Wirral Care & Support at Home Risk Register												
		Risk Assessment						Residual Risk				
Risk Descriptor	Potential Consequence	Probability		mpa M	G G	Risk Score	Control / Mitigation Action Plan	Probability	Impa F M	G	Risk Score	Risk Owner
Staff attraction and retention.	<ul> <li>Unmet needs</li> <li>Unable to meet contractual requirements.</li> <li>Strain on the hospital.</li> <li>Risk to service users.</li> <li>Strain on other services</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Career progression programme.</li> <li>Pay increase-consistency.</li> <li>Mandated guaranteed contracted hours.</li> </ul>	4	5 5	5	60	
OBA	<ul> <li>Lack of transparency/trust.</li> <li>Risk-no gain.</li> <li>Complexity of own organisation not aware of process.</li> </ul>	3	3	3	3	27	<ul> <li>Not mandatory.</li> <li>Guaranteed hours for life of contract.</li> <li>Incentivised.</li> </ul>	2	2 2	2	12	
Business Process	<ul> <li>Current process remains fragmented.</li> <li>Missed communication.</li> <li>Different offer to different organisations/people.</li> <li>Unmanaged demand in capacity.</li> </ul>	3	3	3	3	27	<ul> <li>Reviewing existing process.</li> <li>Streamline.</li> <li>Consistent offer.</li> <li>Capacity v demand planning.</li> </ul>	2	2 2	2	12	
Acute hospital admission/discharge	<ul> <li>Unsafe discharge.</li> <li>Reduced flow.</li> <li>Budget failure.</li> <li>Unable to meet demand.</li> <li>Reputation.</li> <li>Service breach.</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Utilising technologies.</li> <li>Business processing.</li> <li>Partnering with 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.</li> <li>Brokerage process.</li> <li>Trusted assessor.</li> <li>Transparency.</li> </ul>	3	3 3	3	27	
Financial Sustainability	<ul> <li>Market failure.</li> <li>Rising budget.</li> <li>Service user's needs not met.</li> <li>Unemployment.</li> </ul>	3	5	4	4	65	<ul> <li>New model for Dom care.</li> <li>Budget controls-innovation.</li> <li>Use of technologies.</li> <li>Outcomes focused.</li> <li>Trusted assessor</li> <li>Collaboration/partnership working.</li> </ul>					
Lack of Technologies/Innovation	<ul> <li>Rising demand.</li> <li>Market efficiency.</li> <li>Collaboration-lack of financial impact.</li> </ul>	4	3	3	3	36	<ul> <li>Research-implement-review.</li> <li>Intelligence.</li> <li>Budget control.</li> <li>Partnership-open &amp; honest</li> </ul>					
Direct Payment	<ul> <li>Inappropriate use of money.</li> <li>None regulated staff (no DBS).</li> <li>Risk of abuse/neglect.</li> <li>Very little control.</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Level personalised rates across the board.</li> <li>Monitoring/checks.</li> <li>Audits.</li> <li>Penalties in place.</li> <li>Enforcement.</li> </ul>	1	2 2	2	6	

		Risk					ort at Home Risk Register	Re	sidu	al I	Risk		
Risk Descriptor	Potential Consequence	Brobability Impact Risk				-	Control / Mitigation Action Plan	Drahahilitur Impact				Risk Ris	
		Probability		M		Score		Probability			G	Score	Own
External Organisation impact on Dom care	<ul> <li>Failing to work collaboratively will lead to fail.</li> <li>Animosity between services.</li> <li>Waste of resources.</li> </ul>	4	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Workshops.</li> <li>Incentivise -shared gain/risk.</li> <li>Sharing resources.</li> <li>Shared data.</li> </ul>	1	4	4	4	12	
Length of Contract	<ul> <li>Uncertainty.</li> <li>Long term view-costings.</li> <li>Contract commitment.</li> <li>Sustainability/investments.</li> <li>Affordability.</li> <li>Recruitment.</li> <li>Uneasy workforce.</li> </ul>	3	4	4	4	36	<ul> <li>Longer term contract, allows opportunity to develop and invest more.</li> <li>Drive cost efficiencies.</li> <li>Procurement.</li> </ul>	1	1	1	1	3	
Culture	<ul> <li>Domiciliary care provision is wholly dependent on people for delivery.</li> <li>New ways of working are required to meet existing and emerging market challenges.</li> <li>People are naturally resistant to change.</li> <li>If people do not adapt to new ways of working the new delivery and commercial models will fail impacting on service standards and financial performance.</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Leadership recognition and acknowledgement.</li> <li>Allocate resource to implement culture intervention.</li> <li>Implement cultural innovation program.</li> <li>Monitor impact.</li> </ul>	2	3	3	3	18	
Demand	<ul> <li>Unable to meet demand.</li> <li>Service user failure/safeguarding.</li> <li>Provider failure.</li> <li>Contractual implications.</li> <li>Over subscription.</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Staff recruitment processes in place.</li> <li>Working together to cover market and demand – partnership.</li> <li>Collaborative working.</li> <li>Limit contracted providers we commission with.</li> <li>Training-upskill.</li> <li>Increase providers servicers-whole approach.</li> </ul>	2	2	2	2	12	
Legislative	<ul> <li>Increased costs to system.</li> <li>Recruitment impact.</li> <li>Provider sustainability.</li> </ul>	3	5	4	3	36	<ul> <li>Consider contingency.</li> <li>Budget if changes are expected.</li> <li>Providers integrated working for sharing functions to reduce cost impact.</li> </ul>	2	2	2	2	12	
Publicity & Reputation	<ul> <li>Negative publicity.</li> <li>Not represented correctly.</li> <li>Recruitment.</li> <li>Lack of confidence.</li> <li>Suspension.</li> </ul>	5	5	5	5	75	<ul> <li>Positive news stories.</li> <li>Real life positive outcomes.</li> <li>Schools/colleges involvement.</li> <li>Transparent approach.</li> <li>Communication.</li> </ul>	2	2	2	2	12	
Governance and Leadership should providers collaborate	<ul> <li>Project plan.</li> <li>CQC compliance.</li> <li>Lack of structure.</li> <li>Each organisation internal governance.</li> </ul>						<ul> <li>Establish a board.</li> <li>Identify lead representatives.</li> <li>MOU.</li> <li>Mutual agreement.</li> <li>'Professional' oversight.</li> </ul>						<u> </u>

				essme		oort at Home Risk Register	Re	sidual R	isk	
<b>Risk Descriptor</b>	Potential Consequence	Probability	Im	pact M G	Risk Score	Control / Mitigation Action Plan	Probability	Impac F M		Risk Owner
	<ul> <li>QA framework</li> <li>Delegated authority.</li> <li>Legislative requirements.</li> <li>Not co-ordinated.</li> </ul>					<ul> <li>Project plan.</li> <li>Discuss with CQC.</li> <li>Values.</li> <li>Communication.</li> </ul>				
Co-ordination of Transformation	<ul> <li>Misses the culture change.</li> <li>Business process not aligned.</li> <li>Resilience to change.</li> <li>Business process.</li> <li>Technology.</li> <li>Budgetary impact.</li> </ul>					<ul> <li>Need to cover any provider who might pull out.</li> <li>Establish and agree the procurement.</li> <li>Establish partner project plan.</li> <li>Timescales.</li> <li>Whole system approach.</li> <li>Business process mapping.</li> </ul>				
Mobilisation/change to supply chain	<ul> <li>Negative impact on service user.</li> <li>Tupe risk.</li> <li>Workforce delivery.</li> <li>Impact on market.</li> <li>Sustainability.</li> <li>Legal issues.</li> </ul>					<ul> <li>Joint review.</li> <li>Establish a board.</li> <li>Comms strategy.</li> <li>Establish procurement model to legal framework.</li> <li>Timescales/project plan.</li> <li>Write and agree workforce plan.</li> </ul>				
Demand continues to grow unchecked	<ul> <li>Market unable to keep up with demand and service users' needs go unmet or not delivered to required service standards</li> <li>Commissioners budgets are exceeded</li> <li>Providers CQC ratings put at risk because of demand on the system</li> </ul>	5	5		25	<ul> <li>Demand management strategy which is performance managed</li> <li>Assets based approach</li> <li>Strengths based approach</li> <li>Signposting</li> <li>Developing community assets</li> <li>Developing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector assets</li> <li>Objective - Zero growth year on year</li> <li>Target - Year on year demand reduction</li> </ul>	2	4 8		
Market capacity	<ul> <li>Insufficient Providers in market who are convinced of viability of the local market in terms of making long term investments in their local business units</li> <li>Low levels of collaboration between existing Providers inhibiting realisation of potential cost savings and efficiency gains</li> </ul>	5	4		20	<ul> <li>Develop procurement strategy for new framework based on;</li> <li>Open and equity based engagement with supply chain to gain their input to what will represent a sustainable proposition for them pre- ITT</li> <li>Partnering based governance structure for new framework to;- <ul> <li>improve decision making via the input of the experience of all partners</li> <li>increase ownership and commitment</li> <li>facilitate collaboration</li> <li>embed continuous improvement in the operating culture</li> </ul> </li> <li>Open Book Accounting to be used as a base for the commercial management of the framework to:- <ul> <li>provide transparency to all partners</li> <li>to make all partners responsible for cost</li> <li>provide visibility on potential efficiency gains across both Commissioners and Providers business processes</li> <li>support value management throughout the life of the contract</li> <li>demonstrate public accountability for expenditure against the Wirral £</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2	3 6		

						port at Home Risk Register			
		Risk	1	ssmen			Re	sidual Ri	 
<b>Risk Descriptor</b>	Potential Consequence	Probability		pact 4 G	Risk Score	Control / Mitigation Action Plan	Probability	Impact F M (	Risk Owner
	<ul> <li>Market unable secure and retain sufficient resource to keep up with demand and service users' needs to unmet or not delivered to required service standards</li> <li>Not being able to meet specialist provision for CHC &amp; End of Life</li> </ul>					<ul> <li>Develop a Wirral wide ATTRACT - RETAIN - DEVELOP strategy for care workers. Key elements to include:-</li> <li>Develop a career path for care workers</li> <li>Identify savings that can be directed to improving care worker T&amp;C's</li> <li>Comm's strategy to improve profile of care worker role and attractiveness as a career</li> <li>Care worker recruitment and retention incorporated as a KPI in framework incentivisation model</li> <li>Meeting with current provider of this provision</li> <li>Detailed specification on service requirements</li> </ul>			
Utilisation	Provider Partners having secured capacity are then unable to optimise utilisation leading to financial loss	3	2		6	<ul> <li>Improved demand forecasts from Commissioners developed collaboratively with Provider Partners providing clarity on base loads and seasonal variation</li> <li>Based on forecasts guaranteed hours offered to Provider partners for annual or seasonal base loads</li> <li>Penalty payments for Providers failing to meet guaranteed hours commitment</li> <li>Annual workload allocation to Provider Partners determined by Partnership Board based on historical performance against KPI's</li> </ul>	1	2 2	
Provider Partner Sustainability	<ul> <li>ITT thought not to be commercially viable then the potential exists for insufficient bidders or inappropriate bidders</li> <li>Provider Partners cannot make the framework commercially viable throughout life of framework</li> <li>Cost to Commissioners of either scenario above in terms of:         <ul> <li>Impact on statutory duties</li> <li>Impact on service users</li> <li>Cost of change</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4	5		20	<ul> <li>Market engagement exercise pre-ITT</li> <li>Utilisation of Open Book Accounting and proactive Risk Management during the life of the contract</li> </ul>	3	39	
Changes to Legislation / Regulation / Service Standards	<ul> <li>If not addressed in the new contract the Provider will be exposed to changes in legislation that might impact on their costs and viability</li> <li>Providers will therefore have to price that risk</li> <li>The pricing of the risk will most likely either be excessive, leading to avoidably high delivery costs to Commissioners; or they will under-price put at jeopardy their sustainability as a Provider over the life of the</li> </ul>		5		20	<ul> <li>Exclude risk in contract terms and include transparent process based on open book accounting principles for calculating impact of change</li> <li>Commissioners to build contingency for such changes into overall budget on the basis of open book accounting principles</li> </ul>	0	0 0	

		Wirral (	Care 8	k Supp	port at Home Risk Register				
		Risk	Assessme	ent –		Re	sidual R	isk	
<b>Risk Descriptor</b>	Potential Consequence	Probability	Impact F M G		Control / Mitigation Action Plan	Probability	Impac F M		Risk Owner
	contract leading to withdrawal, impact on service delivery and reputational and cost of change impact on the Commissioners								
Inflation	The pricing of the risk will most likely either be excessive, leading to avoidably high delivery costs to Commissioners; or they will under-price put at jeopardy their sustainability as a Provider over the life of the contract leading to withdrawal, impact on service delivery and reputational and cost of change impact on the Commissioners	3	3	12	<ul> <li>Exclude risk in contract terms and include transparent process based on open book accounting principles for calculating impact of change</li> <li>Commissioners to build contingency for such changes into overall budget on the basis of open book accounting principles</li> </ul>	0	0 0		