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| Appendix 3 to PIPOT GuideRisk Management & Balance Sheet |

## A picture containing text, transport, wheel Description automatically generated

The owner of concern information i.e. the first person or nominated representative of the owner’s organisation who identifies a position of trust, risk can use this checklist to determine if position of trust procedures need to be commenced. If in doubt consult the appropriate Adult Safeguarding Lead.

This checklist can also be used by Adult Safeguarding Leads on receipt of a position of trust referral to aid decision making.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **Unlikely to support Position of Trust procedures** | **Likely to support Position of Trust procedures** |
| Has the individual:   * Behaved in a way that has harmed or may have harmed an adult; * possibly committed a criminal offence against, or related to, an adult; * behaved towards an adult in a way that indicates they may pose a risk of harm to adults with care and support needs. | No | Yes |
| Has the individual:   * behaved in a way that has harmed, or may have harmed, a child * possibly committed a criminal offence against, or related to a child; or * behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates s/he is unsuitable to work with adults at risk | No  Child protection issues but does not work in a regulated activity with adults with care and support, | Child protection issues suggesting suitability to work with adults with care and support must be considered. |
| Who is the information coming from – are they credible? Is the any incident/tension/friction between the parties? | After information gathering source of information is questionable (e.g. malicious).  Or is an anonymous concern with insufficient information to warrant procedures. | Source of information is credible and reliable. E.g. police, several consistent witnesses. |
| What is the severity of the allegation? | Insignificant | Severe |
| What level of access to adults at risk  does the individual have? | Supervised | Unsupervised |
| How frequently does the individual have access to adults at risk? | Never/Infrequent | Very frequent |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Likelihood of reoccurrence. | None/Low | | High |
| Does the incident relate to them as a victim or person alleged to be the source of risk? | Victim | | Person alleged to be the source of risk. |
| What is the truth of the allegation? The greater the conviction that the allegation is true the more pressing the need to disclose. | Weak or no evidence  Concern | | Strong evidence Fact |
| Why does the third party need to know (proportionality)? The more intense the need (legally or operationally) the more pressing the need to disclose. | No legal remit to share | | There is a legal right to be told. |
|  | No operational ‘Need to Know’ | | Operational need to safeguarding adults at risk. |
| What are the risks if the information is NOT shared? When answering this question consider the persons previous history (if any) of involvement with children. | No or few risks | | Risks are significant. |
| How will the disclosure of information impact on the persons ARTICLE 8 – European Convention of Human Rights – Right to Private Life? | Whilst everyone has the right to a private life these situations will require a case by case consideration of the facts and a balancing exercise of the individual’s rights against the wider public interest. | | |
| Is there a qualified right to confidentiality or does the law enable or require the information to be shared? | No right to confidentiality and no public interest to share | Of public interest | |