

# **National Guardian's Office**

4.	M	The NGO should document a simple scheme of delegation / authority matrix, giving consideration to how arrangements will operate during the absence of any key individuals.	The NGO is developing a scheme of delegation which reflects the needs of the organisation whilst providing necessary assurance. It is seeking guidance and advice from CQC colleagues on this.	Scheme of Delegation to be prepared.  [REDACTED] Head of Office, and [REDACTED] Senior Administration and Programme Manager.  Initial work in progress; initial drafts April 2018.	Draft Scheme of Delegation.
5.	M	The NGO should develop a simple risk management policy, which could be based around some of the material in the CQC Risk Management handbook. Consider the merits of defining risk appetite and categorising the risks in the light of NGO strategic objectives.	The NGO is developing a risk management policy which reflects the needs of the organisation whilst providing necessary assurance. It is seeking guidance and advice from CQC colleagues on this.	Risk Management Policy to be prepared.  [REDACTED] Head of Office and [REDACTED] Senior Administration and Programme Manager  Initial work in progress; initial drafts April 2018.	Draft Risk Management Policy.

## NATIONAL GUARDIAN'S OFFICE

### 4. FINDING/OBSERVATION:

#### A formal Scheme of Delegation should be defined

##### RISK RATING: MEDIUM

There is currently no formalised Scheme of Delegation of Authority in the NGO. The National Guardian acts as the the only officer with approval authorities and the governance structure is simple as the office has 10 staff members, but nonetheless as the framework of governance is developed it would seem appropriate to define a clear scheme of delegation to govern activities.

It is not currently clear what happens in the situation that the National Guardian was not available to give approvals.

##### RISK/IMPLICATION:

If there is lack of clarity over the key decision makings processes, key decisions may not be made on timely basis during the absence of key staff.

##### RECOMMENDATION:

The NGO should document a simple scheme of delegation / authority matrix, giving consideration to how arrangements will operate during the absence of any key individuals.

### 5. FINDING/OBSERVATION:

#### A formal risk management policy is not in place

##### RISK RATING: MEDIUM

The NGO has a risk management process in place, but this has not been formalised by way of a risk management policy.

A review of the risk register showed that risk description, risk owner, the assessment of impact and likelihood have all been documented / assessments made, so it would appear an appropriate process is being applied but has just not been documented. We did note though that risk appetite for the NGO has not been articulated, although the risk register does show the target impact and likelihood for each risk.

Also, the existing risk register does not clearly identify the link between the NGO strategic objectives and the currently identified risks.

##### RISK/IMPLICATION:

Without formalised risk management process, there may be loss of knowledge of risk management practices in the case of key staff absence and processes may not be applied consistently.

## FINDING/OBSERVATION

OFFICIAL SENSITIVE

Defining a risk appetite is generally recognised to be a good step towards being able to determine risk tolerances and to ensure that sufficient but not excessive action is taken to mitigate risks.

Without clear linkage between strategic objectives and the risk register, it is possible that not all risks that threaten achievement of strategic objectives will be identified or that the potential impact of the risk may not be properly assessed.

##### RECOMMENDATION:

The NGO should develop a simple risk management policy, which could be based around some of the material in the CQC Risk Management handbook. Consider the merits of defining risk appetite and categorising the risks in the light of NGO strategic objectives.