

Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee



26 January 2011

Risk Register Update 2010/11



Joint Report of Terry Collins – Corporate Director: Neighbourhood Services; Don McLure – Corporate Director: Resources and Treasurer to the Joint Committee

Purpose of the Report

1. To provide an update on the current position of the Risk Register for the Durham Crematorium Committee, in accordance with the arrangements established for the routine reporting of risk issues.

Background

2. A Risk Assessment report was presented to members at the 29 September 2010 meeting which included a comprehensive risk register that identified all known risks of a Service and Operational nature, with all risks scored using the Durham County Council methodology and approach to Risk Management. In approving the report, the Committee committed to regular monitoring and reporting of both strategic and operation risks.

Risk Assessment – January 2011

3. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee in September 2010 has been reviewed, reassessed and updated in accordance with the Durham County Council methodology/approach to Risk Management. This entails an assessment of both the gross and net risk from each area, the difference between the gross and net risk score being that the net risk result is after taking into account existing control measures. Full details of the Durham County Risk Management Methodology are set out at Appendix 2.
4. In line with the previous report, two risk registers have been prepared, separately identifying Service and Operational risks.
5. Both sections of the Risk Register have been reviewed by the Risk Officer responsible for Neighbourhood Services and the Superintendent and Registrar. Net risk ratings have been agreed by consensus and actions to mitigate and/or tackle issues arising from the individual risks have been agreed for the forthcoming year.
6. The service risks (i.e. those that are key to the service achieving its strategic objectives and priorities for improvement, linked to service improvement plans and the budget setting cycle) have been plotted onto a risk matrix, based on Net Risk Scores. This is set out in Appendix 3, together with individual risk assessments for each of these. The risk matrix plots the risk to a grid based upon the assessment of likelihood

and impact scores. The higher a risk is towards the top right corner of the matrix the more significant the risk is to the service.

8. All Strategic risks have low Net Scores and there have been no changes to the scores following the review. These risks are all considered to be at tolerable levels.
9. The action associated with Risk 5 “Disclosure of confidential information through the incorrect disposal/maintenance of information”, has been addressed in the plans for the forthcoming extension to the crematorium. It will remain an action until the works have been completed.
10. The actions associated with Risk 7 “IT and power failure” have now been completed and moved into the control measures.
11. There are no outstanding actions at this time.
12. As with Service Risks, the Operational Risks (i.e. those that are key to the operational areas of the service which relate to individual tasks carried out on a routine basis) have also been plotted onto a risk matrix and these are set out at Appendix 4 together with individual risk assessments for each of these. These assessments confirm that these risks are being well managed and it can be demonstrated that there is a risk culture embedded within the business.
13. As with the Service Risks, there have been no changes to Operational Net Risk Scores following the review and all risks are considered to be at a tolerable level.
14. All risk actions have now been completed with the exception of one, Risk 7 “Limited space in office area”, however, the accommodation issues have also been addressed in the plans for the forthcoming extension. This Action will remain until the works have been completed.
15. No new emerging risk were identified during the review, however, the possible adverse impact of the Wear Valley Crematorium at Coundon may still have materialise, as mentioned in September’s report, and this continues to be monitored on a regular basis, to identify any worrying trends as soon as possible.

Embedding Risk Management

16. In order to ensure that risk management continues to be embedded and that the risk register is kept up to date, regular reviews will need to continue to be carried out to ensure any new and emerging risks are identified, existing risks are removed if no longer appropriate and existing risks are reviewed taking into account current issues.

Conclusions

17. The original risk register has been revised and updated and rescored, where appropriate, in accordance with Durham County Council criteria.

Recommendations and Reasons

18. It is recommended that :-

- Members of the Central Durham Joint Crematorium Committee note the content of this report and the updated position following the January review;
- The Risk Registers are kept up to date and continue to be reviewed by the Joint Committee on a half yearly basis.

Background Papers

- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 29 September 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 27 January 2010
- Risk Assessment – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 12 June 2009
- External Audit Report – Report to Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee – 30 October 2009

Contact:	Paul Darby	Tel: 0191 383 6594
	Marian Shanks	Tel: 0191 372 7639

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance

There are no financial implications associated with this report. Exposure to financial risk is integral to the gross and net risk assessments undertaken and included in the Risk Registers attached at Appendix 3 and 4.

Staffing

None

Risk

The report and associated appendices sets out in detail the strategic and operational risks, control measures in place to mitigate these and improvement actions associated with these. Each risk has been scored and against the Durham County Council risk management methodology. Maintaining and continually reviewing the risk register is a key component of the control and governance framework for the Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee.

Equality and Diversity

None

Accommodation

None

Crime and Disorder

None

Human Rights

None

Consultation

Officers of Spennymoor Town Council were consulted on the contents of this report.

Procurement

None

Disability Discrimination Act

None

Legal Implications

None

Appendix 2: Durham County Council Risk Management Process

The risk management process at Durham County Council is based upon a cycle:-



Once a Risk has been identified it is analysed and evaluated as follows:-

- Likelihood X Impact (taking into account Financial + Service Delivery + Stakeholder impacts)

Initially the **Gross Risk** is assessed by scoring the impact and likelihood of the risk **without** taking account of any controls that the Council may already have in place. It is essential to determine this Gross risk, as it is the key baseline against which to evaluate this risk on an ongoing basis.

The **Net Risk** is then determined **after** taking account of any controls that the Council may already have in place, and the likelihood that the risk event may occur over a given period.

In order to calculate the scores for Likelihood and Impact the Risk Assessment criteria is used as outlined below.

After scoring the risk a decision is made whether to Tolerate, Transfer, Treat or Terminate the risk. If any control improvements or actions have been identified as a result of reviewing the risk these are allocated to a responsible officer with timescales to ensure they are carried out before the next review.

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL – IMPACT FACTORS

Factor	Severity	Financial	Service Delivery/ Performance	Stakeholder and Reputation
5	Critical	> / = £15M > 5% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to meet statutory duties Key services can no longer be delivered – emergency actions needed, which need Cabinet approval. Significant Legal Action / Challenge Intervention or sanctions by regulatory body / prosecution or litigation (including corporate manslaughter) Strike action which is Council-wide or service-wide in a critical Service for a long period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception of the majority of potential partners and stakeholders that the Council is not 'fit to deal with'. Loss of life
4	Major	£5M - £15M 3% - 5% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major disruption to some statutory and / or non statutory services i.e. key service delivery adversely affected – crisis management implemented, which needs Cabinet approval. Strike action which is Council-wide or service-wide in a critical Service for a short period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious reputational damage to the Council regionally, nationally and internationally Damage to relationships with central government or other public bodies e.g. One North-East, Environment Agency, other Councils Perception of small number of potential partners and stakeholders that the Council is not 'fit to deal with'. Serious injury to individual
3	Moderate	£1M - £5M 1% - 3% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate disruption to statutory and / or non statutory services i.e. some disruption to service delivery – action plans to rectify Failure of Service to maintain existing status under other Inspection regimes e.g. Ofsted Resolution requires approval at CMT level Limited strike action within a Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results in negative Regional or National press / media coverage Minor reputational damage to the County Council Major criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government
2	Minor	£0.5M - £1M 0.2% - 1% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor service disruption / customer dissatisfaction i.e. little disruption to service delivery – no long term or permanent impact on key services Capable of resolution by Service Management Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results in negative press coverage within County Durham Minor criticism by Community Minor criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government Significant number of complaints from service users Serious Reputational damage to own Service area
1	Insignificant	< £0.5M < 0.2% of Service budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insignificant service disruption e.g. very little or no disruption to services Impairment of quality of service Capable of resolution by Head of Service and their management team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results in negative press coverage within the locality / ward Insignificant criticism by Community Insignificant criticism by other stakeholders e.g. Partners, central government Insignificant number of complaints from service users Minor Reputational damage to own Service area

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL - LIKELIHOOD FACTORS

Factor	Description	Expected Frequency
5	Highly Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than once a year • Something that is already occurring or is likely to be a regular occurrence throughout a one year period • Inevitable i.e. the event is expected to occur in most circumstances • >80% chance of occurring
4	Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once a year • Something that has occurred in the last year, or is likely to occur at least once throughout a one-year period. • Probable or where the conditions of the loss occur on a regular basis i.e. the event will probably occur in most circumstances • 61% to 80% chance of occurring
3	Possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every 1-3 years • Likely only to happen at some point over the next 1 to 3 years. • Possible but responding to well understood situations i.e. the event might occur at some time • 31% to 60% chance of occurring
2	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every 3-5 years • Likely only to happen at some point over the next 3 to 5 years or likely to continue to occur i.e. the event is not expected to occur • 11% to 30% chance of occurring
1	Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 5 years • Rare activity or is unlikely based on current intelligence i.e. the event may only occur in exceptional circumstances • < 10% chance of occurring

Appendix 3: Service Risk Register

RISK MATRIX						
5	Highly Probable					
4	Probable					
3	Possible		11			
2	Unlikely	4,20	7,10,16	3, 15		
1	Remote	13,14, 18,19	1,2,5,6,8,12	9		
		Insignificant (Score 1-3)	Minor (Score 4-6)	Moderate (Score 7-9)	Major (Score 10-12)	Critical (Score 13-15)
IMPACT						

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
3	Impact of staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	14	1
4	Sickness absence of key staff	6	8
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal / maintenance of information	5	13
6	Failure of Cremators / Specialist Equipment	6	8
7	ICT and Power Failure	10	4
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	13
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	7
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	10	4
11	Managing excess deaths	12	3
12	Adverse inspection / Audit report	5	13
13	Financial Losses due to reputation	3	16
14	Contractual failure in relation to future planned projects or maintenance leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e.g. Replacement of Cremators	3	16
15	Inability to meet 2012 legislation changes	14	1
16	Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	10	4
17	Administrative duties CLOSED September 2010		
18	Lack of awareness of the Impact of Equalities, DDA, Access to Services and Age Legislation	3	16
19	Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims	3	16
20	Damage to Public or Vehicles due to tree branches falling	6	8

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score	Net Risk Score	Ranking
3	Impact of staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status	14	1
15	Inability to meet 2012 legislation changes	14	1
11	Managing excess deaths	12	3
7	ICT and Power Failure	10	4
10	Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss	10	4
16	Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	10	4
9	Breakdown of Partnership	7	7
1	Not implementing changes in legislation	6	8
2	Non compliance with the new fire order	6	8
4	Sickness absence of key staff	6	8
6	Failure of Cremators / Specialist Equipment	6	8
20	Damage to Public or Vehicles due to tree branches falling	6	8
5	Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal / maintenance of information	5	13
8	Loss of Income/Money	5	13
12	Adverse inspection / Audit report	5	13
13	Financial Losses due to reputation	3	16
14	Contractual failure in relation to future planned projects or maintenance leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e.g. Replacement of Cremators	3	16
17	Administrative duties CLOSED September 2010		
18	Lack of awareness of the Impact of Equalities, DDA, Access to Services and Age Legislation	3	16
19	Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims	3	16

DESCRIPTION OF RISK			
Business Unit		Durham Crematorium	
Risk		1	
Risk Owner		Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk		Service Risk – Not implementing changes in Legislation	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT			
Risk Causes		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Non compliance with the law	
Potential Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reputational DamageCriticism by StakeholdersResults in negative press coverage.	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT			
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)		6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		12	
Existing Control Measures			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Regular updates from professional institutes – ICCMM & FBCA			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Membership of external organisations			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Updates received from a number of sources inc Justice Dept			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Copies of periodicals circulated among staff members			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Share best practice and communication with Durham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Copies of various periodicals received and circulated to staff			
NET RISK ASSESSMENT			
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)		3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)		6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)		1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		6	
CONCLUSION			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS			
Activity		Responsible	Timescales
Completed by		Date	
T Maddison/A Jose		12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	2	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Non compliance with new fire order	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non compliance with new fire order 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff and public Damage to building 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	12	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff aware of the new order. Responsible officer for building in place Fire wardens in place Fire extinguishers in place Relevant information displayed Auto gas control fitted in control room Regular inspections carried out Fire Alarm Testing Carried out Weekly Draft Fire Risk Assessment in place pending Health & Safety approval. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	6	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	3	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Impact of morale of staff due to Job Evaluation and Single Status	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Job Evaluation• Rationalisation of grades and salaries• Job Evaluation not implemented in COD• Job Evaluation to recommence in new Authority.	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impact on staff morale affecting ability to deliver services	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		4
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)		5
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		35
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regular meeting and team briefings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bereavement Services Manager appointed for County Council		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff kept fully informed of the process.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management participating in the process.		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		4
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)		14
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TOLERATE		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	4	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Sickness absence of key staff	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unexpected sickness absence by key staff Prolonged Sickness Absences 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver service 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	18	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal procedures and policies are in place. Back to Work interviews are undertaken Sickness Monitoring is undertake Family friendly policies in place with HR advice available Trained cremator technicians available at short notice Reciprocal arrangement with Mountsett Crematorium. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	6	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	5	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Disclosure of confidential information through the incorrect disposal/maintenance of information	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of dataData disclosed to persons not authorised	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Breach of confidentialityBreach of Data Protection	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Internal procedures and policies are in place for document retention and disposalSecure environment for storage of informationPasswords in place for electronic data storageDocument retention and disposal policy in placeContract with SecurishredBook of Remembrance and Registers are scanned annually and held on external hard driveImproved filing/folder referencing system on the serverRegister is kept in a fire resistant safe and associated papers are kept in a separate location within the crematorium overnight.All records over 5 years old are stored at County Hall.		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
A fire resistant room has been built into the design of the new extension for the crematorium.	A Jose	31/07/2012
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	6	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Failure of cremators/specialist equipment	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Age and wear and tear	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Impact on the ability to deliver services	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	12	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Maintenance contract in place –response within 24 hours, services every 4 months		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contingency plans in place to cover long term breakdown		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Daily log completed		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Set procedures in place		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Specialised trained staff available in event of failure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Health and Safety evaluated		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cremators relined in 2008		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reciprocal arrangements in place with Mountsett, Darlington and Sunderland Crematoriums		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cremators to be replaced by June 2012		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	6	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	7	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – IT and Power failure	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of utility services Non delivery of Service 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the ability to deliver services 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	15	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Continuity Plan in place Discussions with ICT undertaken Alternative location available for critical function Paper records available Off site back up pack implemented PC's replaced Regular backups daily and stored off site 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	8	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Loss of income/money	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theft Non payment of crematorium fees 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cash/cheques collected and banked in a safe and timely manner Any overdue accounts are subject to recovery Accountancy reconcile income on a regular basis Schedule of income maintained on a daily basis Reconciliation of Paying in book Weekly summary sheets are calculated and kept Written Procedures in Place for dealing with income Maximum levels of cash stored is £1000 Electronic Register implemented 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	9	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Breakdown of Partnership	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner withdraws funding Partner becomes insolvent 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on finances 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	14	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal partnership agreement in place Maintain a good working relationship 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	7	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	10	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through staff loss.	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff leaving for alternative employment Sudden departure of staff 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure in service delivery 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	14	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good employment terms and conditions Work forward planned Regular liaison with outside bodies – ICCM and FBCA Close communication with small team Exit interviews carried out Job Shadowing Procedure notes available for key areas Regular communication with staff Trained cremator technicians available at short notice Reciprocal arrangement with Mountsett crematorium 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	11	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Managing excess deaths	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flu pandemic Catastrophic incident Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope Equipment failure Staff Overtime Existing Staff Resources unable to cope Number of deaths too high to cope with Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	21	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Policies and Procedures in Place Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations each per day 7 days per week. Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site Stocks of Cremation forms held Training of additional volunteer Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags Excess death plan in place Working with Civil Contingencies unit excess deaths group 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	4	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	12	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	12	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Adverse inspection/audit report	
BACKGROUND TO RISK VENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence for inspections 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service Reputational Damage 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	14	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and procedures in place adhered to and can be evidenced. Filing systems in place New employees are subject to an induction process Health and Safety policy available. Regular Health & safety inspection of building carried out and documented Fire Risk assessments in place Adequate signage for first aiders, fire wardens and fire extinguishers in place Staff aware of need to provide evidence of activities Develop Document retention register in accordance with policy 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	13	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Financial Losses due to reputation	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to provide service expected 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service Reputational Damage 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	4	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	4	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal procedures in place to avoid loss of reputation Job shadowing to encourage knowledge of all processes Good relations with partners and associated bodies Contingency Planning Flexible staff willing to work late and or cover other areas Staff carry out work on own initiative Options Appraisal Business Plans developed 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	14	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Contractual failure in relation to future planned projects or maintenance leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e.g. Replacement of Cremators	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to deliver projects on time Inability to maintain equipment 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service Reputational Damage 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants are used Feasibility study undertaken before projects are commenced Options appraisal carried out Project managers assigned to each project. Project Risk Assessment will be in place Procedures in place for management of service vehicles whilst works are ongoing. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	15	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Inability to meet 2012 Legislative change	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equipment will not meet targets set by DEFRA 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	8	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	24	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring Situation DEFRA has reported progress is not suitable to be on target for 2012 Regular reports being produced on progress Option of burden sharing agreement costing £100k pa £2.4 million funding has been approved for the investment in a new extension to the crematorium, plus associated car parking, access road and footpath improvements Cremators are to be replaced by June 2012. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	14	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	16	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impaired service deliver 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	18	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good terms and conditions Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vacancies Attractive professional working environment Good networking 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	18	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Lack of awareness of the Impact of Equalities, DDA, Access to Services and Age Legislation	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims arise from lack of compliance with legislation 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational damage 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	4	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	8	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff aware of Equalities policies and procedures Review of documentation Access and Disability assessments carried out Buildings have been assessed for DDA compliance Training and awareness carried out 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	19	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims arise from lack of compliance with Health and Safety policy 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational damage Financial damage 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	4	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	8	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff aware of Health and Safety policies and procedures – copy held on site Regular Health and Safety inspections of the building which is evidenced Trained First Aiders in place Fire Wardens and relative notices in place. Fire Drills undertaken Fire risk assessment has been carried out Fire extinguishers are labelled and regularly serviced Fire alarms are tested regularly Risk assessments carried out and staff are aware of them 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	20	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Service Risk – Damage to Public / Vehicles due to tree branches falling	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Winds • Disease • Heavy Snow 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to Vehicles / Equipment • Injury to Public or Staff 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	4	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	12	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 yearly inspection scheduled by Olivers Tree Expert Services • Any recommendations made by tree experts acted upon immediately • Visual inspections carried out in grounds by staff monthly 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	6	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

Appendix 4: Operational Risk Register

RISK MATRIX							
5	Highly Probable						LIKELIHOOD
4	Probable						
3	Possible						
2	Unlikely		5				
1	Remote	7,8	2,3,4,6	1			
		Insignificant (Score 1-3)	Minor (Score 4-6)	Moderate (Score 7-9)	Major (Score 10-12)	Critical (Score 13-15)	
IMPACT							

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Injury to staff and visitors	7	2
2	Exterior Pathways, Steps and Grounds	5	3
3	Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening on site, driveway and car park	5	3
4	Cleaning, Maintenance and Gardening Duties	5	3
5	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken	10	1
6	Violent or other Assault on officer whilst lone working	5	3
7	Limited Space in Office Area	3	7
8	Slips, trips and falls	3	7

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score	Net Risk Score	Ranking
5	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken	10	1
1	Injury to staff and visitors	7	2
2	Exterior Pathways, Steps and Grounds	5	4
3	Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening on site, driveway and car park	5	4
4	Cleaning, Maintenance and Gardening Duties	5	4
6	Violent or other Assault on officer whilst lone working	5	4
7	Limited Space in Office Area	3	8
8	Slips, trips and falls	3	8

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	1	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Injury to staff and visitors	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot apparatus – staff handling hot ash pans Staff raking down and removing metal from remains Hydraulic lifting gear. Dust Transferring remains into and between containers. Noise from machinery Staff trapping fingers or limbs in equipment Noise 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff and visitors 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	14	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only certified and trained staff allowed to operate Machinery regularly maintained and serviced Extractor fans and masks used. Make sure others are at a distance whilst work is ongoing PPE issued to staff Operators carry out visual checks of equipment Risk Assessments reviewed on a regular basis Dust cabinet has extraction fan, staff use dust masks 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	7	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	7	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1.		
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	2	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Exterior pathway and steps and grounds	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Path and steps in state of disrepair Holes in grounds due to animals Kerbstones 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff and public 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paths and steps well maintained Inspected regularly Access levels regularly cleaned Handrails on steps safety ridge on top and bottom 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddiosn/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	3	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening on site, driveway and car park	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vibration 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools kept in good order, defective tools replaced 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Machinery regularly serviced and maintained 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools kept in locked storage area 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power tools used away from the public 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff trained in the use of all equipment 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPE issued to staff as appropriate 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Viz jackets used when dealing with traffic 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	4	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Cleaning, Maintenance and Gardening duties	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous cleaning materials Wet floor Noise (vacuums) Work at Height Fountain Pump maintenance Fertilizers and insecticides Using ladders Candles Maintenance of heating system Inspection Hole CCTV equipment Electrical Equipment Manual Handling Injury to staff/public Fire 	
Potential Impact		
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least hazardous cleaning products used Chemicals and other COSHH Items kept in locked store COSHH data sheets on site Pat Testing carried out on electrical items Floors mopped at quiet times wet floor signage displayed Cleaner assisted by other staff if lifting is required Cleaner not required to work at height other trained staff assist PPE available – gloves, goggles, dust masks etc Two person task to lift cover No smoking policy Candle snuffer available Ladder training completed by all staff Manual Handling training completed by staff. 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	5	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Risk Assessments and reviews not undertaken	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff unaware of risks affecting service 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	18	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff trained in risk assessments. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full review undertaken 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk assessment procedures in place 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health & Safety recommendations carried out 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage clear desk policy 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work station assessments carried out 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	10	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	6	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Violent or other assault on officer whilst lone working	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irate and emotional member of the public Remote location 	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	6	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk assessments carried out. Procedures tested Code of conduct in place One to one training Information shared at Team Briefings 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	5	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	5	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	7	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Limited space in office area	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Not sufficient space for staff using office area	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Injury to staff	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Furniture moved to provide maximum space around desks		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Shelves checked to ensure they are secure and sturdy		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Accommodation issues have been addressed in the plans for the new extension proposed for the crematorium.	A Jose	31/07/12
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	8	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk Slips, Trips and Falls	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	Manual handling Tripping hazards Step ladders 2 rung	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff 	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manual handling training provided where appropriate Good Housekeeping – walkways kept clear at all times. Ladder Register kept and maintained Ladder Training carried out Staff training kept up to date Staff training is kept up to date 		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)	3	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions 		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	12/01/11	