

**SURREY DOWNS CCG - GOVERNING BODY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2017/18**

| Principal Objective  | Risks to delivery of this objective  | Source of risk (where does this come from)   | Potential effect of the risk (what might happen)   | Assurance (What do we know)  | Gaps in assurance (What don't we know)   | Controls (what can we do)  | Gaps in Controls (what can we not do)  | Pre-mitigation likelihood Score | Pre-mitigation impact Score | Net initial Score | Date of latest scoring | Comments on Mitigations  | Revised Likelihood Score | Revised Impact Score | Revised Net Score | Risk Appetite range for this category of risk | T Value (Treat, Tolerate, Terminate or Transfer) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| P1) Deliver the Financial Recovery Plan and CCG control total, based largely on a successful transformational QIPP programme   | P1(a): Failure to achieve at least 75% of QIPP target  | Scale and complexity of QIPP programme   | QIPP shortfall would add pressure to find non-recurrent savings in year and add to subsequent years QIPP targets       | PMO programme is fully assured - tracked levels of delivery are reliable. Total QIPP is capped so target should not shift. | Viability of specific schemes may be unclear until fully scoped.                         | Manage projects closely through overall PMO approach and individual programme boards.  | Limited influence over. e.g. behaviour in other organisations. Schemes may deliver less than planned following mobilisation.         | 4                               | 5                           | 20                | 17/07/2017             | Current QIPP achievement forecast being reviewed   | 4                        | 5                    | 20                | Low 6-8                                       | Treat  |
| P1) Deliver the Financial Recovery Plan and CCG control total, based largely on a successful transformational QIPP programme   | P1(b) Failure to control contracts with major suppliers  | Historical volatility of contracts, particularly acute and non-local contracts   | Actual cost pressure generating requirements for additional Non Recurrent Savings and potentially further QIPP schemes | Activity levels from suppliers via SUS and CMS   | There are delays in data which means the CCG rarely has real time information.           | Strict control over contracts particularly high risk / high value contracts  | Provider behaviour ultimately lies outside of CCG control.   | 4                               | 5                           | 20                | 17/07/2017             | Contracts for 2017-18 have been arranged to reduce risk. However there remains a significant gap between budgeted contracts, QIPP forecast and CCG allocations                                     | 4                        | 4                    | 16                | Minimal 1-5                                   | Treat  |
| P1) Deliver the Financial Recovery Plan and CCG control total, based largely on a successful transformational QIPP programme   | P1(c) Unplanned adjustments to central allocations or additional commitments   | Historical examples of central changes that cannot be planned for  | Actual cost pressure generating requirements for additional Non Recurrent Savings and potentially further QIPP schemes | Current planning cycle sets out broad scope of allocations.  | Unplanned changes to allocations e.g. for emergencies, changes in policy                 | Minimal control. Can advocate to minimise changes.   | No control over central policy.  | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | Minimal scope to mitigate central actions.   | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Medium 9-12                                   | Tolerate   |
| P2) Take responsibility, with other partners in the footprint, for developing the Surrey Heartlands STP within the framework of locally devolved responsibilities; and ensure that this contributes significantly to the creation of a sustainable health economy with improved outcomes and quality | P2(a) Failure to agree collaborative arrangements with key partner organisations   | Complexity of STP arrangements - large number of commissioner and provider organisations working together  | STP effectiveness will be severely limited   | MOU in place for Devolution and STP plan submitted and approved in Oct 2016. Broad system wide support for STP in place.   | STP Plans are not yet developed in detail.   | Continue to develop collaborative arrangements at both devolution and STP levels. Continue to explore risks and benefits of collaboration internally.                            | No framework in place for mediation or compliance  | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | Collaborative arrangements under discussion - MOU and terms of reference for joint committee drafted. Work will continue to operationalise arrangements and move through a successful shadow year. | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Low 6-8                                       | Treat  |
| P2) Take responsibility, with other partners in the footprint, for developing the Surrey Heartlands STP within the framework of locally devolved responsibilities; and ensure that this contributes significantly to the creation of a sustainable health economy with improved outcomes and quality | P2(b) Failure to engage with / make the case for change to the public on required transformation   | Known issues with making the clinical case for change where service delivery is complex and public perceptions associate change with service reduction | Transformational change will be delayed or even abandoned  | CCG's have local examples of best practice on engagement and good relationships  | Public reaction to specific schemes  | Work proactively with stakeholders and the media. Ensure that any consultation and decision making processes (particularly around governance arrangements) are legally compliant | Controls over media and public reaction are inherently limited   | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | For future consideration - no current plans for engagement. Reconsider when STP plans are clearer and actual service changes proposed.   | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Medium 9-12                                   | Tolerate   |
| P2) Take responsibility, with other partners in the footprint, for developing the Surrey Heartlands STP within the framework of locally devolved responsibilities; and ensure that this contributes significantly to the creation of a sustainable health economy with improved outcomes and quality | P2(c) Workforce supply issues across the STP cannot be resolved to enable delivery of transformed models of care.  | Historical difficulties with recruitment and retention, particularly those sectors of the STP footprint that border London                             | STP plans will be delayed and there will be an impact on patient care and financial sustainability                     |  |  | Some potential for local training, development and incentivisation   | Control over central training commissioning is limited. Independent providers are not required to collaborate on workforce strategy. | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | For future consideration when STP plans are clearer and actual service change impact on workforce understood.  | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Medium 9-12                                   | Tolerate   |
| P2) Take responsibility, with other partners in the footprint, for developing the Surrey Heartlands STP within the framework of locally devolved responsibilities; and ensure that this contributes significantly to the creation of a sustainable health economy with improved outcomes and quality | P2(d) The STP cannot identify or attract sufficient investment to pump prime transformational change, particularly in the areas of estates, digital infrastructure and skills. | Shortages of national and local investment funds   | STP plans will be delayed and there will be an impact on patient care and financial sustainability                     | Broad understanding of capital requirements to support changes   | The CCG lacks assurance about the level and duration of national capital funding         | Work with partners and with NHSE to influence allocation process   | No control over final decision making at national level  | 4                               | 4                           | 16                | 17/07/2017             | Discussions taking place with centre on capital allocations to underpin transformational change.   | 4                        | 4                    | 16                | Low 6-8                                       | Treat  |
| P3) With partner CCGs, develop the CCG's capacity for the commissioning and delivery of primary care in 2017-18, ensuring that this is consistent with broader commissioning development in areas such as integration.   | P3(a) Lack of investment to make primary care / GP forward view transformation a reality, including delivering the out of hospital agenda and hub capacity                     | Shortages of national and local investment funds   | General practice cannot participate in the CCG primary care strategy and associated workstreams                        | CCG has good baseline data on primary care estate and IT budgets   | Level of funding in any given planning year  | Work with partners and with NHSE to influence investment sums released from centre. No control over future supply of trained GPs   | CCG does not have delegated commissioning authority  | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | Joint work taking place with Guildford and Waverley and NW Surrey CCGs on delivering 5YFV - plans submitted to NHSE  | 2                        | 4                    | 8                 | Medium 9-12                                   | Tolerate   |
| P3) With partner CCGs, develop the CCG's capacity for the commissioning and delivery of primary care in 2017-18, ensuring that this is consistent with broader commissioning development in areas such as integration.   | P3(b) Local improvements in primary care access, particularly extended hours, cannot be delivered  | Shortages of national and local investment funds; lack of strategic fit with other initiatives   | Patients will lack access to a full range of primary care services   | CCG has accurate data on local practice access and some feedback on patients experience of accessing appointments          | Data on access experience could be improved  | The CCG can work with localities and networks to encourage best practice and use of resources e.g. sharing administrative capacity   | CCG does not have delegated commissioning authority  | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | Joint work taking place with Guildford and Waverley and NW Surrey CCGs on delivering 5YFV - plans submitted to NHSE. Application of funds at Surrey Downs level agreed with localities.            | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Low 6-8                                       | Treat  |
| P3) With partner CCGs, develop the CCG's capacity for the commissioning and delivery of primary care in 2017-18, ensuring that this is consistent with broader commissioning development in areas such as integration.   | P3(c) Primary care capacity does not improve due to a lack of primary care workforce planning, skill mix and education   | Mismatch between supply of primary care staff particularly GPs and difficulties with existing staff being able to undertake training                   | Patients will lack access to a full range of primary care services   | Some workforce data available on primary care  | Data on workforce could be improved  | The CCG can work with localities and networks to encourage best practice and use of resources e.g. sharing administrative capacity   | No control over future supply of trained GPs   | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | STP wide and national work taking place on ensuring supply of GPs and other skills needed in primary care  | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Low 6-8                                       | Treat  |
| P3) With partner CCGs, develop the CCG's capacity for the commissioning and delivery of primary care in 2017-18, ensuring that this is consistent with broader commissioning development in areas such as integration.   | P3(d) Wider strategic context and general pressures in primary care mean that local practices cannot easily engage   | Increasing demand on primary care and difficulties with maintaining supply of GPs to local practices   | General practice cannot participate in the CCG's primary care strategy and associated workstreams                      | Current levels of engagement are good e.g. attendance at planned events  | Demand can vary unexpectedly and limit capacity  | The CCG can work with localities and networks to encourage engagement at a CCG wide and locality level   | CCG does not have delegated commissioning authority  | 3                               | 4                           | 12                | 17/07/2017             | Clinical leadership being developed - clinical cabinet and localities act as focal point for engaging practices  | 3                        | 4                    | 12                | Medium 9-12                                   | Tolerate   |
| P4) Ensure that the CCG's Organisational Development programmes support localities, clinical leaders, staff and the Governing Body to work locally and across the STP on the successful delivery of both strategic objectives and Business As Usual.   | P4(a) Staff turnover and continued use of interims reduces the effectiveness of development programmes   | Historical issues with recruitment and retention   | Cohesiveness of senior management as a whole is reduced  | CCG has accurate workforce data  | No known gaps in assurance   | EMT meets weekly and can prioritise actions that address workforce issues quickly; positive staff engagement means retention strategies more likely to succeed                   | Interim workforce market supply is not within CCG control  | 2                               | 4                           | 8                 | 17/07/2017             | At the moment turnover is at acceptable levels however there remain key gaps and a period of destabilisation as the three CCGs determine how they wish to work together.                           | 2                        | 4                    | 8                 | Low 6-8                                       | Tolerate   |
| P4) Ensure that the CCG's Organisational Development programmes support localities, clinical leaders, staff and the Governing Body to work locally and across the STP on the successful delivery of both strategic objectives and Business As Usual.   | P4(b) The effectiveness of clinical and locality leadership is reduced due to the demands of Business As Usual.  | Wider system demand inhibiting clinical staff from moving in to leadership roles   | Lack of clinical leadership impacts on ability to transform services   | Current levels of engagement are good e.g. attendance at planned events  | Workload pressures can vary unexpectedly and limit capacity particularly in primary care | The CCG can work with localities and networks to encourage engagement at a CCG wide and locality level   | High number of stakeholders across the STP could limit consistency of approach with some sectors or places not engaging              | 2                               | 4                           | 8                 | 17/07/2017             | CCG is investing significantly in clinical leadership at all levels and working with other CCGs to do the same across the STP  | 2                        | 4                    | 8                 | Low 6-8                                       | Tolerate   |

**SURREY DOWNS CCG - GOVERNING BODY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2017/18**

| Principal Objective  | Risks to delivery of this objective   | Source of risk (where does this come from)         | Potential effect of the risk (what might happen) | Assurance (What do we know)   | Gaps in assurance (What don't we know)   | Controls (what can we do)   | Gaps in Controls (what can we not do)                                | Pre-mitigation Likelihood Score | Pre-mitigation Impact Score | Net Initial Score | Date of latest scoring | Comments on Mitigations   | Revised Likelihood Score | Revised Impact Score | Revised Net Score | Risk Appetite range for this category of risk | T Value (Treat, Tolerate, Terminate or Transfer) |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| P4) Ensure that the CCG's Organisational Development programmes support localities, clinical leaders, staff and the Governing Body to work locally and across the STP on the successful delivery of both strategic objectives and Business As Usual. | P4(c) Changes in the wider strategic context mean that development programmes are overtaken by events | STP and other strategic change generated centrally | Governing body is limited in scope and influence | Current policy framework (Five Year Forward View Next Steps) is clear | Future policy could emerge relatively quickly, e.g. changes in CCG configuration | Maintain close links with partner organisations and develop a shared view of policy development / horizon scanning that limits exposure to risk | No ultimate control over central policy or reaction to global events | 2                               | 4                           | 8                 | 19/05/2017             | Significant board level development in place and significant influence over STP developments. Review again in early autumn. | 2                        | 4                    | 8                 | Low 6-8                                       | Tolerate   |