



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 (ahead of IJB) |
| 10 | March 2020 (RAPC) |
| 11 | July 2020 (IJB) |
| 12 | October 2020 (IJB Workshop) |
| 13 | November 2020 (IJB) |
| 14 | January 2021 (RAPC) |
| 15 | May 2021 (IJB) |
| 16 | June 2021 (RAPC) |
| 17 | September 2021 (RAPC) |
| 18 | November 2021 (Following IJB Workshop and ahead of IJB meeting in Dec) |
| 19 | February 2022 (RAPC) |
| 20 | August 2022 (ahead of IJB Workshop) |
| 21 | Review reflecting workshop-IJB Oct 22 |
| 22 | November 2022 (RAPC) |
| 23 | January 2023 (SLT) |
| 24 | May 2023 (RAPC and IJB) |

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.



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

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 | <p>Description of Risk: Cause: The commissioning of services from third sector and independent providers (eg General Practice and other primary care services) requires all stakeholders to work collaboratively to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>Event: Potential failure of commissioned services to deliver on their contract</p> <p>Consequence: There is a gap between what is required to meet the needs of local people, and services that are available.</p> <p>Consequences: to the individual include not having the right level of care delivered locally, by suitably trained staff.</p> <p>Consequences: ability of other commissioned services to cope with the unexpected increased in demand.</p> <p>Consequences to the partnership includes an inability to meet peoples needs for health and care and the additional financial burden of seeking that care in an alternative setting</p> | Very High |
| 2 | <p>Cause: IJB financial failure and projection of overspend</p> <p>Event: Demand outstrips available budget</p> <p>Consequence: IJB can't deliver on its strategic plan priorities, statutory work, and projects.</p> | High |
| 3 | <p>Cause: Under Integration arrangements, Aberdeen IJB hosts services on behalf of Moray and Aberdeenshire, who also hosts services on behalf of Aberdeen City.</p> <p>Event: hosted services do not deliver the expected outcomes, fail to deliver transformation of services, or face service failure.</p> <p>Consequence: Failure to meet health outcomes for Aberdeen City, resources not being maximised and reputational damage.</p> | High |
| 4 | <p>Cause: Performance standards/outcomes are set by national and regulatory bodies and those locally-determined performance standards are set by the board itself.</p> <p>Event: There is a risk that the IJB, and the services that it directs and has operational oversight of, fails to meet the national, regulatory and local standards.</p> <p>Consequence: This may result in harm or risk of harm to people.</p> | High |
| 5 | <p>Cause: Demographic & financial pressures requiring IJB to deliver transformational system change which helps to meet its strategic priorities.</p> <p>Event: Failure to deliver transformation and sustainable systems change.</p> <p>Consequence: people not receiving the best health and social care outcomes</p> | High |
| 6 | <p>Cause: Need to involve lived experience in service delivery and design as per Integration Principles</p> <p>Event: IJB fails to maximise the opportunities created for engaging with our communities</p> | Medium |



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| | Consequences: Services are not tailored to individual needs; reputational damage; and IJB does not meet strategic aims | |
| 7 | Cause- The ongoing recruitment and retention of staff. Event: Insufficient staff to provide patients/clients with services required. Consequence: Potential loss of life and unmet health and social care needs, leading to severe reputational damage. | Very High |



-1-

Description of Risk: Cause: The commissioning of services from third sector and independent providers (eg General Practice and other primary care services) requires all stakeholders to work collaboratively to meet the needs of local people.
Event: Potential failure of commissioned services to continue to deliver on their contract
Consequence: There is a gap between what is required to meet the needs of local people, and services that are available.
Consequences: to the individual include not having the right level of care delivered locally, by suitably trained staff.
Consequences: ability of other commissioned services to cope with the unexpected increased in demand.
Consequences to the partnership includes an inability to meet peoples needs for health and care and the additional financial burden of seeking that care in an alternative setting

Strategic Aims: Caring Together
Strategic Enablers: Relationships and Infrastructure

Leadership Team Owner: Lead Commissioner and Primary Care Lead

Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high
VERY HIGH

Rationale for Risk Rating:

IMPACT

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Almost Certain | | | | ✓ | |
| Likely | | | | | |
| Possible | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |

- There continue to be significant gaps in our ability to engage at a strategic level with some parts of the social care sector eg care home owners, and therefore a lack of alignment in our strategic response to the demands placed upon the whole system. Evidence of the impact of this includes a mismatch between the physical capacity we have available to meet the outcomes of people and the suitability and appropriateness of that capacity eg unsuitable accommodation, and a lack of appropriately trained staff
- Increased demand in primary care and widespread recruitment difficulties continues to impact on practices, which has led to practices prioritising the core GMS contract over any non-essential work eg Care Home SLA's. There have been 3 SLA contracts handed back by practices due to demand.
- Increased demand in primary care and widespread recruitment difficulties continues to impact on practices, which has increased the risk and frequency of handing back their contracts or closing their lists.
- Increase in unexpected/unplanned demand is a risk to patients and the ACHSCP
- Increased risk of reduction in General Dental Practitioners capacity as a result of patient deregistration activity seen in some regions
- The removal of the Covid-19 supplier relief funding will have an impact on providers.
- Recruitment difficulties in residential and non-residential businesses.
- Delayed implementation of Primary Care Improvement Plan (PCIP) due to staff redeployment due to Covid and lack of available workforce for recruitment.
- National Care Home Contract rates have been rejected for 2023/24

Risk Movement: increase/decrease/no change
NO CHANGE 12.05.23

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 all providers of primary health and care services to escalate valid concerns at an earlier opportunity.

- Controls:**
- Conscious cultural shift to change relationships, with all strategic commissioning activity proceeding in a collaborative manner.
 - Examples of collaborative commissioning models used as exemplar models within the City. Care at Home, Mental Health / Learning disability accommodation review.
 - Strategic Commissioning Programme Board (includes representatives from third and independent sectors)

- Mitigating Actions:**
- All opportunities to work in a collaborative manner to commission services are advertised on Public Contract Scotland, as well as individual invitations made to CEOs / owners of social care services.
 - Additional offers are made to encourage dialogue where the provider is unavailable to attend collaborative commissioning workshops etc.
 - Agreed strategic commissioning approach for ACHSCP.



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Medical Council GP Sub Group Clinical Director and Clinical Leads Primary Care Contracts Team Residential and Non-Residential Oversight Groups-meet depend on the needs of the sector Providers Huddle (meets weekly) Primary Care Integrated Management Group GP Contract Oversight Group ACHSCP PCIP Project Group Grampian Sustainability Group Senior Leadership Team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic commissioning programme board (SCPB members) established to provide governance framework for commissioning activity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability meetings with all Practices in Aberdeen City Working in collaboration with the Scottish Government, Local Medical Council (LMC) and Clinical Leads with practices to agree a sustainable way forward using individualised action plans and group discussions. Strategic Change Lead is establishing a task and finish group to review medical cover across care settings in the City with a view to establishing an alternative model for medical cover. The review is due to complete by 30 September 2023. Continue to liaise with the care home sector through the collaborative approach detailed in the controls to explore agreement at a local level until a national agreement is in place with Scotland Excel Continue to support the flow from acute into interim beds at Woodlands. |
| <p>Assurances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress against our strategic commissioning workplan Market facilitation opportunities and wide distribution of our market position statements Oversight of both residential and non-residential social care services Inspection reports from the Care Inspectorate Monitoring of Primary Care Improvement Plan Daily report monitoring Good relationships with GP practices, ensuring communication through agreed governance routes Links to Dental Practice Advisor who works with independent dentists Director of Dentistry co-ordinating Grampian contingency planning to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> horizon scan for regional deregistration activity proactively work with practices that wish to deregister patients plan suitable contingency arrangements in the event patients are deregister Part of the Eye Health Network and Clinical Leads for Optometry in Shire & Moray and the overall Grampian Clinical Lead Roles of Clinical Director and Clinical Leads, including fortnightly Grampian wide Clinical Lead Meetings Peer Support | <p>Gaps in assurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Market forces and individual business decisions regarding community optometry, general practice and general dental practitioners cannot be influenced by the Partnership. We are currently undertaking service mapping which will help to identify any potential gaps in market provision Public Dental Services staffing capacity to flexibly increase service provision in short term Difference between National Care Home Contract rate (last reviewed in 2013) and providing a 24 hour residential service. Inability to benchmark accurately due to variation of service models Contract Monitoring visits (enhanced services) Due to the National Care Home Contract not being agreed, there is a risk of local arrangements with each providers and Local Authorities being put in place -leading to disparity of levels funding. Discussions to reach a settlement on the increase to the National Care Home Contract (NCHC) for 23/24 placement fees have not concluded. A final offer of 6% was tabled to the care home sector, however, this was rejected by Scottish Care and its members. Following this rejection, Scottish Care is to seek increased funding from the Scottish Government for the social care sector and the older person's care home sector specifically. Whilst these negotiations take place, an interim increase to the NCHC fee rates is being offered to ensure that the care home sector has sufficient funding to provide staff members increased pay following the rise of the National Minimum Wage. |
| <p>Current performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We now have established a care at home strategic providers group, with agreed terms of reference. Their strategic ambition is to ensure the safe and effective delivery of care at home across Aberdeen. We have recently published and distributed market position statements for both residential and training and skills development for service users with either mental health or learning disability. Both have been co-produced with providers through a series of workshops which had been advertised locally and through public contracts Scotland. A financial risk rating of each residential care home/setting is being undertaken, to give intelligence on the risk across these businesses. | <p>Comments:</p> <p>Cost of living will impact on the provision of the service and the staff ability to get to work due to fuel prices. Lack of space for MDT working. Sustainability report has a limited predictability due to the ever changing nature of primary care.</p> <p>GP practices are expressing an increasing challenge in meeting the needs of practice populations and therefore many are prioritising the delivery of the core GMS contract. The impact of this means that any additional non-core/statutory work is being reviewed by practices and in some instances, stopped. This varies across the City and the Partnership continues to work with Practices to find collaborative and financially sustainable solutions for both parties</p> |



- Regular GP practice status reports which notes operational performance levels and individualised action plans where practices detail how they are pro-actively opening their lists.
- Discussions to reach a settlement on the increase to the National Care Home Contract (NCHC) for 23/24 placement fees have not concluded. A final offer of 6% was tabled to the care home sector, however, this was rejected by Scottish Care and its members. Following this rejection, Scottish Care is to seek increased funding from the Scottish Government for the social care sector and the older person's care home sector specifically. Whilst these negotiations take place, an interim increase to the NCHC fee rates is being offered to ensure that the care home sector has sufficient funding to provide staff members increased pay following the rise of the National Minimum Wage.



-2-

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------------|
| Description of Risk: Cause-IJB financial failure and projection of overspend Event-Demand outstrips available budget Consequence-IJB can't deliver on its strategic plan priorities, statutory work, and projects. | | | | | |
| Strategic Aims: All Strategic Enablers: Finance | | | Leadership Team Owner: Chief Finance Officer | | |
| Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high <p style="text-align: center;">HIGH</p> | | | | | |
| IMPACT | | | | | |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | ✓ | | |
| Possible | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Risk Movement: increase/decrease/no change: <p style="text-align: center;">NO CHANGE 12.05.2023</p> | | | | | |
| Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial information is reported regularly to the Risk, Audit and Performance Committee, the Integration Joint Board and the Senior Leadership Team Risk, Audit & Performance receives regular updates on transformation programme & spend. Approved reserves strategy, including risk fund Robust financial monitoring and budget setting procedures including regular budget monitoring & budget meeting with budget holders. Budgets delegated to cost centre level and being managed by budget holders. | | | Mitigating Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Senior Leadership Team are committed to driving out efficiencies, encouraging self-management and moving forward the prevention agenda to help manage future demand for services. The Senior Leadership Team have formalised arrangements to receive monthly financial monitoring statements. | | |

Rationale for Risk Rating:

- If the partnership does not have sufficient funding to cover all expenditure, then in order to achieve a sustainable balanced financial position, decisions will be required to be taken which may include reducing/stopping services
- 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. The MTFF was reported to the IJB in March 2023.
- The major risk in terms of funding to the Integration Joint Board is the level of funding delegated from the Council and NHS and whether this is sufficient to sustain future service delivery. There is also a risk of additional funding being ring-fenced for specific priorities and policies, which means introducing new projects and initiatives at a time when financial pressure is being faced on mainstream budgets.
- IJB is currently experiencing significant pressures due to inflation, cost of living, staff costs, energy costs.

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).



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium-Term Financial Strategy. • Medium Term Financial Strategy review, including a members workshop ahead of the budget meeting (each year) | |
| <p>Assurances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk, Audit and Performance 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. • Monthly financial monitoring to SLT | <p>Gaps in assurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • There is a gap in terms of the impact of transformation on our budgets. Many of the benefits of our projects relate to early intervention and reducing hospital admissions, neither of which provide early cashable savings |
| <p>Current performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year end unaudited annual accounts 2022/23 will be submitted to Risk, Audit and Performance Committee in May 2023 | <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial position in future years will be challenging. Discussions are continuing with ACC and NHSG regarding level of funding for future years. |



- 3 -

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| <p>Description of Risk: Cause: Under Integration arrangements, Aberdeen IJB hosts services on behalf of Moray and Aberdeenshire, and who also hosts services on behalf of Aberdeen City. Event: hosted services do not deliver the expected outcomes, fail to deliver transformation of services, or face service failure. Consequence: Failure to meet health outcomes for Aberdeen City, resources not being maximised and reputational damage.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Strategic Aims: All Strategic Enablers: Relationships</p> | | | <p>Leadership Team Owner: Chief Officer</p> | | |
| <p>Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high HIGH</p> | | | | | |
| <p>IMPACT</p> | | | | | |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | ✓ | | |
| Possible | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| <p>Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change): NO CHANGE 12.05.2023</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration scheme agreement on cross-reporting North East Partnership Steering Group Aberdeen City Strategic Planning Group (ACSPG) North East System Wide Transformation Group | | | <p>Mitigating Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of Service Level Agreements for 9 of the hosted services considered through budget setting process. In depth review of the other 3 hosted services. Quarterly reporting to ACSPG and annual reporting on budget setting to IJB (once developed). | | |
| <p>Assurances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These largely come from the systems, process and procedures put in place by NHS Grampian, which are still being operated, along with any new processes which are put in place by the lead IJB. North East System Wide Transformation Group (Officers only) led by the 4 pan-Grampian chief executives. 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. Both the CEO group and the Chairs & Vice Chairs group meet quarterly. The meetings are evenly staggered between groups, giving some six weeks between them, allowing progressive work / iterative work to be timely between the forums. The Portfolio approach and wider system approach demonstrates closer joint working across the 3 Health and Social Care Partnerships and the Acute Sector. | | | <p>Gaps in assurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing review of hosted through development of SLA's. | | |



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

Current performance:

- Once the SLA's are reported to the Risk, Audit and Performance Committee, the IJB will be informed on current performance on an ongoing basis.
- An update report is to be submitted to the IJB on the 25th of April, 2023.

Comments:



- 4 -

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| Description of Risk: | | | | | |
| Cause: Performance standards/outcomes are set by national and regulatory bodies and those locally-determined performance standards are set by the board itself. | | | | | |
| Event: There is a risk that the IJB, and the services that it directs and has operational oversight of, fails to meet the national, regulatory and local standards. | | | | | |
| Consequence: This may result in harm or risk of harm to people. | | | | | |
| Strategic Aims: All | | | Leadership Team Owner: Strategy and Transformation Lead | | |
| Strategic Enablers: Technology | | | | | |
| Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high | | | | | |
| HIGH | | | | | |
| IMPACT | | | | | |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | ✓ | | |
| Possible | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change) | | | | | |
| NO CHANGE 12.05.2023 | | | | | |
| Controls: | | | Mitigating Actions: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical and Care Governance Committee and Group Risk, Audit and Performance Committee Data and Evaluation Group Performance Framework Linkage with ACC and NHSG performance reporting Annual Performance Report Chief Social Work Officer's Report Ministerial Steering Group (MSG) Scrutiny External and Internal Audit Reports Links to outcomes of Inspections, Complaints etc. Contract Management Framework Weekly Senior Leadership Team Meetings | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continual review of key performance indicators Review of and where and how often performance information is reported and how learning is fed back into processes and procedures. On-going work developing a culture of performance management and evaluation throughout the partnership Refinement 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 resource to drive performance management process development Risk-assessed plans with actions, responsible owners, timescales and performance measures monitored by dedicated teams Restructure of Strategy and Transformation Team which includes an increase in the number of Programme and Project Managers will help mitigate the risk of services not meeting required standards. | | |



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily Operational Leadership Team Huddles • Urgent and Unscheduled Care Programme Board | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Grampian Operational Pressure Escalation System (G-OPES) and Daily and Weekly System Connect Meetings help to mitigate the risk of services not meeting standards through system wide support. • Four focus areas of the system wide critical response to ongoing system pressures • All recommendations from the Internal Audit report on Performance Management have been implemented. |
| <p>Assurances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint meeting of IJB Chief Officer with two Partner Body Chief Executives. • Agreement that full Dashboard will be reported to both Clinical and Care Governance Committee and Risk, 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. • Benchmarking with other IJBs | <p>Gaps in assurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal performance reporting against the Strategic/Delivery Plan has continued to be developed in consultation with the SLT. • Further work required on linkage to Community Planning Aberdeen reporting. • Review of the Locality Plans, this will include prioritisation of actions. |
| <p>Current performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance reports submitted to IJB, Risk, Audit and Performance and Clinical and Care Governance Committees. • Various Steering Groups for strategy implementation established. • Close links with social care commissioning, procurement and contracts team have been established • IJB Dashboard has been shared widely. • Working on production of Annual Report 2022/23 to be reported to the IJB in August, 2023 • SLT workshops held to develop a Partnership dashboard | <p>Comments:</p> |



-5-

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| Description of Risk: | | | | | |
| Cause: Demographic & financial pressures requiring IJB to deliver transformational system change which helps to meet its strategic priorities. | | | | | |
| Event: Failure to deliver transformation and sustainable systems change. | | | | | |
| Consequence: people not receiving the best health and social care outcomes | | | | | |
| Strategic Aims: All | | | Leadership Team Owner: Strategy and Transformation Lead | | |
| Strategic Enablers: Technology and Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high | | | | | |
| HIGH | | | | | |
| IMPACT | | | | | |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | | | |
| Possible | | | ✓ | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change) | | | | | |
| NO CHANGE 12.05.2023 | | | | | |
| Controls: | | | Mitigating Actions: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance Structure and Process (Senior Leadership Team meetings, Operational Team Daily Huddles and IJB and its Committees) Quarterly Reporting of Delivery Plan progress to Risk, Audit & Performance Committee Annual Performance Report External and Internal Audit | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme management approach being taken across whole of the Partnership Regular reporting of progress on programmes and projects to Senior Leadership Team Increased frequency of governance processes, Senior Leadership Team now meeting weekly A number of plans and frameworks have been developed to underpin our transformation activity across our wider system including: Primary Care Improvement Plan and Action 15 Plan. | | |
| Assurances: | | | Gaps in assurance: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk, Audit and Performance Committee Reporting Robust Programme Management approach supported by an evaluation framework IJB oversight Board Assurance and Escalation Framework process | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our ability to evidence the impact of our transformation: documenting results from evaluations and reviewing results from evaluations conducted elsewhere allows us to determine what works when seeking to embed new models. | | |



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Internal Audit has undertaken a detailed audit of our transformation programme. All recommendations from this audit have now been actioned.• The Medium-Term Financial Framework prioritises transformation activity that could deliver cashable savings• Separation in Year 2 Delivery Plan of transformational projects from business as usual projects• The Medium-Term Financial Framework, Portfolio Management Approach aims and principles, and Programme of Transformation have been mapped to demonstrate overall alignment to strategic plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All Programme and Project Managers to be trained in the appropriate level of Managing Successful Programmes methodology and Prince2, where appropriate.• Changes to funding have meant that temporary recruitment to certain posts is in place for 2023/24, with further work to be done to identify funding beyond that. |
| <p>Current performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Strategic/Delivery Plan has been approved and Strategy and Transformation resource has been allocated to deliver on the projects within the Plan. | <p>Comments:</p> |



- 6 -

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------------|
| Description of Risk | | | | | |
| Cause: Need to involve lived experience in service delivery and design as per Integration Principles | | | | | |
| Event: IJB fails to maximise the opportunities created for engaging with our communities | | | | | |
| Consequences: Services are not tailored to individual needs; reputational damage; and IJB does not meet strategic aims. | | | | | |
| Strategic Aims: All | | | Leadership Owner: Chief Officer | | |
| Strategic Enablers: Relationships | | | | | |
| Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high | | | | | |
| MEDIUM | | | | | |
| IMPACT | | | | | |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | | | |
| Possible | | | ✓ | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change) | | | | | |
| NO CHANGE 12.05.2023 | | | | | |
| Controls: | | | Mitigating Actions: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locality Empowerment Groups (LEGs) Senior Leadership Team Meetings and Operational Leadership Huddles CPP Community Engagement Group Equalities and Human Rights Sub-Group | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Pre-Meeting Group set up to support locality empowerment group members on the SPG. Continued joint working with Community Planning colleagues to oversee the ongoing development of locality planning | | |
| Assurances: | | | Gaps in assurance | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Planning Group (LEGs have representation on this group) Executive Programme Board IJB/Risk, Audit and Performance Committee CPA Board | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographic and diversity representation on Locality Empowerment Groups. The Equalities and Human Rights Sub Group has been tasked to address this. | | |
| Current performance: | | | Comments: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEGs representatives attend the SPG on a regular basis and participate in the meetings. Review of joint locality planning arrangements is underway | | | | | |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| <p>Description of Risk: Cause-The ongoing recruitment and retention of staff Event: Insufficient staff to provide patients/clients with services required. Consequence: Potential loss of life and unmet health and social care needs, leading to severe reputational damage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Strategic Aims: All Strategic Enablers: Workforce</p> | | | <p>Leadership Team Owner: People & Organisation Lead</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Risk Rating: low/medium/high/very high VERY HIGH</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>IMPACT</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Almost Certain</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Likely</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Possible</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unlikely</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rare</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>LIKELIHOOD -</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Minor</td> <td>Moderate</td> <td>Major</td> <td>Extreme</td> </tr> </table> | | | | | | Almost Certain | | | | | ✓ | Likely | | | | | | Possible | | | | | | Unlikely | | | | | | Rare | | | | | | LIKELIHOOD - | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Almost Certain | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Likely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Possible | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LIKELIHOOD - | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Rationale for Risk Rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current staffing complement profile changes on an incremental basis over time. • However the proportion of over 50s employed within the partnership (by NHSG and ACC) is increasing rapidly (i.e. 1 in 3 nurses are over 50). • Totally exhausted work force with higher turnover of staff (particularly over 50) • Current very high vacancy levels and long delays in recruitment across ACHSCP services. • Economic upturn in North East post covid, which means there is direct competition with non-clinical posts and negatively impacting on the calibre of candidates for a number of posts • Post Covid 19 landscape, where many staff have reflected on their personal situation, which has led to increased numbers of early retirement applications, requests for reduced hours and staff leaving the service • Staff experienced the most challenging winter in Health and Social Care history and the likelihood that this will be just as challenging in the winter ahead. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Risk Movement: (increase/decrease/no change) NO CHANGE 12.05.2023</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical & Care Governance Committee reviews tactical level of risk around staffing numbers • Clinical & Care Governance Group review the operational level of risk • Oversight of daily Operational Leadership Team meetings to maximise the use of daily staffing availability • Revised contract monitoring arrangements with providers to determine recruitment / retention trends in the wider care sector-<i>replicate wording in risk 1 and include pc risk</i> • Establishment of daily staffing situational reports (considered by the Leadership Team) • NHSG and ACC workforce policies • Daily Grampian System Connect Meetings and governance structure • Daily sitreps from all services (includes staffing absences) • ACHSCP Delivery Group for Workforce Plan | | | <p>Rationale for Risk Appetite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will accept minimal risks of harm to service users or to staff. By minimal risks, the IJB means it will only accept minimal risk to services users or staff when the comparative risk of doing nothing is higher than the risk of intervention. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Assurances: ACHSCP Workforce Plan and Delivery Group Agreed governance arrangements Formal performance reporting against the Strategic/Delivery Plan has continued to be developed in consultation with the SLT. Staff side and union representation on daily Operational Leadership Team meetings</p> | | | <p>Mitigating Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly increased emphasis on health/wellbeing of staff and positive feedback regularly received • establishment of ACHSCP recruitment programme, with significantly increased Social Media presence • promotion and support of the 'We Care' and 'Grow of own' approaches • embrace the use of new/improved digital technologies to develop and support the ACHSCP infrastructure & develop a road map with a focus on enablement for staff | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Aberdeen City Health & Social Care Partnership

A caring partnership

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> flexible/hybrid working options to become 'normal' working practice that benefit staff time & supports their wellbeing as well as helps staff retention Increased emphasis on communication with staff increased collaboration across the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and integration between professional disciplines, third sector, independent sector and communities through Localities to help diversity of the workforce Increased monitoring of staff statistics (sickness, turnover, CPD, complaints etc) through Senior Leadership Team and daily Operational Leadership Team meetings, identifying trends. Awareness of new Scottish Government, NHSG and ACC workforce policies and guidelines Partnership to reintroduce staff recognition events to encourage retention Staff Wellbeing budget in 2023/24 of £25,000 All staff strongly encouraged to use their annual leave throughout the year, take regular breaks and this to be positively modelled by SLT |
| <p>Current performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership sickness statistics suggest that absences in 2022 were at their highest in December Managing workforce challenges through daily Operational Leadership Team meetings and Daily Connect Meetings and structures Managing very high level vacancies in comparison to neighbouring Health Boards | <p>Gaps in assurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated Project Support of Delivery Group for Workforce Plan |
| | <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing consultation on National Care Service. Any updates arising from the progress of the Service that has a bearing on the risk will be updated in due course. Possible Junior Doctor industrial action could lead to critical services not being provided which will impact on staff wellbeing as would potential deployment of staff to other duties over the next 6 months |



Appendix 1 – Risk Tolerance

| Level of Risk | Risk Tolerance |
|----------------------|--|
| Low | <p>Acceptable level of risk. No additional controls are required but any existing risk controls or contingency plans should be documented.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Medium | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Relevant Chief Officers/Managers/Directors/Assurance Committees will periodically seek assurance that these continue to be effective.</p> |
| High | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> |
| Very High | <p>Unacceptable 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The IJB's will seek assurance that risks of this level are being effectively managed.</p> <p>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</p> |



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 of clinical care. | Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome directly related to care provision – readily resolvable. | Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome, short term effects – expect recovery <1wk. | Unsatisfactory patient experience/ clinical outcome; long term effects – expect recovery >1wk. | Unsatisfactory patient experience/clinical outcome, continued ongoing long term effects. |
| Objectives/ Project | Barely noticeable reduction in scope, quality or schedule. | Minor reduction in scope, quality or schedule. | Reduction in scope or quality of project; project objectives or schedule. | Significant project over-run. | Inability to meet project objectives; reputation of the organisation seriously damaged. |
| Injury (physical and psychological) to patient/ visitor/staff. | Adverse event leading to minor injury not requiring first aid | Minor injury or illness, first aid treatment required. | Agency reportable, e.g. Police (violent and aggressive acts). Significant injury requiring medical treatment and/or counselling. | Major injuries/long term 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 | Justified written complaint peripheral to clinical care. | Below excess claim. Justified complaint involving lack of appropriate care. | Claim above excess level. Multiple justified complaints | Multiple claims or single major claim. Complex justified complaint. |
| Service/ Business Interruption | Interruption in a service which does not impact on the delivery of patient care or the ability to continue to provide service. | Short term disruption to service with minor impact on patient care. | Some disruption in service with unacceptable impact on patient care. Temporary loss of ability to provide service. | Sustained loss of service which has serious impact on delivery of patient care resulting in major contingency plans being invoked. | Permanent loss of core service or facility. Disruption to facility leading to significant "knock on" effect. |
| Staffin and Competence | Short term low staffin level temporarily reduces service quality (< 1 day). Short term low staffin level (>1 day), where there is no disruption to patient care. | Ongoing low staffin level reduces service quality Minor error due to ineffective training/implementation of training. | Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff. Moderate error due to ineffective training/ implementation of training. Ongoing problems with staffin levels | Uncertain delivery of key objective /service due to lack of staff. Major error due to ineffective training/implementation of training. | Non-delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff. Loss of key staff. Critical error due to ineffective training / implementation of training. |
| Financial (including damage/loss/ fraud) | Negligible organisational/ personal financial loss (£<1k). | Minor organisational/ personal financial loss (£1-10k). | Significant organisational / personal financial loss (£10-100k). | Major organisational/personal financial loss (£100k-1m). | Severe organisational/ personal financial 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 Publicity/ Reputation | Rumours, no media coverage. Little effect on staff morale. | Local media coverage – short term. Some public embarrassment. Minor effect on staff morale/ public attitudes. | Local media – long-term adverse publicity. Significant effect on staff morale and public perception of the organisation. | National media/adverse publicity, less than 3 days. Public confidence in the organisation undermined. Use of services affected. | National/International media/ adverse publicity, more than 3 days. MSP/MP concern (Questions in Parliament). Court Enforcement. Public Enquiry/FAI. |

Table 2 - Likelihood Definitions

| Descriptor | Rare | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Almost Certain |
|--------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Probability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can't believe this event would happen Will only happen in exceptional circumstances. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not expected to happen, but definite potential exists Unlikely to occur. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May occur occasionally Has happened before on occasions Reasonable chance of occurring. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong possibility that this could occur Likely to occur. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is expected to occur frequently/in most circumstances more likely to occur than not. |

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 |

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

Table 4 - NHSG Response to Risk

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

| Level of Risk | Response to Risk |
|------------------|---|
| Low | Acceptable level of risk. No additional controls are required but any existing risk controls or contingency plans should be documented. 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. 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 Managers/Directors/Assurance Committees will periodically seek assurance that these continue to be effective. |
| High | Further action should be taken to mitigate/reduce/control the risk, possibly urgently and possibly requiring significant resources. 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. Relevant 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 Board may wish to seek assurance that risks of this level are being effectively managed. However NHSG 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 High | Unacceptable level of risk exposure that requires urgent and potentially immediate corrective action to be taken. Relevant Managers/Directors/Executive and Assurance Committees should be informed explicitly by the relevant Managers/Risk Owners. 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. The Board will seek assurance that risks of this level are being effectively managed. However NHSG 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. |