

CYMORTH COMMISSIONING: PRIORITISATION GUIDANCE

INTRODUCTION

The Prioritisation Matrix has been developed to assist planning groups (Core Groups and Joint Commissioning Group [JCG]) to make decisions about which projects should receive Cymorth funding.

This guidance provides further information about the criteria that are to be used and how they should be assessed to ensure a clear and consistent approach.

COMPLETING THE PRIORITISATION MATRIX

The Matrix provides a way of prioritising proposed and existing services according to

- a) how critical they are to the delivery of the priorities within the Children and Young People's [C&YP] Plan and
- b) the potential level of risk to children, young people and families if they were not delivered.

Both elements need to be considered and assessed in relation to each proposal and existing project using the following scales, so that they can be plotted onto the matrix:

Service's importance:	Probable level of risk:
Critical	High
Significant	Medium
Minor	Low

Core Groups will be asked to provide an assessment and/or advice in relation to the proposals and projects which relate to the delivery of their priorities. **If a number of services fall into the same prioritisation category on the matrix, Core Groups may want to rank them further according to how critical they are to the delivery of their priorities before they go to the JCG.**

Assessments will be collated and moderated by the Lead Support Officers and CUPS Team, but the final judgements and prioritisation will be made by members of the JCG.

a) SERVICE'S IMPORTANCE

The following indicators can be used to identify the level of importance of a particular service (proposed or existing) in relation to the delivery of the Children and Young People's Plan.

Description	Indicators
Critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This service is crucial to the delivery of one or more priorities in the C&YP Plan • Failure to deliver the service would have a major impact on achievement of several key targets / objectives relating to the priorities as set out in the Plan and/or Delivery Plan
Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This service makes/ would make a significant contribution to the delivery of one priority in the C&YP Plan or some contribution to more than one • Failure to deliver the service would have a significant impact on achievement of a key target / objective or some impact on several targets / objectives relating to the priorities as set out in the Plan and/or Delivery Plan
Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This service is in line with the general aims of the C&YP Plan but makes either no specific contribution to the delivery of any of the priorities or only a moderate contribution • Failure to deliver the service would have very little impact on the delivery of the priorities as set out in the Plan

b) PROBABLE LEVEL OF RISK

Risk can be defined as the chance of something happening or not happening that will have an influence upon the achievement of the Partnership's objectives (i.e. to secure improved outcomes for children and young people). A risk can also be the failure to take advantage of opportunities which will enable the Partnership to achieve its objectives.

Once risks have been identified and described they need to be assessed in terms of the likelihood of their occurring and the consequences if they do. 'Likelihood' and 'consequences' will then be plotted against each other to determine the overall level of risk, so that this can be used on the 'Prioritisation Matrix'.

		Consequences			
		1	2	3	4
Likelihood	A	A1	A2	A3	A4
	B	B1	B2	B3	B4
	C	C1	C2	C3	C4
	D	D1	D2	D3	D4

Likelihood:
 A Very Likely
 B Likely
 C Unlikely
 D Very Unlikely

Consequences:
 1 Major
 2 Significant
 3 Moderate
 4 Minor

RED = HIGH **YELLOW** = MEDIUM **GREEN** = LOW

Likelihood

The likelihood table below provides a framework which will be used to score the likelihood of a risk occurring, with A being very likely to D being very unlikely.

Description	Indicators
A - Very Likely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is almost inevitable if the service is not delivered Impact would be felt by service users frequently – daily/ weekly/monthly
B - Likely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will probably occur if the service is not delivered Impact would be felt by service users but not on a frequent basis
C - Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not expected to happen, but is possible Would rarely have any direct impact on service users
D - Very Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May occur only in exceptional circumstances Would not have any direct impact on service users

Consequences

The 'Consequence' table below can be used to assess what would happen in each area of risk if the service in question were not funded. This may apply equally to situations where opportunities would not be available if new services were not delivered, or where services would end if funding is withdrawn. **These are only indicators and may need to be interpreted to suit particular circumstances.**

Taking each area of risk in turn, the consequences in terms of the impact should be considered, assessing each area as major, significant, moderate or minor. The ratings of each consequence are likely to be mixed, for example the consequence of a risk happening may be moderate in terms of reputation but may still have a significant impact on children, young people and families.

Once a judgement has been made for each consequence a 'line of best fit' should be determined. For example, if the consequences of a service not being delivered are mainly significant with one or two moderate consequences then the overall expected consequence of this would be significant.

IMPACT	1 - Major	2 - Significant	3 - Moderate	4 - Minor
AREA OF RISK				
Implications for children, young people and families	Children, young people and families would experience considerable difficulty in pursuing more than one of their rights and entitlements (as set out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child and the Seven Core Aims)	Children, young people and families would experience considerable difficulty in pursuing one of their rights and entitlements (as set out in the UNCRC and the Seven Core Aims) or some difficulty pursuing more than one	Some effects on the ability of children, young people and families to pursue rights and entitlements, e.g. other sources or avenues would be available	The interests of children, young people and families would not be affected
Implications for the Community	Serious impact on more than one vulnerable community or group	Significant impact on a vulnerable community or group or some impact on more than one	Some impact on a vulnerable community or group	No lasting detrimental impact on any vulnerable community or group
Implications for Partnership	Complete failure/ breakdown of relationship with key partners leading to adverse effect on partnership arrangements	Significant impact on relationship with at least one key partner leading to adverse effect on partnership arrangements	Some impact on partnership arrangements	Minimal impact on partnership arrangements
Reputation	Adverse Cardiff-wide publicity of a significant and persistent nature Adverse response from WAG potentially involving (threat of) withdrawal of funding	Adverse publicity within specific communities of a significant and persistent nature Adverse response from local councillors	Some adverse local publicity Complaints from individuals/small group	No real response within the community Complaint from individual/small group, of arguable merit
Financial/Resources	Serious impact on other (match) funding leading to loss of services funded other than by Cymorth Loss of significant volunteer contribution	Other funding affected, with some impact on services funded other than by Cymorth Loss of some volunteer contribution	A small impact on other funding but no implications for services Some impact on volunteer contribution	No impact on other funding sources No impact on volunteer contribution

USING THE INFORMATION

There are two key stages at which this information will be used:

1. Core Groups will use it to agree which proposals should be put forward to the JCG and which projects might be recommended to be put 'on hold' if a phased approach is needed
2. The JCG will use the information to help them to prioritise the services which should receive Cymorth funding across the whole programme and Plan

As outlined above, this guidance has been produced in the first instance to assist in the prioritisation of services and to assist in the decision as to which should receive Cymorth funding. However, the process may identify risks or issues that will need to be addressed by the Core Groups in other ways:

- If a proposal was considered to be important but wasn't allocated funding, are there any other options which would enable the service to be provided?
- If a service is ended or not delivered, are there risks to the reputation of the Partnership or to Partnership working that will need to be mitigated? Is the Core Group able to deal with this or is it serious enough to be referred to the Partnership Board?