

Risk Assessment: Framework 4

RISKS

| Qualitative Measures of Likelihood | | |
|---|-------------------|---|
| LEVEL | DESCRIPTOR | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | Rare | Can't believe the risk will ever happen |
| 2 | Unlikely | Do not expect the risk to happen but it is possible |
| 3 | Possible | The event may occur occasionally |
| 4 | Likely | The event will probably occur but is not a persistent issue |
| 5 | Almost Certain | The event will undoubtedly occur, possibly frequently |

Consequence

| Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major | Catastrophic |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Risk (to success of project) | Likelihood | Consequence | Scoring (Likelihood X Consequence) | Risk Mitigation/Current Controls |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Inability to accept the identified individuals for repatriation. | 3 | 4 | 12 | Joint partnership working between Brent Placement team and Provider to provide assurances about support plans. |
| Delays in transfers of service users into the new units | 3 | 4 | 12 | All current out of borough activity being reviewed and possible service users ready for step down being identified |
| Lack of co-operation and support for the proposed development from local providers | 2 | 4 | 6 | <p>The Accommodation Strategy involved local stakeholders as part of this process however more engagement needed to ensure on-going dialogue with local providers, creating formal processes for customer journeys and pathways and future consultations to facilitate effective transition from Out of borough placements to the new provisions.</p> <p>Pathways and the infrastructures necessary to support people's health and well-being locally being reviewed and reconfigured as part of the mental health services review.</p> <p>Local provision needs to</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | | | be reviewed to ensure this is in line with identified need and can be used to maximum effectiveness. |
| Inability of the Providers to provide timely proposed volume of supported accommodation | 3 | 4 | 12 | Work with local Partners to develop a range of local provision. |
| Standards of Quality, location and suitability of provision unacceptable | 3 | 4 | 12 | Robust property specifications designed |
| | | | | |
| Risks (to LBB, if the project is not delivered successfully) | Likelihood | Consequence | Scoring (Likelihood X Consequence) | Current Controls |
| Placement Costs continue to increase and exceed budget estimate | 3 | 3 | 9 | Recognition of the need to be plans to bring housing, health and social care together around housing, health and social care, prevention, personalisation, co-ordination and integration. Recognition that good housing contributes to health and wellbeing, and may also achieve savings in health and social care costs. For example: • Preventing avoidable placements to out of area units following a stay in hospital because of lack of appropriate and suitable supported housing locally. |
| No efficiencies generated in placement budget because of inability to meet the target numbers. | 4 | 4 | 16 | Plan range of provision that matches demand and respective needs to provision locally. Encourage range and diversity of provision. |
| Continued reactive and less predictive approach to housing and social care. | 3 | 3 | .9 | Develop stronger, local community based provision that can have a significant and positive effect on a person's |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | | | health and well-being. |
| Demand for social housing remains high for those with mental health needs who have often lost their economic independence. | 3 | 3 | 9 | Investment that encourages growth and innovation |
| | | | | |
| Risks to LBB of undertaking the project) | Likelihood | Consequence | Scoring (Likelihood X Consequence) | Current Controls |
| The Providers inability to balance service user risk taking, rights, autonomy and empowerment with issues of protection. Relapse of service users | 3 | 3 | 9 | Regular contact reviews assessments to help identify potential risks |
| No reductions to over reliance on Out of Area placements | 3 | 3 | 9 | Mixed economy of care with targeted care and support more effectively to ensure that needs are being met, and future health and social care needs are being recognised and planned for. |
| Revised and capped Benefit Threshold from April 2011 - £290/week for 2 bedroom flat and £250/week for 1 bedroom flat | 5 | 3 | 15 | New tariff factored into the financial modelling. Provider will have to absorb risks associated with the revised cap. |
| Disjointed social care provision and inability to prevent admissions to hospital or other specialist units | 3 | 3 | 9 | Integrated care providing preventative social care packages with self care encouraged and facilitated |