

**Central Durham Crematorium  
Joint Committee**

**29 September 2010**

**Risk Register Update 2010/11**



---

**Joint Report of Terry Collins – Corporate Director: Neighbourhood Services; Jeff Garfoot – Head of Finance: Resources (Interim Treasurer to the Joint Committee)**

---

**Purpose of the Report**

1. To provide an update on the current position of the Risk Register of the Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee.

**Background**

2. A Risk Assessment report was presented to members at the 27th January, 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 approach to Risk Management. In approving the report, the Committee committed to regular monitoring and reporting of both strategic and operation risks.

**Risk Assessment – September 2010**

3. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee in January 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 identified 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.

7. As the majority of Net Risk Scores were at a low level already, there have been no changes to the majority of scores previously reported, with the exception of two risks. The review found that the majority of actions previously identified have now been completed, reducing the assessment of the risks to tolerable levels i.e. no further action(s) required.

8. The following risks have been rescored:-

Risk 3 "Impact of morale of staff due to Job Evaluation and Single Status". The previously identified actions have all been completed and all possible steps are being taken to alleviate staff concerns, resulting in the Net Score reducing from Moderate, Possible to Moderate, Unlikely.

Risk 15 "Inability to meet 2012 Legislative Change". Again, all outstanding actions have been completed and the control measures strengthened as a result, which has resulted in the Net Score reducing from Moderate, Possible to Moderate, Unlikely.

The amendments to these scores have reduced both risks to a tolerable level.

9. Risk 17 "Administrative Duties" has been closed as it was felt that this was covered by risks 4 ("Sickness Absence of Staff") & Risk 10 ("Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through staff loss").

10. Whilst risk 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" remains at a tolerable level currently it is recognised that this could increase once the planned work commence. The impacts will need to be reflected in the Project Plan Risk Assessment and monitored closely.

11. There are no outstanding actions.

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 well managed and it can be demonstrated that there is a risk culture embedded within the business.

13. There have been no changes to the net risk scores and they are all at a tolerable level, however, the action in Risk 7 "Limited space in office area" may need to be re-visited if it is not addressed within the planned extension.

14. Finally, there is one possible emerging risk that may need some attention in the future and that is that the Wear Valley Crematorium at Coundon, may adversely impact still further on the Durham Crematorium. Whilst there is no immediate cause for concern this should continue to be monitored on a regular basis to identify any worrying trends as soon as possible and respond effectively.

## **Embedding Risk Management**

- 9 In order to ensure that risk management continues to be embedded and that the risk register is kept up to date, regular reviews will 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**

- 10 The original risk register has been revised and updated and rescored in accordance with Durham County Council criteria.

## **Recommendations and Reasons**

- 11 It is recommended that :-
- Members of the Central Durham Joint Crematorium Committee note the content of this report and the updated position; and
  - 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 – 27 January 2010

---

<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Paul Darby</b>	<b>Tel: 0191 383 6594</b>
	<b>Marian Shanks</b>	<b>Tel: 0191 372 7639</b>

---

---

## **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**

There are no staffing implications associated with this report.

### **Equality and Diversity**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Accommodation**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Crime and Disorder**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Sustainability**

Risk Management improves governance arrangements and is integral to the management of the facility and has a positive influence over the sustainability of the operation.

### **Human Rights**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Localities and Rurality**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Young People**

There are no implications associated with this report

### **Consultation**

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

### **Health**

There are no implications associated with this report

---

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

## DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL - LIKELIHOOD FACTORS

Factor	Description	Expected Frequency
5	Highly Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>More than once a year</b></li> <li>• Something that is already occurring or is likely to be a regular occurrence throughout a one year period</li> <li>• Inevitable i.e. the event is expected to occur in most circumstances</li> <li>• &gt;80% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
4	Probable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Once a year</b></li> <li>• Something that has occurred in the last year, or is likely to occur at least once throughout a one-year period.</li> <li>• Probable or where the conditions of the loss occur on a regular basis i.e. the event will probably occur in most circumstances</li> <li>• 61% to 80% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
3	Possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Every 1-3 years</b></li> <li>• Likely only to happen at some point over the next 1 to 3 years.</li> <li>• Possible but responding to well understood situations i.e. the event might occur at some time</li> <li>• 31% to 60% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
2	Unlikely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Every 3-5 years</b></li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 11% to 30% chance of occurring</li> </ul>
1	Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Over 5 years</b></li> <li>• Rare activity or is unlikely based on current intelligence i.e. the event may only occur in exceptional circumstances</li> <li>• &lt; 10% chance of occurring</li> </ul>



**Appendix 3: Service Risk Register**

RISK MATRIX							
5	Highly Probable						LIKELIHOOD
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					

<b>Risk. No.</b>	<b>Risk – Ranked by Risk Number</b>	<b>Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
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 <b>CLOSED</b>		
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

<b>Risk. No.</b>	<b>Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Net Risk Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
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 <b>CLOSED</b>		
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"> <li>Non compliance with the law</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational Damage</li> <li>Criticism by Stakeholders</li> <li>Results in negative press coverage.</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>6</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>12</b>
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular updates from professional institutes – ICCMM &amp; FBCA</li> <li>Membership of external organisations</li> <li>Updates received from a number of sources inc Justice Dept</li> <li>Copies of periodicals circulated among staff members</li> <li>Share best practice and communication with Durham</li> <li>Copies of various periodicals received and circulated to staff</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>6</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		1
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>6</b>
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Non compliance with new fire order</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff and public</li> <li>Damage to building</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>12</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff aware of the new order.</li> <li>Responsible officer for building in place</li> <li>Fire wardens in place</li> <li>Fire extinguishers in place</li> <li>Relevant information displayed</li> <li>Auto gas control fitted in control room</li> <li>Regular inspections carried out</li> <li>Fire Alarm Testing Carried out Weekly</li> <li>Draft Fire Risk Assessment in place pending Health &amp; Safety approval.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>6</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Job Evaluation</li> <li>Rationalisation of grades and salaries</li> <li>Job Evaluation not implemented in COD</li> <li>Job Evaluation to recommence in new Authority.</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on staff morale affecting ability to deliver services</li> </ul>	
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"> <li>Regular meeting and team briefings</li> <li>Bereavement Services Manager appointed for County Council</li> <li>Staff kept fully informed of the process.</li> <li>Management participating in the process.</li> </ul>		
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"> <li><b>TOLERATE</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Unexpected sickness absence by key staff</li> <li>Prolonged Sickness Absences</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to deliver service</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	18	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal procedures and policies are in place.</li> <li>Back to Work interviews are undertaken</li> <li>Sickness Monitoring is undertake</li> <li>Family friendly policies in place with HR advice available</li> <li>Trained cremator technicians available at short notice</li> <li>Reciprocal arrangement with Mountsett Crematorium.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	3	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	6	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and TREAT</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Loss of data</li> <li>Data disclosed to persons not authorised</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breach of confidentiality</li> <li>Breach of Data Protection</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal procedures and policies are in place for document retention and disposal</li> <li>Secure environment for storage of information</li> <li>Passwords in place for electronic data storage</li> <li>Document retention and disposal policy in place</li> <li>Contract with Securishred</li> <li>Book of Remembrance and Registers are scanned annually and held on external hard drive.</li> <li>Improved filing/folder referencing system on the server</li> <li>Register is kept in a fire resistant safe and associated papers are kept in a separate location within the crematorium overnight.</li> <li>All records over 5 years old are stored at County Hall.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
A fire resistant room is to be built into the design of the new extension for the crematorium.	A Jose	30/03/2011
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	



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"> <li>Age and wear and tear</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver services</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>12</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance contract in place –response within 24 hours, services every 4 months</li> <li>Contingency plans in place to cover long term breakdown</li> <li>Daily log completed</li> <li>Set procedures in place</li> <li>Specialised trained staff available in event of failure</li> <li>Health and Safety evaluated</li> <li>Cremators relined in 2008</li> <li>Reciprocal arrangements in place with Mountsett, Darlington and Sunderland Crematoriums</li> <li>Cremators to be replaced by June 2012</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>6</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Loss of utility services</li> <li>Non delivery of Service</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver services</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>15</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business Continuity Plan in place</li> <li>Discussions with ICT undertaken</li> <li>Alternative location available for critical function</li> <li>Paper records available</li> <li>Regular backups daily and stored off site</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details	A Jose	31/03/2011
2. PC's to be replaced to ensure more robust service provision	A Jose	31/10/10
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Theft</li> <li>Non payment of crematorium fees</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on the service</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cash/cheques collected and banked in a safe and timely manner</li> <li>Any overdue accounts are subject to recovery</li> <li>Accountancy reconcile income on a regular basis</li> <li>Schedule of income maintained on a daily basis</li> <li>Reconciliation of Paying in book</li> <li>Weekly summary sheets are calculated and kept</li> <li>Written Procedures in Place for dealing with income</li> <li>Maximum levels of cash stored is £1000</li> <li>Electronic Register implemented</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Partner withdraws funding</li> <li>Partner becomes insolvent</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on finances</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>14</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal partnership agreement in place</li> <li>Maintain a good working relationship</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>7</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	10	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through staff loss.	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff leaving for alternative employment</li> <li>Sudden departure of staff</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure in service delivery</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>14</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good employment terms and conditions</li> <li>Work forward planned</li> <li>Regular liaison with outside bodies – ICCM and FBCA</li> <li>Close communication with small team</li> <li>Exit interviews carried out</li> <li>Job Shadowing</li> <li>Procedure notes available for key areas</li> <li>Regular communication with staff</li> <li>Trained cremator technicians available at short notice.</li> <li>Reciprocal arrangement with Mountsett crematorium</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Flu pandemic</li> <li>Catastrophic incident</li> <li>Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope</li> <li>Equipment failure</li> <li>Staff Overtime</li> <li>Existing Staff Resources unable to cope</li> <li>Number of deaths too high to cope with</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		2
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		2
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>6</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		3
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>21</b>
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal Policies and Procedures in Place</li> <li>Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations each per day 7 days per week.</li> <li>Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation</li> <li>Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site</li> <li>Stocks of Cremation forms held</li> <li>Training of additional volunteer Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills</li> <li>Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office</li> <li>Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags</li> <li>Excess death plan in place.</li> <li>Working with Civil Contingencies unit excess deaths group</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		2
Service Impact (1 to 5)		1
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		1
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>4</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		3
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>12</b>
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Lack of evidence for inspections</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on the service</li> <li>Reputational Damage</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		3
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>7</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>14</b>
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies and procedures in place adhered to and can be evidenced.</li> <li>Filing systems in place</li> <li>New employees are subject to an induction process</li> <li>Health and Safety policy available.</li> <li>Regular Health &amp; safety inspection of building carried out and documented</li> <li>Fire Risk assessments in place</li> <li>Adequate signage for first aiders, fire wardens and fire extinguishers in place</li> <li>Staff aware of need to provide evidence of activities</li> <li>Develop Document retention register in accordance with policy</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		2
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>5</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		1
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>5</b>
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Inability to provide service expected</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on the service</li> <li>Reputational Damage</li> </ul>	
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"> <li>Formal procedures in place to avoid loss of reputation</li> <li>Job shadowing to encourage knowledge of all processes</li> <li>Good relations with partners and associated bodies</li> <li>Contingency Planning</li> <li>Flexible staff willing to work late and or cover other areas</li> <li>Staff carry out work on own initiative</li> <li>Options Appraisal</li> <li>Business Plans developed</li> </ul>		
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"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	



DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	14	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> 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"> <li>Inability to deliver projects on time</li> <li>Inability to maintain equipment</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on the service</li> <li>Reputational Damage</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultants are used</li> <li>Feasibility study undertaken before projects are commenced</li> <li>Options appraisal carried out</li> <li>Project managers assigned to each project.</li> <li>Project Risk Assessment will be in place</li> <li>Procedures in place for management of service vehicles whilst works are ongoing.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Equipment will not meet targets set by DEFRA</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>8</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>24</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring Situation</li> <li>DEFRA has reported progress is not suitable to be on target for 2012</li> <li>Regular reports being produced on progress</li> <li>Option of burden sharing agreement costing £100k pa</li> <li>£2.3 million funding has been approved for the investment in a new extension to the crematorium.</li> <li>Cremators are to be replaced by June 2012.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>14</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	16	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impaired service deliver</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>18</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good terms and conditions</li> <li>Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vacancies</li> <li>Attractive professional working environment</li> <li>Good networking</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	18	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> 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"> <li>Claims arise from lack of compliance with legislation</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>4</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>8</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff aware of Equalities policies and procedures</li> <li>Review of documentation</li> <li>Access and Disability assessments carried out</li> <li>Buildings have been assessed for DDA compliance</li> <li>Training and awareness carried out</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	19	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims arise from lack of compliance with Health and Safety policy</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational damage</li> <li>Financial damage</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		1
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>4</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>8</b>
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff aware of Health and Safety policies and procedures – copy held on site</li> <li>Regular Health and Safety inspections of the building which is evidenced</li> <li>Trained First Aiders in place</li> <li>Fire Wardens and relative notices in place.</li> <li>Fire Drills undertaken</li> <li>Fire risk assessment has been carried out</li> <li>Fire extinguishers are labelled and regularly serviced</li> <li>Fire alarms are tested regularly</li> <li>Risk assessments carried out and staff are aware of them</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)		1
Service Impact (1 to 5)		1
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		1
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>		<b>3</b>
Likelihood (1 to 5)		1
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>		<b>3</b>
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK		
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium	
Risk	20	
Risk Owner	Alan Jose	
Detail of Risk	<b>Service Risk –</b> Damage to Public / Vehicles due to tree branches falling	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		
Risk Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Winds</li> <li>• Disease</li> <li>• Heavy Snow</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to Vehicles / Equipment</li> <li>• Injury to Public or Staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>4</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>12</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 yearly inspection scheduled by Olivers Tree Expert Services</li> <li>• Any recommendations made by tree experts acted upon immediately</li> <li>• Visual inspections carried out in grounds by staff monthly</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>6</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

**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

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



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"> <li>Hot apparatus – staff handling hot ash pans</li> <li>Staff raking down and removing metal from remains</li> <li>Hydraulic lifting gear.</li> <li>Dust</li> <li>Transferring remains into and between containers.</li> <li>Noise from machinery</li> <li>Staff trapping fingers or limbs in equipment</li> <li>Noise</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff and visitors</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>14</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only certified and trained staff allowed to operate</li> <li>Machinery regularly maintained and serviced</li> <li>Extractor fans and masks used.</li> <li>Make sure others are at a distance whilst work is ongoing</li> <li>PPE issued to staff</li> <li>Operators carry out visual checks of equipment</li> <li>Dust cabinet has extraction fan, staff use dust masks</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>7</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>7</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions - TREAT</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Revised Risk Assessments distributed to staff	Ian Ramsey	31/12/10
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Path and steps in state of disrepair</li> <li>Holes in grounds due to animals</li> <li>Kerbstones</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff and public</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paths and steps well maintained</li> <li>Inspected regularly</li> <li>Access levels regularly cleaned</li> <li>Handrails on steps safety ridge on top and bottom</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddiosn/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Vibration</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tools kept in good order, defective tools replaced</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Machinery regularly serviced and maintained</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tools kept in locked storage area</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Power tools used away from the public</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff trained in the use of all equipment</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPE issued to staff as appropriate</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Viz jackets used when dealing with traffic</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Hazardous cleaning materials</li> <li>Wet floor</li> <li>Noise (vacuums)</li> <li>Work at Height</li> <li>Fountain Pump maintenance</li> <li>Fertilizers and insecticides</li> <li>Using ladders</li> <li>Candles</li> <li>Maintenance of heating system</li> <li>Inspection Hole</li> <li>CCTV equipment</li> <li>Electrical Equipment</li> <li>Manual Handling</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff/public</li> <li>Fire</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least hazardous cleaning products used</li> <li>Chemicals and other COSHH Items kept in locked store</li> <li>COSHH data sheets on site</li> <li>Pat Testing carried out on electrical items</li> <li>Floors mopped at quiet times wet floor signage displayed</li> <li>Cleaner assisted by other staff if lifting is required</li> <li>Cleaner not required to work at height other trained staff assist</li> <li>PPE available – gloves, goggles, dust masks etc</li> <li>Two person task to lift cover</li> <li>No smoking policy</li> <li>Candle snuffer available</li> <li>Ladder training completed by all staff</li> <li>Manual Handling training completed by staff.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Staff unaware of risks affecting service</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental Impact on the service</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>18</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff trained in risk assessments.</li> <li>Full review undertaken</li> <li>Risk assessment procedures in place</li> <li>Health &amp; Safety recommendations carried out</li> <li>Encourage clear desk policy</li> <li>Work station assessments carried out</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>10</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Irate and emotional member of the public</li> <li>Remote location</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	3	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>6</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk assessments carried out.</li> <li>Procedures tested</li> <li>Code of conduct in place</li> <li>One to one training</li> <li>Information shared at Team Briefings</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	2	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	2	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>5</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>5</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
<b>Completed by</b>	<b>Date</b>	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Not sufficient space for staff using office area</li> </ul>	
Potential Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Furniture moved to provide maximum space around desks</li> <li>Shelves checked to ensure they are secure and sturdy</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions - TREAT</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Accommodation issues are to be addressed in the plans for the new extension proposed for the crematorium.	A Jose	31/03/11
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	

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"> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Existing Control Measures		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manual handling training provided where appropriate</li> <li>Good Housekeeping – walkways kept clear at all times.</li> <li>Ladder Register kept and maintained</li> <li>Ladder Training carried out</li> <li>Staff training kept up to date.</li> </ul>		
NET RISK ASSESSMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)	1	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</b>	<b>3</b>	
Likelihood (1 to 5)	1	
<b>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</b>	<b>3</b>	
CONCLUSION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</b></li> </ul>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS		
Activity	Responsible	Timescales
1. Ensure training is kept up to date	A Jose	June 10
Completed by	Date	
T Maddison/A Jose	15/09/10	