

**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E1. Participate in the development of regional and local planning policy, and planning applications, where these affect the demand for healthcare services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk - 6

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E2. Have an estate strategy that is reviewed annually and integrated with relevant local, national and organisational clinical/service development plans?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk - 6

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E3. Have a well-managed robust approach to the acquisition and disposals of freehold and leasehold land and premises and ensures surplus land and premises are proactively disposed of?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E4. Have a well-managed robust approach to the management of land and property?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E5. Have effective transport and access arrangements?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Effectiveness**

**E6. Have a well-managed annually updated board approved sustainable development management plan?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P1. Involve patients, the public and Commissioners in shaping estates and facilities services, as well as gathering and using their experiences of estates and facilities services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P2. Ensure that patients, staff and visitors perceive that the condition, appearance, maintenance and privacy and dignity of the estate is satisfactory?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P3. Ensure that patients, staff and visitors perceive cleanliness to be satisfactory?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P4. Ensure that NHS Catering Services provide adequate nutrition and hydration through the choice of food and drink for people to meet their diverse needs?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P5. Ensure that access and car parking arrangements meet the reasonable needs of patients, staff and visitors and are effectively managed at all times?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P6. Ensures that safe, effective Portering Services are provided that meet the needs of patients and the organisation, consistent with all relevant guidance and legislation?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Patient Experience**

**P7. Ensure that the Telephony & Switchboard service is provided efficiently, professionally and courteously within agreed target response times?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 – Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 – Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 – Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 – Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S1. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Asset Management and Maintenance?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S2. Safe and compliant with well-managed systems in relation to: the Design and Layout of Premises?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S3. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Health & Safety at Work?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S4.** **Safe and compliant with well managed systems in respect of Catering Services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S5. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Asbestos?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S6. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Medical Gas Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S7.** **Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Natural Gas and Other Non Medical Piped Gas Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S8.** **Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Water Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S9. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Electrical Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S10. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Mechanical Systems e.g. Lifting Equipment?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S11. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Ventilation Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S12. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Lifts?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S13. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Pressure Systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S14. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Decontamination Processes?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S15. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Fire Safety?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S16. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Waste Management?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S17. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Cleanliness and Infection Control applying to Premises and Facilities?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S18. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Laundry and Linen Services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S19. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Medical Devices and Equipment?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S20. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Security Management?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S21. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Resilience, Emergency and Contingency Planning?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S22. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Transport Services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S23. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Pest Control?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S24. Safe and compliant with well-managed systems in relation to: Premises and Equipment issues identified in all relevant Safety-Related Reporting Systems. e.g. 'never events', MHRA, DH and NHS England safety reporting systems?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S25. Safe and compliant with well-managed systems in relation to: Contractor Management?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S26. Safe and compliant with well-managed systems in relation to: Undertaking New Build and Refurbishment Works?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Safety**

**S27. Safe and compliant with well managed systems in relation to: Safety and Suitability of Premises and Services, when the organisation is not responsible for the premises in which the care, treatment and support is delivered?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Efficiency**

**F1. Have a well-managed approach to achieving value for money and cost improvements in relation to: the procurement of estates and facilities goods and services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Efficiency**

**F2. Have a well-managed approach to achieving value for money and cost improvements in relation to: estates and facilities services operating costs?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Efficiency**

**F3. Have a well-managed approach to achieving value for money and cost improvements in relation to: the efficient utilisation of its estate (space utilisation) and facilities?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Efficiency**

**F4. Have a well-managed approach to achieving value for money and cost improvements in** **relation to: the procurement and management of its capital investment and disinvestment plans and processes?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 – Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Efficiency**

**F5. Have well-managed and robust financial controls, procedures and reporting relating to estates and facilities services?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG1. Ensure its Estates and Facilities staff and functions are embedded in its vision and culture and that they are focused on patient care and engagement with patients, their carers and staff?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG2. Have in place a governance framework for all aspects of Estates and Facilities functions that is transparent, coherent, complete, clear, well understood and fully functioning?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG3. Is there a clear and well-functioning system of Estates and Facilities accountability where individuals understand their responsibilities and are able to effectively account for their decisions, actions, behaviours and performance against objectives?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG4. Have an effective estates and facilities risk management strategy that integrates within the overall clinical, financial and organisational risk management strategy and gives assurance that Estates and Facilities risks are being identified, proactively controlled and mitigated?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG5. Have a clearly defined Board approved Estates and Facilities strategy that is aligned to clinical and service strategy which is focussed on patient care?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk - 6

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG6. Ensure that the Estates and Facilities leadership within the organisation is effective, visible and is maintained and developed?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan



**Premises Assurances Model**

**Governance**

**OG7. Ensure that the Board has access to professional advice on all matters relating to Estates and Facilities assurance and linked to Regulators and Inspectors requirements?**

NEP Responsible Person(s)

Evidence Submitted

SAQ Rating based on compliance with PAM & NEP relevant guidance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding | Good | Requires minimal improvement | Requires moderate improvement | Inadequate | N/A |

Requires Risk Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NEPFT Trust Risk Assessment Process** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Based on the AS/NZ 4360 standard)** | |  |  | **LIKELIHOOD** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | Remote | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Certain |
| **IMPACT** |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 - Extreme | | | | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| 4 - Major (Significant) | | | | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| 3 - Serious | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| 2 - Minor | | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 1 - Negligible | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Risk

Action Plan