

## Risk Assessment Scoring and Matrix

## Appendix 2

Consequence score (severity levels) and examples of descriptors					
	1	2	3	4	5
Domains	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Impact on the safety of patients, staff or public (physical/psychological harm)	Minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment.	Minor injury or illness, requiring minor intervention	Moderate injury requiring professional intervention	Major injury leading to long-term incapacity /disability	Incident leading to death
	No time off work	Requiring time off work for >3 days	Requiring time off work for 4-14 days	Requiring time off work for >14 days	Multiple permanent injuries or irreversible health effects
		Increase in length of hospital stay by 1-3 days	Increase in length of hospital stay by 4-15 days	Increase in length of hospital stay by >15 days	
			RIDDOR /agency reportable incident	Mismanagement of patient care with long-term effects	
			An event which impacts on a small number of patients		An event which impacts on a large number of patients

<b>Quality/ complaints/ audit</b>	Peripheral element of treatment or service suboptimal	Overall treatment or service suboptimal	Treatment or service has significantly reduced effectiveness	Non- compliance with national standards with significant risk to patients if unresolved	Totally unacceptable level or quality of treatment/ service
	Informal complaint/ inquiry	Formal complaint/ Local resolution	Formal complaint / Local resolution (with potential to go to independent review)	Multiple complaints/ independent review	Inquest/ Ombudsman inquiry Gross failure of patient safety if findings not acted on
		Single failure to meet internal standards	Repeated failure to meet internal standards	Critical report	Gross failure to meet national standards
		Minor implications for patient safety if unresolved	Major patient safety implications if findings are not acted on		

Human resources/organisation-al development /staffing/ competence	Short-term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (< 1 day)	Low staffing level that reduces the service quality	Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff	Uncertain delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff	Non-delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff
			Unsafe staffing level or competence (>1 day)	Unsafe staffing level or competence (>5 days)	Ongoing unsafe staffing levels or competence
			Low staff morale	Loss of key staff	Loss of several key staff
			Poor staff attendance for mandatory/ key professional training	Very low staff morale	No staff attending mandatory training /key professional training on an ongoing basis
Statutory duty/ inspections	No or minimal impact or breach of guidance/ statutory duty	Material breach of statutory legislation	Single material breach in statutory duty	Multiple material breaches in statutory duty	Multiple material breaches in statutory duty with high likelihood of enforcement action
			Challenging external recommendations	Critical report	Complete systems change required Severely critical report
			Improvement notice	Prohibition notice	Prosecution

<b>Adverse publicity/ reputation</b>	Rumours with potential for public concern	Local media coverage – short-term reduction in public confidence  Elements of public expectation not being met	Local media coverage – long-term reduction in public confidence	National media coverage for <3 days with service well below reasonable public expectation	National media coverage for >3 days with service well below reasonable public expectation.  MP/AM concerned (questions in the House/ Assembly)  Total loss of public confidence
<b>Business objectives/ projects</b>	Insignificant cost increase/ schedule slippage	<5 per cent over project budget  Schedule slippage	5–10 per cent over project budget  Schedule slippage	10–25 per cent over project budget  Schedule slippage  Key objectives not met	Incident leading >25 per cent over project budget  Schedule slippage  Key objectives not met
<b>Finance including claims</b>	Small loss Risk of claim remote	Loss of 0.1–0.25 per cent of budget  Claim less than £10,000	Loss of 0.25–0.5 per cent of budget  Claim(s) between £10,000 and £100,000	Uncertain delivery of key objective/Loss of 0.5–1.0 per cent of budget  Claim(s) between £100,000 and £1 million  Purchasers failing to pay on time	Non-delivery of key objective/ Loss of >1 per cent of budget  Claim(s) in excess of £1 million  Loss of contract

<b>Service/ business interruption</b>	Loss/ interruption of >1 hour	Loss/ interruption of >8 hours	Loss/ interruption of >1 day	Loss/ interruption of >1 week	Permanent loss of service or facility
<b>Environ- mental impact</b>	Minimal or no impact on the environment	Minor impact on environment	Moderate impact on environment	Major impact on environment	Catastrophic impact on environment

- What is the likelihood of the consequence occurring?
- The frequency based score is appropriate in most circumstances and is easier to identify. It should be used whenever it is possible to identify the frequency at which a risk is likely to occur.
  - The probability score is more appropriate for risks relating to time limited or one-off projects or business objectives

**Table 2**

**Likelihood Score (L)**

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>1 Rare</b>	<b>2 Unlikely</b>	<b>3 Possible</b>	<b>4 Likely</b>	<b>5 Almost Certain</b>
<b><u>Frequency</u></b> How often does it/ might it happen	This will probably never happen/ recur	Do not expect it to happen / recur but it is possible it may do so	Might happen or recur occasionally	Will probably happen/ recur but it is not a persistent issue	Will undoubtedly happen/ recur, possibly frequently
<b><u>Probability</u></b> Will it happen or not? % chance of <u>not</u> meeting objective	<0.1 per cent	0.1-1 per cent	1 -10 per cent	10-50 per cent	>50 per cent

**Table 3**

**Risk Scoring = Consequence x Likelihood (C x L)**

<b>Consequence Score</b>	<b>Likelihood Score</b>				
	<b>1 Rare</b>	<b>2 Unlikely</b>	<b>3 Possible</b>	<b>4 Likely</b>	<b>5 Almost certain</b>
<b>5 - Catastrophic</b>	5	10	15	20	25
<b>4 - Major</b>	4	8	12	16	20
<b>3 - Moderate</b>	3	6	9	12	15
<b>2 - Minor</b>	2	4	6	8	10
<b>1 - Negligible</b>	1	2	3	4	5

**Table 4**

**For grading risk, the scores obtained from the risk matrix are assigned grades as follows**

<b>1 - 3 = Low Risk</b>	<b>Quick, easy measures implemented immediately and further action planned for when resources permit</b>
<b>4 -10 = Moderate Risk</b>	<b>Actions implemented as soon as possible but no later than a year</b>
<b>12 -16 = High Risk</b>	<b>Actions implemented as soon as possible but no later than six months</b>
<b>20 - 25 = Extreme Risk</b>	<b>Requires urgent action. The UHB Board is made aware and it implements immediate corrective action</b>