. those with an overall score of 12 and over).
- The potential impact of the overall changes to the CQC regulatory regime in terms of the need to educate staff around the changes and the need to amend the Trust's current approach to the assessment of compliance via CQC Assure.

5. Items for discussion

5.1. The information on the Risk Register Dashboard has been grouped to provide a range of different views of the CRR as follows:

View	Description	Page
1	**Risk Score Trend rolling 12 months:** The scores as presented in all papers from September 2012 to date have been included in this view and the overall trend for each individual risk included.	18
2	**Risks sorted by Risk Score:** The summary register has been sorted by current risk score giving the highest score first and then by the previous risk score to provide a view of changes to score	19

5.2. The Board is asked to review the risk dashboards and consider the following:

- In relation to view 1, are there any concerns in relation to those risks where the risk score has remained static for the past 12 months?
- In relation to view 2, are there any risks that now need to be reconsidered in the light of their relativity to other risks in the register?

6. Recommendations

6.1. The Board is asked to:

- Note the changes made to the BAF and highlight any further changes that may be required;
- Review the changes to the CRR and consider if these changes are reasonable;
- Note the emerging issues identified from horizon scanning and make any suggestions as to how to take these forward; and
- Discuss the information presented in the risk register dashboard views.

Eileen Walsh, Director of Assurance

Prepared by:

Clare Winch, Deputy Director of Assurance

November 2014

Appendix 1:
Board Assurance Framework

Assurance Summary / Assurance Dashboard

1. Board Assurance Framework for the delivery of Objectives

The Board has overall responsibility for ensuring systems and controls are in place, sufficient to mitigate any significant risks which may threaten the achievement of the strategic objectives. Assurance may be gained from a wide range of sources, but where ever possible it should be systematic, supported by evidence, independently verified, and incorporated within a robust governance process. The Board achieves this, primarily through the work of its Assurance committees, through use of Audit and other independent inspection and by systematic collection and scrutiny of performance data, to evidence the achievement of the objectives.

2. The Trust's Strategic Objectives for 2014/15 are:

SO1	To be a patient-centred organisation, providing high quality and compassionate care, within a culture of integrity and respect for patients and staff – **"delivering compassionate excellence"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulation 22; Outcome 13, reg 24 Outcome 6, reg 10 Outcome 16*
SO2	To be a well governed organisation with high standards of assurance, responsive to members and stakeholders in transforming services to meet future needs – **"a well governed and adaptable organisation"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulation 10, Outcome 16 Regulations 20 & 23, Outcomes 14 & 21*
SO3	To meet the challenges of the current economic climate and changes in the NHS by providing efficient and cost-effective services and better value healthcare – **"delivering better value healthcare"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulation 10, Outcome 16 Regulations 20 & 23, Outcomes 14 & 21*
SO4	To provide high quality general acute healthcare services to the population of Oxfordshire, including more joined up care across the local health and social care economy – **"delivering integrated healthcare"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulation 24; Outcome 6, 10, 16*
SO5	To develop extended clinical networks that benefit our partners and the people they serve. This will support the delivery of safe and sustainable services throughout the network of care that we are part of and our provision of high quality specialist are to the population of Oxfordshire and beyond – **"excellent secondary and specialist care through sustainable clinical networks"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulation 10, Outcome 16*
SO6	To lead the development of a durable partnerships with academic, health and social care partners and the life sciences industry to facilitate discovery, and implement its benefits – **"delivering the benefits of research and innovation to patients"** ***Health and Social Care Act Regulation and CQC outcomes which may be affected by the risk:*** *Regulations 21, 22 & 23, Outcomes 12, 13, 14*

3. Assurance Framework Legend

The Assurance Framework has the following headings:

Principal Risk:	What could prevent the objective from being achieved? Which area within organisation does this risk primarily impact on – clinical, organisational or financial?
Key Controls:	What controls / systems do we have in place to assist secure delivery of the objective?
Sources of Assurance:	Where can we gain evidence relating to the effectiveness of the controls / systems which we are relying on?
Assurances on the Effectiveness of controls:	What does the evidence tell us in relation to the effectiveness of the controls / systems which are being relied on?
Gaps in control:	Are there any gaps in the effectiveness of controls/ systems in place?
Gaps in assurance:	Where can we improve evidence about the effectiveness of one or more of the key controls / systems which we are relying on?
Action Plans:	Plans to address the gaps in control and / or assurance and indicative completion dates

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 1: Failure to maintain the quality of patient services.								
SO 1 SO 5 IBP Risk 1	**Potential Cause:** • Failure to meet the Trust's Quality Strategy goals (1.3). • Failure to deliver the quality aspects of contracts with the commissioners (1.4). • Patients experience indicators show a decline in quality (1.1). • Breach of CQC regulations (1.2). • CIPs impact on safety or unacceptably reduce service quality (1.5). **Potential Effect:** • Poor patient experience and standards of care. • Inaccurate or inappropriate media coverage. **Potential Impact:** • Potential loss of licence to practice. • Potential loss of reputation. • Financial penalties may be applied. • Poor Monitor Governance Risk Rating.	• Quality metrics in monthly Divisional Quality Reports • 'Safety Thermometer' data • 'Observations of care' reviews. • Patient feedback via complaints & claims. • Friends & Family test • Incident reporting. • Trust Values • Quality Strategy • CQUIN & Contract monitoring process. • Quality impact review process of all CIP plans. • Whistleblowing policy • M&M / clinical governance meetings at service level • Benchmarked outcomes data • Quality meetings between executives and PCT • Appraisal / revalidation • QA priorities • Pressure Ulcer Reduction Plan • Draft Public Health Strategy • Patient Experience Strategy • Patient feedback system to be implemented.	Reported to Board • Integrated Performance Reports (IPR) (L1 (L1)). • Reports from Quality Committee to Board (L 2). • Audit Committee Report to the Board (L2) • Annual H&S Report (L1) Reported elsewhere • Annual nursing skill mix review (L1). • Picker Patient and Staff Surveys (L2). • PROMs (L3). • GMC Trainee survey (patient safety) (L3). • National Clinical Audits/ (L3). • Audit Committee review Clinical Audit (L2)	Reported to Board • IPR (L1) (May 14, July 14 , *Sept 14*) • Reports from Quality Committee(L2) (May, July 14*, Sept 14*) • Audit Committee Report (L2) (May, July 14) • Quality Report (L1) (May, July 14, , *Sept 14*) • Patient Story Report (L1) (May, July 14, , *Sept 14*) • Nurse staffing (L1) (May, July 14, , *Sept 14*) • Monitor Quality Governance Framework (L3) (May 14) • CQC Inspection Action Plan L3 (July 14, , *Sept 14*) • Theatres Safety Review (L2) (July 14) • *Annual H&S Report (L1) (Sept 14)* • *Complaints Annual Report (L1)(Sept 14)* *Assurance in previous year* • *CQC Inspection Report (L3) (May 13)* • *Peer Review (L2) March 14) Safeguarding (L1) Nov 13)* • *Complaint's Annual Report (L1) (Sept 13)* • *Francis Enquiry Response (L1) (Sept 13)* • *Cavendish Compliance(L1) March 14)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 24, Level 2:9, Level 3:3)*	Quality Strategy to be implemented Monitoring process of progress on local quality goals to be developed.	Map to performance indicators and corporate score show no gaps identified at 16/10/2014	**Control Gap**: Implementation of Quality Strategy to be further embedded. Enhanced monitoring process to be developed to ensure local quality goals are attained. **Action Owner:** LW/TB – on-going	**Overall Risk Owner:** TB

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 2: Failure to maintain financial sustainability.								
SO 3 SO 5 IBP Risk 2	**Potential Cause**: • Failure to deliver the required levels of CIP (2.1). • Failure to effectively control pay and agency costs (2.2). • Failure to generate income from non-core healthcare activities (2.3). • Failure to manage outstanding historic debt (2.5). • Services display poor cost-effectiveness (2.4). **Potential Effect**: • Additional CIPS may need to be identified and delivered. **Potential Impact:** • Reductions in services or the level of service provision in some areas. • Potential loss in market share and or external intervention.	• Two-year rolling CIP with contingencies in place. • Divisional ownership of schemes. • Programme office support of schemes. • Contingency plans for strategic disinvestments and sale of assets, where necessary. • Performance Management Regime in place. • Budget setting & business planning processes. • Quality Impact Assessment process. • Bi-weekly monitoring of CIP programme • Contract monitoring process • PLICS in place – Trust part of DH PLICs based reference costing pilot • Revisions to SOs SFIs presented to Board Jan 14 • Declaration of Interests presented to Board Jan 14 • 6 facet survey completed.	Reported to Board • Director of Finance and Procurement Reports to the Board (L1) • Finance and Performance Committee (L2). • Audit Committee Report to the Board (L2) Reported elsewhere • Internal Audit review of CIPs (L3) • IA review of Financial Management arrangements (L3). • CIP reports to Quality Committee (L2). • Data Quality reviews with commissioners (L2) • Assessment against Monitor Risk Assessment Framework	Reported to Board • Finance reports (L1) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • F&P report to the Board (L2) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • Audit Committee Report to the Board (L2) (May, July 14) • TME report (L2) March 14, , *Sept 14*) • Trust Business Plan (L2) (May14) *Assurance in previous year* • *Finance Demand management (L1)* • *HDD Report (L3) (Nov 12)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 13, Level 2:12, Level 3:9)*	None at 16/10/2014	None at 16/10/2014	None at 16/10/2014	**Overall Risk Owner:** MM

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 3: Failure to maintain operational performance								
SO 1 SO 2 SO 3 SO 4 IBP Risk 3	**Potential Cause**: • Failure of national performance target (ED, cancer, RTT) (3.3,3.4, 3.5, 3.6) • Failure to reduce delayed transfers of care in the changing NHS environment (3.1). • Failure of accurate reporting and poor data due to implementation of EPR (3.2). • Inability to meet the Trust needs for capital investment (3.7) **Potential Effect:** • High numbers of people waiting for transfer from inpatient care. • Delays in patient flow, patients not seen in a timely way. • Reduced patient experience. • Failure of KPI's and self-certification. **Potential Impact**: • Services may be unaffordable. • Quality of care provided to patients may fall. • Loss in reputation. • Failure to meet contractual requirements. • Failure to gain FT status	• Monthly Program Board, with representation from OUH, social services and the PCT at C.E. level. • Bi-weekly Project Team meetings at COO and equivalent level. • Internal weekly DToC meetings. • Supported Discharge Service in place with 8 work streams. • Provider Action Plan (DTOC) • Monthly Chief Executives meetings. • A&E Action Plan • Internal Urgent Care Programme Board • Urgent Care Task Force • Diagnostic Waits Action Plan • Supported Hospital Discharge Service • Clinical Services Strategy. • Outpatient re-profiling.	Reported to Board • Director of Finance Reports to the Board (L1). • Integrated Performance Reports (L1) • Director of Clinical Services reports re review of services (L1). • Emergency Planning Annual Report (L1) • Audit Committee Report (L2) Reported elsewhere • ACE (Appropriate care for everyone) Programme Board meetings (L2). • PCT monthly Monitoring Review meetings (L3). • Chief Executive's Meetings (L2).	Reported to Board: • Finance reports (L1). (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • Integrated Performance Reports (L1) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • Audit Committee Report (L2) (May, July 14) • TME Report (L2) March 14, May 14, *Sept 14*) • Foundation Trust Update (L2) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • Cardiac Theatre Review (L2) (May 14) • Emergency Preparedness audit (L2) (May14, *Sept 14*) *Assurance in previous year* • *Winter Plan(L1) (Sept 13)* • *Cardiac Surgery Review (L3) Nov 13)* • *Discharge Improvement Programme (L1) March 14)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 9, Level 2:5, Level 3:1)*	None identified at 16/10/2014	Board reporting of performance to be further reviewed for any potential gaps.	**Assurance Gap:** Board approved review of reports **Action owner:** Head of Corporate Governance to act as facilitator - on-going	N/A for action (**Risk Owner** : PB)

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 4: Mismatch with commissioners plans.								
SO 2 SO 3 IBP Risk 4	**Potential Cause:** • Lack of robust plans across healthcare systems (4.2). • Loss of Commissioner alignment of plans between the Trust and the commissioner (4.3). • Failure to reduce activity through robust demand management plans (4.2) **Potential Effect:** • Loss of existing market share. • Stranded fixed costs due to poor demand management / QIPP. • Difficult to manage capacity plans. **Potential Impact:** • Reduced financial sustainability. • Inability to meet quality goals. • Reduced operational performance.	• 14/15 contract set at outturn for OCCG • Compliant 14/15 contract with specialist commissioners • Initial business cases for QIPP developed by OCCG • OUH to sit on QIPP Steering Group • External contracts to be operationalised internally • Monthly meetings with commissioners re outcome based commissioning.	Reported to Board • CE reports to Board (L1) • Director of Clinical Services reports re review of services (L1). • Finance Reports include contractual and commissioning issues, where relevant. (Level1) • Progress of agreeing contracts reported via Finance to Board annually (L1) • Business Cases involving commissioners reported, where these occur (L1) Reported elsewhere • Minutes of Network meetings (L2). • Update reports from Community Partnership Network (L2). • Minutes of Monthly Contract Review Meetings (L2) • Scrutiny from Finance and Performance Committee (L2)	Reported to Board: • CE reports to Board (L1) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) • FPC Report (L2) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) *Assurance in previous year* • *GP Engagement (L1) (July 2013)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 0, Level 2 :0,Level 3:0)*	None identified at 16/10/2014	None identified at 16/10/2014	None identified at 16/10/2014	(**Risk Owner** : AS)

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 5: Loss of share of current and potential markets.								
SO 3 SO 5 IBP Risk 5	**Potential Cause:** • Loss of existing market share (5.1). • Failure to gain share of new markets (5.2). • Negative media coverage relative to our competitors (5.3). • Lack of support for business cases (5.2). **Potential Effect:** • Poor staff morale. • Stifles innovative developments / ability to redesign services. **Potential Impact:** • Reduced influence/ reputation across the health economy. • Reduction in overall income reduced financial stability.	• Commissioner approved Network Strategies • Clinical Network meetings • Oxford Health collaborative arrangements. • Contingency plans for withdrawal from services. • Continued monitoring and engagement with local economy partners as set out in Risk 3. • AHSN Programme • Collaborative approach with OH	Reported to Board • Income element of Finance Report to Board (L1) • Director of Clinical Services reports re review of services (L1). • Chief Executive Reports include information re AHSN, where relevant (L1) Reported elsewhere • OUH won tender for integrated sexual health services (L1) • Report to Board workshop on collaborative work with OH (L1)	Reported to Board: • Finance reports to the Board (L1) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*). • CE Briefing (L1) (May, July 14, *Sept 14*) *Assurance in previous years* • *Review of Acute Medicine (L1) (Dec 2012)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 2, Level 2:0, Level 3:0)*	Commercial strategy for new and existing services Standard response to tendering of services	None identified at 16/10/2014	**Control Gap:** Director of Planning & Information: • Analysing current services to develop a clear strategy • Reviewing resource requirements re tendering responses. **Action owner:** AS on-going	N/A for action (**Risk Owner** : AS)

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 6: Failure to sustain an engaged and effective workforce.								
SO 1 SO 3 SO 5 IBP Risk 6	**Potential Cause:** • Difficulty in recruiting and retaining high-quality staff in certain areas (6.1). • Low levels of staff satisfaction (6.2). • Insufficient provision of appropriate education and learning development opportunities (6.3) • Failure to establish effective leadership and talent development interventions. **Potential Effect:** • Low levels of involvement and engagement in the trust's agenda. • Higher vacancy rates. • Poor staff health & wellbeing **Potential Impact:** • Poor patient experience and outcomes and patient survey results. • Loss of reputation • Reduced ability to embed new ways of working.	• 'Values into Action' / Listening into Action Programme in place. • Improved recruitment and induction processes. • Staff engagement and awareness programme in place. • Divisional Staff Survey Action Plans. • Value based interviewing project. • Education and development processes in place. • Appraisal compliance and training attendance monitored • Workforce Plan • Safe Staffing reviews • Recruitment & Retention Group • First Care system – absence management • OD & Workforce Strategy	Reported to Board • Director of Workforce Reports to Board (L1), • Integrated Performance Report to the Board (L1). • Staff survey and values update work reported specifically and through Quarterly workforce reports (L1). • Annual H&S Report (L1) Reported elsewhere • 1/4ly Pulse surveys	Regular reports to Board: • Integrated Performance Report (L1) (May, July 14*, Sept 14*) • HR & Workforce Report (L1) (May 14) • IG Review (L1) • Nurse staffing (L1) (May, July 14*, Sept 14*) • Post Graduate Medical Education Report (L2) (July 14) • *Annual H&S Report (L1) (Sept 14)* • *Leadership and Talent Development Strategy Framework (L1)(Sept 14)* *Assurance from previous years* • *Board Development (L1) March 2013* • *R&A Report (L2) (July 2013)* • *Education & Training Report (L1) Jan 14)* • *Medical Appraisal rates (L1) 13/14, March 14)* • *Cavendish Compliance (L1) March 14)* • *E&D annual report (L1) Mar14)* • *Staff Survey (L3) (Mar 14)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 6, Level 2:0 Level 3:7)*	IPR to include information in relation to vacancy levels by division and by staff group	Potential gaps in assurance include: • Lack of annual H&S report to Board	**Control Gap:** IPR to be included in Board approved review of reports **Action owner:** Head of Corporate Governance to act as facilitator – on-going **Assurance Gap:** Annual H&S report added to forward agenda for the Board. **Action owner:** Head of Corporate Governance	**Overall Risk Owner:** MP

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 7: Failure to deliver the required transformation of services.								
SO 2 SO 3 SO 4 IBP Risk 7	**Potential Cause:** • Failure to maintain an open culture consistent with the Trusts values (7.1). **Potential Effect:** • Failure to increase utilisation of high value resources and inability to reduce delivery costs. • Failure to deliver new patient pathways. • Failure to obtain the clinical advantages from EPR (7.5). • Failure to embed robust governance and assurance processes (7.6). **Potential Impact:** • Patient experience. • Performance issues. • Service fail to achieve long term sustainability.	• Quality Strategy and Implementation Plan • Clinical management structure • Learning & development framework. • Job planning • Appraisal • Leadership programmes • Enhanced patient involvement • Service Improvement Programmes. • Workforce Strategy. • Implementation Programmes with strategic documents.	Reported to Board • Director of Workforce Reports to Board (L1), • Reports from Quality Committee to Board (L2 • Director of Clinical Services reports re review of services (L1). • BGAF Internal Assessment (L1) External Assessment (L3) • Governance of Board Committees (L1) • Board Sub Committee appointments (L1) • Effectiveness of Board (L3) • Director of IM&T reports (L1) Reported elsewhere • Reports to Workforce Committee (L2) • Minutes of CIP Executive Group. (L2)	Regular reports: • Reports from Quality Committee (L2) (May, July 14, *Oct 14*) • BGAF Evidence Review (L2) (May 14) *Assurance from previous years:* • *NOC PPE review (L1) (Jan 13)* • *BGAF (L1) Sept 12) (L3) (Nov 12)* • *Business Cases / reviews (L1) (Sept 13)* • *EPR Updates (L1) Jan 13, Feb 13)* • *Board Effectiveness (L1 May 13)* • *Annual Review of Risk Management Strategy (L1) (Sept 13)* • *Annual Review of Assurance Strategy (L1) Nov 13)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 8, Level 2:4 Level 3:1)*	Coherent programmes for leadership to be developed.	None identified at 16/10/2014	**Control Gap:** Leadership working group to be established **Action Owner:** LW – on-going	**Overall Risk Owner:** PB

Ref no.	Principal Risk Description (CRR ref)	Key Controls	Sources of Assurance	Assurance on the Effectiveness of controls	Gaps in Control	Gaps in Assurance	Action Plans for gaps	Action plan / Owner
Principal Risk 8: Failure to deliver the benefits of strategic partnerships.								
SO 5 SO 6 IBP Risk 8	**Potential Cause:** • Failure to sustain effective regional networks (8.1). • Failure to provide adequate support for education (8.2). • Failure to support research and innovation (8.3). **Potential Effect:** • The emergence of more effective or innovative leaders elsewhere. • Failure to develop innovative services. **Potential Impact**: • Threat to sustainability of specialist services. • The possible requirement to scale back some services.	• Joint working agreement with Oxford Universities. • Strategic Partner Board 1/4ly meetings (Joint Chair Dame Fiona Caldicott) • Education and training strategy. • Lead role in AHSC – Local Oxford partners • Lead role in AHSN – Wider network partners • Clinical network groups. • Engagement strategy • DoC Trust Lead with CCGs, Oxford Health, SS in relationship management process. • Oxford Biomedical Research Centre • Biomedical Research Unit • Oxford Brooks Joint working agreement • Better Care Fund LA engagement • Vascular Network development	Reported to Board • Chief Executive reports to Board (L1). Reported elsewhere • Board to Board meetings with PCT (L2)	Reported to Board: • CE Briefing Strategic Partnership Update (L1) • Oxford Academic Health Sciences Annual Report (L2) (May 14) • *Annual R&D Governance and Performance Report (L1) (Sept 14)* • *BRC Report (L1) (Sept 14)* *Assurance from previous year:* • *AHSN Update (L1) (Nov 13)* Number of Assurances reported elsewhere *(Level 1: 0, Level 2:0 Level 3:0)*	None identified at 31/3/14 Joint Strategic Objectives to be developed	None identified at 31/3/14	No further action required at 31/3/14	**Overall Risk Owner:** AS

Appendix 2:
Corporate Risk Register

Key

esc	risk escalated from lower risk register
de-esc	risk de-escalated to a lower risk register
new	new risk identified through discussion

Trend

↑	risk score increasing
↔	risk score remains static for rolling 12 months
↓	risk score reducing
variable	risk score changes up and down overtime

Risk Dashboard View 1: Rolling 12 months

Risk/Lead	ID	Risk Description	Proximity	Nov-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Apr-14	Jun-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Trend	Target	Link to SO
PR 1: (TB)	1.1	Patients experience indicators show a decline in quality.	+ 12 mths	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	↔	4	SO1 SO5
	1.2	Breach of CQC regulations	3-12 mth	6	6	6	6	4	4	4	↓	2	
	1.3	Failure to meet the Trust's Quality Strategy goals.	+ 12 mths	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	↔	4	
	1.6	Poor Bed Management equipment replacement and decontamination facilities impact on patient safety	3-12 mths	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	↔	4	
	1.9	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001 Part A	3-12 mths	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	↔	3	
	1.10	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001 Part b	3-12 mths	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	↔	3	
	1.12	Staffing levels and skill mix consistently monitored and reported to Board	3-12 mths	6	6	6	4	4	4	4	↓	3	
	1.14	Poor clinical records management processes have a potential impact in quality and safety	3 mths	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	↔	4	
	1.16	Infection Control	3-12 mths		new	tbc	6	6	6	6	↔	4	
	1.17	Medicine Management	3-12 mths		new	tbc	5	5	3	3	↓	3	
	1.18	Patient transportation and co-ordindation of care	3-12 mths		new	tbc	15	15	9	9	↓	4	
	1.19	Pneumaonia - Risk Summit	3-12 mths		new	tbc	8	8	8	8	↔	3	
	1.20	Diabetes - Risk Summit	3-12 mths		new	tbc	12	12	12	12	↔	3	
	1.21	Out of hours care	3-12 mths			new	16	16	12	12	↓	4	
	1.22	Storage of Cylindars in Neonatal	3-12 mths			new	8	8	8	8	↔	6	
	1.23	Failure in the Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS)	3-12 mths				new	16	16	16	↔	8	
	1.24	Tie failure between EPR and CRIS poses a risk to accurate data recording and reporting	3-12 mths				new	15	9	9	↓	3	
	1.26	*Failure to comply with NICE Quality Standard 13 End of Life Care*	*3 mths*						*esc*	*tbc*	*new*	*tba*	
PR2: (MM)	2.1	Failure to deliver the required levels of CIP	3-12 mth	9	9	9	16	16	16	16	↑	9	SO3 SO5
	2.2	Failure to effectively control pay and agency costs.	3 mths	9	9	9	12	12	16	16	↑	9	
	2.4	Services display poor cost-effectiveness	3-12 mth	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	↔	4	
	2.5	Failure to manage outstanding debtors	3-12 mth	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	↔	4	
PR3: (PB)	3.1	Failure to reduce delayed transfers of care	3 mths	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	↔	12	SO1 SO2 SO3 SO4
	3.2	Failure of accurate reporting & poor data quality due to implementation of the EPR	3-12 mth	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	↓	4	
	3.3	Failure to deliver National A&E targets	3-12 mth	9	9	16	16	16	16	16	↑	6	
	3.4	Failure to deliver National Access targets 18 weeks	3-12 mth	6	6	12	12	12	12	12	↑	3	
	3.6	Failure to deliver National Access targets Cancer,	3-12 mth		new	9	9	9	9	9	↔	6	
	3.7	Inability to meet the Trust needs for capital investment	3-12 mth		new	tbc	12	12	12	12	↔	6	
	3.8	Long delays for patients accessing Spinal Services	3 mths					esc	12	12	↔	3	
	3.9	*Access to hospital site and current car parking constraints across the trust*	*3 mths*						*esc*	*tbc*	*new*	*tba*	
PR4: (AS)	4.2	Lack of robust plans across healthcare systems	3-12 mth	12	12	12	12	12	16	16	↑	6	SO2 SO3
	4.3	Loss of Commissioner alignment of plans between the Trust and commissioner	+ 12 mths	16	16	16	16	9	6	6	↓	6	
PR5: (AS)	5.3	Negative media coverage relative to our competitors	+ 12 mths	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	↔	3	SO3 SO5
PR6: MP	6.1	Difficulty recruiting and retaining high-quality staff in certain areas.	3-12 mth	8	8	6	6	6	16	16	↑	8	SO1 SO3 SO5
	6.2	Low levels of staff satisfaction, health & wellbeing and staff engagement	3-12 mth	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	↔	6	
	6.3	Insufficient provision of training, appraisals and development	3-12 mth	6	6	6	6	6	9	9	↑	3	
	6.5	Staffing in maternity service	3-12 mth	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	↔	4	
	6.6	Failure of non-compliance to CQC Action Plan	3-12 mths					new	12	12	↔	4	
PR7: (PB)	7.5	Failure to obtain the clinical advantages from EPR	3-12 mth	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	↔	6	SO2 SO3 SO4
	7.8	Building issues in the Women's Centre could lead to patient safety issues	3 mths	16	12	12	12	12	12	12	↓	3	
	7.9	Fire detection systems in the JR require upgrading	3 mths	16	16	16	16	12	12	12	↓	3	
	7.10	Failure of laboratory accreditation process due to poor pathology sample store facilities	3 mths	16	12	12	12	12	12	12	↓	3	
	7.12	Failure to Generate hot water and heat in retained parts of the Churchill estate	3 mths				12	12	12	12	↔	3	
	7.13	Failure to resolve Churchill PFI contractual and service performance issues	3-12 mth					esc	12	12	↔	6	
PR8: (AS)	8.1	Failure to establish sustainable regional networks	+ 12 mths	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	↔	2	SO5, SO6
	8.2	Failure to provide adequate support for education.	3-12 mth	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	↔	3	
	8.3	Failure to support research and innovation.	3-12 mth	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	↓	3	

Risk Dashboard View 2 : sorted by current risk score

ID	Risk Description	Proximity	current score	Target
3.1	Failure to reduce delayed transfers of care	3 mths	20	12
1.23	Failure in the Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS)	3-12 mths	16	8
2.1	Failure to deliver the required levels of CIP	3-12 mth	16	9
2.2	Failure to effectively control pay and agency costs.	3 mths	16	9
3.3	Failure to deliver National A&E targets	3-12 mth	16	6
4.2	Lack of robust plans across healthcare systems	3-12 mth	16	6
6.1	Difficulty recruiting and retaining high-quality staff in certain areas.	3-12 mth	16	8
1.10	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001 Part b	3-12 mths	12	3
1.20	Diabetes - Risk Summit	3-12 mths	12	3
1.21	Out of hours care	3-12 mths	12	4
3.4	Failure to deliver National Access targets 18 weeks	3-12 mth	12	3
3.7	Inability to meet the Trust needs for capital investment	3-12 mth	12	6
3.8	Long delays for patients accessing Spinal Services	3 mths	12	3
6.6	Failure of non-compliance to CQC Action Plan	3-12 mths	12	4
7.8	Building issues in the Women's Centre could lead to patient safety issues	3 mths	12	3
7.9	Fire detection systems in the JR require upgrading	3 mths	12	3
7.10	Failure of laboratory accreditation process due to poor pathology sample store facilities	3 mths	12	3
7.12	Failure to Generate hot water and heat in retained parts of the Churchill estate	3 mths	12	3
7.13	Failure to resolve Churchill PFI contractual and service performance issues	3-12 mth	12	6
1.6	Poor Bed Management equipment replacement and decontamination facilities impact on patient safety	3-12 mths	9	4
1.14	Poor clinical records management processes have a potential impact in quality and safety	3 mths	9	4
1.18	Patient transportation and co-ordindation of care	3-12 mths	9	4
1.24	Tie failure between EPR and CRIS poses a risk to accurate data recording and reporting	3-12 mths	9	3
3.6	Failure to deliver National Access targets Cancer,	3-12 mth	9	6
6.3	Insufficient provision of training, appraisals and development	3-12 mth	9	3
6.5	Staffing in maternity service	3-12 mth	9	4
1.9	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001 Part A	3-12 mths	8	3
1.19	Pneumaonia - Risk Summit	3-12 mths	8	3
1.22	Storage of Cylindars in Neonatal	3-12 mths	8	6
6.2	Low levels of staff satisfaction, health & wellbeing and staff engagement	3-12 mth	8	6
7.5	Failure to obtain the clinical advantages from EPR	3-12 mth	8	6
1.1	Patients experience indicators show a decline in quality.	+ 12 mths	6	4
1.3	Failure to meet the Trust's Quality Strategy goals.	+ 12 mths	6	4
1.16	Infection Control	3-12 mths	6	4
2.4	Services display poor cost-effectiveness	3-12 mth	6	4
2.5	Failure to manage outstanding debtors	3-12 mth	6	4
3.2	Failure of accurate reporting & poor data quality due to implementation of the EPR	3-12 mth	6	4
4.3	Loss of Commissioner alignment of plans between the Trust and commissioner	+ 12 mths	6	6
8.2	Failure to provide adequate support for education.	3-12 mth	6	3
1.2	Breach of CQC regulations	3-12 mth	4	2
1.12	Staffing levels and skill mix consistently monitored and reported to Board	3-12 mths	4	3
5.3	Negative media coverage relative to our competitors	+ 12 mths	4	3
8.1	Failure to establish sustainable regional networks	+ 12 mths	4	2
1.17	Medicine Management	3-12 mths	3	3
8.3	Failure to support research and innovation.	3-12 mth	3	3
1.26	*Failure to comply with NICE Quality Standard 13 End of Life Care*	*3 mths*	*tbc*	*tba*
3.9	*Access to hospital site and current car parking constraints across the trust*	*3 mths*	*tbc*	*tba*

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
Principal Risk 1: Failure to maintain the quality of patient services.													
1.1	CS	IBP	Patients experience indicators may show a decline in satisfaction with quality. **Cause:** • Negative experiences reported through annual national CQC Patient Survey Programmes and friends and family test **Effect:** • Failure to meet CQUIN goals **Impact:** • Potential loss of reputation & patient experience. • Negative media coverage	**Controls** • Improvements planned for improved patient feedback systems via a tender process due to complete December 2014. • Numerous examples at service level of patient experience information being collected and acted upon (patient stories). • Quality metrics in monthly Divisional Quality Reports • Peer review. • Patient feedback via complaints, complements & claims	Over 12 Mths	2	3	2	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						6		6				4	
1.2	EW	IBP	Potential breach of CQC regulations **Cause:** • Failure to maintain compliance with any one of the CQC's 16 essential outcomes **Effect:** • Patient experience and standards of care. • Financial penalties could be applied. • Trust fails to recognise and react to potential safety issues **Impact:** • Potential loss of licence to practice. • Poor Monitor Governance Risk Rating • Potential financial impact of specialist derogations	**Controls** • CQC Action Plan (s) in place and regular monitoring by TME • Health Assurance QA process in place. • HealthAssure system used to report CQC compliance at Divisional level • Quality Strategy and implementation plan • Values • Internal Peer Review Programme • Monthly quality dashboards and other quality data relating to ward care • Divisional inspection visits & declaration of compliance. • Director walkround process • Executive Director reports on safety issues and changes in service reported to the Board	3 -12 mths	2	2	2	2	↔	11/09/2014	1	2
						4		4				2	
1.3	TB	IBP	Potential failure to meet the Trust's Quality Strategy goals. **Cause**: • Lack of staff knowledge in relation to the Quality Strategy.	**Controls** • Quality Strategy in place. • Implementation Plan to embed Strategy monitored via Quality Account.	Over 12 mths	2	3	2	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						6		6				4	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			Effect: • Front line staff fails to monitor and measure quality in line with the strategy. **Impact:** • Potential loss of reputation • Goals are not achieved.	• Implementation permissive of localisation of Trust priorities to maximise relevance to clinical teams • Quality strategy to be embedded into employment processes, performance management and reward systems • Development off local metrics to monitor achievement of local quality goals. • Quality priorities linked to Quality Strategy and the contract • Safety Thermometer to be developed to monitor Trust wide goals (e.g. pressure ulcer reduction – link to 1.1) • Risk Summits • HSMR and SHMI Review									
1.6	PB	RA	Poor management of bed frames and other associated equipment **Cause** • Bed Frames: Centred on the change to regulations due to take place from April 2013. **Effect** • Bed Store / Repair sites: In relation to the suitability of the current locations. **Impact** • Risks to compliance with CQC, H&S and Fire regulations	**Controls** • Current store location managed by named individual in operations team. • Process for the tender of bed contract initialising. **Contingency** • Bed frame contract tender being scoped and specification in place to include Lo beds, bariatric and birthing beds *note: this risk has now been split to risk ref 1.25 to remove the risk of contamination from static foam mattresses, which was addressed via adequate controls and de-escalated.	3 -12 mths	3 9	3	3 9	3	↔	11/09/2014	2 4	2
1.9	TB	Esc	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001: Safer spinal (intrathecal), epidural and regional devices Part A (applies to non-chemotherapy spinal (intrathecal) bolus doses and lumbar puncture) **Cause:** • Risk of wrong route of administration due to compatibility of spinal devices with intravenous Luer connectors. **Effect** • Failure to comply with national guidance	• Steering group for this alert has an action plan to introduce safer devices first within anaesthesia (from October 2014), then within neurosciences and for lumbar puncture. This follows a clinical evaluation and a change to non Leur devices for chemotherapy this July. • Confirming where spinal needles are used for other indications to provide a suitable alternative device	3 -12 mths	2 8	4	2 8	4	↔	11/09/2014	1 3	3

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Patient harm **Impact:** • Patient safety and potential loss of reputation • Noncompliance with core safety standards e.g. CGC rating										
1.10	TB	*Esc*	CAS Alert NPSA 2011/PSA001: Safer spinal (intrathecal), epidural and regional devices Part B (applies to spinal infusions, all epidural and regional blocks) **Cause:** • Risk of wrong route of administration due to compatibility of epidural, spinal and regional infusion devices with intravenous Luer connectors. There is a national supply issue affecting all hospitals; at this time the Trust is unable to fully implement NPSA recommendations re introduction of safe connectors as some components are not commercially available. (NB. The epidural infusions currently available either use an iv spike to connect the infusion bag hence an iv medication could be given via the wrong route. Or the epidural infusion available with a different connector do not offer a local anaesthetic and opiate combination so would require addition in clinical areas which conflicts with NPSA alert on epidural infusions [2007]) **Effect** • Failure to comply with national guidance • Patient harm **Impact** • Patient safety and potential loss of reputation • Noncompliance with core safety standards e.g. CGC rating	• Epidural guidelines are in place for children and adults and reviewed regularly; staff training and competency assessments by the acute pain team; audits of epidural guidelines and results reported to the directorates as a quality metric. • Nerve block guidance is in development led by the Pain team. • Compliant epidural/regional block infusion devices for trust been purchased (but not meet full requirements of the alert). • Steering Group to work on an action plan to enable compliance once suitable devices and infusions are available. • Lead Pain Service Consultant and Nurse, Medicines Safety Pharmacist to meet 5.09.14 to review strategies to mitigate risk. • Action plan to be reviewed as ISO standard on non Leur connectables published, but not anticipated to be commercially available before early 2016.	3 -12 mths	3	4	3	4	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						12		12				6	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
1.12	CS	Esc	Potential failure to deliver and maintain safe staffing levels and skill mix, including out of hours cover. **Cause:** • Current processes are in the process of development and partially address Keogh recommendations on reporting to Board **Effect:** • Lack of transparency in reporting **Impact:** • Board may be unaware of potential staffing issues • Impact on quality and safety • Reputational risk • Potential financial pressure of meeting changing national staffing ratios	• Daily real time monitoring of safe staffing levels at all sites. Electronic Tool in use by ward staff and reporting of staffing levels at staff and bed capacity meetings on all four sites with twice daily email escalation for transparency right up to the Chief Nurse. • to calculate acuity and dependency of each patient over a two week period and validated within the divisions against nursing establishments using a quality assurance processes. • Quality Nurse Sensitive Indicators and HR metric dashboard designed use with the staffing data to develop a system of triangulation • All of the above for board reporting on wards. • Status of nurse staffing levels in Trust Board papers. • Requirement for an electronic tool to measure acuity - specification being drafted	within 3 mths	2	2	2	2	↔	14/08/2014	1	3
						4		4				3	
1.14	TB	TME	Poor clinical records management processes may have a potential impact in quality and safety **Cause & Effect:** • Temporary & multiple notes • Transportation on notes between sites and notes availability • Security of notes storage in some areas • EPR rollout – effects completeness of notes and raises questions around the links with other systems. **Impact:** • Quality and safety may be effected	• Tracking system in place • EPR Roll-out continues, risks reviewed and included on EPR risk register as identified • Training programme in place and delivered. • Links to other IT systems being addressed • CQC Action Plan includes actions in relation to records Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • E Learning Training Package to be implemented	3-12 mths	3	3	3	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						9		9				4	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
1.15	CS	RA	Excessive use of agency staff may pose a risk to the quality of service delivered **Cause:** • Negative experiences reported through patient feedback (for example, net promoter score) and other externally benchmarked feedback exercises. • Failure to provide adequate staffing trained at an appropriate level. **Effect:** • Failure to meet CQUIN goals • Negative media coverage **Impact:** • Potential loss of reputation & patient experience • *Loss of income from CQUIN targets*	• Management of workforce efficiency and temporary staffing meeting with revised terms of reference • Daily monitoring of safe staffing levels at all sites and staff moved to mitigate clinical risk. • Monitoring of all temporary staff including medical locums and nursing on the NHSP platform and reporting to the temporary staffing CIP group chaired by the Deputy Director of Clinical Services • Use of recognised agencies to ensure competencies as assessed • Local induction of agency staff according to Policy and documented • Recruitment campaign overseas and local; recruited- 95 EU nurses.—Vacancy rates much improved. Induction programme in place and 'English' support. Further recruitment campaign in planning with three agencies shortlisted and Divisional GM sign up including AHP and medical recruitment • Review undertaken of the EU nurse recruitment campaign including focus group of EU staff and feedback from senior clinical staff • Multi strata recruitment design to focus on Horton site and specialist posts including AHPs • Vacancy levels monitored monthly both through ESR and manual data inputted by matrons for nursing. • Long lines of rostered bank/agency I n place, and most expensive agency staff replaced by new recruits.	within 3 mths	3	3	3	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						9		9				6	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
1.16	TB	Peer review	Infection Control **Cause:** • Peer review identified some areas where cleanliness and adherence to correct procedures required improvement. **Effect:** • Patient experience and standards of care. • Trust fails to recognise and react to potential safety issues **Impact:** • Potential loss of reputation & patient experience • *Loss of income from CQUIN targets*	• TME to ensure monitoring of local divisional actions (good progress noted) • Each division has policies and procedures in place, as well as monitoring processes to ensure that standards of cleanliness are maintained • Divisions have taken immediate action to improve staff awareness. • Hand hygiene training sessions have been held and the senior management walk rounds, as well as routine monitoring are being used to monitor and improve current practice, where required.	*3 -12 mths*	3	2	3	2	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						6		6				4	
1.17	TB	Peer review	Aspects of medicines management were identified as an area that required improvement during the reviews across all divisions. This mainly related to the safe and secure storage of medicines. **Effect:** • Patient experience and standards of care • Financial penalties could be applied • Trust fails to recognise and react to potential safety issues **Impact:** • Potential loss of reputation & patient experience • *Loss of income from CQUIN targets*	• TME to ensure monitoring of local divisional actions (good progress noted) • Divisions have taken some immediate actions to ensure medicines are held securely. They have also begun to implement actions to improve staff's knowledge and awareness of the policies and procedures by disseminating 'At a glance' versions and ensuring staff have attended medicines training. • Monitoring is being undertaken by ward sisters and matrons through weekly checks to ensure staff are complying with the procedures and team meetings are being used to reinforce learning. Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Positive outcome from CQC Report	3 -12 mths	5	1	5	1	↔	11/09/2014	3	1
						5		5				3	
1.18	PB	Risk summit	Patient transportation and co-ordination of care **Cause:** • SCAS are 3rd party providers of	• Deputy Director of Clinical Services consulting with both CCGs and 3rd Party providers on contractual agreements	3-12 mths	3	3	3	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						9		9				4	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			transportation under contract to the CCGs in Swindon and Oxford respectively **Effect/Impact:** • Poor patient experience with patients left waiting for transport to arrive and subsequently late for appointments • Patient safety in delays of dialysis • Reputational damage	• Formal meeting held with ARIVA, Oxford CCG and Trust to discuss actions • Long term plan for contract(s) to be held between Trust and Service Provider • OCCG consultation about their non-urgent patient transport which ended on 8th August 2014 outcome being reviewed • Monthly meetings with SCAS and CCG regarding transport issues								
1.19	TB	Risk summit	Community Acquired Pneumonia in Adults Benchmarked outcome data for mortality was adverse – 5% higher than national mean (from Dr Foster Intelligence / HSMR). • Recognised that patients with CAP are found across many services such that the Trust's clinical management structure is not ideally placed to provide assurance as to the quality of management • Recognised that the respiratory service (Churchill) does not manage the majority of cases of pneumonia • National clinical audits suggested local deficiencies in documentation of risk stratification scores, and poor adherence with antimicrobial guidelines. **Cause:** • Poor clinical coding practice does not support assurance of quality of management. **Effect / Impact:** • suboptimal clinical outcomes • Reputational damage. • *Loss of income from CQUIN targets*	• Recognition that coding practice (and over use of term 'acute bronchitis' in this patient group) was a contributory factor – improved training of medical staff [on-going]. • Revision of antibiotic guidelines [complete]. • Introduction of Care Bundle [on-going]. • Develop standard in relation to radiology reporting times for admission chest x-rays [on-going]. • Develop improved level 2 care facilities on the John Radcliffe site [on-going].	3-12 mths	2	4 8	2	4 8	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3
1.20	TB	Risk summit	Management of Inpatient Diabetes **Cause:** • The annual national inpatient diabetes	• Implementation of Think Glucose approach across the Trust [on-going] • Enhanced staffing [business case	3-12 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			audit benchmarks and self-reported local information against national self-reported data. In the 2011 and 2012 rounds highlighted deficiencies with regard to: high medication errors, low involvement of diabetes specialists in care, and high rates of hypoglycaemia. **Effect / Impact:** • suboptimal clinical outcomes. • Reputational damage· .	approved] • Enhanced training and revision in training model [on-going] • Use of IT to facilitate identification and management of patients with diabetes [on-going] Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • TME monitor progress against action plan • Actions built into CQC Action Plans and also monitored via TME									
1.21	PB	Risk summit	Out of Hours Care (Care 24/7 Project) **Cause:** • Potential risk around multi-site working and super-specialization can favour silo working • Team working out of hours may be less advanced than in some areas. **Effect / Impact:** • suboptimal clinical outcomes, • poor staff and patient experience • reputational damage	• A series of risk summits held to agree principles and identify solutions for each site • Care 24/7 Programme in place monitored via TME Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • A series of work streams are in place and programme managed by Associate Director of Clinical Services • Out of hours rota now available via the Intranet to improved communication	3-12 mths	3 12	4	3 12	4	↔	11/09/2014	2 4	2
1.22	PB	Esc	Storage of oxygen cylinders in Neonatal **Cause:** • Storage of gas cylinders does not fully comply with health and safety guidelines **Effect:** • Potential for H&S review and penalties **Impact:** • Reputation of the Trust and financial penalty possible	• Clear identification of current cylinder storage areas • Sharing gas cylinder storage belonging to A&E dept. (located adjacent to PICU storage room.). • Raised with Estates, recognised as wider problem and escalated	3-12 mths	2 8	4	2 8	4	↔	11/09/2014	2 6	3
1.23	AS	Esc	Risk of inaccurate reporting & poor data quality due to failings in the Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS). **Cause:** Ineffective PACS infrastructure • Ineffective technical and team support. • Configuration of the DDP **Effect:** • PACS and Web PACS is slow (10	• Issues raised to the PACS team regarding speed • Network connect has been tested. • The PACS system was upgraded on 12th April 2014 and is being monitored by the PACS team • Retrieval time discussed with the PACs team who have escalated to GE. The upgrade on the 12th April also saw the	3-12 mths	4 16	4	4 16	4	↔	10/10//2014	2 8	4

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			seconds delay in loading) impacts on the MDTs and ability to discuss cases • Number of reports are reduced by the accumulation of time spent loading images • Incorrect image displayed as images switch between screens • two patient displays loaded at the same time Incorrect image can be assumed as current and thus, incorrect reports issued **Impact:** • Negative impact on patient care • Heightened clinical risk • Financial risk of increased claims	addition of 100MB server switches that are reputed to increase the speed • Screen display switches are related to default DDP settings. The issue has been raised with the PACS team who recommend that Radiologists checks their settings, however, this is not possible for Radiologists and the PACS team are in the process of resolving the issue • Contingency plan for staff to consciously check the date of the image on the screen prior to reporting. • Communication and updates are improving although downtime still seems lengthy. If a long downtime is evident then Clear Canvas and modality workstations can be used to report images. Although there are not sufficient for the number of consultants. • *Summit held with Supplier on 12 September 2014.* • *Joint Action Plan agreed and being implemented.* • *Follow up Summit to be held on 11 November 2014.*								
1.24	AS	Esc	Failure of accurate reporting & poor data quality due to implementation of the Electronic Patient Record (EPR) Tie failure between EPR and CRIS **Cause:** • Lack of adequate training on EPR • Ad hoc solutions offered to each service without understanding the consequences **Effect** • Consultants not added to CRIS in a timely fashion • Referrals not entered accurately or	• Radiology is reporting all ward tie failures, new consultants to IM&T for resolution. • Radiology is no longer rejecting requests without first contacting the clinician to ensure that they are aware of the issues. • Teams advised to revert to Pink cards (if OP) as this is not live yet, until the issues are resolved. • Meetings scheduled 20th June to discuss the Tie failures with CRIS and ensure a pathway between EPR and	3-12 mths	3 / 9	3	3 / 9	3	↔	10/10/2014	1 / 3	3

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			processed (if order comm) to the correct referrer • Incorrect referral location sent to CRIS • Examinations are not booked and reports not sent to the appropriate referrer **Impact:** • Negative patient experience and impact on care • Potential loss of reputation	CRIS. • *Project initiated to reconcile consultant list on CRIS with that on the EPR and to put in place arrangements to keep it up to date.*									
1.26	*TB*	*esc*	*Failure to comply with NICE Quality Standard 13 End of Life Care for Adults The following standards are currently non-compliant: Standard 1:..identified in a timely way Standard 9:..who experience a crisis at any time .. receive prompt, safe and effective urgent care appropriate to their needs and preferences Standard 11:.. have their care coordinated and delivered in accordance with their personalised care plan, including rapid access to holistic support, equipment and administration of medication Standard 16: Generalist and specialist services providing care ..have a multidisciplinary workforce sufficient in number and skill mix to provide high-quality care and support*	***Key controls**:* • *Guidance sought from Leadership Alliance for care of dying people following withdrawal of the Liverpool Care Pathway* • *Business case for increase in specialist palliative care provision* • *Group led by Medical Director and Chief Nurse to address the issue*	*within 3 mths*	*esc*		TBC		N E W	TBC	TBC	
Principal Risk 2: Failure to maintain financial sustainability.													
2.1	MM	IBP	Potential failure to deliver the required levels of CIP **Cause**: • High levels of local cost pressures. • Lack of engagement within clinical teams • Poor financial planning process. • *Over-performance on contract against non-elective & A&E activity* • If the Trust carries out levels of activity that exceed those within the OCCG	• CIP Steering Group • Reports to TME & Board • DoC and Director of Efficiency oversee CIP process. • Performance Management Process (1/4ly review meetings across all divisions) • CIP Operational Group • Business Planning process • Contract negotiation.	3 -12 mths	4 4 16		4 4 16		↔	11/09/2014	3 3 9	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			contract **Effect**: • Additional CIPS may need to be identified and delivered. **Impact:** • Reductions in services or the level of service provision in some areas. • Potential loss in market share +/ external intervention	• Business continuity									
2.2	MM	IBP	Potential failure to effectively control pay and agency costs. **Cause:** • Tariff reduction requires internal efficiencies that may not be sustainable. • *Pension cost pressures not funded in tariff* • *Negative changes to specialist services tariffs* • Lack of knowledge re safe staffing levels. **Effect:** • Poor financial controls destabilise the financial position. **Impact:** • Employee engagement and perceptions of safety	• Sickness management and monitoring • Workforce plans • Vacancy controls • Business Planning Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Individual divisional mitigations recorded and in place – to be monitored and reported via TME (as noted 7/8/14) • Additional financial controls around tighter signoff of agency usage at a higher level. • Strategy over use of financial contingency	Within 3 mths	4 16	4	4 16	*4*	↔	11/09/2014	3 9	3
2.4	MM	IBP	Services display poor cost-effectiveness. **Cause:** • Ineffective and insufficiently granular planning. • *Pension cost pressures not funded in tariff* • *Negative changes to specialist services tariffs* **Effect:** • Services not able to remain within existing budgets **Impact:** • Further cost pressures and need for additional CIPS • Potential financial impact is pension cost	• Budget setting processes in place linked to business planning. • Divisional efficiency meetings • Performance review process • Service Line Reporting • PLICS Steering Group and Project Plan • PLICS information mandatory to support all new business cases. Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Individual divisional mitigations recorded and in place – to be monitored and reported via TME (as noted 7/8/14) • Additional financial controls around	3 -12 mths	3 6	2	3 6	2	↔	11/09/2014	2 4	2

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			pressures are not recognised and funded within the tariff.	budget management and review of financial position • Strategy over use of financial contingency									
2.5	MM	IBP	Failure to manage outstanding debtors. **Cause**: • Lack of robust debt management processes **Effect:** • Increased need to make further savings • *Adverse impact on balance sheet from calls on R&D* **Impact:** • Potential loss in market share and or external intervention.	• Development of LTFM • Reporting to Board and F&P Committee • Cash flow forecasting • Debt Control Meetings weekly • Internal Audit review of process Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Individual divisional mitigations recorded and in place – to be monitored and reported via TME (as noted 7/8/14) • Additional financial controls around tighter recovery of debt • Strategy over use of financial contingency	3 -12 mths	2	3	2	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						6		6				4	
Principal Risk 3: Failure to maintain operational performance													
3.1	PB	IBP	Potential failure to reduce delayed transfers of care. **Cause**: • High numbers of people waiting for transfer from inpatient care. • Demography – ageing population with multiple long-term conditions • Failure of a joint approach to resolve delayed transfers of care across commissioners & provider organisations. • Recruitment difficulties in social care. • Poor access to community beds or provision care to maintain patients in their own home **Effect:** • Poor patient experience • Failure to meet Monitor standard • Loss of reputation • Capacity used exceeds plan • High costs of temporary capacity	**Internal:** • Daily monitoring of DToC & escalation beds; Monthly Divisional Performance Reviews; Reporting & monitoring to Trust Management Executive & Trust Board monthly. **Actions taken** • Implemented Trust Supported Discharge scheme • Implemented Step-down wards within JR and Horton • Opened escalation beds • Reviewed Escalation Procedures • Health Liaison meeting with health & social care partners • Implemented system wide discharge pathway for frail & elderly patients • Capacity escalation procedures in place **External:**	Within 3 mths	5	4	5	4	↔	11/09/2014	3	4
						20		20				12	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Inpatient episodes funded at only 30% marginal rate • Delays in patient flow, patients not seen in a timely way. **Impact**: • Prevents reduction in acute capacity and costs • Delays to service integration and site moves • Financial impact from the requirement to maintain additional beds. • Financial impact through increased penalties • Quality of care provided to patients may fall. • Loss in reputation.	• CEO & DCS attendance at ACE joint provider programme Board, & OP/JAP joint commissioning/provider meetings • DTOC Provider COO's meetings established to over se implementation of 8 work streams – prime object to reduce DTOC									
3.2	AS	IBP	Potential failure of accurate reporting & poor data quality due to implementation of the Electronic Patient Record(EPR) **Cause:** • Poor data to manage key access targets • Poor data quality • Implementation of EPR has led to or has been perceived by the PCT/CCG to have led to deterioration in data quality. **Effect:** • Patients not seen in a timely way, poor patient experience. • Board does not have sufficient assurance on service and financial performance. • Trust will have a reduced rating on external assurance. • Trust will fail service and financial targets because managers do not have adequate information. • Reputational damage • Loss of commissioning income. • Loss of support from PCT/CCG	**Internal** • Data quality overseen by Information Governance and Data Quality Group • Weekly EPR meetings with clinical & operational staff & Suppliers • Clear programme of work to improve data quality, workflow, training & fixes into EPR. • Data Quality benchmarked against other Trusts • Risk assessed key clinical areas to reduce impact of patient care • Regular operational performance meetings address RTT data quality • Monthly EPR Operational Steering & EPR Programme oversight meetings in place. • Trust Board and Audit Committee to have specific updates from Programme Board • Quality reports have reported on operational issues. • Data Quality dashboard in place to monitor weekly progress	3-12 mths	2	3 6	2	3 6	↔	11/09/2014	2	2 4

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			Impact: • Failure to meet contractual requirements, increased costs. • Failure to gain FT status • Failure of ED Monitor standard – Red Flag • Increased costs of temporary staff & in additional capacity. • Unable to manage key access targets • Potential loss of credibility with commissioners. • Failure to gain FT status.	• Independent audits. • Regular data quality internal audits undertaken. • Programme of Divisional data quality audits undertaken on a quarterly cycle. • Director Walkarounds. • Data Quality Board & Data Quality Assurance Review Process DQ tool to be rolled out • Integrated performance Report – assessment of data quality made on each indicator. Data Quality processes for non-standard reporting items developing **External** • CEO led Supplier & NHS meeting • Monthly PCT contract meeting • External reporting to SHA									
3.3	PB	IBP	Failure to deliver National Access targets in relation to A/E and the increasing level of delays impacting on patient flow **Cause:** • Lack of sufficient capacity/workforce • Increase in demand or failure of health system to divert patients. • Poor bed availability due to delayed transfers of care. • Failure to deliver efficient patient pathways. • Poor Productivity **Effect:** • Patients waiting longer – NHS Constitution • Poor patient experience • Loss of Reputation • High costs of temp capacity & workforce • Failure of access targets and Monitor's compliance standards. • Poor staff morale • Patients not seen in a timely way	**Internal `** • Daily & weekly monitoring of key access targets; Weekly EPR meetings; Monthly EPR Operational & Monthly EPR Programme Board meetings • Daily whole system teleconference calls • Contingency & Recovery plans in place • Fortnightly performance meetings • Monthly Divisional performance meetings; Monthly reporting & monitoring access targets through Trust Management executive & Trust Board • Implemented MSK Hub for demand management • Reviewed complaints/Patient experience at Board • Review of Incidents at Board • Board walk rounds	3-12 mths	4	4	4	4	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						16		16				6	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			Impact: • Failure to meet contractual requirements, increased costs. • Failure to gain FT status • Failure of ED Monitor standard – Red Flag • Increased costs of temporary staff & in additional capacity. • Financial impact through increased penalties	**External** • OUH senior manager attendance at Urgent Care taskforce, Planned care Programme Board & Long Term Conditions. • Monthly Contract meeting with PCT • Weekly SHA teleconference calls • Weekly South Central Ambulance meeting									
3.4	PB	IBP	Failure to deliver National Access targets 18 weeks. **Cause:** • Lack of sufficient capacity/workforce • Implementation of Electronic Patient Record (EPR) disrupted data • Increase in demand or failure of health system to divert patients. • Poor bed availability due to delayed transfers of care. • Failure to deliver efficient patient pathways. • Poor Productivity **Effect:** • Patients waiting longer – NHS Constitution • Poor patient experience • Loss of Reputation • High costs of temp capacity & workforce • Failure of access targets and Monitor's compliance standards. • Poor staff morale • Patients not seen in a timely way **Impact:** • Failure to meet contractual requirements, increased costs. • Failure to gain FT status • Increased costs of temporary staff & in additional capacity.	**Internal** • Daily & weekly monitoring of key access targets; Weekly EPR meetings; Monthly EPR Operational & Monthly EPR Programme Board meetings • Daily whole system teleconference calls • Contingency & Recovery plans in place • Fortnightly performance meetings • Monthly Divisional performance meetings; Monthly reporting & monitoring access targets through Trust Management executive & Trust Board; • Implemented MSK Hub for demand management • Reviewed complaints/Patient experience at Board • Review of Incidents at Board • Board walk rounds **External** • OUH senior manager attendance at Planned care Programme Board & Long Term Conditions • Bimonthly OCCG/Clinical Directors meeting for Planned Care delivering QIPP • Weekly SHA teleconference calls	3-12 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
3.6	PB	Esc	Failure to deliver National Access targets Cancer **Cause:** • Lack of sufficient capacity/workforce • Implementation of Electronic Patient Record (EPR) disrupted data • Increase in demand or failure of health system to divert patients. • Poor bed availability due to delayed transfers of care. • Failure to deliver efficient patient pathways • Poor Productivity **Effect:** • Patients waiting longer – NHS Constitution • Poor patient experience • Loss of Reputation • High costs of temp capacity & workforce • Failure of access targets and Monitor's compliance standards • Poor staff morale • Patients not seen in a timely way **Impact:** • Failure to meet contractual requirements, • Failure to gain FT status increased costs. • Increased costs of temporary staff & in additional capacity.	**Internal** • Daily & weekly monitoring of key access targets; Weekly EPR meetings; Monthly EPR Operational & Monthly EPR Programme Board meetings • Daily whole system teleconference calls • Contingency & Recovery plans in place • Fortnightly performance meetings • Monthly Divisional performance meetings; Monthly reporting & monitoring access targets through Trust Management executive & Trust Board; • Implemented MSK Hub for demand management • Reviewed complaints/Patient experience at Board • Review of Incidents at Board • Board walk rounds **External** • OUH senior manager attendance at Planned care Programme Board & Long Term Conditions • Bimonthly OCCG/Clinical Directors meeting for Planned Care delivering QIPP • Monthly Contract meeting with PCT • Weekly SHA teleconference calls	3-12 mths	3	3	3	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						9		9				6	
3.7	PB	IBP	Inability to meet the Trust needs for capital investment **Cause:** • Potential for insufficient capital to finance the trust's various requirements. • Potential failure to obtain a capital loan at the required level • Potential growth of costs of specific projects.	• Robust business planning approval processes • Strong financial case to justify investments • Board review of investments to ensure affordability over time .	3-12 mths	3	4	3	4	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						12		12				6	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Potential failure to obtain charitable funding to support projects										
3.8	PB	Esc	Long delays in Spinal Service (~~Outpatient appointments~~, Elective and Non-elective surgery). **Cause:** • Large demand for the service • lack of capacity and human resources **Effect** • Inability to deliver adequate services Deterioration of patient conditions, **Impact** • failure to meet RTT Target, • financial penalties • Failure to gain FT status • Negative impact upon reputation	• Merging of Adult and Paediatric Spinal Management • 2 new WTE Spinal Surgeons to cross cover • TCI for spinal patients currently >52 weeks • Temporary closure of service to new referrals outside Thames Valley, Brackley and Byfield • Outsource up to 90 routine patients to other providers	Within 3 mths	3	4 = 12	3	4 = 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 = 3
3.9	MT	ESC	Access to hospital site and current car parking constraints across the trust have an impact on operational performance	Risk under development.	*within 3 mths*	*esc*		TBC		NEW	TBC	TBC	
Principal Risk 4: Mismatch with commissioners plans.													
4.2	AS	IBP	Lack of robust plans across healthcare systems. / Failure to reduce activity through robust demand management plans. **Cause:** • Lack of clear leadership. • Poor culture across the health economy • Inter-organisational barriers • Changing commissioning structures increase the risks **Effect:** • Unaffordable levels of care demanded • *Loss of income from CQUIN targets* • *Over-performance on contract against non-elective and A&E activity* **Impact:** • Financial deficits for commissioners and OUH • Adverse impact on quality and service performance.	• QIPP Programme Framework. • Risk management provisions in contract • Collaboration with Oxford Health. • Commissioner alignment meetings • Relationship management process. • Further letters of support from commissioners in relation to FT application	3-12 mths	4	4 = 16	4	4 = 16	↔	11/09/2014	2	3 = 6

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Fines and denial of CQUIN funding by Wessex and other Commissioners										
4.3	AS	IBP	Loss of Commissioner alignment of plans between the Trust and the commissioners. **Cause:** • Lack of trust, • changing commissioning structures increase the risks. • Trust stance in relation to contracted activity levels may increase this risk • Better Care Fund **Effect: / Impact:** • PCT / CCG fails to support FT application. • FT application not allowed to progress.	• Commissioner alignment meetings. • Relationship management process. Further letters of support from commissioners in relation to FT application Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Agreed contracts in place for 2014/15	Over 12 mths	2	3 6	2	3 6	↔	11/09/2014	2	3 6
Principal Risk 5: Loss of share of current and potential markets.													
5.3	AS	IBP	Potential of negative media coverage relative to our competitors. **Cause:** • Poor performance • Poor media handling • Poor handling of service reconfiguration **Effect:** • Loss of confidence in services provided • Loss of support from commissioners and referrers **Impact:** • Reduced referrals threaten clinical and financial sustainability· .	• Performance management process • Relationship management process with commissioners • Communications team in place • Stakeholder engagement strategy in place • Strategic communications strategy being developed	Over 12 mths	2	2 4	2	2 4	↔	11/09/2014	2	2 4
Principal Risk 6: Failure to sustain an engaged and effective workforce.													
6.1	MP	IBP	Difficulty recruiting and retaining high quality staff in certain areas **Cause:** • National shortages in some staff categories • Economic - cost of living; transport; proximity of other markets (e.g. London) • Failure to attract staff with the requisite skills and experience • Failure to provide sufficient personal and	• Improved recruitment processes, which are regularly reviewed • Recruitment and Retention Strategy in development • Overseas recruitment of trained nursing staff • Application of targeted recruitment and retention incentives • Recruitment and retention summit results and action plan.	Within 3 mths	4	4 16	4	4 16	↔	11/09/2014	2	4 8

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			professional development opportunities • *Access to site and current car parking arrangements* **Effect:** • High-vacancy rate and agency staff use • Potential impact on continuity of care and quality outcomes • Additional pressure on staff • Increased additional costs **Impact:** • Potential impact on service provision, quality of care and patient experience • Potential increases in sickness absence • Potential impact on ability to deliver aspects of the Annual Plan and Strategic Objectives.										
6.2	MP	IBP	Low levels of staff satisfaction **Cause:** • Poor local leadership and management practices • Poor staff engagement • Insufficient recognition • Pressures of work • Working environment • Economic factors, such as levels of pay **Effect:** • Low levels of staff involvement. In decision-making and change initiatives • Poor staff motivation • Potentially higher sickness rates • Increased staff turnover **Impact:** • Failure to deliver required activity levels • Loss of reputation • Inability to embed new ways of working. • Increased costs in relation to agency spend to cover potential increases in sickness.	• Enhanced Appraisal process established • Raising a concern at work policy • Values Based interviewing initiative • Partnership working via JSCNC/LNC • Established Staff Health & Wellbeing Strategy and Committee • Listening into Action Programme • Comprehensive Occupational Health Service • Divisional Staff Survey Response Plans. • Development of local staff surveys and exit interview process Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Regular Pulse surveys • Exit surveys run electronically • Improved sickness reporting systems	3-12 mths	2	4	2	4	↔	11/09/2014	2	3
						8		8				6	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
6.3	MP	IBP	Insufficient provision of appropriate education and learning development opportunities **Cause:** • Insufficient funding causes inability to support training and development **Effect:** • Reduced staff motivation and morale • Increased staff turnover **Impact:** • Potential impact on ability to attract, recruit and retain high quality staff • Potential impact on quality of care and patient experience • Loss of reputation	• Statutory / Mandatory training via e'learning in place. • Appraisal process now on ELMS • CPD and access to national development programmes • Multi-professional Education and Training Strategy to be established • Education and Training Committee	3-12 mths	3	3	3	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						9		9				4	
6.5	CS	Esc	Potential of poor staffing levels within the Maternity Service **Cause:** • Peaks in workload are managed using on call hospital and the community staff. This creates a knock on effect for the community service and can mean postnatal visits and clinics are delayed or cancelled and continuity of care is affected. • During busy times staff who are working non-clinically are moved to cover clinical areas which affects their workload and performance **Effect / Impact:** • Midwives may be unavailable to support junior midwifery staff • A delay to elective delivery beyond the optimum time is a potential risk for mothers and babies • This is a potential reputational risk to the Trust • Workflow and specialist services such as the bereavement service may be effected • Staff may be at increased risk of stress	• Zero hours staff are available to cover shifts • Intrapartum toolkit in use to measure acuity of workload on a 4 hourly basis • Two hospitals covered by a senior member of staff on-call out of hours, with the rotation not acute from community midwives dependent upon activity levels and gaps in staffing to ensure the unit is safe • Delays are discussed with the bleep holder, manager and consultant on call and plan put in place. • Managerial support needed to close any clinical area • Monitoring of sickness and occupational health input when appropriate • Recruitment is underway with new graduates due to start in post up until September 2014. Delivery Suite • Manager post appointment filled. Some outstanding posts still to fill • Recruitment of midwives on-going but majority in post from maternity business case	3-12 mths	4	3	4	3	↔	11/09/2014	2	2
						12		12				4	

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			and related issues· .	• Birth Rate + used to monitor acuity of patients against staff levels									
6.6	CS	new	Failure to meet CQC Action Plan requirements to recruit Supervisors of Midwives at a ratio of 1:15 as recommended by the NMC **Cause:** • Difficulties in recruiting sufficient supervisors of midwives to meet the guidance from NMC. **Effect/Impact** • Midwives may be unavailable to support junior midwifery staff • A delay to elective delivery beyond the optimum time is a potential risk for mothers and babies • Staff may be at increased risk of stress and related issues.	• Recruitment campaign underway to recruit more midwives to the 2014-15 intake. • Ongoing support and discussions with LSAMO. • NHS England involved in review and recruitment process and have escalation processes in place. *NOTE: this risk has been split between risk 6.5 staffing in maternity following discussion at TME 28/08/14	3-12 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	2	3 6
Principal Risk 7: Failure to deliver the required transformation of services													
7.5	AS	IBP	Potential failure to obtain the clinical advantages from EPR. **Cause:** • Lack of clinical engagement • Poor data quality • Poor implementation • Poor system build • Lack of successful and timely re-procurement exercise • Failure to continue to invest in the clinical aspects of the system due to resources implications **Effect:** • Failure to deliver clinical benefits • Need to maintain inefficient patient pathways • Failure to deliver clinical benefits • Need to maintain inefficient patient pathways **Impact:** • Additional costs and reduced efficiency	• Clinical roll-out commenced with order communications and admissions, discharges and transfers. • Roll-out of e-Prescribing currently planned for September 2014 • Service repositioned as a service transformation project with operational leadership from Director of Clinical Services • New level of engagement and implementation being adopted • Development of cadre of champions (including visit of staff to Cerner Health Conference) • Project management processes to continue • Review of IM&T being undertaken action plan being developed *and signed off by TME 11/09/14)* • Deep-dive benefits realisation project being undertaken with HSCIC.	3-12 mths	2	4 8	2	4 8	↔	10/10/2014	2	3 6

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Negative impact on morale and patient experience • Heightened clinical risk • Reputational damage	• New benefits realisation infrastructure being set up. Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Action Plans in place • Reported through Quality Matters • *Roll-out of electronic prescribing and medicines management commenced on 6 October 2014. This will help to drive improvements in clinical engagement and data quality.*								
7.8	MT	Esc	Building issues in the Women's Centre could lead to patient safety issues, poor practice could lead to effluent blockages. **Cause:** • Poor practice in terms of items flushed **Effect:** • Potential for infrastructure failures. **Impact:** Potential impact on patients	• Additional education in relation to good practice processes • Regular monitoring of potential issues.	Within 3 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3
7.9	MT	Esc	Potential risk posed by the fire detection systems in the JR that require upgrading **Cause:** • Poor estate infrastructure **Effect:** • Potential for increased risk if fire should break out **Impact:** • Potential impact on patients.	• Increase to regular testing of alarm system • Monitoring of all alarms and response when activated, with RCA to evaluate response times etc. **Comments** • Additional work in relation to fire detection system identified from a future capital programme. • Increased testing programme implemented	Within 3 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3
7.10	PB	Esc	Failure of laboratory accreditation process due to poor pathology sample store facilities **Cause:** • Poor estate infrastructure **Effect:** • Potential for samples to degrade over time	Advice sought from H&S team for safe working requirements (actions implemented) Comments Issue raised through clinical governance Enquiries made with commercial companies for off-site solutions (not preferred option due to difficulties	Within 3 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			Impact: • Potential impact on trust reputation.	accessing material at the time of enquiry) Numerous temporary / permanent solutions sought on Churchill site (permanent solution unsuccessful as yet, temporary solution possible in old radiology basement) Potential off-site facility under review									
7.12	MT	Esc	Failure to generate hot water and heat in retained parts of Churchill estate **Cause:** • Poor estate infrastructure. **Effect:** • Potential for temporary loss of services in some areas **Impact:** • Potential impact on patients.	An outline business case for primary plant replacement (under the Carbon Energy Fund scheme) is to be taken to the board, with a view to installation in the summer 2015 Main in-patient areas in the retained estate are proposed to be progressively vacated over time	Over 12 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3
7.13	MT	Esc	Failure to resolve Churchill PFI contractual and service performance issues **Cause:** • Poorly constructed PFI contract makes resolving residual issues difficult to manage. **Effect** • Residual issues with the construction of the building are not able to be resolved, leading to additional costs, **Impact** • Potential breach of building regulations resulting in penalties and additional costs	• Legal advice sought • Establish Sub-Committee of Trust Board to make recommendations on key actions	3-12 mths	3	4 12	3	4 12	↔	11/09/2014	2	3 6
Principal Risk 8: Failure to deliver the benefits of strategic partnerships.													
8.1	PB	IBP	Potential failure to sustain effective regional networks. **Cause:** • Poor quality care. • High cost care • Poor relationship management. **Effect:** • Loss of support from referrers.	• Clinical network meetings. • Development of AHSN • Marketing and market research • Performance review process Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Internal processes developed to maintain partnership links	Over 12 mths	2	2 4	2	2 4	↔	11/09/2014	1	2 2

RISK ID	Risk Owner	Source	RISK DESCRIPTION	KEY CONTROLS & CONTINGENCY PLANS	Proximity	Risk Rating (Sept 14) L	Risk Rating (Sept 14) C	Risk Rating (Oct 14) L	Risk Rating (Oct 14) C	Trend	Last Review	Target L	Target C
			• Aggressive competitive behaviour of other organisations **Impact:** • Reduced referrals threaten clinical and financial sustainability.										
8.2	MP	IBP	Potential failure to provide adequate support for education via partnership arrangements. **Cause:** • Failure to adequately prioritise education requirements in planning. **Effect:** • Criticism of educational provision by external reviews. **Impact:** • Removal of support for education placements within organisation.	• Joint working agreement with Oxford Universities. • Strategic Partner Board 1/4ly meetings (Joint Chair Dame Fiona Caldicott • Education and training strategy.) • Lead role in AHSC – Local Oxford partners • Lead role in AHSN – Wider network partners • Clinical network groups • Engagement strategy • DoC Trust Lead with CCGs, Oxford Health, SS in relationship management process. Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Improvement changes in TVHETV • Positive GMC survey results and monitoring of progress	3-12 mths	3	2 6	3	2 6	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3
8.3	TB	IBP	Potential failure to support research and innovation. **Cause:** • Failure to adequately plan and resource research and innovation. **Effect:** • Failure to secure additional research programmes with associated income. Loss of potential benefits of new technologies and innovation **Impact:** • Loss of income and lack of improvements in quality and efficiency	• Joint working agreement with Oxford Universities. • Strategic Partner Board 1/4ly meetings (Joint Chair Dame Fiona Caldicott) • Lead role in AHSC – Local Oxford partners • Lead role in AHSN – Wider network partners • Clinical network groups. • Engagement strategy • DoC Trust Lead with CCGs, Oxford Health, SS in relationship management process. Additional control added (TME 28 8/14): • Improved monitoring of R&D process reported via TME	3-12 mths	1 3	3 3	1 3	3 3	↔	11/09/2014	1	3 3

Key Risk Owners:

PB	Director of Clinical Services (Paul Brennan)	MT	Director of Development and the Estate (Mark Trumper)
MP	Director of OD Workforce (Mark Power)	TB	Medical Director (Tony Berendt)
AS	Director of Planning & information (Andrew Stevens)	EW	Director of Assurance (Eileen Walsh)
MM	Director of Finance and Procurement (Mark Mansfield	CS	Chief Nurse (Catherine Stoddart)