

Risk Assessment for Key Decision – Local HealthWatch

Risk Log			Impact				Likelihood
Ref	Risk Description	Potential Impact	Financial (A)	Service Delivery (B)	Reputation (C)	Overall Impact (A + B + C)	
R-01	Risk of failure to have Local Healthwatch in County Durham in place by April 2013 as per the legislation.	Contrary to legislation. Delayed implementation Damage to reputation Cost	2	3	4	9	1
	R-01 (A) From legal challenge to procurement process.	Lack of provision in this service area Legal issues					
	R-01 (B) Project team's inability to commission in time due to internal factors (e.g. lack of time, expertise or ability, mistakes, internal disputes, staffing issues)						
	R-01 (C) Project team's inability to commission in time due to external factors (e.g. lack of guidance from DH, unclear budgetary position)						
	R-01 (D) Lack of interested parties who would be willing to provide and tender. May be related to budget allocation from government.						
R-02	Delays and issues caused by TUPE issues (e.g. from current provider of LINK, existing services which may transfer to Healthwatch – e.g. signposting function from PCT PALS).	Delayed implementation Damage to reputation Legal issues.	2	2	2	6	1

Risk Log			Impact				Likelihood
Ref	Risk Description	Potential Impact	Financial (A)	Service Delivery (B)	Reputation (C)	Overall Impact (A + B + C)	
R-03	Risks related to impact of ineffective transition period between LINK and Local Healthwatch.	TUPE issues Loss of volunteers during transition phase Loss of knowledge and data Decrease in service during transition	2	2	2	6	1

R01 - Appetite for Risk						
Impact	Critical (score 13 – 15)					
	Major (score 10 – 12)					
	Moderate (score 7 – 9)	X				
	Minor (score 4 – 6)					
	Insignificant (score 1 – 3)					
		Remote (score 1)	Unlikely (score 2)	Possible (score 3)	Probable (score 4)	Highly Probable (score 5)
Likelihood						

R02- Appetite for Risk

Impact	Critical (score 13 – 15)					
	Major (score 10 – 12)					
	Moderate (score 7 – 9)					
	Minor (score 4 – 6)	X				
	Insignificant (score 1 – 3)					
	Remote (score 1)	Unlikely (score 2)	Possible (score 3)	Probable (score 4)	Highly Probable (score 5)	
Likelihood						

R03 - Appetite for Risk

Impact	Critical (score 13 – 15)					
	Major (score 10 – 12)					
	Moderate (score 7 – 9)					
	Minor (score 4 – 6)	X				
	Insignificant (score 1 – 3)					
	Remote (score 1)	Unlikely (score 2)	Possible (score 3)	Probable (score 4)	Highly Probable (score 5)	
Likelihood						

Conclusion:

There are no reportable risks to this Key Decision.

Risk Assessment Summary with mitigation

Risk description	Potential Impact	Measures to mitigate the risk	Risk owner
<p>Risk of failure to have Local Healthwatch in County Durham in place by April 2013 as per the legislation.</p> <p>(A) From legal challenge to procurement process.</p> <p>(B) Project team's inability to commission in time due to internal factors (e.g. lack of time, expertise or ability, mistakes, internal disputes, staffing issues)</p> <p>(C) Project team's inability to commission in time due to external factors (e.g. lack of guidance from DH, unclear budgetary position)</p> <p>(D) Lack of interested parties who would be willing to provide and tender.</p> <p>May be related to budget allocation from government.</p>	<p>Contrary to legislation.</p> <p>Delayed implementation</p> <p>Damage to reputation</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>Lack of provision in this service area</p> <p>Legal issues</p>	<p>Carry out a robust, transparent procurement process under Part A of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.</p> <p>Project Team are from a wide range of service areas including Commissioning, Finance, CYPS and the PCT.</p> <p>Project plan is in place with clear milestones.</p> <p>Market testing exercise undertaken.</p> <p>Engagement with the Local Involvement Network.</p> <p>Information from pathfinder projects.</p> <p>Attendance at HealthWatch "masterclass" held by DH.</p>	<p>Corporate Director Adults Wellbeing & Health</p>
<p>Delays and issues caused by TUPE (e.g. from current provider of LINK and existing services which may transfer to Healthwatch – e.g.</p>	<p>Delayed implementation</p> <p>Damage to reputation</p> <p>Legal issues.</p>	<p>Communication undertaken with potential parties affected at an early stage in the process.</p> <p>TUPE timescales adhered to, if appropriate.</p> <p>DH guidance followed.</p> <p>Legal advice sought to ensure TUPE regulations</p>	<p>Corporate Director Adults Wellbeing & Health</p>

signposting function from PCT PALS).		are followed.	
Risks related to impact of ineffective transition period between LINK and Local Healthwatch.	Loss of volunteers during transition phase Loss of knowledge and data Decrease in service during transition	January – March 2013 allowed for transition period. Transition between LINK and new provider outlined in LINK contract 2012/13. Tasks and outcomes required from the LINK set out in contract 2012/13. Engagement events re Local HealthWatch held by LINK.	Corporate Director Adults Wellbeing & Health