



11	RISK	01/04/17	Plan alignment: There is lack of alignment with neighbouring BCF plans ( Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool) which impacts on the delivery of the BCF schemes across local health economies.	BCF	Schemes that are linked to or part of local delivery across boundaries are unable to mobilise sufficiently and deliver expected outcomes	3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	Formal arrangements are put in place to compare current BCF plans, clarifying alignment arrangements, interdependencies and any required joint actions. These arrangements to promote joint planning for future BCFs.	Quarterly	1	3	3	Joint BCF planning group meets monthly.
	RISK				Differing priorities result in conflict and poor outcomes	3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3	
12	RISK	01/04/17	Plan alignment: A lack of alignment and/ or agreement with Provider plans	BCF	Schemes dependent upon aligned activity of providers i.e. a whole pathway approach fail to deliver in an effective way resulting in poor outcomes.	2	4	8	PMG	PM for each partner	Providers are involved at a proportionate level to ensure engagement and alignment. The main arena for this will be at CCG / LCC Operational plan level	Quarterly	1	3	3	
	RISK				Opportunities to identify success and develop effective services further are missed	3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3	
								-								
13	RISK	01/04/17	Plan alignment: That the Lancashire BCF plan does not fit with individual BCF partner plans		Local / organisational level of the impact of the BCF is minimal	1	5	5	PMG	PM for each partner	BCF planning process and governance scrutiny requires cross check and evidence of fit with CCG and LCC operational plans	Quarterly	1	3	3	
	RISK				Conflict arises within the BCF partnership affecting overall delivery, partnership integrity and opportunities for shared learning.	1	5	5	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3	
								-								
14	RISK	01/04/17	Partnership: That the BCF partnership does not develop sufficiently to be robust, and fit for purpose.	BCF	That the integrity of the partnership is challenged by: Lack of resource allocated by partners	2	4	8	PMG	PM for each partner	Partners are required to identify the level of resource each will commit and to name the individuals involved	Quarterly	1	2	2	
	RISK				That the integrity of the partnership is challenged by: A lack of balance between sovereignty and collaboration and collective assurance	3	4	12	PMG	PM for each partner	That the governance structure builds in challenge to itself and partners to test out commitment and willingness to share a reasonable level of risk.	Quarterly	1	3	3	
	RISK				That the integrity of the partnership is challenged by: Competing pressures, political agendas and external / local changes.	3	4	12	PMG	PM for each partner	That the governance structure provides a safe arena within which such challenges can be considered and joint responses agreed	Quarterly	1	3	3	
	RISK				That the integrity of the partnership is challenged by: An inability of the Health and Well Being Board to provide a robust oversight role.	2	4	8	PMG	PM for each partner	That the Health and well Being Board is provided with sufficient information/ training and timely reporting to fulfil this role.	Quarterly			-	Quarterly reports provided to HWB SRO and Programme lead provide regular briefings to HWB chair and written and verbal updates to board. All policy frameworks and guidance
								-								
15	RISK	01/04/17	Reporting: That reporting at all levels does not fulfil a supporting role to the BCF plan delivery.	BCF	Quarterly reporting to NHSE provides only a high level view of activity and impact of the BCF not reflecting real delivery.	3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	All quarterly reporting is reported by an agreed narrative and parallel reporting to the Steering Group and HWB.	Quarterly	2	3	6	
	RISK				Individual scheme reporting is variable in quality resulting in difficulty in comparing performance.	2	3	6	PMG	PM for each partner	All scheme progress to be reported using a single reporting template submitted initially to PMG and then once quality assured on to steering group.	Quarterly	2	3	6	
	RISK				BCF steering group does not receive sufficiently timely and detailed scheme reporting to guide and direct corrective actions as required. ( See risk 1)	2	4	8	PMG	PM for each partner	Timetable of reporting and PMG and steering group meetings is aligned so as to allow flow of reporting in a timely manner.	Quarterly	1	3	3	PMG 2nd meeting second Monday of each month. Steering Group meeting 4th Friday of each month.

16	RISK	01/04/17	Finance: That financial arrangements are not sufficiently clear across the BCF for all partners to be clear on their own and others commitments and activity.	BCF	That the agreed level of investment of each partner is unclear.		3	4	12	PMG	PM for each partner	The Section 75 agreement is put in place in a timely manner once the BCF plan is confirmed. This agreement to set out each partner's responsibilities and detail of financial commitment to the BCF pooled fund.	Quarterly	1	3	3		
	RISK				That the basis on which the BCF is pooled is unclear resulting in uncertainty on responsibilities.		2	3	6	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3		
	RISK				Activity within the BCF pool is unclear resulting in concern that prescribed responsibilities are not being met.		3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	An agreed reporting mechanism is set out in the S75 agreement. Quarterly pool finance reports to be submitted to the steering group.	Quarterly	2	3	6		
	RISK				Individual organisational financial activity within the BCF is unclear resulting in concern about the strength of the partnership		3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	An agreed individual partner financial reporting mechanism is set out in the S75 agreement.	Quarterly	2	3	6		Reporting templates for all partners agreed by steering group.
									-									
17	RISK	01/04/17	Communication: That limited or poor communication of all aspects of vision and detail of the BCF affects delivery and reputation.	BCF	Those delivering scheme level activity do not have the opportunity to understand the context and contribute to BCF development		3	3	9	PMG	PM for each partner	A communication plan is in place that covers: Reporting within the BCF governance structure Common messages to be shared across organisations. Frequency of communication with a range of stakeholders and wider public.	Quarterly	1	3	3		
	RISK				That different messages explaining the purpose and detail of the BCF are heard across organisations resulting in confusion and disengagement		2	4	8	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3		
	RISK				That stakeholders and wider population do not have the opportunity to understand the purpose and detail of delivery of the BCF locally and at Lancashire level.		3	4	12	PMG	PM for each partner	Ditto	Quarterly	1	3	3		

Guide note: Risk Register

**Objectives**

1. To log all risks raised and demonstrate how these have been dealt with to minimise risk to the project completing successfully and on-time.

**Actions**

1. Log risks raised
2. Establish significance of risk by using scoring
3. Score Likelihood on basis of the chance or frequency that the risk will occur
4. Score impact according to what the result is likely to be if the risk occurs
5. For any significant risks (really anything scoring 4 or above, but certainly anything scoring above 8) ensure that mitigation steps are taken and the risk re-scored taking these steps into account
6. Remember to add significant risks to the corporate risk register as appropriate
7. All items rated Red or Amber or added to the risk register should be escalated to Steering Group.
8. All Items scoring 4 or above after mitigation should be reviewed by programme board along with any risks scoring 8 or above before mitigation actions. The programme board should document that risks have been reviewed and appropriate actions taken.

**Scoring Programme Risks**

Impact: severity of the consequences should a risk occur						Likelihood: probability of risk occurring		
Impact rating	Project Activity Shift / Delivery as % of Plan	Support Function Budget %	Objectives	Service Delivery	Reputation	Likelihood rating	Likelihood of occurrence within budget cycle, contract period (incl. tender) or project lifecycle	
5	<50%	>35%	None achieved	Catastrophic impact on cost, time and/or quality performance targets - very difficult to recover if at all	Significant loss of customers/ shareholder confidence	5	Almost certain	> 90%

4	50 - 75%	>25% <35%	<b>Mostly achieved</b>	<b>not</b> Major impact on cost, time and/or quality performance targets - medium to long term effect and expensive to recover	Loss of some customers/ shareholder confidence		4	Probable	>50% <90%
3	75 - 85%	>15% <25%	<b>Some achieved</b>	Moderate impact on cost, time and/or quality performance targets - medium term effect and expensive to recover	Harder to attract new customers/ obtain new finance		3	Possible	>10% <50%
2	85 - 95%	>5% <15%	<b>Most achieved</b>	Minor disruption on cost, time and/or quality performance measures - short to medium term effect	Customers and/or shareholders raise questions		2	Remote	>1% <10%
1	> 95%	<5%	<b>Significantly achieved</b>	Insignificant impact on cost, time and/or quality performance measures - can be easily and quickly remedied	No effect on customer/ shareholder confidence		1	Improbable	<1%

RISK  
ISSUE