

**Appendix A – Risk Scoring Matrix**

| Step 1<br>Consequence Scoring   | Consequence Score   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|   | 1 - Negligible  | 2 - Minor   | 3 - Moderate  | 4 - Major  | 5 - Catastrophic   |
| Impact on the safety of patients, staff or public (physical/psychological harm) | Minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention. No time off work.               | Minor injury or illness. Time off work for >3 days. Increase in length of hospital stay by 1-3 days   | Injury requiring professional intervention. Time off work 4-14 days. RIDDOR reportable. Increase in hospital stay 4-15 days. An event which impacts on a small number of patients.  | Major injury leading to long term disability/ incapacity. Time off work >14 days. Increase in hospital stay >15 days. Mismanagement of patient care.   | Incident leading to death. Multiple permanent injuries or irreversible health effects. Impact on a large number of patients  |
| Quality/ complaints/ audit  | Informal complaint/ enquiry Peripheral element of treatment or service suboptimal | Overall treatment or service suboptimal Formal complaint (stage 1). Local resolution. Single failure to meet internal standards Minor implications for patient safety if unresolved. Reduced performance rating if unresolved | Treatment or service has significantly reduced effectiveness. Formal complaint (stage 2) complaint. Local resolution (with potential to go to independent review) Repeated failure to meet internal standards. Major patient safety implications if findings are not acted on | Non-compliance with national standards with significant risk to patients if unresolved Multiple complaints/ independent review Low performance rating Critical report                              | Totally unacceptable level or quality of treatment/service Gross failure of patient safety if findings not acted on Inquest/ombudsman inquiry Gross failure to meet national standards                     |
| Human resources/ organisational development/ staffing/ competence               | Short term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (<1 day)   | Low staffing level that reduces service quality   | Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff Unsafe staffing level or competence (>1 day) Low staff morale Poor staff attendance for mandatory/key training   | Uncertain delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff. Unsafe staffing level or competence (>5 days) Loss of key staff Very low staff morale No staff attending mandatory/ key training | Non-delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff Ongoing unsafe staffing levels or competence Loss of several key staff No staff attending mandatory training/ key training on an ongoing basis |
| Statutory duty / inspections  | No or minimal impact on breach of guidance.                                       | Breach of statutory legislation. Reduced performance rating if unresolved   | Single breach in statutory duty. Challenging external recommendations/ improvement notice   | Enforcement action Multiple breaches in statutory duty Improvement notices Low performance rating Critical report  | Multiple breaches in statutory duty. Prosecution. Zero performance rating. Complete systems change required. Severely critical report  |
| Adverse Publicity / Reputation  | Rumours Potential for public concern  | Local media - short term. Reduction in public confidence.   | Local media coverage – long term. Reduction in public confidence  | National media coverage with <3 days. Service well below public expectation  | National media coverage with >3 days service well below reasonable public expectation. MPs concerned (questions in the House). Total loss of public confidence.  |
| Business objectives, Projects (Includes QIPP)                                   | Insignificant cost increase/ schedule slippage                                    | <5% over budget, schedule slippage  | 5-10% over budget, schedule slippage  | 10-25% over budget, schedule slippage, key objectives not met  | >25% over budget, schedule slippage, key objectives not met  |
| Finance including claims  | Small loss - risk of claim remote   | Loss of 0.1-0.25% of budget. Claim less than £10,000  | Loss of 0.25-0.5% of budget. Claims between £10,000 and £100,000  | Non-delivery of key objective. Loss of 0.5-1% of budget. Claims between £100,000 and £1 million. Purchasers failing to pay on time.  | Non-delivery of key objective/ Loss of >1 per cent of budget Failure to meet specification/ slippage. Loss of contract / payment by results Claim(s) >£1 million   |
| Service/ business interruption environmental impact                             | Loss / interruption of <1 hour. Minimal or no impact on the environment.          | Loss / interruption of <8 hours. Minor impact on the environment.   | Loss / interruption of <1 day. Moderate impact on the environment.  | Loss / interruption >1 week. Major impact on the environment.  | Permanent loss of service. Catastrophic impact on the environment.   |

**Key**  
Corporate Oversight (CO)  
Functional Oversight (FO)

| Step 2 Likelihood Scoring  |  |                  |
|--|--|------------------|
| How likely is this to happen, taking into account the controls already in place to prevent or mitigate the harm? |  |                  |
| Frequency  | Likelihood   | Score            |
| Not expected to occur for years  | <1% - Will only occur in exceptional circumstances | 1 Rare           |
| Occur at least annually  | 1-5% - Unlikely to occur                           | 2 Unlikely       |
| Occurs at least monthly  | 6-20% - Reasonable chance of occurring             | 3 Possible       |
| Occur at least weekly  | 21-50% - Likely to occur                           | 4 Likely         |
| Occur at least daily   | >50% - More likely to occur than not               | 5 Almost Certain |

| Step 3 Establishing Overall Score and Rating   |                |                   |                   |                   |                    |                     |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Using the appropriate score for Consequence, and the appropriate score for Likelihood, follow the table below to obtain the overall Incident / Risk severity rating. |                |                   |                   |                   |                    |                     |
|  |                | Likelihood        |                   |                   |                    |                     |
|  |                | 1 Rare            | 2 Unlikely        | 3 Possible        | 4 Likely           | 5 Almost Certain    |
| Consequence  | 5 Catastrophic | 5^ (low - FO)     | 10# (medium - FO) | 15* (high - CO)   | 20 (high - CO)     | 25 (Extreme - CO)   |
|  | 4 Major        | 4^ (low - FO)     | 8# (medium - FO)  | 12 (medium - FO)  | 16 (high - CO)     | 20 (high - CO)      |
|  | 3 Moderate     | 3 (very Low - FO) | 6 (Low - FO)      | 9 (medium - FO)   | 12 (medium - FO)   | 15# (medium - FO)   |
|  | 2 Minor        | 2 (very Low - FO) | 4 (very low - FO) | 6 (Low - FO)      | 8^ (low - FO)      | 10^ (low - FO)      |
|  | 1 Negligible   | 1 (very Low - FO) | 2 (very Low - FO) | 3 (very Low - FO) | 4~ (very low - FO) | 5 ~ (very low - FO) |

| Levels of Risk          |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Extreme (25)</b>     | An unacceptable level of risk which requires urgent Executive and senior management attention and immediate corrective action. <b>Recorded on the operational risk register with committee oversight and reported into the ICB Board.</b>   |
| <b>High (15-20) *</b>   | An unacceptable level of risk which requires senior management attention and corrective action. <b>Recorded on the operational risk register with committee oversight, risks scoring 20 + will also be reported into the ICB Board.</b><br>*A risk could score 15 and be high if the consequence score is high.       |
| <b>Medium (8-15) #</b>  | A generally acceptable level of risk but corrective action needs to be taken, the SRO is responsible. <b>Operational risk register with functional oversight.</b><br>#A risk could score 8-10 and be 'Medium' if the consequence score is high. A risk could score 15 and be medium if the consequence score is low.  |
| <b>Low (4-10) ^</b>     | An acceptable level of risk that can be managed at directorate / team / project level ( <b>recorded on the operational risk register with functional oversight</b> ).<br>^A risk could score 4-5 and be 'low' if the consequence score is high. A risk could score 8-10 and be 'Low' if the consequence score is low. |
| <b>Very Low (1-5) ~</b> | An acceptable level of risk that can be managed at directorate / team / project level ( <b>recorded on the operational risk register with functional oversight</b> ).<br>~A risk could score 4-5 and be 'very low' if the consequence score is very low.  |

**Step 4 – Use the Risk Appetite Matrix to support with calculating an appropriate target score (this must be done for risks categorised as high or extreme).**