# Central Durham Crematorium Joint Committee



27 January 2010

**Risk Register Update** 



# Joint Report of Terry Collins – Corporate Director: Neighbourhood Services; Stuart Crowe – 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 and to set out proposals for regular routine reporting of risk.

## Background

- 2. In the past the Risk Register for Durham Crematorium was produced and monitored by the Superintendent and Registrar and the Director of Strategic Resources at City of Durham. The risk register included a comprehensive register that included all risks of a service and operational nature, with all risks scored on the methodology/approach to Risk Management within the former City of Durham Council.
- 3. The Forward Plan for 2009/10 commits the Joint Committee to considering an update to the Risk Assessment by 31/1/10.

#### **Risk Assessment – December 2009**

- 4. Following LGR, the Durham Crematorium Risk Register 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 risks 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 for members information.
- 5. Two risk registers have been prepared separately, identifying Service and Operational risks. In preparing the updated risk registers comparisons have also been made with the Mountsett Crematorium Risk Register to ensure consistency of risks across the County.
- 6. Both sections of the risk register have been reviewed by the Superintendent and Registrar and the Bereavement Services Manager, Neighbourhood Services, Durham County Council. Gross and 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.

- 7. 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 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.

#### **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 need 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 Risk Register has been rescored in accordance with Durham County Council Criteria. Comparisons have been made with the Mountsett Crematorium Risk Register to ensure risks that may have previously been omitted are now included ensure consistency.

#### **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;
  - The Risk Registers be kept up to date and reviewed by the Joint Committee on a half yearly basis; and
  - An annual report on the approach to risk management being prepared in April / May to inform the Annual Governance Statement.

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

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

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> <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> <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> <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> <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> <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> <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> <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> <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	Insignifican t	< £0.5M < 0.2% of Service budget	<ul> <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> <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	More than once a year
	Probable	<ul> <li>Something that is already occurring or is likely to be a regular occurrence throughout a one year period</li> </ul>
		Inevitable i.e. the event is expected to occur in most circumstances
		>80% chance of occurring
4	Probable	Once a year
		• Something that has occurred in the last year, or is likely to occur at least once throughout a one-year period.
		<ul> <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> </ul>
		61% to 80% chance of occurring
3	Possible	• 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	• 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	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 M	ATRIX			
5	Highly Probable						
4	Probable						٩
3	Possible		11	3,15			POOH
2	Unlikely	4,20	7,10,16				гікегіноор
1	Remote	13,14,17,18,19	1,2,5,6,8,12	9			Ξ
		Insignificant (Score 1-3)		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	21	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	21	1
16	Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice	10	4
17	Administrative duties	3	16
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	21	1
15	Inability to meet 2012 legislation changes	21	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	3	16
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	n Legislation			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EV	ENT				
Risk Causes	Non compliance with the	e law			
Potential Impact	Reputational Damage				
	Criticism by Stakeholders				
	Results in negative pres	s coverage.			
	GROSS RISK A	SSESSMENT			
Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to	5)			3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2	
Total Gross Impact Score (s	um above)			6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)				2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Tot	Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)			12	
	Existing Cont	rol Measures			
Regular updates from p	rofessional institutes – ICCMN	1 & FBCA			
Membership of external	organisations				
Updates received from	a number of sources inc Justi	ce Dept			
Copies of periodicals cir	culated among staff members	;			
Share best practice and	communication with Durham				
Copies of various period	licals received and circulated	to staff			
	NET RISK AS	SESSMENT			
Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1	
Service Impact (1 to 5)				3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2	
Total Net Impact Score (sum	i above)			6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)				1	
Total Net Risk Score (Total I	mpact * Likelihood)			6	
	CONCL				
-	nto account existing control	measures			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS	/ ACTIONS				
			Responsible	Timescales	
1. Continue with current cont		Α	Jose	Ongoing	
Complet			Date		
Marian Shanks		18/12/09			

DESCRIPTION OF RISK							
Business Unit	Durham Crer	natorium					
Risk	2						
Risk Owner	lan Ramsey						
Detail of Risk	Service Risk	_					
	Non compliand	ce with new fire o	order				
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT						
Risk Causes	Non comp	Non compliance with new fire order					
Potential Impact	<ul> <li>Injury to st</li> </ul>	aff and public					
	Damage to	Damage to building					
	GF	ROSS RISK ASS	ESSMENT				
Financial Impact (1 to 5)					1		
Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)				3			
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)					2		
Total Gross Impact Score (su	Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)				6		
Likelihood (1 to 5)				2			
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)				12			
	E	kisting Control	Measures				
Staff aware of the new or	der.						
Responsible officer for but	uilding in place						
Fire wardens in place							
Fire extinguishers in plac	е						
Relevant information disp	blayed						
Auto gas control fitted in	control room						
Regular inspections carri	ed out						
Fire Alarm Testing Carrie	d out Weekly						
	Ν	NET RISK ASSE	SSMENT				
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 In	npact * Likeliho	ood)			6		
		CONCLUS	ION				
TOLERATE after taking in	to account exis	sting control me	easures				
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/	ACTIONS						
Activity			Responsible		Timescales		
1.Continue with Current Contro	ls		I Ramsey	Ongoing			
Completed by				Date			
Marian Shanks		18/12/09					

DESCRIPTION OF RISK			
Business Unit	Durham Crematoriu	m	
Risk	3		
Risk Owner	Alan Jose		
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –		
	Impact of morale of sta	aff due to Job Evaluation a	nd Single Status
BACKGROUND TO RISK EV	'ENT		
Risk Causes	<ul> <li>Job Evaluation</li> </ul>		
	Rationalisation of	grades and salaries	
	<ul> <li>Job Evaluation no</li> </ul>	t implemented in COD	
	Job Evaluation to	recommence in new Autho	rity.
Potential Impact	Impact on staff mo	orale affecting ability to deli	ver services
	GROSS	RISK ASSESSMENT	
Financial Impact (1 to 5)			1
Service Delivery Impact (1 t	Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)		
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)			2
Total Gross Impact Score (s	um above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)			5
Total Gross Risk Score (Tot	al Impact * Likelihood	)	35
	Existing	Control Measures	
Regular meeting and te	am briefings		
Bereavement Services	Manager appointed for	County Council	
	NET RI	SK ASSESSMENT	
Financial Impact (1 to 5)			1
Service Impact (1 to 5)			4
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)			2
Total Net Impact Score (sun	n above)		7
Likelihood (1 to 5)			3
Total Net Risk Score (Total			21
	C	ONCLUSION	
• TREAT			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS	ACTIONS		
Activity		Responsible	Timescales
1. Keep staff informed o	•	Alan Jose	Ongoing
- · · ·	ate in job evaluation pro	cess	
Completed by			Date
Marian Shanks	18/12	2/09	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK						
Business Unit	Durham Crem	natorium				
Risk	4					
Risk Owner	Alan Jose					
Detail of Risk	Service Risk -	_				
	Sickness abse	nce of key staff				
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT					
Risk Causes	Risk Causes         • Unexpected sickness absence					
	Prolonged	Sickness Absen	ces			
Potential Impact	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 (su	ım above)			6		
Likelihood (1 to 5)				3		
Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	l Impact * Likel	ihood)		18		
	Ex	kisting Control	Measures			
<ul> <li>Internal procedures and procedures</li> </ul>	oolicies are in pl	ace.				
Back to Work interviews	are undertaken					
Sickness Monitoring is ur	ndertake					
Family friendly policies in	place with HR a	advice available				
	Ν	IET RISK ASSE	SSMENT			
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 In	npact * Likeliho	ood)		6		
		CONCLUSI	ON			
TOLERATE after taking int	to account exis	ting control me	asures and TR	REAT		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/	ACTIONS					
Activity	Activity Re			Timescales		
1.Continue with Current Controls A			A Jose	Ongoing		
2. Reinforce Sickness Absence	Policies and Pro	ocedures	A Jost	Ongoing		
Completed by				Date		
Marian Shanks		18/12/09				

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
CORPORATE THEME	Тб			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Disclosure of confidential information through the i	ncorrect disposa	l/maintenance of	
	information			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT			
Risk Causes	Loss of data			
	Data disclosed to persons not authorised			
Potential Impact	Breach of confidentiality			
	Breach 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 (su	ım above)	5		
Likelihood (1 to 5)		2		
Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)			
	Existing Control Measures			
<ul> <li>Internal procedures and</li> </ul>	policies are in place for document retention and dispos	sal		
Secure environment for s				
Passwords in place for e				
Document retention and	-			
Contract with Securishree				
	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 In	nnact * Likelihood)	5		
	CONCLUSION	5		
• TOI ERATE after taking in	to account existing control measures and planned	Lactions and TP	ΈΔΤ	
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/				
Activity	ACTIONS	Responsible	Timescales	
	ng system on the server – dependant on using	A Jose	Ongoing	
2. Improve archiving of old docu		A Jose	Ongoing	
- ·	ts and holding them electronically	A Jose	Ongoing	
Completed by	Dat	e		
Marian Shanks	18/12/09			

DESCRIPTION OF RISK					
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium				
Risk	6				
Risk Owner	Alan Jose				
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –				
	Failure of cremators/speci	alist equ	ipment		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT				
Risk Causes	Age and wear and tea	ır			
Potential Impact	Impact on the ability to	o deliver	services		
	GROSS RISK	ASSES	SMENT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1	
Service Delivery Impact (1 to	5)			3	
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2	
Total Gross Impact Score (su	m above)			6	
Likelihood (1 to 5)				2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	l Impact * Likelihood)			12	
Existing Control Measures					
Maintenance contract in	place –response within 24 h	nours, se	rvices every	4 months	
Contingency plans in place	ce to cover long term break	down			
Daily log completed					
Set procedures in place					
Specialised trained staff	available in event of failure				
Health and Safety evaluation	ted				
Cremators relined in 200	8				
	NET RISK A	SSESSI	MENT		
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 In	npact * Likelihood)			6	
	CONC	LUSION			
TOLERATE after taking in	to account existing contro	ol measu	ures and pla	nned actions and TREAT	
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/	ACTIONS				
Activity			esponsible	Timescales	
1.Procedures recorded		Ste	even Tinkler	April 2009	
Completed by				Date	
Marian Shanks	18/12/09				

Business Unit Ourham Crematorium Risk Or 7 Sie Control Risk Service Risk - IT and Power failure BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE IT IT and Power failure BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE IT IT and Power failure IT IT and Power failure IT IT and Power failure IT IT AND POWER IN It IN IT	DESCRIPTION OF RISK						
Risk Owner       Alan Jose         Detail of Risk       Service Risk – IT and Power failure         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Loss of utility services</li> <li>Non delivery of Service</li> <li>Potential Impact</li> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver services</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSIMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact * Service Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact * Service Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact * Service Impact * Serv</li></ul>	Business Unit	Durham Crema	atorium				
Detail of Risk       Service Risk – IT and Power failure         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       IT and Power failure         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       I. Loss of utility services         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Loss of utility services</li> <li>Non delivery of Service</li> </ul> Potential Impact <ul> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver services</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> Financial Impact (1 to 5) <ul> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Italionod (1 to 5)</li>             &lt;</ul>	Risk	7					
IT and Power failure BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT Risk Causes	Risk Owner	Alan Jose	Alan Jose				
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Loss of utility services</li> <li>Non delivery of Service</li> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver servicess</li> </ul> Potential Impact <ul> <li>Impact on the ability to deliver services</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> Financial Impact (1 to 5) <ul> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>S</li></ul>	Detail of Risk	Service Risk –					
Risk Causes <ul> <li>Loss of utility services</li> <li>Non delivery of Service</li> </ul> Potential Impact              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            Business Continuity Plan in place             Discussions with ICT undertaken             Alternative location available for critical function             Paper records available             Regular backups daily and stored off site           Service Impact (1 to 5)             Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		IT and Power fa	ilure				
• Non delivery of Service         Potential Impact         Impact on the ability to deliver services         GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood         Stakehold	BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT					
Potential Impact       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)       3         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       3         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Existing Control Measures         Impact Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Existing Control Measures         Impact Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Discussions with ICT undertaken         Impact Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Impact RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION <td colspa<="" th=""><th>Risk Causes</th><th>Loss of utilit</th><th>ty services</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td>	<th>Risk Causes</th> <th>Loss of utilit</th> <th>ty services</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Risk Causes	Loss of utilit	ty services			
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)         1         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)         Likelihood (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)         Impact Core (sum above)         Existing Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Business Continuity Plan in place         Object (1 undertaken         Alternative location available for critical function         Paper records available         Regular backups daily and stored off site         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         CONCLUSION         Telefact after taking into account existing control measures and planed actions and TREAT         CONTCL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity         Responsible         Timescales <t< th=""><th></th><th>Non delivery</th><th>y of Service</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>		Non delivery	y of Service				
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         Existing Control Measures         Business Continuity Plan in place         Discussions with ICT undertaken         Alternative location available for critical function         Paper records available	Potential Impact	Impact on the second seco	ne ability to deliver serv	vices			
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         • Business Continuity Plan in place       -         • Discussions with ICT undertaken       -         • Alternative location available for critical function       -         • Regular backups daily and stored off site       -         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS' ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing       Ongoing	GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT						
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         • Business Continuity Plan in place       -         • Discussions with ICT undertaken       -         • Alternative location available for critical function       -         • Regular backups daily and stored off site       -         Trinscial Impact (1 to 5)         1         Service Impact (1 to 5) </th <th>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th></th>	Financial 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         Business Continuity Plan in place       -         Discussions with ICT undertaken       -         Alternative location available for critical function       -         Paper records available       -         Regular backups daily and stored off site       -         NET RISK ASSESSMENT       1         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder 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       CONCLUSION         * TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planed actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS       A Jose         Activity       Responsible       2009 to be reviewed details         .2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing	Service Delivery Impact (1 to	5)			3		
Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Existing Control Measures <ul> <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> <ul> <li>Paper records available</li> <li>Regular backups daily and stored off site</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Total Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>5</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Total Net Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>10</li> </ul> <ul> <li>CONCLUSION</li> </ul> <ul> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT</li> <li>CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS</li> </ul> <ul> <li>A Jose</li> <li>Ougoing</li> <li>Completed by</li> <li>Date</li> </ul>	Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				1		
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       15         Existing Control Measures         Image: State Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         Image: Score (Sum above)         Score (Sum above)         Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         Image: Score (Sum above)         Sconclusion <td< th=""><th>Total Gross Impact Score (su</th><th>ım above)</th><th></th><th></th><th>5</th><th></th></td<>	Total Gross Impact Score (su	ım above)			5		
Existing Control Measures         Business Continuity Plan in place         Discussions with ICT undertaken         Alternative location available for critical function         Paper records available         Regular backups daily and stored off site         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)       5         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planet actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       Ongoing         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing	Likelihood (1 to 5)				3		
Business Continuity Plan in place     Discussions with ICT undertaken     Alternative location available for critical function     Paper records available     Regular backups daily and stored off site     INET RISK ASSESSMENT Financial Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     S Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     I Stakeholder Impact Impact Score (sum above)     I Stakeholder Impact Impact Score (su	Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	l Impact * Likelih	nood)		15		
Discussions with ICT undertaken     Alternative location available for critical function     Paper records available     Regular backups daily and stored off site     NET RISK ASSESSMENT Financial Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)		Exi	sting Control Measur	es			
<ul> <li>Alternative location available for critical function</li> <li>Paper records available</li> <li>Regular backups daily and stored off site</li> <li>RET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planed actions and TREAT</li> <li>CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS</li> <li>Activity</li> <li>Responsible</li> <li>Timescales</li> <li>Scontinue with ongoing controls</li> <li>A Jose</li> <li>Ongoing</li> </ul>	Business Continuity Plan	in place					
Paper records available     Regular backups daily and stored off site      NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact (1 to 5)     I Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     S Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     S Likelihood (1 to 5)     CONCLUSION	Discussions with ICT unc	lertaken					
Regular backups daily and stored off site      NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)      Service Impact (1 to 5)      Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)      Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)      Total Net Impact Score (sum above)      Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)      Total Net Impact Score (sum above)      Sorvice (sum above)      Sorvice Impact (1 to 5)      Total Net Impact Score (sum above)      Sorvice Impact (1 to 5)      Total Net Impact Score (sum above)      Sorvice Impact (1 to 5)      Sorvice (sum above)      Sorvice Impact (1 to 5)      Sorvice (sum above)      Sorvice Impact Score (sum above)      Sorvice Impact Impact Score (sum above)      Sorvice Impa	Alternative location availate	able for critical fur	nction				
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	Paper records available						
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         TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planed actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2. Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing       Ongoing         Date	Regular backups daily ar	nd stored off site					
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date		NE	ET RISK ASSESSMEN	IT			
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planed actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	Financial 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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	Service Impact (1 to 5)				3		
Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				1		
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2. Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	Total Net Impact Score (sum above)				5		
CONCLUSION            • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT          CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2.Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date	Likelihood (1 to 5)			2			
• TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions and TREAT         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS       Responsible       Timescales         Activity       Responsible       2009 to be reviewed         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2. Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date					10		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2. Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date			CONCLUSION				
Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details       A Jose       2009 to be reviewed         2. Continue with ongoing controls       A Jose       Ongoing         Date	TOLERATE after taking in	to account exist	ing control measures	and plan	ned actions ar	nd TREAT	
1. Develop off site back up pack including telephone numbers and contact details     A Jose     2009 to be reviewed       2. Continue with ongoing controls     A Jose     Ongoing       Date	CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/	ACTIONS					
details     A Jose     Ongoing       2.Continue with ongoing controls     A Jose     Ongoing       Date	Activity				Responsible	Timescales	
Completed by Date		cincluding telepho	one numbers and conta	act	A Jose	2009 to be reviewed	
Completed by Date	2.Continue with ongoing contro	ls			A Jose	Ongoing	
	Completed by				Date		
	Marian Shanks		18/12/09				

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crem	natorium		
Risk	8			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk	_		
	Loss of income	e/money		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVE	NT			
Risk Causes	Theft			
	Non paym	ent of crematoriu	m fees	
Potential Impact	Detrim	nental Impact on t	he service	
	GF	ROSS RISK ASSI	SSMENT	
Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to	5)			2
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2
Total Gross Impact Score (su	ım above)			5
Likelihood (1 to 5)				2
Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	l Impact * Likelihood) 10			10
Existing Control Measures				
Cash/cheques collected and banked in a safe and timely manner				
Any overdue accounts are subject to recovery				
Accountancy reconcile in	come on a regu	lar basis		
Schedule of income main	ntained on a dail	y basis		
Reconciliation of Paying	in book			
Weekly summary sheets	are calculated a	and kept		
Written Procedures in Pla	ace for dealing v	vith income		
Maximum levels of cash	stored is £1000			
Electronic Register imp	lemented			
	Ν	NET RISK ASSES	SMENT	
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 In	npact * Likeliho			5
		CONCLUSI		
• TOLERATE after taking in		sting control me	asures	
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/	ACTIONS			
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
Completed by				Date
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	9			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Breakdown of Partners	nip		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Partner withdraws f	unding		
	Partner becomes in	solvent		
Potential Impact	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
E	xisting Control Measure	s		
Formal partnership agreement in place				
Maintain a good working relationship				
1	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> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account exis</li> </ul>	ting control measures			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
Completed by			Date	

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	g workload through	premature sta	aff loss.
BACKGROUND TO RISK EV	ENT			
Risk Causes	Staff leaving for alternative employment			
	Sudden departure of staff			
Potential Impact	Failure in service delivery			
	GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT	Г		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1
Service Delivery Impact (1 to	5)			3
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				3
Total Gross Impact Score (se	um above)			7
Likelihood (1 to 5)				2
Total Gross Risk Score (Tota	al Impact * Likelihood)			14
	Existing Control Measures			
Good employment term	s and conditions			
Work forward planned				
Regular liaison with out	side bodies – ICCM and FBCA			
Close communication w	ith small team			
Exit interviews carried of	but			
Job Shadowing				
Procedure notes available	ble for key areas			
Regular communication	with staff			
	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 I	mpact * Likelihood)			10
	CONCLUSION			
• TREAT				
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS	ACTIONS			
Activity		F	Responsible	Timescales
1.Develop procedure notes for		S	Tinkler	July 10
2.Continue with current control		S	Tinkler	Ongoing
	Completed by		Date	
Marian Shanks	· · ·	18/12/09		

Business Unit         Durham Crematorium           Risk V         11           Risk Voren         Alan Jose           Detail of Risk         Service Risk – Managing excess deaths           BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Managing excess deaths           BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         - Flu pandemic           - Catastrophic incident         - Catastrophic incident           - Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff         Potential Impact           Potential Impact         - Flug strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope           - Equipment failure         - Staff Overtime           - Equipment failure         - Staff Overtime           - Equipment failure         - Staff Overtime           - Funeral Directors unable to cope with         - Funeral Directors unable to cope with           - Funeral Directors unable to be deliver coffins         2           Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)         2           Stakholder Impact (1 to 5)         2           Staff Oross Impact Score (sun above)         6           - Intermal Policies and Procedures in Place         2           - Intermal Policies and Procedures in Place         3           - Intermal Policies and Procedures in Place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation         2           - Stocks of cons	DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Risk Owner       Alan Jose         Detail of Risk       Service Risk – Managing excess deaths         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Managing excess deaths         Risk Causes       • Flu pandemic • Catastrophic incident • Loss of experienced statf/ind enough trained staff         Potential Impact       • Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope • Equipment failure • Staff Overtime • Existing Staff Resources unable to cope with • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)       2         Staff Overtime       2         Staff Ores Impact Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Staff Ores Impact Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       21         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Existing Control Measures       2         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       2         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       5         Stocks of cremation sparse for each cremator is purchased and stored on site       5         Stocks of cremation remoter Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills       1         Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office       2		Durham Crematorium			
Detail of Risk       Service Risk – Managing excess deaths         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT <ul> <li>Flu pandemic</li> <li>Catastrophic incident</li> <li>Loss of experienced staff/hot enough trained staff</li> <li>Potential Impact</li> <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 with</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> <li>Carcoss Risk ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Existing Staff Control Measures</li> <li>Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation</li> <li>Stocks of cremation forms held</li> <li>Training of additional volunteer Cremator is purchased and stored on site</li> <li>Stocks of cremation forms held</li> <li>Training of additional volunteer Cremator are place day in the Cremation/Centery Office</li> <li>Stocks of Cremation are prepared and kept in the Cremation/Centery Office</li> <li>Stoppies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack ums or heavy duty plastic bags</li> <li>Price Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stocks of cremation forms held</li> <li>Training of additional volunteer Cremator rechnicians 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<!--</td--><td>Risk</td><td>11</td><td></td><td></td></li>	Risk	11			
Managing excess deaths         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Flu pandemic</li> <li>Catastrophic incident</li> <li>Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff</li> </ul> Potential impact         Potential impact         List Governme         Existing Staff Resources unable to cope with - Existing Staff Resources unable to deliver coffins         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Starkeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (fortal Impact * Likelihood)       21         Existing Control Measures       2         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       3         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       3         Internal Policies of Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills       5         Stocks of Cremation Gross Risk ASSESSMENT       2         Stocks of Cremation Gross Head       2         Stocks of Cremation Gross Head       3         Stocks of Cremation Gross Head       3         Stocks of Cremation Gross Head       3         Stocks of Cremation Gross	Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Flu pandemic</li> <li>Catastrophic incident</li> <li>Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff</li> </ul> Potential Impact <ul> <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 with</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> </ul> Brancial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Stocks of Cremation forms held           Training of additional volunteer 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         Plans are in place should the requipare and kept in the Crematorium/Cemete	Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>Flu pandemic</li> <li>Catastrophic incident</li> <li>Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff</li> </ul> Potential Impact <ul> <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 with</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> </ul> Brancial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Internal Policies and Procedures in Place           Stocks of Cremation forms held           Training of additional volunteer 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         Plans are in place should the requipare and kept in the Crematorium/Cemete		Managing excess deaths			
A Catastrophic incident         • Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff         Potential Impact       • Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope         • Equipment failure       • Equipment failure         • Equipment failure       • Existing Staff Resources unable to cope         • Number of deaths too high to cope with       • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)       2         StateAbolder Impact (1 to 5)       2         StateAbolder Impact (1 to 5)       2         StateAbolder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Ital Gross Risk Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Difference       3         Total Gross of Cremation forms held       3         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       Impact and to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       Impact         Stocks of Cremation forms held       Impact         Training of additional volunteer Cremator is purchased and stored on site       Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urms or heavy duty plastic bage	BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
• Catastrophic incident         • Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff         • Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope         • Equipment failure         • Staff Overtime         • Existing Staff Resources unable to cope with         • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffic         • Number of deaths too high to cope with         • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffic         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)       2         Staff Overtime       2         Staff Oress Impact Score (sum above)       6         Idelivers Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       3         Ital Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Stocks of Consumable spares for each cremator are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       9         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       9         Stocks of Consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site       5         Stocks of consumable spares for cremater remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bars       9         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhan	Risk Causes	Flu pandemic			
• Loss of experienced staff/not enough traimed staff         Potential Impact       • Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope         • Equipment failure       • Staff Overtime         • Staff Overtime       • Number of deaths too high to cope with         • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins       • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Ottal Gross Risk Score Gro		-			
Potential Impact <ul> <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 with</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> </ul> GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT           Financial Impact (1 to 5)             2               Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)             2               Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)             2               Total Gross Risk Score (sum above)             6               Likelihood (1 to 5)             3               Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)             21               Existing Control Measures             2               Internal Policies and Procedures in Place             2               Internal Policies and Procedures in Place             2               Stocks of Cremation forms held             3               Stocks of Cremation forms held             5               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 urms or heavy duty plastic bags </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>ugh trained staff</td> <td></td>			ugh trained staff		
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         Stakeholder 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)         Tasting Control Measures         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       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       NET RISK ASSESMENT         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 back         Financial Im	Potential Impact			0	
• Staff Overtime         • Existing Staff Resources unable to cope         • Number of deaths too high to cope with         • Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins         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         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       3         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       1         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       5         Stocks of Cremation forms held       1         Training of additional volunteer Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills       2         Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery offuc       2         Stacksof Stacksof (1 to 5)       2         Stacksholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Stocks of Cremater for cremater termators, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic back       3         Stocks of Cremater for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemete		-		6	
<ul> <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> EROSS RISK ASSESSMENT           Financial 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         3           Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         21           Existing Control Measures         3           Internal Policies and Procedures in Place         3           Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         9           Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation         4           Stocks of Cremation forms held         5           Training of additional volunteer Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills         2           Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office         2           Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags         1           Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office         2           Supplies of					
<ul> <li>Number of deaths too high to cope with Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Cotal Gross Risk Score (sum above)</li> <li>Cotal Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>21</li> <li>Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day</li> <li>Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation</li> <li>Stocks of Cremation forms held</li> <li>Training of additional volunteer Cremator rechnicians in Durham has been undertaken – work norm 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 bas</li> <li>Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bas</li> <li>Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bas</li> <li>Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bas</li> <li>Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or</li></ul>					
<ul> <li>Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>6</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>21</li> </ul> Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) 21 Existing Control Measures Internal Policies and Procedures in Place Internal Policies and Procedures in Place Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator are able to cope with 8 cremations per day 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 EVERTISK ASSESSMENT Financial Impact (1 to 5) 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 3 3 5 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 8 8 9 8 9 8 9 8 9 9 8 9		-	-		
CROSS 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         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       2         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       2         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       5         Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site       5         Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills       7         Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office       5         Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags       1         Priceedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office       1         Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1       1         Stakehol					
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         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         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         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Total Net Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1					
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         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       2         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       1         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       5         Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site       5         Stocks of Cremation forms held		ROSS RISK ASSESSMENT		•	
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         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place       2         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       9         Plans are in place should the requirement be to move from normal to enhanced operation       5         Stocks of consumable spares for each cremator is purchased and stored on site       5         Stocks of Cremation forms held       7         Training of additional volunteer Cremator Technicians in Durham has been undertaken – working one day per month to keep up skills       9         Procedure notes for administration are prepared and kept in the Crematorium/Cemetery Office       5         Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags       2         Service Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       4					
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Existing Control Measures         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place          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       1         NET RISK ASSESSMENT       1         Financial 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					
Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Existing Control Measures         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place          Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day       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       2         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder 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				2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       21         Existing Control Measures         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         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         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       2         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       12	. , ,				
Existing Control Measures         Internal Policies and Procedures in Place         Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day         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         VET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       12				3	
<ul> <li>Internal Policies and Procedures in Place</li> <li>Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day</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 bass</li> <li>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>4</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>12</li> </ul>				21	
<ul> <li>Testing has been carried out to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day</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>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> </ul>	E	Existing Control Measures			
<ul> <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>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>3</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> </ul>	Internal Policies and Procedures in Place				
<ul> <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>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>4</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>12</li> </ul>	Testing has been carried out to ensure crem	ators are able to cope with 8 cremations	per day		
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 <u>NET RISK ASSESSMENT     Financial Impact (1 to 5)         1     Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)         12     Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) </u>	Plans are in place should the requirement be	to move from normal to enhanced oper	ation		
<ul> <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 basses</li> <li>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> </ul>	Stocks of consumable spares for each crema	ator is purchased and stored on site			
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 basses         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	Stocks of Cremation forms held				
Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags <u>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</u> 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) 12 CONCLUSION		chnicians in Durham has been undertak	en – working one d	ay per month to	
Supplies of suitable containers for Cremated remains, flat pack urns or heavy duty plastic bags <u>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</u> 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) 12 CONCLUSION	Procedure notes for administration are prepa	red and kept in the Crematorium/Cemet	ery Office		
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		•	-		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)2Service Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Total Net Impact Score (sum above)4Likelihood (1 to 5)3Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)12CONCLUSION					
Service Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Total Net Impact Score (sum above)4Likelihood (1 to 5)3Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)12CONCLUSION				2	
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					
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       12         CONCLUSION					
Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       12         CONCLUSION       12					
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)     12       CONCLUSION     12					
CONCLUSION					
		CONCLUSION		12	
IOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and blanned actions and TREAT			od options and	TDEAT	
		sung control measures and plann			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS					
	-	tore and Clargy to advice how considered	· · · · · ·		
1.Procedure notes to be prepared for Funeral Directors and Clergy to advise how services would A Jose March 10 operate at enhanced and critical levels		to a and clergy to advise now services v		Warch 10	
2.Working with Civil Contingencies unit excess deaths group A Jose Ongoing		hs group	A Jose	Ongoing	
Completed by Date	Completed by		Date		
Marian Shanks 18/12/09	Marian Shanks	18/12/09			

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	12			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Adverse inspection/audi	t report		
BACKGROUND TO RISK VENT				
Risk Causes	Lack of evidence fo	r inspections		
Potential Impact	Detrimental Impact	on the service		
	Reputational Dama	ge		
G	ROSS RISK ASSESSMEN	NT		
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 * Likelihoo	od)			14
E	Existing Control Measure	S		
Policies and procedures in place adhered to	and can be evidenced.			
Filing systems in place				
New employees are subject to an induction p	process			
Health and Safety policy available.				
Regular Health & safety inspection of building	g carried out and documer	nted		
Fire Risk assessments in place				
Adequate signage for first aiders, fire warder	ns and fire extinguishers in	place		
Staff aware of need to provide evidence of a	ctivities			
Develop Document retention register in acco	rdance 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			
TOLERATE after taking into account exist	sting control measure	<mark>s</mark>		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
Completed by			Date	
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	13			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Financial Losses due to re	eputation		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT		•		
Risk Causes	Inability to provide se	ervice expected		
Potential Impact	Detrimental Impact o	n 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 * Likeliho	od)			4
	Existing Control Measures			
• Formal procedures in place to avoid loss of	reputation			
Job shadowing to encourage knowledge of	all processes			
Good relations with partners and associated	d bodies			
Contingency Planning				
Flexible staff willing to work late and or cover	er 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			
TOLERATE after taking into account ex	isting control measures			
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		F	esponsible	Timescales
1.Continue with existing control measures			Jose	Ongoing
Completed by		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Date	
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

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 maintenan leading to financial claims or losses and loss of reputation and income e Replacement of Cremators			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Inability to deliver pr	ojects on time		
	Inability to maintain equipment			
Potential Impact	Detrimental Impact of	on the service		
	Reputational Damage	ge		
GR	ROSS RISK ASSESSMEN	-		
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	i)			5
Ex	xisting Control Measure	s		
Consultants are used				
Feasibility study undertaken before projects ar	re commenced			
Options appraisal carried out				
Project managers assigned to each project				
N	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			
TOLERATE after taking into account exist	ting control measures	s and planned a	ctions and TR	EAT
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
1.Continue with existing control measures			A Jose	Ongoing
2.Develop prince 2 methodology for projects			A Jose	Ongoing
	onaoina		A Jose	Ongoing
3.Management of Service Vehicles whilst works are of				
3.Management of Service Vehicles whilst works are c Completed by			Date	

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	15			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Inability to meet 2012 Le	Inability to meet 2012 Legislative change		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Equipment will not r	neet targets set by	/ DEFRA	
Potential Impact	Financial			
	GROSS RISK ASSESSMEN	IT		
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 * Likeli	hood)			24
	Existing Control Measure	s		
Monitoring Situation				
DEFRA has reported progress is not suit	able to be on target for 2012			
Regular reports being produced on progr	ress			
Option of burden sharing agreement cost	ting £100k pa			
	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)				3
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likeliho	od)			21
	CONCLUSION			
• TREAT				
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
1. Investigate new equipment			A Jose	Ongoing
2. Monitor situation			A Jose	Ongoing
Completed by			Date	I
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

Business UnitDurham CrematoriumRisk16Risk OwnerAlar JoseDetail of RiskService Risk – Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short noticeBACKGROUND TO RISK EVENTInstant and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff at short noticeBACKGROUND TO RISK EVENTImpaired service deliverRisk Causes• National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staffPotential Impact• Impaired service deliverFinancial Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)3Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihoot)1Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihoot)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)3Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihoot)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)2Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)3Sta	DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Alan Jose         Detail of Risk       Service Risk – Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         Background To Risk Event       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stateholder Impact (1 to 5)       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         I Cool networking       I         Stateholder Impact (1 to 5)       I       I	Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Detail of Risk       Service Risk – Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT       Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         Risk Causes <ul> <li>National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff</li> <li>Dotential Impact</li> <li>Impaired service deliver</li> <li>Impaired service impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Impaceli service service service service service</li></ul>	Risk	16			
Inability to recruit appropriately qualified staff at short notice         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff</li> <li>Potential Impact</li> <li>Impaired service deliver</li> <li>CROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>I</li> <li>Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>I</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>I</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>I</li> <li>Italian Conditions</li> <li>Italian Condin Conditions</li> <li>Italian Conditi</li></ul>	Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT  Risk Causes  National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff  Potential Impact  Impaired service deliver  GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)  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)  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  CONCLUSION  NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  CONCLUSION  Total Are raking into account existing control measures  CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS  Attivity  Completed by  Date  NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  Conclusion  Conclusion  Attivity  Completed by  Date  Dete  Dete Dete Dete Dete  Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete Dete De	Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
Risk Causes <ul> <li>National and Regional shortage of appropriately qualified staff</li> <li>Impaired service deliver</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Conclusion</li> <li>Attractive professional working environment</li> <li>Attractive professional working</li> <li>Good networking</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>18</li> <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> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Good networking</li> <li>VET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Q</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Q</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Q</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>Q</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>Attivity Responsible into account existing control measures</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>Responsible into account existing control measures</li> <li>Advise into account existing control measures</li> <li>Good networking into account existing control measures</li> <li>Control Improvements' Actions</li> <li>Advise into account existing control measures</li> <li>Control Improvements' Actions</li> <li>Advise into account existing control measures</li> <li>Advise into account exi</li></ul>		Inability to recruit approp	oriately qualified sta	aff at short notice	)
Protential Impact              Impaired service deliver            Financial Impact (1 to 5)         1           Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)         3           Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         2           Total Gross Risk AssEssment         6           Likelihood (1 to 5)         3           Total Gross Risk Score (sum above)         8           Existing Control Measures         3           Codd terms and conditions         1           Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the accures         1           Good terms and conditions         1           Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the accure is accure in the acur	BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
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         Codd terms and conditions         • Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vaca-cices         • Attractive professional working environment       •         • Good networking       1 <b>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</b> 1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vaca-cices         • Attractive professional working environment       •         • Good networking       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         • Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         • Total Net Risk Score (Total Impac	Risk Causes	National and Region	nal shortage of app	propriately qualifi	ed staff
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         Texisting Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Service for the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vacancies         Attractive professional working environment         • Good networking         • Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         Service Impact (1 to 5)         1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         2         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         10         CONCLUSION         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)         10         CONCLUSION         10         CONTCOL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Actinv	Potential Impact	Impaired service de	liver		
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         Existing Control Measures         Ocod terms and conditions         Iter Taixing involvement         Ocod networking         Iter ISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       2         Service Impact (1 to 5)       2         Service Impact Score (sum above)       5         Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         Service Impact * Likelihood)       10         C		GROSS RISK ASSESSME	NT		
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         Existing Control Measures         Odd terms and conditions         Existing Control Measures         Odd terms and conditions         Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vac-rcies         Attractive professional working environment         Odd networking         Impact (1 to 5)         ODD 1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS	Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)       6         Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       18         Existing Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Good terms and conditions         Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of valuations         Attractive professional working environment       Impact 1         Good networking       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)       2         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         CONCLUSION         Total Mer Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)         ONGCLUSION         Timescales         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS' ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Monitor situation       A Jos       Ongoing	Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)				3
Likelihood (1 to 5)       3         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       18         Existing Control Measures         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	Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       18         Existing Control Measures         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 Score (sum above)       5         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2       -         CONCLUSION       10         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing	Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)				6
Existing Control Measures         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       Interested in the event of vacancies         Good networking       Interested in the event of vacancies         Service 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       Interested         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures       CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing	Likelihood (1 to 5)				3
• Good terms and conditions         • Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vacures         • Attractive professional working environment         • Good networking         • ET 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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jos       Ongoing	Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelil	hood)			18
Pool of volunteers have been trained in the event of pandemic who may be interested in the event of vacues         Attractive professional working environment         Good networking         I         INET RISK ASSESSMENT         INET RISK ASSESSMENT         Interested in the event of vacues         INET RISK ASSESSMENT         Interested in the event of vacues         Interested in the event of vacue existing control measures         Interested in the event of vacue existing control measures         Interested in the event of vacue existing control measures         Interested in the event of vacue existing control measures         Interested in the event of vacue existing control measure         Interested i		Existing Control Measure	es		
Attractive professional working environment     Good networking     NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact	Good terms and conditions				
Attractive professional working environment     Good networking     NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)     I Service Impact	Pool of volunteers have been trained in the second se	ne event of pandemic who m	ay be interested in	the event of vac	ancies
Good networking      NET RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)  Service Impact (1 to 5)  Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)  Stak		-			
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)       5         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         1.Monitor situation       Date					
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         TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date	5	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date	Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date					
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       5         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date					2
Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Date					5
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       10         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Date					
CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date		od)			
TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date					-
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.Monitor situation       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date	TOLERATE after taking into account of the second of t		es		
Activity     Responsible     Timescales       1.Monitor situation     A Jose     Ongoing       Completed by     Date					
1.Monitor situation     A Jose     Ongoing       Completed by     Date				Responsible	Timescales
Completed by Date	1.Monitor situation				
	Completed by			Date	
			18/12/09		

Business UnitDurham CrematoriumRisk17Risk OwnerAlan JoseDetail of RiskService Risk – Administrative dutiesBACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT- Administrative dutiesBACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT- Administrative duties fall behind due to staff bearcePotential Impact• • • • • • •Potential Impact (1 to 5)-Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)2Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)2Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)2Vork practice procedures are in place-•1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)1Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)3Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)3<	DESCRIPTION OF RISK						
Risk Owner       Alan Jose         Detail of Risk       Service Risk – Administrative duties         BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>One member of staff deals with Administration</li> <li>Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence</li> <li>CROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> Potential Impact (1 to 5) <ul> <li>Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>4</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>2</li> <li>Total Arcs Score (sum abore)</li> <li>Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence</li> <li>Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency</li> <li>Work practice procedures are in place</li> <li>Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate</li> <li>Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate</li> <li>Total Mora Score (sum above)</li> <li>I</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>3</li> <l< td=""><td>Business Unit</td><td>Durham Crematorium</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></l<></ul>	Business Unit	Durham Crematorium					
Detail of Risk         Service Risk – Administrative duties           BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Administrative duties           Risk Causes <ul></ul>	Risk	17					
Administrative duties  Administrative duties  Administration duties subter Administration  Potential Impact  Administration duties fall behind due to staf absence  Potential Impact  Administration duties fall behind due to staf absence  CROSS RISK ASSESSMENT  Financial Impact (1 to 5)  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Vork practice procedures are in place  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency  Contacted previous admin staff	Risk Owner	Alan Jose					
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT         Risk Causes <ul> <li>One member of staff deals with Administration</li> </ul> Potential Impact <ul> <li>Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence</li> <li>GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> Financial Impact (1 to 5) <ul> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> </ul> Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) <li>1</li> Total Gross Risk Score (sum above) <ul> <li>Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence</li> <li>2</li> </ul> Itabilihood (1 to 5) <ul> <li>Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence</li> <li>Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency</li> <li>Vork practice procedures are in place</li> </ul> Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence <ul> <li>Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency</li> <li>Work practice procedures are in place</li> </ul> Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate             Financial Impact (1 to 5) <ul> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>Contal Net Impact Score (sum</li></ul>	Detail of Risk	Service Risk –					
Risk Causes       • One member of staff deals with Administratur         Potential Impact       • Administration duties fall behind due to staff deals with Administration         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Starkeholder 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)       2         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence       3         Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency       1         Work practice procedures are in place       1         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence       1         Occumentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate       1         Period Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakehold		Administrative duties					
Potential Impact       ● Administration duties fall behind due to start fabence         CROSS RISK ASSESSMENT       1         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Delivery 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         Outropol (1 to 5	BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT						
GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT         Inancial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2       2         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       8         Existing Control Measures       8         Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         • Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Work practice procedures are in place       •       1         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate       1       1         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         CONCLUSION       3         CONCLUSION         Inter	Risk Causes	One member of staff	deals with Admini	stration			
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)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       8         Bitting Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Existing Control Measures         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         Octoracted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Vork practice procedures are in place         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         • NET RISK ASSESSMENT <b>Total Impact (1 to 5)</b> 1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)       3         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)       3         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSION         Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)       3	Potential Impact	Administration duties	s fall behind due to	staff absence			
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         Existing Control Measures         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         Octracted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         • Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Work practice procedures are in place       1         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate       1         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)       3         Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSION <td account="" colspan="2" control="" existing="" into="" m<="" state="" taking="" td=""><td colspan="5">GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</td></td>	<td colspan="5">GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT</td>		GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT				
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         Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         Vork practice procedures are in place         Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         CONCLUSION         Total Mer Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSIO	Financial Impact (1 to 5)				1		
Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)       4         Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       8         Existing Control Measures         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         Vork practice procedures are in place         Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)         1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)         1         CONCLUSION         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Responsible         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         Ongoing         1         Likelihood)         3         Likelihood)         3         CONCLUSION         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS <td< td=""><td>Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></td<>	Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5)				1		
Likelihood (1 to 5)       2         Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       8         Existing Control Measures         • Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         • Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency       •         • Work practice procedures are in place       •         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate       • <b>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</b> 1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)       3         Likelihood (1 to 5)       1         CONCLUSION <b>CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS' ACTIONS Responsible</b> Alose       Ongoing         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose	Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)				2		
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       8         Existing Control Measures         Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         Work practice procedures are in place         Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)       3         CONCLUSION       3         CONCLUSION         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.       Continue with existing control measures       A Jose       Ongoing	Total Gross Impact Score (sum above)				4		
Existing Control Measures <ul> <li>Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence</li> <li>Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency</li> <li>Work practice procedures are in place</li> <li>Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate</li> <li>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)         <ul> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> </ul> </li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>3</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>3</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</li> <li>CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS</li> <li>Activity</li> <li>Responsible</li> <li>Timescales</li> <li>1. Continue with existing control measures</li> <li>Completed by</li>	Likelihood (1 to 5)				2		
• Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at times of absence         • Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency         • Work practice procedures are in place         • Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         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)         Likelihood)         TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.       Continue with existing control measures       Ongoing	Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likeling	ood)			8		
<ul> <li>Contacted previous admin staff to see if they would cover in an emergency</li> <li>Work practice procedures are in place</li> <li>Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate         <ul> <li>NET RISK ASSESSMENT</li> </ul> </li> <li>Financial Impact (1 to 5)         <ul> <li>1</li> <li>Service Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> </ul> </li> <li>Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Impact Score (sum above)</li> <li>3</li> <li>Likelihood (1 to 5)</li> <li>1</li> <li>Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)</li> <li>3</li> <li>CONCLUSION</li> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures</li> <li>CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS</li> <li>Activity</li> <li>Responsible</li> <li>Netwith existing control measures</li> <li>Ongoing</li> <li>Completed by</li> </ul>		Existing Control Measure	s				
Work practice procedures are in place     Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate     NET RISK ASSESSMENT Financial Impact (1 to 5)     1 Service Impact (1 to 5)     1 Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     3 Likelihood (1 to 5)     1 Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)     3 CONCLUSION	Staff multiskilled and are able to cover at til	mes of absence					
Work practice procedures are in place     Documentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate     NET RISK ASSESSMENT Financial Impact (1 to 5)     1 Service Impact (1 to 5)     1 Stakeholder Impact Score (sum above)     3 Likelihood (1 to 5)     1 Stakeholder Impact * Likelihood)     3 CONCLUSION	Contacted previous admin staff to see if the	ey would cover in an emerg	jency				
Occumentation completed on time and chased up where appropriate           NET RISK ASSESSMENT           Financial Impact (1 to 5)         1           Service Impact (1 to 5)         1           Stakeholder 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         3           CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS           Activity         Responsible         Timescales           1.         Continue with existing control measures         Completed by           Ongoing         A Jose         Ongoing			-				
NET RISK ASSESSMENT         Financial Impact (1 to 5)       1         Service Impact (1 to 5)       1         Stakeholder 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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.       Continue with existing control measures       Ongoing         1.       Completed by       Date		sed up where appropriate					
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         TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1.       Continue with existing control measures       Ongoing         1.       Completed by       Date			-				
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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.       Continue with existing control measures       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date	Financial 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         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1.       Continue with existing control measures       Ongoing					1		
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)       3         Likelihood (1 to 5)       1         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date       Date					1		
Likelihood (1 to 5)       1         Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity         1. Continue with existing control measures         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose         Ongoing       Ongoing					3		
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood)       3         CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date							
CONCLUSION         • TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures         CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date		d)			3		
OUMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS     CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS     Activity         I. Continue with existing control measures         Completed by         Date							
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS         Activity       Responsible       Timescales         1. Continue with existing control measures       A Jose       Ongoing         Completed by       Date	TOLERATE after taking into account examples and the second examples after taking into account examples and the second exa		es				
1. Continue with existing control measures     A Jose     Ongoing       Completed by     Date							
1. Continue with existing control measures     A Jose     Ongoing       Completed by     Date	Activity			Responsible	Timescales		
Completed by Date	1. Continue with existing control measures						
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
	Completed by			Date	<u> </u>		
			18/12/09				

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 E and Age Legislation	qualities, DDA, Ac	cess to Services
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT			
Risk Causes	Claims arise from lack of compliance	e with legislation	
Potential Impact	Reputational damage		
G	ROSS 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 * Likeliho	tal Impact * Likelihood) 8		8
1	Existing Control Measures		
Staff aware of Equalities policies and proce	dures		
Review of documentation			
Access and Disability assessments carried	out		
Buildings have been assessed for DDA con	npliance		
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		
TOLERATE after taking into account ex	isting control measures		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS			
Activity		Responsible	Timescales
1. Continue with existing control measures		A Jose	Ongoing
Completed by		Date	l 
Marian Shanks	18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	19			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Lack of evidence for Emp	ployers Liability Claim	IS	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Claims arise from lag	ck of compliance with	Health and S	Safety policy
Potential Impact	Reputational damag	e		
	Financial damage			
	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	NT		
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 * Likelih	ood)			8
	<b>Existing Control Measure</b>	es		
Staff aware of Health and Safety policies a	and procedures – copy held	l on site		
Regular Health and Safety inspections of	of the building which is evid	enced		
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 regular	ly serviced			
Fire alarms are tested regularly				
Risk assessments carried out and staff are	e aware of them			
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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 * Likelihoo	d)			3
	CONCLUSION			
<ul> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account e</li> </ul>	xisting control measur	es		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		R	esponsible	Timescales
1. Continue with existing control measures		A	lose	Ongoing
Completed by			Date	 
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	20			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Service Risk –			
	Damage to Public / Vehi	cles due to tree br	anches falling	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	High Winds			
	• Disease			
	Heavy Snow			
Potential Impact	Damage to Vehicles / Equipment			
	Injury to Public or Staff			
G	ROSS RISK ASSESSME	NT		
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 * Likeliho	od)			12
E	Existing Control Measure	es		
• 2 yearly inspection scheduled by Olivers Tre	ee Expert Services			
Any recommendations made by tree experts	s acted upon immediately			
Visual inspections carried out in grounds by	staff monthly			
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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			
TOLERATE after taking into account ex	isting control measur	es		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
1. Continue with existing control measures			A Jose	Ongoing
Completed by			Date	
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

# Appendix 4: Operational Risk Register

		(Score 1-3)	(Score 4-6)	(Score 7-9)	(Score 10-12)	(Score 13-15)	
		Insignificant		Moderate		Critical	
1	Remote	7,8	2,3,4,6	1,9			Ξ
2	Unlikely		5				гікегіноор
3	Possible						ООН
4	Probable						Q
5	Highly Probable						
			RISK M	ATRIX			

Risk. No.	Risk – Ranked by Risk Number	Net Risk Score	Ranking
1	Injury to staff and visitors		2
2	Exterior Pathways, Steps and Grounds		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
5	Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken		1
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
9	Fire	7	2

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
9	Fire	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	S			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT					
Risk Causes	<ul> <li>Hot apparatus – sta</li> </ul>	ff handling hot as	n pans		
	Staff raking down ar	nd removing meta	I from remains		
	<ul> <li>Hydraulic lifting gea</li> </ul>	r.			
	Dust				
	Transferring remains into and between containers.				
	Noise from machinery				
	Staff trapping fingers or limbs in equipment				
	• Noise				
Potential Impact					
C	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	ENT			
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)	lihood (1 to 5)			2	
Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelih				14	
	Existing Control Measu	res			
Only certified and trained staff allowed to c	operate				
Machinery regularly maintained and servic	ed				
Extractor fans and masks used.					
Make sure others are at a distance whilst ways are at a distance while the sure of th	work is ongoing				
PPE issued to staff					
Operators carry out visual checks of equip	ment				
Dust cabinet has extraction fan, staff use d	lust masks				
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	т			
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				
TOLERATE after taking into account e	xisting control measu	res and planne	d actions - TR		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS					
Activity			Responsible	Timescales	
1. Risk Assessment s distributed to staff			lan Ramsey	June 2010	
Completed by			Date		
Marian Shanks		18/12/09			

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	2			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk			
	Exterior pathway and ste	eps and grounds		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Path and steps in st	ate of disrepair		
	Holes in grounds du	e to animals		
	Kerbstones			
Potential Impact	Injury to staff and public			
(	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	INT		
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 Measu	es		
Paths and steps well maintained				
Inspected regularly				
Access levels regularly cleaned				
Handrails on steps safety ridge on top and	bottom			
Kerbstones filled in by staff				
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	IT		
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			
TOLERATE after taking into account example.	xisting control measu	res		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		R	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by			Date	
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	3			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk			
	Use of hand tools and m	achinery for garde	ening on site, driv	veway and car
	park			
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Vibration			
	Noise			
Potential Impact	Injury to staff			
	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	ENT		
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 * I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			10
	Existing Control Measur	res		
Tools kept in good order, defective	tools replaced			
Machinery regularly serviced and m	aintained			
Tools kept in locked storage area				
Power tools used away from the put	blic			
Staff trained in the use of all equipm	nent			
• PPE issued to staff as appropriate				
High Viz jackets used when dealing	with traffic			
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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			
TOLERATE after taking into acco	ount existing control measu	ires		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
Completed by		Date		
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

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		<u> </u>		
Risk Causes	Hazardous cleaning	g materials		
	Wet floor			
	Noise (vacuums)			
	Work at Height			
	Fountain Pump ma			
	Fertilizers and inser	cticides		
	Using ladders			
	Candles			
	Maintenance of hea     Inspection Hole	ating system		
	Inspection Hole     CCTV equipment			
	Electrical Equipment	nt		
	Manual Handling			
Potential Impact				
	Fire			
	GROSS RISK ASSESSMI	ENT		
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 Measu	res		
Least hazardous cleaning product				
Chemicals and other COSHH Iten				
COSHH data sheets on site	•			
<ul> <li>Pat Testing carried out on electric</li> </ul>	al items			
<ul> <li>Floors mopped at quiet times wet</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Cleaner assisted by other staff if I</li> </ul>				
Cleaner not required to work at he				
PPE available – gloves, goggles,	dust masks etc			
Two person task to lift cover				
No smoking policy     Candle snuffer available				
Candle snuffer available	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	JT		
Financial Impact (1 to 5)	NET MON ASSESSMET			3
Service Impact (1 to 5)				
Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5)			1	
Total Net Impact Score (sum above)				1
				5
Likelihood (1 to 5)				1
Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * L				5
	CONCLUSION			
<ul> <li>TOLERATE after taking into ac</li> </ul>	count existing control measu	ires		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTION	S			
Activity		R	esponsible	Timescales
Completed	by		Date	l
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		
		1		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	5			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk			
	Risk Assessments and re	eviews not undertake	า	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Staff unaware of risk	s affecting service		
Potential Impact	Detrimental Impact on the service			
(	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	NT		
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 * Likelih	ood)			18
	Existing Control Measure	es		
• Staff trained in risk assessments.				
Full review undertaken				
Risk assessment procedures in place				
Health & Safety recommendations carried	out			
Encourage clear desk policy				
Work station assessments carried out				
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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			
TOLERATE after taking into account e	xisting control measur	res		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		Re	esponsible	Timescales
Completed by			Date	
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

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	e working	
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Irate and emotional	member of the pub	lic	
	Remote location			
Potential Impact	Injury to staff			
(	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	ENT		
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 Measu	res		
Risk assessments carried out.				
Procedures tested				
Code of conduct in place				
One to one training				
Information shared at Team Briefings				
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	Т		
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> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account e</li> </ul>	xisting control measu	ires		
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		F	Responsible	Timescales
Completed by		Date		
Marian Shanks		18/12/09		

DESCRIPTION OF RISK				
Business Unit	Durham Crematorium			
Risk	7			
Risk Owner	Alan Jose			
Detail of Risk	Operational Risk			
	Limited space in office a	rea		
BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT				
Risk Causes	Not sufficient space for staff using office area			
Potential Impact	<ul> <li>Injury to staff</li> </ul>	Injury to staff		
C	GROSS RISK ASSESSME	INT		
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 Measur	es		
Furniture moved to provide maximum spac	e around desks			
Shelves checked to ensure they are secure	e and sturdy			
	NET RISK ASSESSMEN	IT		
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				
TOLERATE after taking into account extension	xisting control measu	res and planned	l actions - TRI	EAT
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity			Responsible	Timescales
1. Explore possibility of larger office space		A Jose	June 10	
1. Explore possibility of larger office space				
1. Explore possibility of larger office space Completed by			Date	

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	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				
Manual handling training provided where appropriate				
Good Housekeeping – walkways kept clear at all times.				
Ladder Register kept and maintained				
Ladder Training 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> <li>TOLERATE after taking into account existing control measures and planned actions</li> </ul>				
CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS				
Activity		Responsible	Timescales	
1. Ensure training is kept up to date		A Jose	June 10	
Completed by		Date		
Marian Shanks	rian Shanks 18/12/09			