

Audit Committee, 4 March 2020

Social Worker Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan

Executive summary and recommendations

Introduction

- 1. The Social Worker Risk Register and Risk Treatment plan is a document reflecting current and recent levels of risk recognised by risk owners, related to the project to migrate Social Workers in England to a new regulator. Social Work England
- 2. The project is closing, with only one risk remaining open (Strategic Risk S1.1). The closed risks page has been removed.
- 3. The project was successful from HCPC's point of view. We remain in communication with SWE as and when they require our expertise or assistance.

Decision

No decision is required.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

None

Date of paper

25 February 2020

Classification: Restricted until published to Council or Audit Committee

Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan Social Workers in England John Barwick Interim Chief Executive & Registrar

John Barwick, Interim Chief Executive & Registrar Report to Audit Committee, (Mar 2020)





Issue Date:25/02/2020

Classification: Restricted until published to Council or Audit Committee

May 2019 Risk Assessment

Contents	Page
Contents page	2
Top HCPC risks	3
Changes since last published	4
Strategic risks	5
Operations risks	6
Communications risks	7
Corporate Governance risks	8
Information Technology risks	9
Partner risks	10
Education risks	11
Project Management risks	12
Quality Management risks	13
Registration risks	14
HR risks	15
Legal risks	16
Fitness to Practise risks	17
Policy & Standards risks	18
Finance risks	19
Information Security risks	20
Closed risks	21
Appendix i Glossary and Abbreviations	22
Appendix ii HCPC Risk Matrix	23
HCPC Risk Matrix terms detail	24
Appendix iii HCPC Strategic Objectives & Risk Appetite	25

THE HEALTH AND CARE PROFESSIONS COUNCIL

				"Top Risks	" (High & Medium	after mitigation)									Histori	ic Ris	k Scores
	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	CURRENT RISK SCORE	Feb-19	Nov-18	Sep-18	Jun-18	Mar-18	Nov-17	Sep-17	Apr-17			
S.1.1			employees	Management openness and employees assistance scheme		Medium, decreasing	Medium										

Top HCPC Risks Page 3

Classification: Restricted until published to Council or Audit Committee Changes since the previous iteration of HCPC's Risk Register

Category	Ref#	Description	Nature of change in this version
Operational	S2.2		Closed
Operational	S2.3		Closed
Operational	S2.4		Low / Closing
Communications	S3.24		Closed
Corporate Goverenance	S4.1		Closed
Information Technology	S5.1		Closed
Information Technology	S5.5		Closed
Information Technology	S5.6		Closed
Project Management	S8.1		Closed
Project Management	S8.2		Closed
Project Management	S8.5		Closed
Project Management	S8.6		Closed
Registration	S10.2		Closed
Registration	S10.3		Closed
Registration	S10.5		Closed
Legal	S12.1		Closed
Legal	S12.2		Closed
FTP	S13.3		Closed
FTP	S13.4		Closed
FTP	S13.5		Closed
Finance	S15.4		Closed
Information Security	S17.6		Closed
Information Security	S17.7		Closed

Closed Risks page removed

Overview of Risk Management and Risk Treatment process

Throughout the year exisiting r Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan

the effectiveness of mitigations and the levels of residual risk.

Future risks are also documented, evaluated and monitored against the same criteria.

Every six months these changes and additions to risks are updated in the risk register and formally documented by the

Director of Operations or Head of Business Process Improvement, and the Top Ten Risks (High & Medium only after mitigation) are recorded.

Individual risks are linked to the current Statement of Applicability by the ISO27001 Clauses noted in the ISMS Risks column on each page. Strategic Objectives are linked to individual risks where applicable.

THE HEALTH AND CARE PROFESSIONS COUNCIL

RISK ASSESSMENT & RISK TREATMENT PLAN Feb 2020

For Strategy 1 and	Ref Category	ISMS Risks Ref #	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date Raised	Escalation	Mitigation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation October 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Seegel: 100 Control Co	1 Strategic	S.1.1	Impact of transfer on HCPC's culture and working practices	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	3	4	12	inc sharing of information and consultation with	Management openness and employees assistance scheme	Papers being placed in council	Currently reducing risk but not at zero, remains low "Medium"	employees updates, the next one is on the 10th October 2019. Proactice engagement with				Med	Med
State of the control	Strategic	S.1.2	regulator's early failure to deliver service standards, blaming HCPC	HCPC Chief Executive &	John Barwick	3	3	9	Level of cooperation with new regulator (joint project boards meetings)	sharing risks, sharing ftp data	PSA oversight inc joint meetings with SWE, DHSC, D/E and HCPC	CLOSED	briefings on the project. 27/03/2019: There have been two joint board meetings to review status and key decision making. 2/9/19 Next joint project board 8 October 2019 30/10/19 - Increased of frequency of meetings/dialogue between SWE and HCPC delivery teams including refinement of go.				Low	Low
Sensigle 1.1 International control and con	Strategic	S.1.3	final go live date leads to project	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	3	4	12	v1.0 16th May 2018. Transistional arrangement	PSA meetings, infastructure review	Cabinet office infrastructure review June/July 2019	CLOSED	less likely to fail. 2/9/19 - Ministerial announcement confirming 2 December go live. IPA review scheduled in October. 30/10/19 - IPA review has assessed SWE readiness as amber/green.				Low	High
Solid Control on control on the control of the cont	Strategic	S.1.5	significant political and media	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	3	3	9	On going regular contact with Gvmt depts		: Joint comms planning with SWE and HCPC comms teams. Sharing risks	CLOSED					Med	Med
Borelage New St. St. Projection description from the Post of the project fallow St. Project fallow	Strategic	S.1.6	DHSC is damaged through inabilit to deliver on time	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	3	4	12	On going regular contact with Gvmt depts	own project planning and contacting DHS0 Proactive dialog about transition scheme	meeting project deliverables	CLOSED	2/9/2019 - Ongoing regular dialogue with DHSC and DfE inc progress review meetings hosted by PSA.				Med	Med
Strategic NEW S.1.9 Department of the control of th	Strategic	merge with 1.2 S.1.8		HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	3	3	9	Proactive prompting of SW-England project tean of potential pitfalls based on HCPC experience	Level of cooperation with new regulator		CLOSED	review the project. 2/9/2019 - BDO (Internal Audit) scheduled to undertake a review of the SWE transfer project. Scoping doc due w/c 2/9/19 30/10/19 - Internal audit				Med	Med
new transfer date (Dec 2019 - Feb 2020) may improved LPDC's business as usual authorities, resources and finance in the province of the superior of the superi	Strategic	NEW S.1.9	project may be cancelled by Government causing rapid change	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	4	1	4	communications from government departments		al Data transfer scheme and Data Sharing agreement.	CLOSED	Act 2017 (Transitional and Savings Provisions) (Social Workers) Regulations drafted.				Low	NEW
01/09/2019	Strategic	\$.1.11	new transfer date (Dec 2019 – Feb 2020) may impact HCPC's business as usual activities, resources and finance	HCPC Chief Executive & SMT	John Barwick	4	4	16	Data transfer scheme	PSA oversight of project	second grant request submitted to DfE	CLOSED	to the expected two month delay in the transfer date (£618K) 2. Costs incurred due to the transfer of social workers and uncertainties around the transfer date (£998K) 3. A proposal to increase FTP capacity in advance of transfer to help manage the number of open cases that will be transferred to SWE. (£673K) In addition, a contingency fund to cover any run down costs incurred following transfer is also proposed. The request reflects the additional income that HCPC will receive as a result of the two month delay. 08/04/2019: The latest update is that the request is being reviewed by the Government's internal auditors at the request of DTE. 16/06/2019: There is a PWC meeting on the 21st May 2/9/2019 - Grant Funding agreement has been varied to include additional £1,116,033 in respect of second grant			01/09/2019	Med	High

Page 5

Strategic Risks

Operations

Ref Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitgation plan deadline	Updates	Date Raised	Escalation/Decision Group	Mitigation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation October 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Operations		S.2.1	Operational costs increased due to loss of volume discounts and scalability opportunities	SMT	SMT	2	3	6	Changes to supplier contracts	Potential fee rise to maintain service levels	submission of additional grant requests	CLOSED	27/03/2019: grant submitted on the 20th March. Fee rise has been approved. 29/2019 - Grant Funding agreement has been varied to include additional £1,116.033 in respect of second grant request. Maximum grant available is now £3,516,033. Retendering of FTP P&P contract underway			01/09/2019	low	Med
Operations		S.2.2	Changes to transfer date disrupts to resource planing	SMT	SMT	3	3	9	Delay non time critical work to deliver Social Worker England project	Increase contractor resource	indentification of arrangments to reduce premature staff turnover (retention allowances)	CLOSED	Requested confirmation of transfer date from the DFE 2/9/19 - Public ministerial confirmation of expected transfer date of 2/12/19. Further IPA review planned for October. 30/10/19: IPA review has given SWE readiness an amber/green rating. This reduces the likelihood of a change to the transfer date,				Med	Med
Operations			Due to no clear govt timetable HCPC delays investment in internal projects	SMT	SMT	3	3	9	Ongoing close monitoring of problematic governmental timetable and objectives	Ongoing reprioritisation of project list		CLOSED	Requested confirmation of transfer date from the DFE 27/03/2019- there is a higher timetable plan. 2/9/19 - Public ministerial confirmation of expected transfer date of 2/12/19. Further IPA review planned for October. 30/10/19. IPA review given SWE readiness amber/green rating, Implementation of organisation reform programme has commenced				low	Med
Information Technology	REASSIGNED 06/06/19 Previously an IT Risk - S.5.1	S.2.4	New Regulator fails to deliver to timetable and our operations and performance are compromised (as awaiting transfer out of SW records)	SMT	SMT	3	4	12	Share HCPC's migration expertise with new Regulator project team	Backfill rescource		CLOSED	Requested confirmation of transfer date from the Dft. Transitional arrangements agreed and discussion with SWE around an early data transfer point to enable SWE to ingest data ahead of go live date. Dress rehearsals for data transfer are in progress. Final reconciliation of small cost anomilies.				Med	Med

Page 6

Operations

Communications

Ref Category Risk	S s Ref#	pers	tisk owner (primary rson responsible for assessing and anaging the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)	Impact before mitigations Fe 2020	Likelihood before b mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation October 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Communications	S.3.1	Reputation damage Causes: 1. Choice of government to need a new and different way of regulating social work. 2. HCPC ineffective at communicating its commitment to the transfer or is seen as dragging its feet. 3.SWE criticise HCPC whilst building the case for their edistence and to demonstrate their different approach to regulation	ad of Communications, R	Roz Allison	2	3	6	Position statement & FAQs on website and ready for stakeholder engagement briefings	Close liaison with SWE communications teams and reminder of this as a concern. Any issues escalated and resolved rapidly		CLOSED	Positioning statement developed in case of media concern. Engagement by SMT with key external stakeholders. Regular meetings with SWE communications providing timely insight and messaging aligned.		SMT	Ongoing until end of project	Low	Low
Communications	S.3.2	Confusion on which regulator to work with. Causes: 1. Social work students and registrants are confused as to where to register and delay registration 2. The public don't understand where to check the register or make a complaint	ad of Communications, R	Roz Allison	2	4	8	SW hub on HCPC website explaining the transfer and answering FAQs. Post transfer remove all social work references in text and tags within websites on date of transfer and adjust adwords	Clear communication to registrants of date of transfer and HCPC ceases to SW regulator. Send emails with updates (Newsletters)	Monitor social media comments and respond if required	CLOSED	Social work hub completed and updates shared in emails and enews with strong engagement rates. Effective collaboration with SWE Common on messaging and comme planning taking place. Go live communications plan agreed with SWE. Joint media am discolal media monitoring and collaboration on media enquiries taking place.		SMT	Ongoing until end of project	Low	Low
Communications	S.3.3	Poor quality communications to all stakeholders. Cause: Lack of communications timeline built into transfer of regulatory service timeline which in itself is not agreed.	ad of Communications, Reject Portfolio Mgr	Raz Allison	2	2	4	Build regulatory function transfer timeline into project plan once Transfer order finalised. Build communications timeline into the service transfer timeline ensuring appropriate dependencies are mapped			CLOSED	Go live comms plan agreed working with the project plan		SMT	Ongoing until end of project	Low	Low
Communications	S.3.4	SWs complain that HCPC approach to regulation has been unacceptable through the transfer (particularly FTP, emotive, long gasa). Heac Causes: 1. Lack of management expectations from HCPC. 2. Lack of joining up of engagement between SWE and HCPC	ad of Communications, R ject Portfolio Mgr	Roz Allison	2	4	8	Build and deliver detailed communications programme (ensure that registrants are supported, especially those with FTP proceedings	Test communications approach and draft communications with FTP SW partners	Close liaison between regulatory function departments and communications learns between HCPC and SWE allowing joined up planning	CLOSED	Go live communications planning completed, working closely with regulatory function departments. The communications approach around the week-long shut down of systems and the closure of the registrant portal is bleng considered by the Project Board to ensure the approach meets our risk management requirements.		SMT	Ongoing until end of project	medium	med
Communications	S.3.5	Service-user FTP complainants complain about poor process resulting from transfer: Gause: Lack of management expectation from HCPC	ad of Communications, R ject Portfolio Mgr	Roz Allison	2	4	8	Build and deliver detailed communications programme (and ensure that we are supportive to registrants who are subject to FTP proceedings)	Test communications approach and draft communications with FTP Case Managers	Close liaison between regulatory function departments and communications teams between HCPC and SWE allowing joined up planning	CLOSED	Key changeover communications in preparation re FTP. Close planning between regulatory functions and comms team in HCPC and SWE under way		SMT	Ongoing until end of project	med	med
Communications	S.3.6	Affected HCPC employees feel forgotten or disillusioned and decide to leave Causes: 1. Lack of coordination and control between HR teams 2. Lack of HR comms plan and careful dependency mapping so changes in other areas of the plan flag knock or inpegion with the comment of t	ad of Communications, eject Portfolio Mgr, sctor HR	Roz Allison	2	4	8	Continued close liaison between HR teams resulting in HR timeline and communications plan built into the project plan ensuring dependencies are mapped. Aim for clarity on FTCs 4 months prior to end of contract in this timeline	Communications prior to clarity recognise the emotional impact of the lack of certainty	Discussions with SWE, DIE and DHSC should make clear the need for employee engagement in advance of ministerial announcement if possible	CLOSED	Transfer date announcements and clarity on contractual implications coordinated. Further changes resulting in financial review need to be managed through as become clear. This will be managed through transformation communications rather than social work transfer comms.		SMT	Complete	med	med

Audit Committee

2020224 4 March 2020

Page 8 of 25

Communications

Corporate Governance

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks Ref#	Risk owner (primary person responsible fo assessing and managing the ongoing Description	r Risk Owner (Names)	Impact before mitigations Feb 2020	Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	mitigation plan date	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	mitigation completion date		RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
	Corporate Governance	S.4.1	Changes to Council structure disrupts regular Council member ceruitment cycle - appropriate transitional provisions legislation not created	Claire Amor	1	2		Obtain legal advice around interpretation of requirement	Work with DH to ensure the requirment is fulfilled	None	CLOSED					Low	Low

Page 8

Corporate Governance

Partners

Ref Category	ISMS Risks	r	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitgartion plan date	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Partners		S.6.1 Loss of Registrants results in shortfall of SW Partners for existing or ongoing FTP cases, pre-transfer	Director of HR, Partner Manager, Head of FTP	Partner Mgr / Brian James	3	2		Outsource existing / ongoing SW cases to service provider post transfer	D of E funding of service provider	Outsourced contractors SLA		CLOSED				Med	Med

Education

Low		03/12/201	Risk closed as of 31/10/2019 as risk have been effectively mitigated and no issues running into the transfer Risk closed as of 24/07/2019 based on a number of UAT carried out on data and shared with SWE for testing. GO-Live plans are now in	CLOSED		Proactive communications with NewReg to education providers	_							
Med	3/12/2019 Med	03/12/201	on data and shared with SWE for testing. GO-Live plans are now in					2	3	Brendon Edmonds	Head of Education		Education CLOSE 31/10	
			place which reflect go-live activities based on snapshot of UAT cycles conducted.	CLOSED	Ensure the testing cylces for data migration are followed and agreed between HCPC and SWE	Ensure data requirements are documented and formally signed off by both HCPC and SWE.		4	4	Brendon Edmonds	Head of Education,		Education CLOSE 08/19	
Med	'/11/2019 Med	27/11/201	As this is about resourcing against multiple systems projects, the mitigation will remain live for the duration of the SW project. Risk closed as of 31/10/2019 as risk have been effectively mitigated and no issues running into the transfer	CLOSED	Pausing progress where required on lower priority projects			4	2	Brendon Edmonds	Head of Education,		Education CLOSE 31/10	
Med	3/06/2019 Med	03/06/201	Risk closed as of 24/07/2019 Primarily related to upgrade to SP 2016 having an impact. However this is now in place and testing has been done on this version.	CLOSED	Select migration approach which can accommodate changes to infrastructure/dataschema	Capture same risk within Education Systems		3	1	Brendon Edmonds	Head of Education,		Education CLOSE 08/19	
 	+-	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +										+ +		-
	ı	1												
	3/06/2019	03/06/201	Primarily related to upgrade to SP 2016 having an impact. However	CLOSED	accommodate changes to	Capture same risk within Education Systems		3	1	Brendon Edmonds	Head of Education,	LOSED 08/19 S.7.6 Upgrade project require further changes migrations tool developed to support data		

Audit Committee 20200224 **4**W **N A CHA 2020 0** ar2020 Page 11 of 25

Education

Information Technology

Ref Ca	itegory	ISMS Risks Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)			Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation plan date	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitgation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
	rmation hnology	Not an IT Risk? Move to Operations section?	New Regulator fails to deliver to timetable and our operations and performance are compromised (as awaiting transfer out of SW records)	Exec Director of IT & Resources, Project Portfolio Mgr	Guy Gaskin	3	4	12	Share HCPC's migration expertise with new Regulator project team	Backfill rescource	SWE dress rehersals	CLOSED	Requested confirmation of transfer date from the DfE				Med	Med
	rmation hnology	Closed S.5.2	Inability to meet the technology data migration timetable	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	3	4	12	HCPC to draft out principles document on arrangements/ plan for migration with suppliers in month of Set 2018	Early enagement with suppliers / clear requirements	Transfer scheme, data sharing agreement		Risk closed as of 30/10/2019 based on a number of UAT carried out on data and shared with SWE for testing. GO-Live plans are now in place which reflect go-live activities based on snapshot of UAT cycles conducted.				Med	Med
	rmation hnology	Closed S.5.3	HCPC may not transfer all of the data required by SWE. This may cause reputational damage to the HCPC.	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	4	3	12	An analysis of data held at the HCPC, and the data required by SWE will be reviewed jointly.	Transfer Agreement will be entered into. A- 92-0004, A-92-0003/ data Sharing agreement	SWE sign off migration testing cycles	CLOSED	Risk closed as of 30/10/2019 based on a number of UAT carried out on data and shared with SWE for testing. GO-Live plans are now in place which reflect go-live activities based on snapshot of UAT cycles conducted.				Med	Med
	rmation hnology	Closed S.5.4	Suppliers may not respond in time HCPC's request to create export process	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	3	3	9	effective project planning/ open communication with SWE	Early engagement with suppliers	Issue esculation to senior management	CLOSED	All export processes have been received from suppliers.				Med	Med
	rmation hnology	S.5.5	SWE may change their data requirements after tool has been cretaed/ HCPC process are set in place with suppliers	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	4	3	12	SWE BA assigned to workshop requirements with HCPC teams, and HCPC will run a series on workshops with suppliers to review report, map out an export plan and a DTA before Dec 2018	Agreement of data requirements through transfer agreement and data shaing		CLOSED					Low	Med
	rmation hnology	\$.5.6	Export process may not be quick enough to allow an export at the final transition week/ weekend	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	4	3	12	Transfer Agreement details test cycles which identify performance	Migration preformed for some systems using large cloud rescources	Agreement with SWE for transition period	CLOSED					Low	Med

Audit Committee

20200224 4 March 2020 Page 12 of 25

Page 11 Information Technology

Information Security

Categ		ISMS Risks	Ref#		Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Informa Secui		Closed	S.17.3	Apparent loss of SW material in ransit, arriving at HCPC after ransfer of bulk records to new egulator	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	5	2	10		Interception at HCPC post room to specific named individual at HCPC	Robust internal processes	CLOSED	Robustly tested transfer process in place.				Low	Low
Informa Secui	ation Assi	signed to Claire Amour	S.17.5	Removal of historic Social Worker nformation and inability to answer FOI requests results in ICO action availability issues)	Exec Director of IT & Resources, Head of FTP, Hd of BPI, Head of Registration		2	3	6			Data transfer agreement, agreed between both parties	CLOSED					Low	Low
Informa Secui			C 17 6	coss of HCPC data or security oreaches occur during UAT tests or extracts to SWE before GO-Live date	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	3	3	9	development of an IT principles aggreement,	Robust internal processes specifically targeted to hope IT teams and all external suppliers/ parties involved in handling data		CLOSED					Low	Low
Informa Secur			0 47 7 b	coss of HCPC data or security oreaches occur during UAT tests or extracts to SWE during GO-Live date	IT, Infrastructure Manager	Jason Roth	3	3	9	Data Transfer agreement and Data Sharing Agreement	UAT data transfer	Robust internal processes (ISO 27001)	CLOSED					Low	

Audit Committee
20200224 4 March 2020 2020
Page 13 of 25

Page 12 Information Security

Quality Management

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks Ref#	ı	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)		Impact before mitigations Feb 2020	Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation deadline date	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion date		RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
9	Quality Management.		Loss of ISO 9001:2015 Certification	CISRO	Head of BPI Roy Dunn	4	3	12	Regular & internal audits	QMS standards applied across HCPC	Management buy - in	CLOSED					Low	Low
			Links to 2.3, 10.3															
	Quality Management.	I A7.1.2 S9.2	Employees non-compliance with established Standard Operating Proceedures	SMT	SMT	5	2	10			Extend ISO systems as required, regular audits	CLOSED					Low	Low
	Quality Management.			Head of Quality, Complaints Manager	Paul Robson/ Paula Lescott	3	2		Comms plan in place with regular updates for social workers about the impact of the transfer	Previous experience of Social Worker feedback styles	Governance administrator able to cover admin side of complaints if necessary. OMT and SMT complaints on a regular basis	CLOSED					Low	Low
		New S9.4	Increased turnover of contracter staff, threatens aderance to existing processes		Brian James, Richard Houghton and Brendon Edmonds	2	3	6	Culture, follow procedures and report errors	increase level of internal auditting		CLOSED					medium	

Audit Committee

20200224 4 March 2020 2020

Page 14 of 25

Page 13 Quality Management

HR

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before b mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion date		RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
	HR	CLOSED	S.11.1	Adverse impact on wellbeing and performance of employees concerned about long term future of their role	Resources & Org Dev,	Ben Spittles	2	2	4	Regular updates and communications with employees	Retention strategy including hiring new employees on fixed term contracts, focus on engagement, wellbeing and development, change management training and briefings for managers	Employee Assistance programme	CLOSED	10/19 - Not a risk solely related to SWE project. Ongoing change may still be unsettling but wider organisational issue rather than soley as a result of this project.				Low	Low
	HR	CLOSED		High turnover of employees due to uncertainty leads to resourcing challenges	Director of Human Resources & Org Dev, specific departmental managers	Ben Spittles	2	2	4	Agency temps and employees on fixed term contracts engaged to provide additional capacity.	Department of health funding to increase temporary support	Fixed term employees offered permanent contracts if a permanent opportunity becomes available	CLOSED	10/19 - Not a risk solely related to SWE project. Ongoing change may still be unsettling but wider organisational issue rather than soley as a result of this project.				Low	Low
	HR	CLOSED	S.11.4	subject matter experts causing impact to productivilty of work/	Director of Human Resources, Specific Departmental managers, Heads of Unit	Ben Spittles	3	3	9	Provision of agency temps and employees on fixed term contracts to provide additional capacity. Department of health funding to increase temporary support	Proactively identify subject matter experts and key employees for targeted retention			11/19 - Now one month to transfer, if key employee leave now, will be required to work notice perios which will take them beyond transfer date.				Low	Low
	HR	CLOSED	S.11.5	hoing made redundant without	Director of Human Resources & Org Dev, specific departmental managers	Ben Spittles	1	1	1	Impact on HCPC staff numbers May cause productivity and moral issues with department Ongoing conversations with SWE to clarify on possibility of staff willing to transfer to SWE after GC live date. Update 07/09/18: SWE has recruite a Head of People and Change to manage its HR, training and development. New contact will engage with Teresa Haskins to discuss recruitment and COSOP.	for roles included in COSOP	HCPC signpost employees to SWE vacancies	CLOSED	10/19 - COSOP not applicable as not reduction in permanet roles which fall in to scope. May be structural changes within HCPC but these will be post transfer.				Low	Low
	HR	CLOSED		SWE keen to advertise new posts, need to ensure there are vacancies for employees moving. Low risk for HCPC due to numbers and it being the responsibility of SWE, but something to be aware of.	Director of Human Resources & Org Dev, specific departmental managers	Ben Spittles	1	1	1	n/a			CLOSED	10/19 - As above COSOP not applicable.				Low	Low

Audit Committee
20200224 # March 2020 2020
Page 15 of 25

Page 14

Legal

Legal

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
	Legal		Poorly drafted legislation around transfer leaves HCPC with unsupported requirements	Exec Director of Policy & External Relations, SMT	Jacqueline Ladds	4	1	4	Proactive involvement with DoE / DH legislators	Experienced HCPC legal advisors		CLOSED				Low	Low
	Legal	S.12.2	Helpful legislation changes not wrapped up in legislation supporting transfer to new Regulator	Exec Director of Policy & External Relations, SMT	Jacqueline Ladds	3	2	6	Proactive involvement with DoE / DH legislators	Experienced HCPC legal advisors		CLOSED				Low	Low

Page 15

Project Management

Ref Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the on-going risk)	Risk Owner (Names)	Impact before mitigations Feb 2020	Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitgation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitgation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Project Management		S.8.1	Time Quality That communication around the content of the transfer order is not forthcoming, leading to a lack of ability for HCPC to sufficiently prepare in time for the transfer	Project Sponsor Project Lead	John Barwick	4	4	16	Early and frequent communication with D of E Project Team / Government departments to ensure that timeframes allocated to the transfer are adequate	stakeholder plan (internal/ external). Preparing material before the announcment of go live date	joint comms between SWE and HCPC teams	CLOSED	UPDATE: 09/08/2018 - We now know that legislation is approved by parliament. However we are still waiting for confirmation to publically announce the final GO-Live date.				medium	High
Project Management		S.8.2	Quality That stakeholder managemen is poorly undertaken by HCPC	^t PMO	HCPC PMO	3	3	9	Clear identitifcation of stakeholders and early allocation of responsibility within the project team			CLOSED	UPDATE: 09/08/2018 - Internal and External Comms plan and Stakeholder engagement plan/ Matrix is being produced by PMO				Med	Med
Project Management		S.8.5	Time Quality That due to inexperience, the receiving organisation is unco-operative or unclear in stipulating their data requirements, which would lead to delays in HCPC preparations	Project Lead	John Barwick	3	4	12	Early expectation setting with the receiving organisation to manage a smooth transferral process			CLOSED					Med	Med
Project Management		S.8.6	Time Quality That there are delays in implementing technology solutions in the receiving organisation which could have a knock on effect to HCPC preparations for data transfer	Project Lead	John Barwick	3	4	12	Early expectation setting with the receiving organisation to manage a smooth transferral process	Create a clear set of plan for the transfer of data (systems, method, approach)		CLOSED	UPDATE: Within the data sharing agreement (Annex 3) outlines the method of transfer from HCPC to SWE. HCPC and SWE carried out a number of tests in using a process of using either Azure File or Blob Storage. SWE has confirmed the use of Blob storage as the preferred system for transferring data.				Med	Med
Project Management		S.8.7	Cost That the cost of the project will excede HCPC expectations	Project Sponsor	John Barwick	3	2	6	Experience of HCPC with inbound transfers helps predict outbound costs			CLOSED	UPDATE: HCPC decision to extend resources past September are based on the following terms: There are two groups of people, the first (A) are those currently funded by the DIE grant and those that (B) that are not and are mostly due to end their contracts at the end of September. In terms of those in group (A) – the project can at its discretion extend those resources to the end of Feb 2020. In terms of those in group (B) – their extension is based on agreements dependent post the final approval of the 2nd funding request which is currently under evaluation by PWC. A decision is expected by the DfE / DoHSC by the 16 May 2019.				Low	Low
Project Management		S.8.8	HCPC's non-Social Worker England projects delayed due to poorly constrained or slipping time scales of Social Worker England project & conflicting commitments	SMT	SMT	5	2	10	Monitoring of budget and work plans	Experience of HCPC's SMT	Experience of HCPC project management	CLOSED	Experience of HCPC project management				Med	Med
Project Management	give to Marc	S.8.9	Transfer Order fails to enable the delivery of SWE project requirements	HCPC BDB/ Government / D o E	John Barwick	5	5	25	Engagement of DoE for the need of a transferal order	Experience of HCPC's SMT	_	CLOSED	UPDATE: HCPC has held a number of joint meetings with the DfE. PSA, DHSC and SWE to discuss progress updates, the status of the date export build plan, the announcement of the transfer date and collaborative working to a				Low	Low

Audit Committee

20200224 4 March 2020 Page 17 of 25

Page 16 Project Management

Registrations

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitgation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
	Registration		S.10.1	being sent to HCPC when we are		Richard Houghton / (Jacqueline Ladds) Roz Allison	2	4	8	Extensive Comms campaign to university third year students at HCPC approved courses	Filter applications for registration at Post Room, log names & postcodes, and securely return to applicant		CLOSED	UPDATE 01/10/19 - Communication plan agreed between HCPC/SWE				Low	Low
	Registration		S.10.2	Continuation of SW regulation beyond published dates caused resource shortfall in Reg Dept	Head of Registration & Executive Director of Regulation	Richard Houghton / John Barwick	3	2	6	Upscale resources with contractors in short term	Different contracts are ending at different times/ can extend fix term contracts of needed		CLOSED	UPDATE: 09/08/2018 - Discussions with HCPC HR and SWE have commenced to explore ideas on how to mitigate this risk as well as agree on details for timescales for transfer and how this impacts staff count at HCPC				Low	Low
	Registration		S.10.3	Limited remit of New Reg functions results in Gvmt request for HCPC to maintain register for unknown period of time, splitting functions	Executive Director of	Richard Houghton / John Barwick	2	2	4	Design specific shared regulation processes between SWE & HCPC	Upscale resources with contractors in short to medium term. Changes to NetRegulate implimented in short term.	Regular communication wth SWE and HCPC	CLOSED	UPDATE 31/10/2019 - HCPC aiming to reduce work in progress to a minimum which will mitigate the impact of this risk.				Low	Low
	Registration	REASSIGNED 05/06/19 Previously regsitered under information security (S.17.4)	S.10.4	Delay in deleting SW data to archive status or other exporting impacts delivery of other functionality to NetRegulate, damages integrity of data	Head of Registration	Richard Houghton	3	3	9	Proactive modification of internal deadlines based on evolving requirements.	Project prioritisation process		CLOSED					Low	Low
	Registration	REASSIGNED 06/06/19 Previously regsitered under information security (S.8.4)	S.10.5	Time Quality That expectations around registrant application processing at the point of transfer are unrealistic given the timeframe assigned to the transfer process	Head of Registration	Richard Houghton	3	3	9	Early expectation setting with the receiving organisation to manage a smooth transferral process			CLOSED	UPDATE: 09/08/2018 - Early dialogue with consultants for FTP. Similar workshop will be developed for Education and Registration functions to determine and agree on transitional arrangements for each of the regulatory functions have now been agreed between HCPC and SWE. These now provide more definitive timetables and shared understanding of time required to effect a smooth transition. SWE has also indicated that they are preparing to receive more work in progress. Update 31/10/19 - Regular meetings occurred with SWE and clear timelines agreed, which have been shared with the internal teams.				low	High

Fitness to Practise

Ref	Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#	Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	
	FTP		S.13.1	Retain legacy FTP cases without clear case transfer and funding arrangements in place	Head of Fitness to Practice, Director of Finance	Brian James, Jameela Khan	3	2	6	Cost allocation and overhead charging method agreed with DfE prior to transfer	Request additional funding for specific cases	Reforecasting budget processes and resource allocation	CLOSED	29/10/19: this risk can now be reduced or closed off, as we have secured resources, and have a firm plan. The only factor that may affect the transfer would be an IT failure to transfer or digest case information.				Med	Med
	FTP		S.13.2	Maintain FTP function for unknown period of time, rather than project delay	Head of Fitness to Practice, Director of Finance	Brian James, Jameela Khan	4	2	8	Cost allocation and overhead charging method agreed with DfE prior to transfer	Reforecasting budget processes and resource allocation	Request additional funding for specific cases	CLOSED	29/10/19: this risk can now be reduced or closed off, as we have secured resources, and have a firm plan. The only factor that may affect the transfer would be an IT failure to transfer or digest case information.				Low	Low
	FTP		S.13.3	HCPC's increasing number of cases, increases the complexity of the work done to prepare for the data transfer and the time and volume of data being transferred.	Head of Fitness to Practice, Director of Finance	Brian James, Jameela Khan	4	2	8	Request registrants funds to help monitor the case load	Joint project to agree data transfer UAT witest assumptions.	11	CLOSED	29/10/19: this risk can now be reduced or closed off, as we have secured resources, and have a firm plan. The only factor that may affect the transfer would be an IT failure to transfer or digest case information.				Med	Med
	FTP	REASSIGNED 06/06/19 Previously registered under project management (S.8.4)	S.13.4	Time Quality That expectations around case progression at the point of transfer are unrealistic given the timeframe assigned to the transfer process	Head of Fitness to Practice	Brian James,	3	3	9	Early expectation setting with the receiving organisation to manage a smooth transferral process			CLOSED	Update 29/10/19: we are working with SWE closely, and providing weekly updates on cases. We have transferred some cases to them, so they are familiarising themselves. As such the risk is minimal. UPDATE: 90/80/2018. Early disloque with consultants for FTP. Similar workshop will be developed for Education and Registration functions to determine and agree on transitional arrangements. Update 12/03/2019: Transitional arrangements for each of the regulatory functions have now been agreed between HCPC and SWE. These now provide more definitive timetables and shared understanding of time required to effect a smooth transition. SWE has also indicated that they are preparing to receive more work in progress.				low	High
	FTP	NEW	S.13.5	SWE request to deviate from sharing data by the technical platform and parameters outline within the DSA	Head of Fitness to Practice	Brian James,	3	3	9	HCPC to seek advice from BDB (legal Teams) if there are any legal implications that could occur if HCPC entertained this notion.	Conduct a test to ensure the approach an method of using MS teams is secure before finalising/ approving on method of transfer for final week of GO-live	3	CLOSED	29/10/19: this risk remains at the same level. we have had some short notice and new requests for additional or different data. This may continue in the next 4 weeks. UPDATE 02/10/2019: Based on SWE's request on using MS teams to share the manual updates during the final week of the migration. BDB has reviewed this approach and the frequency and has come to the conclusion that this approach would pose a very high risk to the HCPC at this stage in the project. It is not ideal for both parties to derogate from the DSA which does clearly stateed to be recommended best practice by the ICO.				low	High

Audit Committee
20200224 4 March 2020 Page 19 of 25

Page 18 Fitness to Practise

Finance

Ref Category	ISMS Risks	Ref # Description	Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)		Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Miligation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitigation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation completion date	RISK score after Mitigation Oct 2019	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Financial		Lost contribution caused by transfer of SW in England from HCPC to SW (England)	Finance Director, SMT	Gordon Dixon / SMT	5	5		Short Term Financial Plans are being re-worked with a Turnaround Lens			CLOSED				TBC	High	High
Financial		Transfer of SW to SWE substantially reduces HCPC cas balance, since up to £5m of cas S15.2 with a case of case	Finance Director, SMT	Gordon Dixon / SMT	5	4		Short Term Financial Plans are being re-worked with a Turnaround Lens	Arrange borrowing facility with bank if required		CLOSED	Update 25/03/2019 We are developing a three month rolling cash forecasting model to manage payement cycle and income more effectively			TBC	Med	Med
Financial	Closed 10/19	Social workers may cancel direct debit instructions for their HCPC fees in 2018-19 due to their S15.3 rouss experience of a double registration fee hit when transferring from the SSCC to HCPC in 2012, causing a short in income and additional work.	Finance Director, Head of Registration	Gordon Dixon / Richard Houghton	4	3	12	Only cash received in advance will be transferred to SWE. Data cleansing exercise is being undertaken to increase accuracy of data.	Last SW DD has been completed.		CLOSED	UPDATE: 28/11/18: We are likely to see the effect of these in December, once social workers completes their renewal. So we should be able to update on this risks then.			TBC	Medium	Medium
Financial		Cost of work leading up to the transfer and/or cost of any functions undertaken on behalf SWE after the transfer not fully covered by DH / DfE grant, including related overheads	of HCPC Accounting Officer	Gordon Dixon	4	3	12	Operational risks to be managed within the DfE grant amounts.	Budget already assigned for back fill		CLOSED				TBC	Medium	Medium
Financial		S15.6 DH fails to reimburse HCPC incurred costs	HCPC Accounting Officer & Finance Director	Gordon Dixon	1	1	1	Monthly DH billing for incurred costs	Project planning, defines when costs to be incurred		CLOSED					Low	Low
Financial	Closed 10/19	SW fail to renew in 2018 (in attempt to avoid potential double S15.7 fee charge as in GSCC to HCPC transfer) causing financial shortfall	HCPC Accounting Officer & Finance Director	Gordon Dixon	2	3		Only cash received in advance will be transferred to SWE. Data cleansing exercise is being undertaken to increase accuracy of data.	Final SW DD completed		CLOSED	UPDATE: 28/11/18: We are likely to see the effect of these in December, once social workers completes their renewal. So we should be able to update on this risks then. 18/02/19: Likelihood should be increased to 3 – early indication suggest that lapse rate is at 6.4% compared to 4% forecasted. We are reviewing the number of readmissions from SW as they may come back on in January. 26/03/2019: since the 1st December 2018 until 25th March we have received approximately 1,794 readmission forms from social workers.			ТВС	Low	low
Financial	Closed 10/19	HCPC must establish and ages way to recover costs from SWE regarding PSA levies that work apply to the Social Worker regulation after the transfer date otherwise there will be an operational budget impact to the HCPC (issue name / description	Finance Director	Gordon Dixon	3	3	9	Agree a reduced levy, or refund from the PSA based on the transition date (unlikely)	Retain money to cover PSA costs when we transfer the balance of Social Worker fees		CLOSED	UPDATE: 28/11/18: In August, Marc informed finance and the SMT that we will pay the 100% full PSA levy cost for FY2019/20 and claim the money back from DoH or DfE when the social workers leave the register. Marc will inform HCPC finance when more information is known. Update Update 2503/2019 Plans in place to recover the rebate from Psa. Already factored in budget			ТВС	Low	Low
Financial		SWE/ DfE failure to make timely S15.9 payments towards scheduled grant claims for SW project	Finance Director	Gordon Dixon	3	3	9	Escalate issues to internal HCPC project board and DfE authorisation group.	Look at penalties in contract for default/ late payments to cover cost through interest percentage on fees claimed	Cash receipts have been occurring on time for grants claims	CLOSED				TBC	Low	Low

Page 19

Audit Committee ***March**2020***
Page 20 of 25

Finance - revised

Policy & Standards

Ref Category	ISMS Risks	Ref#		Risk owner (primary person responsible for assessing and managing the ongoing risk)	Risk Owner (Names)	Impact before mitigations Feb 2020	Likelihood before mitigations Feb 2020	Risk Score = Impact x Likelihood	Mitigation I	Mitigation II	Mitigation III	Mitogation plan deadline	Updates	Date raised	Escalation/ Decision group	Mitigation	Mitigation Oct	RISK score after Mitigation Sep 2019
Policy & Standards			N/A									CLOSED						
												CLOSED						

Page 20 Policy & Standards

Issue Date:25/02/2020

Classification: Restricted until published to Council or Audit Committee

Glossary & Abbreviations

Term Meaning

AGM Annual General Meeting

BCP / BCM Business Continuity Plan / Business Continuity Management (Disaster Recovery and associated processes)

CCM's Council & Committee Members

CDT Cross Directorate Team (formerly HCPC's Middle Management Group)

CPD Continuing Professional Development

DH Departments of Health in Home countries

DfE Department for Education

EEA European Economic Area, = European Economic Union, plus Norway, Iceland, plus for our purposes Switzerland HCPC's Executive Management Team (closed down May 2018, responsibilities taken over by SMT & OMT)

EU European Economic Union (formerly known as the "Common Market")

FReM Financial Reporting Manual

FTP Fitness to Practise GP Grandparenting

HSWPO Health and Social Work Professions Order (2001)

HR Human Resources

HW Abbreviation for computer hardware

ISMS Information Security Management System (ISMS) risk

Impact The result of a particular event, threat or opportunity occuring. Scored between 1 least effect on HCPC and 5 maximum effect on HCPC.

ISO International Standards Organisation (the global governing body for the Quality standards used by HCPC)

ISO 9001:2008 The ISO Quality Management Standard used by HCPC. ISO 27001:2013 The ISO Information Security Standard used by HCPC.

IT Risk Register & Risk Treatment Plan

Likelihood Used to mean Probability of the event or issue occurring within the next 12 months

MIS Management Information System MOU Memorandum of Understanding

NetRegulate The bespoke computer application used to manage the application, registration and renewal processes, and publish the online register

New Reg New bespoke regulator for Social Workers in England

OIC Order in Council

OJEU Official journal of the European Union
OMT Operation Management Team 2019 onwards

Onboarding The process of bringing a new profession into statuatory regulation from HCPC's viewpoint

OPS Operations

PSA Formerly (CHRE), renamed Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care in the 2012 legislation.

PLG Professional Liason Group

Probability Likelihood, chance of occurring. Not the "mathematical" probability. Scored between 1 least likely and 5 most likely to occur within the next year.

Q Quality Management System (QMS) Risk

QMS Quality Management System, used to record and publish HCPC's agreed management processes
Risk Any uncertain event/s that could occur and have an impact on the achievement of objectives

Risk Owner The person or entity that has been given the authority to manage a particular risk and is accountable for doing so.

Risk Score Likelihood x Impact or Probability x Significance

SI Statutory Instrument
Significance Broadly similar to Impact
SMT Senior Management Team

SSFS Scheme Specific Funding Standard, a set of standards relating to pensions services

STD Standards

SW Abbreviation for computer software

SW (England) Name of the new Social Work regulator in England

VPN Virtual Private Network, a method of securely accessing computer systems via the public internet

ISO27001 Term	Meaning
ISO27001:2013 A5	Security Policy Management
ISO27001:2013 A6	Corporate Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A7	Personnel Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A8	Organizational Asset Management
ISO27001:2013 A9	Information Access Management
ISO27001:2013 A10	Cryptography Policy Management
ISO27001:2013 A11	Physical Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A12	Operational Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A13	Network Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A14	System Security Management
ISO27001:2013 A15	Supplier Relationship Management
ISO27001:2013 A16	Security Incident Mangement
ISO27001:2013 A17	Security Continuity Management
ISO27001:2013 A18	Security Compliance Management

IMPACT

HCPC RISK MATRIX

HCPC RISK MATRIX Public Protection		Financial	Reputation						_
Catastrophic 5 A systematic failure for which HCPC a responsible for, exposes the public to serio where mitigation was expect	us harm in cases		Catastrophic 5 Incompetence/ maladministration or other event that will destroy public trust or a key relationship	5	10	15	20	25	
Significant 4 A systematic failure for which HCPC a responsible for, exposes more than 10 per cases where mitigation was exp	eople to harm in	Significant 4 Unfunded pressures £250,000 -£1 million	Significant 4 Incompetence/ maladministration that will undermine public trust or a key relationship for a sustained period or at a critical moment.	4	8	12	16	20	
Moderate 3 A systemic failure for which HCPC are ultim for exposes more than 2 people to harm mitigation was expected.		Moderate 3 Unfunded pressures £50,000 - £250,000	Moderate 3 Incompetence/ maladministration that will undermine public trust or a key relationship for a short period. Example Policy U-turn	3	6	9	12	15	
Minor 2 A systemic failure which results in inadequindividuals/individual communities, including celebrity cases.		Minor 2 Unfunded pressures £20,000 - £50,000	Minor 2 Event that will lead to widespread public criticism.	2	4	6	8	10	
Insignificant 1 A systemic failure for which fails to addres requirement	s an operational	Insignificant 1 Unfunded pressures over £10,000	Insignificant 1 Event that will lead to public criticism by external stakeholders as anticipated.	1	2	3	4	5	
KEY				Negligible1	Rare 2	Unlikely 3	Possible 4	Probable 5	
>11 High Risk: Urgent action	on required			Extremely infrequent – unlikely to happen in a strategic environment or occur during a project or programmes lifecycle. May occur once a year or so in an operational environment.	Only small chance of occurring in the lifetime of the strategy.	May well occur during the lifetime of the strategy.	Likely to happen at some point during the next one or two years.	"Clear and present danger", represented by this risk - will probably impact on this initiative - sooner rather than later.	Strategic
6-10 Medium Risk: Som required	e action			Extremely infrequent – unlikely to happen in a strategic environment or occur during a project or programmes lifecycle. May occur once a year or so in an operational environment.	Not likely to occur during the lifecycle of the programme of project.	May occur during the life of the programme or project.	Likely to happen in the life- cycle of the programme or project.	Likely to occur in the life-cycle of the project, probably early on and perhaps more than once.	Programme / Project
<5 Low Risk: Ongoing merced	onitoring			Extremely infrequent – unlikely to happen in a strategic environment or occur during a project or programmes lifecycle. May occur once a year or so in an operational environment.	Does not happen often - once every six months.	May well happen on a monthly basis.	May well happen on a weekly basis.	The threat is likely to happen almost every day.	Operational

LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT TYPES

Public Protection	Financial	Reputation
Catastrophic 5	Catastrophic 5	Catastrophic 5
A systematic failure for which HCPC are ultimately responsible for, exposes the public to serious harm in cases where mitigation was expected.	Unfunded pressures greater than £1 million	Incompetence/ maladministration or other event that will destroy public trust or a key relationship
Significant 4	Significant 4	Significant 4
A systematic failure for which HCPC are ultimately responsible for, exposes more than 10 people to harm in cases where mitigation was expected.	Unfunded pressures £250k - £1 million	Incompetence/ maladministration that will undermine public trust or a key relationship for a sustained period or at a critical moment.
Moderate 3	Moderate 3	Moderate 3
A systemic failure for which HCPC are ultimately responsible for exposes more than 2 people to harm in cases when mitigation was expected.	Unfunded pressures £50,000 - £250,000	Incompetence/ maladministration that will undermine public trust or a key relationship for a short period. Example Policy U-turn
Minor 2	Minor 2	Minor 2
A systemic failure which results in inadequate protection for individuals/individual communities, including failure to resolve celebrity cases.	Unfunded pressures between £20,000-£50,000	Event that will lead to widespread public criticism.
Insignificant 1	Insignificant 1	Insignificant 1
A systemic failure for which fails to address an operational requirement	Unfunded pressures over £10,000	Event that will lead to public criticism by external stakeholders as anticipated.

LIKELIHOOD AREAS

Strategic		Programme / Project	Operational
Probable 5		Probable 5	Probable 5
"Clear and present dang represented by this risk - probably impact on this init sooner rather than late	will th	ely to occur in the life-cycle of ne project, probably early on nd perhaps more than once.	The threat is likely to happen almost every day.
Possible 4		Possible 4	Possible 4
Likely to happen at some during the next one or two		kely to happen in the life-cycle f the programme or project.	May well happen on a weekly basis.
Unlikely 3		Unlikely 3	Unlikely 3
May well occur during the lifetime of the strategy		ay occur during the life of the programme or project.	May well happen on a monthly basis.
Rare 2		Rare 2	Rare 2
Only small chance of occur in the lifetime of the strate	ırrıng _{lif}	Not likely to occur during the fecycle of the programme of project.	Does not happen often - once every six months.
Negligible1		Negligible1	Negligible1
Extremely infrequent – unlil happen in a strategic environment or occur duri project or programmes lifed May occur once a year or an operational environment.	ng a er cycle. pro so in Ma	remely infrequent – unlikely to happen in a strategic nvironment or occur during a bject or programmes lifecycle. ay occur once a year or so in an operational environment.	Extremely infrequent – unlikely to happen in a strategic environment or occur during a project or programmes lifecycle. May occur once a year or so in an operational environment.

LIKELIHOOD

Audit Committee
20200224 SW. Risk Register4AuditComm_Mar2020
4 March 2020 Page 24 of 25

Page 23 App ii Risk Matrix defns Issue Date:25/02/2020

Classification: Restricted until published to Council or Audit Committee HCPC Strategic Priorities 2018 - 2020

_	_	ᆈ
r	n	

code	
SP1.Perf	Strategic priority 1: Improve our performance to achieve the Professional Standards Authority's Standards of Good Regulation
SP2.Com	Strategic priority 2: Ensure our communication and engagement activities are proactive, effective and informed by the views and expectations of our stakeholders
SP3.Adapt	Strategic priority 3: Ensure the organisation is fit for the future and is agile in anticipating and adapting to changes in the external environment
SP4.Evid	Strategic priority 4: Make better use of data, intelligence and research evidence to drive improvement and engagement

HCPC has an averse appetite to risk in that we;

- a. Identify all relevant risks
- b. Mitigate those risks to an appropriate level
- c. Invest mitigation resources in proportion to the level of risk