

# **POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE JOINT AUDIT, RISK & ASSURANCE PANEL**

Paper Marked

**C**

Report of	<b>OFFICES OF CHIEF CONSTABLE AND POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER</b>
Subject	<b>RISK REGISTER</b>
Date	<b>MONDAY 19<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016 – 1.00 P.M.</b>
Author	<b>LAURA SAUNDERS – RISK AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY ADVISOR</b>

## **Purpose of report**

1. This report provides JARAP with information about the corporate risk register, highlighting high priority, newly registered and risks of note.

## **Recommendation**

2. The panel is asked to discuss the contents of this report and note the current state of risk arrangements.

## **Summary**

3. The force Strategic Organisational Risk Board (SORB) oversees and directs the strategic risks facing the force. This board last met on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016 and was chaired by DCC Bannister. At this board the OPCC were represented, JARAP were unrepresented.
4. The OPCC risks are overseen by its Chief Executive and presented to the Senior Management Team within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

## **Risk**

5. The corporate risk register identifies the key strategic risks. In the main these risks represent long-term issues and typically remain on the register for long periods.
6. All risks are scored on an ascending scale of 1 - 4 in terms of impact and likelihood. Multiplication of these two figures leads to a risk priority rating, which is expressed as a 'RAG' rating.

Priority Rating	'RAG' Rating	Review
9 - 16	High	Monthly
5 - 8	Medium	3 Monthly
1 - 4	Low	3 Monthly

## Risk status

7. *Controlled* – this risk is in the ideal state. Circumstances or time may change this state.

*Controls Tasked* – when additional controls have been identified. These additional controls will have an owner tasked to complete them and a target completion date. Within the Orchid risk register the term 'Awaiting Control' is used to describe this status.

*Overdue Control* – when the completion date for additional controls has passed.

*Managed* – when no further controls have been identified at that time to reduce the risk further, however, the risk is not acceptably controlled.

*Awaiting Review* – a managed risk which requires a review. It may also be a new risk prior to first review or a risk transferred to a new 'Responsible Officer'.

## Strategic risks

8. On the corporate risk register there are 38 police strategic risks and 9 OPCC strategic risks.

The overall risk rating grid for the corporate risk register is shown below.

Corporate Risk Rating Grid		Likelihood			
		Very High	High	Medium	Low
Impact	Very High	0	1	0	0
	High	1	2	8	8
	Medium	1	2	15	6
	Low	0	0	1	2

There are 4 high priority risks, 2 new risks, 1 risk of note and 2 risks that have been archived since the last JARAP meeting; they are outlined within Appendix A.

The full corporate risk register is attached as Appendix B.

## Implications

### *Financial*

#### **STR1844 – Failure to transition to the ESN.**

Costs incurred by the infrastructure upgrade and purchase of new equipment. In addition, costs associated to the possible extension of the Airwave contract.

#### **STR1329 – Transforming services.**

This revolves around providing services with the reduced budget.

### *Equality impact assessment*

#### **STR430 – Disability related harassment.**

The police reputation for providing a fair and equitable service may be damaged.

### *Risks and impact*

As per the tables above.

### *Link to Police and Crime Plan*

As per report.

## Appendices

Appendix A: Strategic Risks

Appendix B: Corporate Risk Register

Appendix C: Risk Matrix

## Persons to contact

Roger Bannister – Deputy Chief Constable – (0116) 248 2005

Email: [Roger.Bannister@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Roger.Bannister@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

Paul Stock – Chief Executive – (0116) 229 8981

Email: [Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

Laura Saunders – Risk and Business Continuity Advisor – (0116) 248 2127

Email: [Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

## Appendix A – Strategic Risks

### High risks

<b>STR1844</b>		<b>Failure to transition to the ESN</b>	
Responsible Officer	Roger Bannister	Impact/Likelihood	Very High/High
Date Recorded	15/08/14	Current Rating	High (12)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	High (12)
Information	Leicestershire Police use Airwave for radio voice communications; however, the contract is due to expire in 2017. The government are driving the procurement process as every emergency service will move to mobile communications and connect to the Emergency Services Network (ESN).		
Impact	This risk is concerned with the impact of not transitioning to the ESN within the timescales, however, there are a number of associated risks:- Financial; upgrading our infrastructure, possibility of extending our contract with Airwave, purchase of new handsets. Operational; abstractions caused by equipment being fitted to cars and training in the use of new equipment.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Airwave user group</li> <li>Monitoring of Airwave performance</li> <li>National project team</li> <li>Creation of ESMCP Project Board</li> <li>COT oversight</li> <li>ICCS infrastructure upgrade</li> <li>Appointment of a project manager locally</li> <li>Monthly conference calls with national police team</li> <li>Purchase of repair credits for existing Airwave radios</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>24/08/16 – Andrew Rodwell (Communications Manager):-</b>            There were initial concerns that if we do not transition to the ESN within the timescales, we may have to extend our contract with Airwave. The Home Office are in discussions with Airwave regarding a Change Control Notice (CCN) which allows contracts to continue beyond the expiry date at the same pricing (plus RPI – Retail Price Index).</p> <p><b>Current status: managed.</b></p>		

<b>STR1679</b>		<b>Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime</b>	
Responsible Officer	Caroline Barker	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	12/06/13	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	High (9)
Information	The Service Improvement Unit carried out a number of audits under the heading "Missed Opportunities" which identified issues with the accuracy of our crime recording, both on initial contact and in relation to classification of crime. In addition, in April 2015 the Home Office Crime Recording reduced the timescale for when crimes must be recorded from 72 hours to 24 hours.		
Impact	Operational: crimes not being recorded. Reputational: loss of confidence in published figures and in the police as a whole.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Audit of 'STORM' incidents within CMD – compliance check</li> <li>Audit schedule – conducted by the Service Improvement Unit</li> <li>Task and finish groups – part of Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time</li> <li>Communication plan – as part of Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time</li> <li>Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time – Gold Group</li> <li>HMIC inspection</li> <li>Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time delivery plan</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>22/08/16 – Paul Howe (Deputy Crime Registrar):-</b>            There is nothing significant to update. Work is ongoing to increase compliance with crime recording, such as training and the audit regime. The work streams continue to be managed and monitored through the Get It Right First Time Group, which meets every 6 weeks.</p> <p><b>Current status: controls tasked.</b></p>		

<b>STR1935</b>		<b>Management of seized and found property provision</b>	
Responsible Officer	Jason Masters	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	30/06/16	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	A series of internal audits and related staff issues have highlighted that the organisational provision and processes relating to property are in need of comprehensive review. Some of the themes highlighted include; no single point of leadership, lack of clear processes and a high volume of property retained with no systematic process for disposal. With this risk there is an opportunity to improve the current service provision and also generate income through the sale of property.		
Impact	There is an operational impact of items being missing, which may be required for investigation purposes. There is a reputational risk associated to the poor management of the force property provision where items are lost, whether through theft or being unaccounted for.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal audit completed</li> <li>• Force Property Working Group</li> <li>• Safe audit</li> <li>• Appointment of Project Manager and team</li> <li>• Force Property Manager</li> <li>• Policies and procedures</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property review project</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>23/08/16 – Andy Elliott (Head of Change):-</b>  Work is apace with the property review project under the leadership of a Project Manager. A project plan, timeline, business work areas and working group have been established. The project has been divided into sub projects, which include a review of the existing property management system, policy and procedure and property stores. Each sub project is staffed by project officers and are being simultaneously progressed. Initial interim measures have been put in place where issues have been identified until longer term solutions devised by the project work are put in place.  <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b></p>		

<b>STR473</b>		<b>Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO Vetting Policy</b>	
Responsible Officer	Ross Dimmock	Impact/Likelihood	High/Very High
Date Recorded	22/03/10	Current Rating	High (12)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	Medium (8)
Information	The ACPO National Vetting Policy is partially implemented; anybody joining the organisation after January 2012 is vetted to the ACPO national guidance. Anyone who joined the organisation before this date (approximately 60% of the current workforce - in excess of 2500 people) would not be vetted to the national standards.		
Impact	There is an ongoing risk associated to a) operational security, b) corruption and c) organisational reputation. The risk posed extends to resources deployed to regional units such as EMOpSS and EMSOU.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New starters vetted per ACPO policy</li> <li>• Renewal procedure for CTC introduced</li> <li>• Compliance with policy for all new employees</li> <li>• Centralisation of vetting within PSD</li> <li>• Review of the force vetting function</li> <li>• Priority EMOpSS vetting</li> <li>• Priority vetting cases identification</li> <li>• Operational security</li> <li>• Business case implementation</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure all staff are vetted in line with policy</li> <li>• All staff to be subject of aftercare / review</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>16/08/16 – Simon Hurst (Head of Professional Standards):-</b>  There has been a reduction in the resilience of staffing arrangements within the Vetting Department. A number of existing vetting clerks have successfully been recruited into other roles and the Senior Force Vetting Manager post will soon be vacant. A recruitment process has now commenced and Corporate Services are completing urgent demand analysis to quantify the ongoing resource requirement.  <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b></p>		

New risk

<b>STR1936</b>		<b>Impact of Tri-force Collaboration on local change programme</b>	
Responsible Officer	Andy Elliott	Impact/Likelihood	High/Medium
Date Recorded	30/06/16	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Finance	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	Work has been underway to develop a Strategic Alliance (SA) between the forces of Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire. The intention of the SA has been to generate savings through streamlined and more efficient processes in place. Following discussions between Chief Constables and Commissioners and a Programme Board in June 2016, a decision was made to not continue with the SA but instead use the work undertaken so far to develop a Tri-force Collaborative Programme.		
Impact	There is uncertainty with what collaboration will take place and therefore whether it will align to the work currently being undertaken by the localised Change Team. In turn this creates uncertainty in whether we will meet the projected savings required as an individual force.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate project management resourcing</li> <li>• Change Board</li> <li>• Blueprint 2020</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>30/06/16 – Andy Elliott:-</b> As local projects are continuing with projected savings it would be beneficial to have an early understanding of potential collaborative arrangements to ensure local work aligns to it. As the programme develops we expect to gain greater clarity of this. <b>Current status: managed.</b>		

Archived risks

<b>STR1608</b>		<b>Governance of partnership working arrangements</b>	
Responsible Officer	Steph Pandit	Impact/Likelihood	High/Medium
Date Recorded	02/01/13	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Governance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	The force is increasingly working with external partners to assist us to deliver services. This can involve co-location, our staff working in partner agency premises or partners working on our premises. This may involve partners on our computer systems and having access to our information. There is currently no corporate overview of these arrangements and the people involved. There does not appear to be a structure, policy or procedure governing these arrangements.		
Impact	The potential risk is: Without this overview it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of these arrangements. There are potentially unvetted staff being given access to our buildings/systems and information with the resultant potential for malicious or accidental loss or misuse of information.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance of access to force systems</li> <li>• Departmental advice available</li> <li>• Policy and procedure</li> <li>• Register of partnerships.</li> <li>• Liaison with OPCC</li> <li>• Information Management Group</li> <li>• Strategic Partnership Board</li> <li>• Robust ISA capability</li> <li>• Compliance Audit Plan for 2016</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>21/06/16 – Steph Pandit (outgoing Head of Corporate Services):-</b> Existing controls are now fully in place. Much has been done which means the original risk has been fully mitigated. Whilst other elements of partnership working may lead to different risks being identified, there will be ongoing oversight at the Strategic Partnership Board and the DCC as mitigation. <b>Current status: controlled.</b>		

<b>STR459</b>	<b>Failure to respond to ASB</b>		
Responsible Officer	Mark Newcombe	Impact/Likelihood	Low/Low
Date Recorded	10/03/10	Current Rating	Low (1)
Category	Stakeholders/Reputation	Previous Rating	Low (1)
Information	This current risk originated from a previous risk created alongside Operation Teak, which was the force investigation and response to the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Francecca Hardwick in Barwell. This case received widespread media coverage with the force criticised for the response to that family, over a number of occasions.		
Impact	There is a risk to the reputation of the force if a further incident is highlighted that questions our response to vulnerable persons if we do not learn from the identified failings in Op Teak.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum standards for ASB</li> <li>• Restorative justice</li> <li>• Data sharing and mapping</li> <li>• Use of Sentinel system</li> <li>• Case management supported by JAG process</li> <li>• Webstorm / CRM / Genie2</li> <li>• Crime incident policy</li> <li>• Mobile data</li> <li>• Dedicated Sgt posts for ASB</li> <li>• ASB Management System</li> <li>• ASB Control Strategy</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>04/07/16 – Mark Newcombe (Strategic Partnerships Lead):-</b>  Our own reporting figures and those of the most recent British Crime Survey show a reduction in both reported and non-reported types of ASB dealt with by the police, but an increase in noise and fly-tipping ASB typically dealt with by councils. Whilst there is no grounds for complacency and the effect on individuals and communities can be profound, this is the case for many crime types, where the actual and reputational risk is similar or worse. At this moment in time there is no indication that our ability to deal with ASB creates a risk that is significantly different to that which applies to some other crime types.  <b>Current status: controlled.</b></p>		

Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register				25 <sup>th</sup> August 2016			
Reference	Owner	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Status	Recorded	Last review	Priority	Previous rating
STR1844	Roger Bannister Deputy Chief Constable	Failure to transition to the ESN.	Very High	High	Managed	August 2014	24/08/16	12	12
STR1679	Caroline Barker Crime Registrar	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2013	22/08/16	9	9
STR473	Ross Dimmock Anti-Corruption Unit	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy.	High	Very High	Controls Tasked	March 2010	16/08/16	12	8
STR1935	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Management of seized and found property provision.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2016	23/08/16	9	New Risk
STR1922	Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice	Inability to adequately audit Niche.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	October 2015	30/06/16	8	8
STR1936	Andy Elliott Head of Change	Impact of Tri-force Collaboration on local Change Programme.	High	Medium	Managed	June 2016	04/07/16	6	New Risk
STR1926	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Quality of video recorded evidence.	High	Medium	Controlled	January 2016	01/08/16	6	6
STR1917	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the 'Building the Picture' HMIC recommendations.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/06/16	6	6
STR1904	Neil Castle Head of Investigations	Safe keeping of property within force safes.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2015	25/08/16	6	6
STR1910	Jason Ross Contact Management	Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC compromises service.	Medium	High	Controlled	August 2015	12/07/16	6	6
STR420	Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety	Management system for energy use.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2010	20/07/16	6	6
STR1519	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	RMADS management for information security.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2012	27/06/16	6	6
STR1801	Alison Naylor HR Director	Ability to meet mandatory training requirements.	Medium	High	Controlled	June 2014	08/08/16	6	6
STR1329	Andy Elliott Head of Change	Transforming services – meeting the budget challenge for 2020.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2012	20/07/16	6	6
OPCC1934	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Newly elected PCC for LLR could result in widespread change.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2016	24/08/16	6	6
STR1915	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - asset owners.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/06/16	4	4
STR1916	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - records management.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/06/16	4	4
STR11	Alison Naylor HR Director	Potential for industrial action affecting our service.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	October 2007	08/08/16	4	4



OPCC1700	Matthew Clarke Partnership Coordinator	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	4	4
OPCC1690	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	4	4
STR1521	Ross Dimmock Anti-Corruption Lead	Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2012	23/06/16	4	4
STR508	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	April 2010	08/06/16	4	4
STR1875	Julie Saunders Senior HR Business Partner	Increased number of subject to vetting contracts issued.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	December 2014	14/07/16	4	4
STR1706	Alison Naylor HR Director	Loss/absence/churn of key personnel.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	August 2013	08/08/16	4	4
STR533	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	The fair and effective use of stop and search to promote confidence.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2010	08/06/16	4	4
STR1818	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2014	27/06/16	4	4
OPCC1698	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	4	4
OPCC1695	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	4	4
OPCC1864	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	October 2014	16/06/16	4	4
OPCC1699	Helen King Head of Commissioning	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	21/06/16	4	4
OPCC1694	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	3	3
STR1764	David Craig Head of IT	Accreditation for the use of the PSN.	High	Low	Controlled	January 2014	04/07/16	3	3
STR564	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Management of MFH enquiries.	High	Low	Controlled	August 2010	01/08/16	3	3
STR1571	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments.	High	Low	Managed	September 2012	01/08/16	3	3
STR458	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Failure to protect vulnerable persons.	High	Low	Controlled	March 2010	01/08/16	3	3
STR310	David Sandall Head of Crime and Intelligence	Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and 'learn lessons'.	High	Low	Controlled	November 2009	15/06/16	3	3
STR520	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Governance of collaborative arrangements.	High	Low	Controlled	May 2010	08/06/16	3	3
STR253	David Craig Head of IT	High risk of virus introduction and data loss.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2009	21/06/16	3	3
STR1927	David Craig Head of IT	Lack of agility in applying local change to shared services.	Low	Medium	Controlled	January 2016	12/07/16	2	2

STR1765	Ian Howick Head of EMOpSS	Regional operational support command structure.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2014	09/08/16	2	2
STR1890	Kerry McLernon Strategic Partnerships Lead	Making the best use of the DNT to reduce demand upon other teams.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	April 2015	20/07/16	2	2
STR430	Lynne Woodward Head of Equalities	Inquiry into disability related harassment.	Medium	Low	Managed	March 2010	18/08/16	2	2
STR380	Alex Stacey-Midgley Senior HR Business Partner	Current JES unlikely to meet Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) criteria.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	January 2010	23/06/16	2	2
STR1623	Andy Lee Director of Intelligence	Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2013	23/06/16	2	2
STR1861	Fiona Linton Information Security Manager	Risk to redacted information.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	September 2014	09/08/16	2	2
OPCC1696	Helen King Chief Finance Officer	Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	16/06/16	1	1
STR1475	Mark Newcombe Strategic Partnerships Lead	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	May 2012	20/07/16	1	1

Risk of note	New risk	New risk owner
--------------	----------	----------------

### Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact							
	Score	Performance/ Service Delivery	Finance/ Efficiency £	Confidence/Reputation	Health and Safety	Environment	Strategic Direction
<b>Very High</b>	<b>4</b>	Major disruption to service delivery.  Major impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force >1,000,000  Business area >150,000	Major stakeholder/investigations/longer lasting community concerns. Major reputational damage; adverse national media coverage > 7 days.	Death or a life changing injury.	Very high negative environmental impact (high amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Major impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
<b>High</b>	<b>3</b>	Serious disruption to service delivery.  Serious impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force 251,000-1,000,000  Business area 41,000-150,000	Serious stakeholder/investigations/prolonged specific section of community concerns. Serious reputational damage; adverse national media coverage < 7 days.	An injury requiring over 24 hours hospitalisation and/or more than 3 days off work or a major injury as defined by the RIDDOR regulations.	High negative environmental impact (medium amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Serious impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
<b>Medium</b>	<b>2</b>	Significant disruption to service delivery.  Noticeable impact on performance indicators.	Force 51,000-250,000  Business area 11,000-40,000	Significant investigations/specific section of community concerns. Significant reputational damage; adverse local media coverage.	An injury requiring hospital/professional medical attention and/or between one day and three days off work with full recovery.	Medium negative environmental impact (low amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Significant impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	Minor disruption to service delivery.  Minor impact on performance indicators.	Force <50,000  Business area <10,000	Complaints from individuals. Minor impact on a specific section of the community.	An injury involving no treatment or minor first aid with no time off work.	Low negative environmental impact (limited amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Minor impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.

Likelihood			
Score			
<b>Very High</b>	<b>4</b>	>75% chance of occurrence	Almost certain to occur
<b>High</b>	<b>3</b>	51-75% chance of occurrence	More likely to occur than not
<b>Medium</b>	<b>2</b>	25-50% chance of occurrence	Fairly likely to occur
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<25% chance of occurrence	Unlikely to occur

Overall Risk Rating: Impact x Likelihood	
<b>9 - 16 = High</b>	
<b>5 - 8 = Medium</b>	
<b>1 - 4 = Low</b>	

This page is intentionally blank.