

Strategic Risk Register

Revision	Date
1.	March 2018
2.	September 2018
3.	October 2018 (IJB & APS)
4.	February 2019 (APS)
5.	March 2019 (IJB)
6.	August 2019 (APS)
7.	October 2019 (LT)
8.	November 2019 (IJB workshop)
9.	January 2020
10.	February 2020



Introduction & Background

This document is made publicly available on our website, in order to help stakeholders (including members of the public) understand the challenges currently facing health and social care in Aberdeen.

This is the strategic risk register for the Aberdeen City Integration Joint Board, which lays the foundation for the development of work to prevent, mitigate, respond to and recover from the recorded risks against the delivery of its strategic plan.

Just because a risk is included in the Strategic Risk Register does not mean that it will happen, or that the impact would necessarily be as serious as the description provided.

More information can be found in the Board Assurance and Escalation Framework and the Risk Appetite Statement.

Appendices

- Risk Tolerances
- Risk Assessment Tables

Colour – Key

Risk Rating	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Risk Movement		Decrease	No Change	Increase



Risk Summary:

1	There is a risk that there is insufficient capacity in the market (or appropriate infrastructure in-house) to fulfil the IJB's duties as outlined in the integration scheme. This includes commissioned services and general medical services.	High
2	There is a risk of financial failure, that demand outstrips budget and IJB cannot deliver on priorities, statutory work, and projects an overspend.	High
3	There is a risk that the outcomes expected from hosted services are not delivered and that the IJB does not identify non- performance in through its systems. This risk relates to services that Aberdeen IJB hosts on behalf of Moray and Aberdeenshire, and those hosted by those IJBs and delivered on behalf of Aberdeen City.	High
4	There is a risk that relationship arrangements between the IJB and its partner organisations (Aberdeen City Council & NHS Grampian) are not managed to maximise the full potentials of integrated & collaborative working. This risk covers the arrangements between partner organisations in areas such as governance; corporate service; and performance.	Low
5	There is a risk that the IJB, and the services that it directs and has operational oversight of, fail to meet both performance standards/outcomes as set by regulatory bodies and those locally-determined performance standards as set by the board itself. This may result in harm or risk of harm to people.	Medium
6	There is a risk of reputational damage to the IJB and its partner organisations resulting from complexity of function, delegation and delivery of services across health and social care	Medium
7	Failure to deliver transformation at a pace or scale required by the demographic and financial pressures in the system	High
8	There is a risk that the IJB does not maximise the opportunities offered by locality working	High
9	There is a risk that if the System does not redesign services from traditional models in line with the current workforce marketplace in the City this will have an impact on the delivery of the IJB Strategic Plan.	Very High
10	There is a risk that ACHSCP is not sufficiently prepared to deal with the impacts of Brexit on areas of our business, including affecting the available workforce and supply chain.	High

Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

- 1 -

Description of Risk: There is a risk that there is insufficient capacity in the market (or appropriate infrastructure in-house) to fulfil the IJB's duties as outlined in the integration scheme. Commissioned services in this context include third and independent providers of care and supported living and independent providers of general medical services. Additional pressures from other parts of the system also add to market instability. For example, recruitment of care staff within a competing market, reduction of available beds and the requirement to care for more complex people at home.

Strategic Priority: Prevention and Communities Leadership Team Owner: Lead Commissioner	
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating:
HIGH	There have been several experiences of provider failure in the past and this has provided valuable experience and an opportunity for learning. There is unmet need in the care sector evidenced by out of area placements and use
Risk Movement: increase/decrease/no change	 of agency staff which would indicate that there are insufficient staff to fill roles etc. Discussion with current providers and understanding of market conditions across the UK and in Aberdeen locally.
NO CHANGE 11.02.2020	 Impact of Living Wage on profitability depending on some provider models (employment rates in Aberdeen are high, care providers have to compete within this market)
	 Rationale for Risk Appetite: As 3rd and independent sectors are key strategic partners in delivering transformation and improved care experience, we have a low tolerance of this risk. It is suggested that this risk tolerance should be shared right throughout the organisation, which may encourage staff and providers to escalate valid concerns at an earlier opportunity.



Controls:

- Robust market and relationship management with the 3rd and independent sector and their representative groups, building a sense of shared risk, in an environment where people operate in a respectful and responsible fashion. In particular, with a sense of etiquette in the way in which businesses conduct themselves
- Market facilitation programme and robust contract monitoring process. Working in partnership to advise, design and stimulate a vibrant care market, including the development of a provider network, a market position statement and a training passport.
- GP Contracts and Contractual Review and GP Sustainability Risk Review workforce and role review in primary care.
- Funding arrangements which take into account the annual increase to support payment of the Scottish Living wage
- Contract monitoring arrangements regular exchange of information between contracts and providers
- Clinical and care governance processes and the opportunity to provide assurance, including assurance that all appropriate leadership team members and staff have undertaken Adult Protection training.

Mitigating Actions:

- The IJB's commissioning model has an influence on creating capacity and capability to manage and facilitate the market
- Development of provider forum and peer mentorship to support relationship and market management. This includes a workshop on business continuity.
- Risk fund set aside with transformation funding
- Approved Reimaging Primary Care Vision and currently implementing the Primary Care Improvement Plan
- Implementation of the new GMS Contract.
- Aberdeen City Council has a duty under the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 to provide social care services, including acting as 'provider of last resort'. Bon Accord Care (BAC) has been contracted to provide certain social care services. So long as BAC exists, the Council expects BAC to act as provider of last resort. Should BAC cease to trade (the Council as sole shareholder could take steps to prevent that), the Council would be responsible for providing those statutory services. Therefore, ultimately, the Council is provider of last resort as it has the statutory duties. However so long as BAC exists, it is expected to perform the role of provider of last resort.



 Leadership team monthly discussion of operational and strategic risk – to ensure shared sense of responsibility and approach to potential challenging situations. Lessons learned during a recent experience of managing a residential home; GP practice closure and care provider should market failure occur, and the transition of a significant number of care packages, and continued strengthening relationships and partnership working 	 Provider Forum business continuity plan workshop The development of risk predictor tools in association with the care inspectorate, and individual team escalation plans
Assurances:	Gaps in assurance:
 Market management and facilitation Inspection reports from the Care Inspectorate Contract monitoring process, including GP contract review visit outputs. 	 Market or provider failure can happen quickly despite good assurances being in place. For example, even with the best monitoring system, the closure of a practice can happen very quickly, with (in some cases) one partner retiring or becoming ill being the catalyst. We are currently undertaking service mapping which will help to identify any potential gaps in market provision
Current performance:	Comments:
 A 'Lessons Learnt' exercise was undertaken in February 2019 with the contracts team relating to the recent situation with Allied Healthcare – this will provide useful information should other providers fail. Several GP practices have required support from ACHSCP over the past 2 years, most recently Carden. 	 National Care Home Contract uplift for 2016/17 was 6.4% and 2.8% 2017/18. Negotiations with individual providers are currently taking place for uplifts specific to their needs of up to 3.8%. IJB agreed payment of living wage to Care at Home providers for 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19



- We held a workshop with providers in October 2019 to progress the development of a training passport. We have taken that learning and we have established a test of change implementing a collaborative approach to the delivery of medication administration training between 4 providers. Aberdeenshire are doing a similar test with moving and handling
- Our approach to the redesign of care at home and supported living has been through collaboration with providers. Two workshops were held in 2019 to progress shared vision for this provision. The ideas for future delivery were presented to over 80 representatives from provider services on 13th January 2020 and a further question and answer session will be held on January 28th. One of our key objectives in this design is market sustainability. A leader in market sustainability attended the session on the 13th and we have received positive feedback about our approach



-2-	
Description of Risk: There is a risk of IJB financial failure and projecting an overspend, due to demand outstripping available budget, which would impact on the IJB' ability to deliver on its strategic plan (including statutory work).	
Strategic Priority: Prevention and Communities	Leadership Team Owner: Chief Finance Officer
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	 Rationale for Risk Rating: If the partnership fails financially then decisions will be required to stop
HIGH	services. In a health and social care environment this is difficult to do given the reliance service users place on these services. It could also impact on
Risk Movement: increase/decrease/no change:	the delivery of the strategy plan as officer's time would be diverted from transformational activities to balance the budget.
NO CHANGE 31.01.2020	 If the levels of funding identified in the Medium Term Financial Framework are not made available to the IJB in future years, then tough choices would need to be made about what the IJB wants to deliver. It will be extremely difficult for the IJB to continue to generate the level of savings year on year to balance its budget.
	Rationale for Risk Appetite: The IJB has a low-moderate risk appetite to financial loss and understands its requirement to achieve a balanced budget. The IJB recognises the impacts of failing to achieve a balanced budget on Aberdeen City Council & its bond – an unmanaged overspend may have an impact on funding levels.
	However the IJB also recognises the significant range of statutory services it is required to meet within that finite budget and has a lower appetite for risk of harm



	to people (low or minimal).
Controls: Budgets delegated to cost centre level and being managed by budget holders.	 Mitigating Actions: Financial information is reported regularly to the Audit & Performance Systems Committee, the Integration Joint Board and the Leadership Team. Approved reserves strategy, including risk fund. Robust financial monitoring and budget setting procedures including regular budget monitoring & budget meeting with budget holders. Medium-Term Financial Strategy was reviewed and approved at the IJB on 12th March 2019. This includes a predicted outlook for 10 years Audit & Performance Systems receives regular updates on transformation programme & spend. The Leadership Team are committed to driving out efficiencies, encouraging self-management and moving forward the prevention agenda to help manage future demand for services. Lean Six Sigma methodology is being applied to carry out process improvements.



 Assurances: Audit and Performance Systems Committee oversight and scrutiny of budget under the Chief Finance Officer. Board Assurance and Escalation Framework. Quarterly budget monitoring reports. Regular budget monitoring meetings between finance and budget holders. 	 Gaps in assurance: The financial environment is challenging and requires regular monitoring. The scale of the challenge to make the IJB financially sustainable should not be underestimated. Financial failure of hosted services may impact on ability to deliver strategic ambitions.
 Current performance: Year-end position for 2017/18 Forecasted year end position 2018/19 overspend on mainstream position Projected overspend on mainstream budgets can be accommodated from within the total resources available to the IJB. 	 Comments: Regular and ongoing budget reporting and management scrutiny in place. Budget monitoring procedure now well established. Budget holders understand their responsibility in relation to financial management. Scottish Government Medium Term H&SC Financial Framework – released and considered by APS Committee. The recent Audit Scotland report 'Progress with Integration' recommended that HSCPs should aspire to develop a long-term financial strategy.



- 3 -	
service failure and that the IJB fails to identify such non-pe	lo not deliver the expected outcomes, fail to deliver transformation of services, or face erformance through its own systems and pan-Grampian governance arrangements. chalf of Moray and Aberdeenshire, and those hosted by those IJBs and delivered on
Strategic Priority: Prevention and Connections.	Leadership Team Owner: Chief Officer
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	 Rationale for Risk Rating: Considered high risk due to the projected overspend in hosted services
HIGH	Hosted services are a risk of the set-up of Integration Joint Boards.
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change): NO CHANGE 31.01.2020	 Rationale for Risk Appetite: The IJB has some tolerance of risk in relation to testing change.
 Controls: Integration scheme agreement on cross-reporting North East Strategic Partnership Group Operational risk register 	 Mitigating Actions: This is discussed regularly by the three North East Chief Officers Regular discussion regarding budget with relevant finance colleagues. Chief Officers should begin to consider the disaggregation of hosted services.
 Assurances: These largely come from the systems, process and put in place by NHS Grampian, which are still being 	Gaps in assurance:procedures• There is a need to develop comprehensive governance



				-
	along with any new processes which are put in place by the lead IJB.			
•	At an April 2019 seminar, convened to consider the future of the			
	North East Partnership, the four Chief Executives (NHS Grampian, Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council and			
	Moray Council) agreed to develop a North East Group (Officers			
	only) which they would lead. The aim of the group is to develop			
	real top-level leadership to drive forward the change agenda,			
•	especially relating to the delegated hospital-based services. The Chief Officers have taken a paper about hosted and			
•	hospital based delegated services to each of the three IJBs			
	during June. Amongst other issues, the paper sought			
	permission to develop a new role and remit for the Chairs and			
	Vice Chairs of the three IJBs to come together. This is under development.			
•	Both the CEO group and the Chairs & Vice Chairs group will			
	meet quarterly. The meetings will be evenly staggered between			
	groups, giving some six weeks between them, allowing progressive work / iterative work to be timely between the			
	forums. The dates are currently being arranged			
Curre	nt performance:	Comments:		
•	The projected overspend on hosted services is a factor in the	 It is noted that NHS Grampian are currently underta internal audit on the governance of heated convinces 	iking an	
	IJB's overspend position. This may in future impact on the outcomes expected by the hosted services.	internal audit on the governance of hosted services.		



- 4 -		
Description of Risk: There is a risk that relationship arrangements between the IJB and its partner organisations (Aberdeen City Council & NHS Grampian) are not managed in order to maximise the full potential of integrated & collaborative working to deliver the strategic plan. This risk covers the arrangements between partner organisations in areas such as governance arrangements, human resources; and performance.		
Strategic Priority: Prevention, Resilience and Communitie	es. Leadership Team Owner: Chief Officer	
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	 Rationale for Risk Rating: Considered medium given the experience of nearly three years' operations 	
Low	since 'go-live' in April 2016.However, given the wide range and variety of services that support the IJB	
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)	from NHS Grampian and Aberdeen City Council there is a possibility of services not performing to the required level.	
Decreased 31.01.2020	Rationale for Risk Appetite: There is a zero tolerance in relation to not meeting legal and statutory requirements.	
Controls:	Mitigating Actions:	
 IJB Strategic Plan-linked to NHS Grampian's Clinic and the Local Outcome Improvement Plan (LOIP) IJB Integration Scheme IJB Governance Scheme including 'Scheme of Ge Roles & Responsibilities'. Agreed risk appetite statement Role and remit of the North East Strategic Partnersh relation to shared services Current governance committees within IJB & NHS. Alignment of Leadership Team objectives to Strategic 	 Regular and ongoing Chief Officer membership of Aberdeen City Council's Corporate Management Team and NHS Grampian's Senior Leadership Team Regular performance meetings between ACHSCP Chief Officer, Aberdeen City Council and NHS Grampian Chief Executives. Additional mitigating actions which could be undertaken include the audit programme and bench-marking activity with 	



	 In relation to capital projects, Joint Programme Boards established to co-produce business cases, strategic case approved by IJB and economic, financial, commercial, management case approved by NHSG Board and ACC Committees
Assurances:	Gaps in assurance:
• Regular review of governance documents by IJB and where necessary Aberdeen City Council & NHS Grampian. A review of the Scheme of Governance commenced in June 2019 and was reported to the IJB in November 2019.	 None currently significant though note consideration relating to possible future Service Level Agreements.
Current performance:	Comments:
 Most of the major processes and arrangements between the partner organisations have been tested for over two years of operation and no major issues have been identified. A review of the Integration Scheme has been undertaken and the revised scheme has been approved by NHSG, Aberdeen City Council & Scottish Government. However this does not remove the risk as processes within the IJB and partner organisations will continue to evolve and improve. 	 Nothing to update on the narrative for the risk.

Description of Risk: There is a risk that the IJB, and the services that it directs and has operational oversight of, fail to meet both performance standards/outcomes as set by national and regulatory bodies and those locally-determined performance standards as set by the board itself. This may result in harm or risk of harm to people.

- 5 –

Strategic Priority: Prevention, Resilience, Perso Connections and Communities.	nalisation, Leadership Team Owner: Lead Strategy & Performance Manager
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating: Service delivery is broad ranging and undertaken by both in-house and external providers. There are a variety of performance
MEDIUM	standards set both by national and regulatory bodies as well as those determined locally and there are a range of factors which may impact on service performance
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)	against these. Poor performance will in turn impact both on the outcomes for service users and on the reputation of the IJB/partnership.
NO CHANGE 31.01.2020	
	Rationale for Risk Appetite: The IJB has no to minimal tolerance of harm happening to people as a result of its actions, recognising that in some cases there may be a balance between the risk of doing nothing and the risk of action or intervention.
 Controls: Clinical and Care Governance Committee and Group Audit and Performance Systems Committee Performance and Risk Management Group Performance Framework Risk-assessed plans with actions, responsible timescales and performance measures monitored by teams Linkage with ACC and NHSG performance reporting Annual Report 	 Review of systems used to record, extract and report data Review of and where and how often performance information is reported on and how learning is fed back into processes and procedures. On-going work developing a culture of performance management and evaluation throughout the partnership



 Chief Social Work Officer's Report Ministerial Steering Group (MSG) Scrutiny Internal Audit Reports Links to outcomes of Inspections, Complaints etc. Contract Management Framework 	 Production of Performance Dashboard, presented to a number of groups, raising profile of performance and encouraging discussion leading to further review and development Recruitment of additional temporary resource to drive performance and risk management process development Performance now a standing agenda item on Leadership Team meetings
 Assurances: Joint meeting of IJB Chief Officer with two Partner Body Chief Executives. Agreement that full Dashboard with be reported to both Clinical and Care Governance Committee and Audit & Performance Committee. Lead Strategy and Performance Manager will ensure both committees are updated in relation to the interest and activity of each. Annual report on IJB activity developed and reported to ACC and NHSG Care Inspectorate Inspection reports Capture of outcomes from contract review meetings. External reviews of performance. 	 Gaps in assurance: Formal performance reporting process is continually evolving. Work on understanding extent to operational performance reporting is at an early stage but will progress more quickly now the IJB Dashboard is nearing completion. Further work required on linkage to ACC, NHSG and CPA reporting.



 Current performance: Performance reports submitted to IJB, Audit and Performance Systems and Clinical and Care Governance Committees. Performance and Risk Management Group terms of reference and membership revised, and regular meetings are now scheduled and taking place. Various Steering Groups for strategy implementation established and reviewing performance regularly. Performance data discussed at team meetings. Close links with social care commissioning, procurement and contracts team have been established IJB Dashboard nearing completion. Dashboard has beer shared widely. 	Self Evaluation in relation to progress against integration and that although the result was very positive (45% Exemplary, 41% Established, 14% Part Established and no area not yet established),the Partnership have identified areas for improvement and these have been compiled into an Action Plan with Lead Officers and Timescales assigned. Delivery of the plan will be monitored by the Leadership Team and an annual progress report submitted to the IJB in preparation for the anticipated repeat of the self-evaluation exercise next year.
--	--



	- 6 -	
Description of Risk: There is a risk of reputational damage making, delegation and delivery of services across health a	to the IJB and its partner organisations resulting from complexity of function, decision nd social care.	
Strategic Priority: All	Leadership Team Owner: Communications Lead	
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating:	
Medium	 Governance processes are in place and have been tested since go live i April 2017. Budget processes tested during approval of 3rd budget, which wa approved. 	
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)		
No Change 31.01.2020	Rationale for Risk Appetite: Willing to risk certain reputational damage if rationale for decision is sound.	
 Controls: Leadership Team IJB and its Committees Operational management processes and reporting Board escalation process Standards Officer role 	 Mitigating Actions: Clarity of roles Staff and customer engagement – recent results from iMatter survey alongside a well-establish Joint Staff Forum indicate high levels of staff engagement. Effective performance and risk management To ensure that ACHSCP have a clear communication & engagement strategy, and a clear policy for social media use, in order to mitigate the risk of reputational damage. Communications lead's membership of Leadership Team facilities smooth flow of information from all sections of the organisation 	



	• Robust relationships with all local media are maintained to ensure media coverage is well-informed and accurate, and is challenged when inaccurate/imbalanced.
 Assurances: Role of the Chief Officer and Leadership Team Role of the Chief Finance Officer Performance relationship with NHS and ACC Chief Executives Communications plan / communications manager 	Gaps in assurance: None known at this time
Communications officer in place to lead reputation management	 Comments: A refreshed communications strategy is in preparation and will be presented to the IJB in due course A new Engagement Ambassadors Group has been established, with membership drawn from staff from across the partnership and from partner organisations. The group meets on a sixweekly cycle and provides a platform for internal and external communications issues to be discussed and for decisions to be taken on the best modes of onward communication. External and internal websites are regularly updated with fresh news/information; both sites continue to be developed and refined Locality leadership groups being established to build our relationship with communication flow across partners as does CO's membership of the Corporate Management Teams of both ACC and NHSG



	-7-	
Description of Risk: Failure of the transformation to delivery sustainable system & financial pressures.	is change, which helps the IJB deliver its strategic priorities, in the face of demographic	
Strategic Priority: All	Leadership Team Owner: Transformation Lead	
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating:	
HIGH	 Recognition of the known demographic curve & financial challenges, we mean existing capacity may struggle 	
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)	This is the overall risk – each of our transformation programme work streams are also risk assessed with some programmes being a higher risk	
NO CHANGE 31.01.2020	than others.	
	Rationale for Risk Appetite:	
	• The IJB has some appetite for risk relating to testing change and being innovative.	
	• The IJB has no to minimal appetite for harm happening to people – however this is balanced with a recognition of the risk of harm happening to people in the future if no action or transformation is taken.	



 Controls: Transformation Governance Structure and Process Audit and Performance Systems Committee – quarterly reports to provide assurance of progress Programme Board structure: Executive Programme board and portfolio programme boards are in place. 	 Mitigating Actions: Programme management approach being taken across whole of the transformation programme Transformation team in place and all trained in Managing Successful Programmes methodology Regular reporting to Executive Programme Reard and
 portfolio programme boards are in place. All decision making (other than business as usual) is now flowing through the programme board structure which is enabling a holistic perspective to be taken when making decisions. 	 Regular reporting to Executive Programme Board and Portfolio Programme Boards Regular reporting to Audit and Performance Systems Committee and Integration Joint Board Lean Six Sigma methodology being used to support delivery of strategic plan, medium term financial plan and to ensure sustainability. Evaluation process in place to track delivery of change and efficiencies. Prioritisation process in place to prioritise allocation of transformation resource. A number of plans and frameworks have been developed
	 to underpin our transformation activity across our wider system including: Reimagining Primary and Community Care Vision, Transformation Plan, Primary Care Improvement Plan, Action 15 Plan. Transformation team amalgamated with public health and wellbeing to give greater focus to localities.
Assurances:	Gaps in assurance:
 Executive Management and Committee Reporting Robust Programme Management approach supporting by an evaluation framework IJB oversight Board escalation process 	• There is a gap in terms of the impact of transformation on our budgets. Many of the benefits of our project relate to early intervention and reducing hospital admissions, neither of which provide earlier cashable savings.



• Internal Audit has undertaken a detailed audit of our transformation programme. All recommendations from this audit have now been actioned.	
 Current performance: Demographic financial pressure is starting to materialise in some of the IJB budgets. Many projects are now in Delivery phase with a couple of projects achieving Close stage. The CO presented a paper to IJB in September with a revised programme aligned to our revised Strategic Plan. Reporting structures and governance now aligned to the revised programme. 	 team have been brought together (November 2018) and with the Public Health and Wellbeing teams (June 2019) to maximise the potential for successful and sustainable system change. The leadership team have developed priority shared

	- 8 -	
Description of Risk There is a risk that the IJB does not maximise the opportun	ities offered by locality working	
Strategic Priority: All Leadership Owner: Chief Officer		
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating:	
HIGH	 Localities are in an early, developmental stage and currently requisite strategic oversight so are included in this risk register. Once they a operational, they will be removed from the strategic risk register as a star alone item and will be included in the wider risk relating to transformati (risk 7). 	
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)		
NO CHANGE 31.01.2020		
	Rationale for Risk Appetite: The IJB has some appetite to risk in relation to testing innovation and change There is zero risk of financial failure or working out with statutory requirements of a public body.	
 Controls: IJB/Risk, Audit and Performance Committee Action plans as derived from the locality plans. Locality Empowerment Groups Strategic Planning Group 	 Mitigating Actions: Continued broad engagement on locality working and requested development of comprehensive communication plan Position Statement issued in August 2019 	
 Assurances: Strategic Planning Group Locality plans performance monitoring and review. 	Gaps in assuranceProgress of delivering locality plans.	



Current performance:

- Following the decision by the IJB on the planned approach to developing localities, work is ongoing to support the establishment of the 3 Locality Empowerment Groups (LEG's). A work plan focussing on key themes of data and profiling, communication & engagement, membership and recruitment, upskilling and governance has been established, led by the Public Health Coordinators and key stakeholders including community representatives on current Locality Leadership Groups (LLG's) and wider members of the local communities. Recruitment of community members for the LEG's has commenced. Key outputs anticipated to be delivered by Spring 2020 will include a visual data tool ready for April to engage with communities; revised membership of LLGs/LEGs; and clear governance arrangements for these groups being in place.
- Two workshops will be held with the partnership's operational leadership team in February and March, 2020 to support them to: build relationships; adopt a collaborative leadership approach; identify the skills they need to support their teams to work collaboratively in localities and develop an implementation plan that they will lead the delivery of.

Comments:

- The LEG's will ensure locality plans align to the broader Aberdeen Community Planning plans and will use existing networks to maximise the potential of community and front-line staff engagement. They will work alongside operational locality delivery teams
- Updates on the progress of localities (LEGs and operational alignment) is being included in the CO report being presented to each IJB.
- Delivery of our localities is a shared leadership team objective for 2020/21



	- 9 –	
Description of Risk: There is a risk that if the System does not redesign services this will have an impact on the delivery of the IJB Strategic I	s from traditional models in line with the current workforce marketplace in the City Plan.	
Strategic Priority: All	Leadership Team Owner: People & Organisation	
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high VERY HIGH	 Rationale for Risk Rating: The current staffing complement profile changes on an incremental basis 	
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)	 The current staning complement profile changes on all incrementation over time. However the number of over 50s employed within the partnership (by N and ACC) is increasing (i.e. 1 in 3 nurses are over 50). 	
INCREASE 11.02.2020	 Current high vacancy levels and long delays in recruitment across ACHSCP services. Inability to fill vacancies 	
	 Rationale for Risk Appetite: Risk should be able to be managed with the adoption of agile and innovative 	
	workforce planning structures and processes	
 Controls: Clinical & Care Governance Group reviews operation around workforce. Revised contract monitoring arrangements with prodetermine recruitment / retention trends in the wider Organisational Development (OD) and Culture Work (meets quarterly) 	 Active engagement with schools to raise ACHSCP profile (eg Developing the Young Workforce, Career Ready) Active work with training providers and employers to encourage 	



 Performance Dashboard (considered by the Risk, Audit and Performance and Clinical and Care Governance Committees as well as the Leadership Team) Partnership's Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee-considers absence rates. 	 Apprenticeships/Modern Apprenticeships through NESCOL, working with Department for Work and Pensions) Greater use of commissioning model to encourage training of staff Increased emphasis on health/wellbeing of staff Increased emphasis on communication with staff Greater promotion of flexible working Increased collaboration and integration between professional disciplines, third sector, independent sector and communities through Localities. Increased monitoring of staff statistics (sickness, turnover, CPD, complaints etc) through Performance Dashboard, identifying trends. Developing greater digitisation opportunities, e.g. using Text Messaging to shift emphasis from GPs to increased use of Texts for pharmacology
Assurances: • ACHSCP Workforce Plan	 Gaps in assurance Need more information on social care staffing statistics for Performance Dashboard Information on social care providers would be useful to determine trends in wider sector-For Performance Dashboard
 Current performance: Workforce plan developed for health and social care staff. High levels of locum use and nursing vacancies in the psychiatry service, 	 Comments: Consultation responses provided to the Scottish Government relating to the Health & Care (Staffing) (Scotland) Act 2019. This Act potentially offers opportunities and risks to the Partnership and a better understanding of the detail of the Act is required ahead of revising this strategic risk further.



 6 secondary schools have been visited by members of the Leadership Team between November 2019 and February 2020 ACHSCP sickness absence rates to be updated and reported through the Performance Dashboard (considered by the Partnership's Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee on 3rd 	2020 agreed that the IJB can actively provide comments through the consultation process on the Chapters relating to the Act by providing examples of projects undertaken by the Partnership (ie Health Visiting Digitisation) which redesign services by
February 2020).	of working to increase patient facing time, within current establishment figures.

- 10 -

Description of Risk: There is a risk that ACHSCP is not sufficiently prepared to deal with the impacts of Brexit on areas of our business, including affecting the available workforce and supply chain.

Whilst the impact on health and social care services of leaving the EU is impossible to forecast, it is clear that a number of issues will need to be resolved. Key areas for health and social care organisations to consider include: staffing; medical supplies; accessing treatment; regulation (such as working time directive and procurement/competition law, for example); and cross border issues.

Strategic Priority: Resilience and Communities.	Executive Team Owner: Business Manager		
Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high	Rationale for Risk Rating:		
HIGH	There is still a high level of uncertainty around 'Brexit' as impacts are difficult to forecast.		
Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change)			
NO CHANGE 31.01.2020			
 Controls: NHSG have held a voluntary survey of EU nationals. ACC currently undertaking a survey of all staff to gather similar information. NHSG - An initial operational assessment has been undertaken. A BREXIT co-ordinating group established with executive leadership. Engagement with staff who may be impacted by withdrawal of UK from the EU. Co-ordination with professional leads across Scotland and at SG - procurement, medicines, staff and resilience 	 Mitigating Actions: Mitigating actions have been developed on a national and local level through Scottish Government guidance and the ACC and NHSG EU exit steering groups respectively. These actions are linked to the Scottish Planning Assumptions (based on the reasonable worst case scenario-no deal). The assumptions are: •Travel, Freight and Borders • Disruption of Services 		



 Partnership is a member of this Group. National Procurement of NHS National Services Scotland has been working for over 6 months with Scottish Government, NHS Scotland Health Boards, DHSC and suppliers to try to minimise the impact of EU Exit on the supply of Medical Devices & Clinical Consumables. Activities range from increased stock holding in items supplied from our own National Distribution Centre to UK wide participation in centralised stock building and supplier preparedness. The Partnership has established an Incident Management Team (IMT) ahead of daily reporting being re-established. The IMT will report through both the ACC and NHSG routes, as required. 	 Information and Data Sharing Demonstrations and Disorder Remote and Rural Scotland Scottish Workforce As the Partnership does not directly employ staff, The Chief Officer will work closely with partners to ensure that as implications become clear the Partnership are able to best represent and meet the needs of all staff. The Partnership's Business Continuity Planning process is established which will identify key services to prioritise in any contingency event. Review ALEO contingency plans. Request evidence of risk assessment and mitigation from ALEOS for assurance of ability to deliver against contract. This is being considered and scrutinised through the ALEO Hub governance arrangements. Survey of providers asking key questions on preparedness. A joint City and Shire Care Home providers workshop was held in May 2019 to discuss with providers their preparedness for any EU exit. Partnership took part in Exercise Pisces run by NHSG on the 19th
---	--



	re-introduced at any time once national reporting is re-established (see current performance update).
 Assurances: Understanding that current legislation will remain in effect immediate post Brexit 	 Gaps in assurance: Uncertainty of final trade agreement with EU.
 Current performance: Aberdeen City Council have provided the following update as at 8 January 2020: The decision has been made for the EU Exit Group to "stand down" based upon the following developments: The UK Government stood down planning for the consequences of a "no deal" EU Exit and the Scottish Government will do the same on 31st January, 2020. When the UK leaves the EU on 31st January, 2020, there will be <u>no</u> requirement for daily reporting that was previously required in 2019. Local Resilience Partnerships are maintaining a watching brief on EU Exit consequences and stand ready to re- activate process and governance structures if required. The risk of a "no deal" EU Exit is still possible if a trade agreement is not in place by 31st December, 2020. If this is the case or if other circumstances create the requirement, the EU Exit Group will be re- established. NHSG also provided similar guidance in January, 2020. 	Comments: • ACHSCP colleagues will need to ensure continued engagement with ACC and NHSG working groups.



Appendix 1 – Risk Tolerance

Level of Risk	Risk Tolerance				
Low	Acceptable level of risk. No additional controls are required but any existing risk controls or contingency plans should be documented. Chief Officers/Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the minimum review table within the risk register process document to assess whether these continue to be effective.				
Medium	Acceptable level of risk exposure subject to regular active monitoring measures by Managers/Risk Owners. Where appropriate further action shall be taken to reduce the risk but the cost of control will probably be modest. Managers/Risk Owners shall document that the risk controls or contingency plans are effective.				
Medium	Chief Officers/Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the minimum review table within the risk register process document to assess whether these continue to be effective. Relevant Chief Officers/Managers/Directors/Assurance Committees will periodically seek assurance that these continue to be effective.				
	Further action should be taken to mitigate/reduce/control the risk, possibly urgently and possibly requiring significant resources. Chief Officers/Managers/Risk Owners must document that the risk controls or contingency plans are effective. Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the minimum review table within the risk register process document to assess whether these continue to be effective.				
High	Relevant Chief Officers/Managers/Directors/Executive and Assurance Committees will periodically seek assurance that these continue to be effective and confirm that it is not reasonably practicable to do more. The IJB's may wish to seek assurance that risks of this level are being effectively managed.				
	However the IJB's may wish to accept high risks that may result in reputation damage, financial loss or exposure, major breakdown in information system or information integrity, significant incidents(s) of regulatory non-compliance, potential risk of injury to staff and public				



Very HighUnacceptable level of risk exposure that requires urgent and potentially immediate corrective action to be taken. Relevant Chief
Officer/Managers/Directors/Executive and Assurance Committees should be informed explicitly by the relevant Managers/Risk Owners.Very HighManagers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the minimum review table within the risk register process document to assess
whether these continue to be effective.
The IJB's will seek assurance that risks of this level are being effectively managed.
However the IJB's may wish to accept opportunities that have an inherent very high risk that may result in reputation damage, financial loss or
exposure, major breakdown in information system or information integrity, significant incidents(s) of regulatory non-compliance, potential risk of
injury to staff and public



Appendix 2 – Risk Assessment Matrices (from Board Assurance & Escalation Framework)

Table 1 - Impact/Consequence Definitions

Descriptor	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
Patient Experience	Reduced quality of patient experience/ clinical outcome not directly related to delivery	Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome directly related to care	Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome, short term effects – expect	Unsatisfactory patient experience/ clinical outcome; long term effects –expect	Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome, continued ongoing long term
	of clinical care.	provision - readily resolvable.	recovery <1wk.	recovery >1wk.	effects.
Objectives/			Reduction in scope or quality		Inability to meet project
Project	Barely noticeable reduction in scope, quality or schedule.	Minor reduction in scope, quality or schedule.	of project; project objectives	Significnt project over-run.	objectives; reputation of the organisation seriously
			or sched a le.		damaged.
Injury (abuaical and			Agency reportable, e.g. Police (a iolent and aggressive	Major injuries/long term	
(physical and psychological) to patient/ visitor/staff.	Adverse event leading to s minor injury not requiring firt åsd	Minor injury or illness, firt a d treatment required.	acts). Significnt injury requiring medical treatment and/or counselling.	incapacity or disability (loss of limb) requiring medical treatment and/or counselling.	Incident leading to death or major permanent incapacity.
Complaints/ Claims	Locally resolved verbal complaint	Justifie written complaint peripheral to clinical care.	Below exdess claim. Justifie comp I aint involving lack of appropriate care.	Claim above exces s level. Multiple justifie comp I a nt s	Multiple claims d r single major claim. Complex justifie comp I a n .
Service/	Interruption in a service which does not impact on the	Short term disruption to service	Some disruption in service with unacceptable impact on	Sustained loss of service which has serious impact	Permanent loss of core service or facility.
Business Interruption		with minor impact on patient care.	patient care. Temporary loss of ability to provide service.	on delivery of patient care resulting in major contingency plans being invoked.	Disruption to faciliary leading to signifignt "knock on" g≢ fect.
Staffin and	Short term low staffin level temporarily reduces setyrice quality (< 1 day).	Ongoing low staffin level reduces service quality	Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff. Moderate error due to	Uncertain delivery of key objective /service due to lack of staff.	Non-delivery of key objective, service due to lack of staff. Loss of key staff.
Competence	Short term low staffin level (>1 day), where there is no disruption to patiegt care.	Minor error due to ineffective training/implementation of training.	ineffective training/ implementation of training. Ongoinggroblems with staffin level s	Major error due to ineffective training/implementation of training.	Critical error due to ineffective training / implementation of training.
Financial (including damage/loss/ fraud)	Negligible oaganisational/ personal finnci al loss (£≤1k).	Minor organi s ational/ personalafinnci al loss (£1- 10k).	Significnt er gani sational / personal finnci al loss (£10-100k).	Majer organisational/personal finnci al loss (£100k-1m) .	Severe organisational/ personal finnci à loss (£>1m).
Inspection/Audit	Small number of recommendations which focus on minor quality improvement issues.	Recommendations made which can be addressed by low level of management action.	Challenging recommendations that can be addressed with appropriate action plan.	Enforcement action. Low rating. Critical report.	Prosecution. Zero rating. Severely critical report.
Adverse	Rumours, no media coverage.	Local media coverage – short term. Some public embarrassment.	Local media – long-term adverse p ublicity. Significnt e f fect on staff	National media/adverse publicity, less than 3œlays. Public confidnce in tte	National/International media/ adverse publicity, more than 3 days. MSP/MP concern (Questions
Publicity/ Reputation	Little effect on staff morale.	Minor effect on staff morale/ public attitudes.	morale and public perception of the organisation.	organisation undermined. Use of services affected.	in Parliament). Court Enforcement. Public Enquiry/FAI.

Table 3 - Risk Matrix

Likelihood	Consequences/Impact				
	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
Almost Certain	Medium	High	High	V High	V High
Likely	Medium	Medium	High	High	V High
Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
Rare	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium

nces: AS/NZS 4360:2004 'Making It Work' (2004)

4 - NHSG Response to Risk

bes what NHSG considers each level of risk to represent and spells out the extent of se expected for each.

	Level of Risk	Response to Risk
ing to ect. ctive/ ff.	Low	Acceptable level of risk. No additional controls are required or contingency plans should be documented. Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the the risk register process document to assess whether these co
g.	Medium	Acceptable level of risk exposure subject to regular active Managers/Risk Owners. Where appropriate further action shab but the cost of control will probably be modest. Managers/F that the risk controls or contingency plans are effective. Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the the risk register process document to assess whether these con Relevant Managers/Directors/Assurance Committees will per these continue to be effective.
idia/ han iions	High	Further action should be taken to mitigate/reduce/control the possibly requiring significnt resources. Managers/Risk Owr risk controls or contingency plans are effective. Managers/Risk risks applying the minimum review table within the risk register whether these continue to be effective. Relevant Managers/Directors/Executive and Assurance Com assurance that these continue to be effective and Assurance Com assurance that these continue to be effective managed. However NHSG may wish to accept high risks that may result in loss or exposure, major breakdown in information system or in incidents(s) of regulatory non-compliance, potential risk of injur
y to	Very High	Unacceptable level of risk exposure that requires urgent corrective action to be taken. Relevant Managers/Directors Committees should be informed explicitly by the relevant Man Managers/Risk Owners should review these risks applying the the risk register process document to assess whether these or The Board will seek assurance that risks of this level are being However NHSG may wish to accept opportunities that hav that may result in reputation damage, finnci a loss or exp information system or information integrit g , significnt inco compliance, potential risk of injury to staf f and public.

Table 2 - Likelihood Defintions

Descriptor	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
Probability	 Can't believe this event would happen Will only happen in exceptional circumstances. 	 Not expected to happen, but definte pot ent ial exists Unlikely to occur. 	 May occur occasionally Has happened before on occasions Reasonable chance of occurring. 	 Strong possibility that this could occur Likely to occur. 	This is expected to occur frequently/in most circumstances more likely to occur than not.

I but any existing risk controls e minimum review table within continue to be ef fective. tive monitoring measures by hall be taken to reduce the risk Risk Owners shall document e minimum review table within continue to be ef fective. eriodically seek assurance that he risk, possibly urgently and vners must document that the sk Owners should review these r process document to assess mmittees will periodically seek t it is not reasonably practicable of this level are being ef fectively t in reputation damage, finnci a information integrity, significnt iury to staff and public. ent and potentially immediate ors/E xecutive and Assurance nagers/Risk Owners. e minimum review table within continue to be ef fective. ing ef fectively managed. ave an inherent very high risk xposure, major breakdown in cidents(s) of regulatory non-