

Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee

29 January 2010



Risk Register 2009/10



Joint Report of Terry Collins – Corporate Director: Neighbourhood Services; Stuart Crowe – Corporate Director: Resources (Treasurer to the Joint Committee)

Purpose of the Report

1. To provide an update on the current position with regards to the Risk Register for the Mountsett Crematorium Committee and to set out proposals for regular routine reporting of risk.

Background

2. As members will recall, the 2008-09 external audit “issues arising” letter concluded that “There was no Risk Assessment carried out and minuted during 2008/09” and recommended that “The Crematorium Committee must ensure that an annual risk assessment is carried out and reviewed and minuted by the Committee”.
3. Members will also recall that a Risk Assessment report was presented to members at the 12th June meeting. This included a comprehensive risk 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 Derwentside District Council.
4. The Forward Plan for 2009/10 commits the Joint Committee to considering an update to the Risk Assessment by 31/01/10.

Risk Assessment – December 2009

5. The Risk Register considered and approved by the Joint Committee in June 2009 has been reviewed, reassessed and updated in accordance with the Durham County Council methodology / approach to Risk Management. This entails an assessment of both the gross and net risk from each area, the difference between the gross and net risk score being that the net risk result is after taking into account existing control measures. Full details of the Durham County Risk Management Methodology are set out at Appendix 2.
6. In line with the previous report, 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 Durham Crematorium Risk Register to ensure consistency of risks across the County.

7. 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.
8. 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 at 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 in the top right corner of the matrix the bigger a risk it is to the service.
9. 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. The work undertaken on Operational Risk confirms that there is still some work to be done with regard to Risk Assessments with staff that can be facilitated during January and February 2010, however, it is anticipated that this work will be completed before the end of March 2010. The work to be carried out with regard to Risk Assessments will also raise Risk Awareness amongst staff and assist in embedding a Risk Management culture into the Business.

Embedding Risk Management - Monitoring and Review

10. In order to ensure that risk management is 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

11. The original risk register has been revised and updated and rescored in accordance with Durham County Council criteria. Comparisons have been made with the Durham Crematorium Risk Register to ensure risks that may have previously been omitted are now included to ensure consistency.
12. There are some risks which are specific to Mountsett Crematorium, such as the Harmonisation of Fees and Charges, which will require a decision by the Committee to determine a way forward. The individual risk assessments attached at Appendix 3 and 4 set out a range of planned actions to address / mitigate against the key risks identified. These actions will be taken forward by officers and risks updated on a continual basis.

Recommendations

13. It is recommended that:-

- Members of the Mountsett 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.
- An annual report on the approach to risk management being prepared in April / May to inform the Annual Governance Statement.

Background Papers

- Risk Assessment – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 12 June 2009
- External Audit Report – Report to Mountsett Crematorium Joint Committee – 30 October 2009

Contact(s): Paul Darby, 0191 383 6594
Ian Hault, 01207 218 733
Ian Staplin, 01207 570 255
Marian Shanks, 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 in this report

Accommodation

There are no implications in this report

Crime and disorder

There are no implications in this report

Sustainability

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

Human rights

None

Localities and Rurality

None

Young people

None

Consultation

Officers of Gateshead Council were consulted on the contents of this report.

Health

None

Appendix 2: Durham County Council Risk Management Process

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL – IMPACT FACTORS

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

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL – LIKELIHOOD FACTORS

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

Appendix 3: Service Risk Register

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

| Risk. No. | Risk – By Risk Number | Net Risk Score | Ranking |
|-----------|--|----------------|---------|
| 1 | Not implementing changes in legislation | 6 | 9 |
| 2 | Non compliance with the new fire order | 6 | 9 |
| 3 | Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status | 21 | 1 |
| 4 | Sickness absence of staff | 8 | 7 |
| 5 | Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information | 5 | 12 |
| 6 | Failure of Cremators | 6 | 9 |
| 7 | Power Failure | 10 | 4 |
| 8 | Adverse inspection/Audit report | 5 | 12 |
| 9 | Loss of Income/Money | 5 | 12 |
| 10 | Breakdown of Partnership | 7 | 8 |
| 11 | Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss | 10 | 4 |
| 12 | Managing Excess Deaths | 12 | 2 |
| 13 | Joint Committee fail to Harmonise Fees and Charges in line with Durham Crematorium | 12 | 2 |
| 14 | Administration Duties | 4 | 15 |
| 15 | Lack of Evidence for Employers Liability Claims | 10 | 4 |

| Risk. No. | Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score | Net Risk Score | Ranking |
|------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------|
| 3 | Impact on staff morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status | 21 | 1 |
| 12 | Managing Excess Deaths | 12 | 2 |
| 13 | Joint Committee fail to Harmonise Fees and Charges in line with Durham Crematorium | 12 | 2 |
| 7 | Power Failure | 10 | 4 |
| 11 | Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss | 10 | 4 |
| 15 | Lack of Evidence for Employers Liability Claims | 10 | 4 |
| 4 | Sickness absence of staff | 8 | 7 |
| 10 | Breakdown of Partnership | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Not implementing changes in legislation | 6 | 9 |
| 2 | Non compliance with the new fire order | 6 | 9 |
| 6 | Failure of Cremators | 6 | 9 |
| 5 | Disclosure of confidential information through incorrect disposal/maintenance of information | 5 | 12 |
| 8 | Adverse inspection/Audit report | 5 | 12 |
| 9 | Loss of Income/Money | 5 | 12 |
| 14 | Administration Duties | 4 | 15 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 1 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Not implementing changes in Legislation | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non compliance with the law | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational Damage Criticism by Stakeholders Results in negative press coverage Financial penalties / prosecution Loss of operator's licence | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular updates from professional institutes – ICCMM & FBCA Membership of external organisations Updates received from a number of sources inc Justice Dept Copies of periodicals circulated among staff members Share best practice and communication with Durham | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 6 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 2 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Non compliance New Regulatory Fire Order | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non compliance with new fire order | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff and public Damage to building Public Liability / Insurance Implications | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | | 1 |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | | 3 |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | | 2 |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | | 6 |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | | 2 |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | | 12 |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff aware of the new order. Responsible officer for building in place Fire wardens in place Fire extinguishers in place Relevant information displayed Auto gas control fitted in control room Regular inspections carried out | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | | 1 |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | | 3 |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | | 2 |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | | 6 |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | | 1 |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | | 6 |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE – taking into account existing control measures and planned actions | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 3 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Impact on Staff Morale due to uncertainty over Job Evaluation and Single Status | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Evaluation Job Evaluation not implemented in Derwentside DC New Authority will commence work on Job Evaluation causing confusion for staff who have already been through the DDC process Staff in Durham Crematorium are paid at different rates than at Mountsett. | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on staff morale affecting ability to deliver services Staff may leave Reluctance of trained staff to move to Mountsett. | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 4 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 5 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 35 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep staff informed by regular meeting and team briefings Bereavement Services manager has been appointed for Durham County Council | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 4 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 21 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE taking into account existing control measures and planned actions | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Keep staff informed of process | Ian Staplin | Ongoing |
| 2. Management participation in Job Evaluation | | |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 4 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Sickness absence of key staff | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unexpected sickness absence by key staff • Prolonged Sickness Absences | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to deliver service • Reputational damage • Loss of confidence • Loss of income | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 18 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal procedures and policies are in place. • Back to Work interviews are undertaken • Sickness Monitoring is undertake • Family friendly policies in place with HR advice available • Emergency arrangement with Durham Crematorium for staff to cover | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 4 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 8 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Continue with Current Controls | Ian Staplin | Ongoing |
| 2. Reinforce Sickness Absence Policies and Procedures | Ian Staplin | Ongoing |
| 3. Train Volunteer Cremator Technicians and Attendants | Ian Staplin | September 10 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 5 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Disclosure of confidential information through the incorrect disposal/maintenance of information | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of data Data could be disclosed to unauthorised persons | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal procedures and policies are in place for document retention and disposal Secure environment for storage of information Data quality and security controls in place | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE taking into account existing control measures | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 6 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Failure of cremators | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age and wear and tear | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the ability to deliver services | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance contract in place –response within 24 hours Contingency plans in place to cover long term breakdown Reciprocal arrangement with Durham Gateshead Crematoria would assist in the event of an emergency | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 6 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 7 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Power failure | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of utility services | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the ability to deliver services | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 15 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contingency plans in place to cover loss of service Reciprocal agreement with Durham Crematorium In an emergency Gateshead Crematoria could assist | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 8 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Adverse inspection/audit report | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence for inspections | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service Reputational damage Greater levels of audit and inspection | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 14 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and procedures in place adhered to and can be evidenced. Filing systems in place New employees are subject to an induction process Health and Safety policy available. Fire Risk assessments in place Adequate signage for first aiders, fire wardens and fire extinguishers in place | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Regular Health & safety inspection of building carried out and documented | Ian Staplin | April 2010 |
| 2. Annual Audit of Accounts | BDO Stoy Hayward | June 2010 |
| 3. Internal Audit Inspections | Internal Audit | March 2010 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 9 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Loss of income/money | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theft Non payment of crematorium fees | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service Reputational damage | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cash/cheques collected and banked in a safe and timely manner Any overdue accounts are subject to recovery through finance Accountancy reconcile income on a regular basis Schedule of income maintained on a daily basis | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 10 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Breakdown of Partnership | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner withdraws funding Partner becomes insolvent | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on finances | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 7 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal partnership agreement in place Maintain a good working relationship Maintain financial viability of the facility | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 7 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 11 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Loss of knowledge and ability to cover existing workload through premature staff loss. | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff leaving for alternative employment Sudden departure of staff | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure in service delivery | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 14 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work forward planned Reciprocal agreement in place with Durham Crematorium to provide emergency cover Close communication with small team | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | |
|--|---|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium |
| Risk | 12 |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin |
| Detail of Risk | Managing excess deaths |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flu pandemic Catastrophic incident Loss of experienced staff/not enough trained staff |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huge strain on crematorium capacity - unable to cope Equipment failure Staff Overtime Existing Staff Resources unable to cope Number of deaths too high to cope with Funeral Directors unable to deliver coffins |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 2 |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 2 |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 21 |
| Existing Control Measures | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reciprocal Agreement with Durham Crematorium staff to assist with cover Internal Policies and Procedures in Place Testing has been carried out in Durham to ensure cremators are able to cope with 8 cremations per day – Manufacturers have confirmed Mountsett cremators could deal with this also 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 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) | 1 |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 4 |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 |
| CONCLUSION | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | |

| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Procedure notes to be prepared for Funeral Directors and Clergy to advise how services would operate at enhanced and critical levels | I Staplin | June 10 |
| 2. Working with Civil Contingencies unit excess deaths group | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| 3. Training of volunteer Cremator Technicians to assist in enhanced and critical situations | I Staplin | September 10 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 13 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Joint Committee fail to Harmonise fees and charges in line with Durham Crematorium | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all crematoria in the County charge the same fees No charge for some services at Mountsett that are charged for in Durham | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertakers will be opposed to increase in charges Community criticism at increase in charges Failure to harmonise with lead to inequality being maintained Failure to generate additional income will impact on ability to finance cremator replacements | |
| 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) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparison table of charges has been produced to identify anomalies Fees and Charges Harmonisation Proposals Developed for consideration by members DCC adopted policy with regards to harmonising fees and charges | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 4 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Increase to be agreed by Crematorium Committee | I Staplin | January 10 |
| 2. Undertakers to be informed of committee decision | I Staplin | February 10 |
| 3. New rates to be published to stakeholders | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 4. Manage Communications | I Staplin | March 10 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks | | 18/12/09 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 14 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Administrative Support | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One member of staff deals with Administration | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration duties fall behind due to staff absence | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 4 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 8 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff 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 | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 4 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 4 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium | |
| Risk | 15 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Lack of evidence for Employers Liability Claims | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims arise from lack of compliance with Health and Safety policy | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational damage Financial detriment | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff aware of Health and Safety policies and procedures – copy held on site Trained First Aiders in place Fire Wardens and relative notices in place. Fire risk assessment has been carried out Fire extinguishers are labelled and regularly serviced | | |
| 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) | 2 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Continue with existing control measures | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| 2. Commence regular Health and Safety inspections of the building which is to be evidenced | I Staplin | 1/2/10 |
| 3. Risk assessments to be carried out and communicated to staff | I Staplin | 1/2/10 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

Appendix 4: Operational Risk Register

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

| Risk. No. | Risk – By Risk Number | Net Risk Score | Ranking |
|-----------|---|----------------|---------|
| 1 | Injury to staff and visitors | 7 | 2 |
| 2 | Exterior Pathways and Steps | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | Cleaning Duties | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | Violence/Assault from Member of the Public | 6 | 4 |
| 6 | Fire | 7 | 2 |
| 7 | Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken | 10 | 1 |
| 8 | Slips, trips and falls | 3 | 8 |

| Risk. No. | Risk – Ranked by Net Risk Score | Net Risk Score | Ranking |
|------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|
| 7 | Risk Assessments and Reviews not undertaken | 10 | 1 |
| 1 | Injury to staff and visitors | 7 | 2 |
| 6 | Fire | 7 | 2 |
| 2 | Exterior Pathways and Steps | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | Cleaning Duties | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | Violence/Assault from Member of the Public | 6 | 4 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 8 | Slips, trips and falls | 3 | 8 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 1 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Injury to staff and visitors | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot apparatus – staff handling hot ash pans Staff raking down and removing metal from remains Hydraulic lifting gear. Dust Transferring remains into and between containers. Noise from machinery | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff Employee / Public liability claim | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 14 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only certified and trained staff allowed to operate Machinery regularly maintained and serviced Extractor fans and masks used. | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 7 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 2. Risk Assessment s to be carried out for individual duties and distributed to staff | Ian Staplin | January 2010 |
| 3. Investigation of Refresher training for existing staff | Ian Staplin | March 2010 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 2 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Exterior pathway and steps | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Path and steps in state of disrepair | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff and public Employee / Public liability claim | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paths and steps well maintained Inspected regularly Access levels regularly cleaned Handrails on steps | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Recording sheets for Paths and Grounds to be introduced to record and report defects | I Staplin | January 10 |
| 2. Method of reporting defects to be established as this has changed since LGR. | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 3. Method of chasing reported works to be established to ensure works are carried out in a timely manner | I Staplin | March 10 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 3 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Use of hand tools and machinery for gardening | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vibration Noise | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff Employee liability claim | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools kept in good order Machinery regularly serviced and maintained | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Risk Assessments to be carried out and communicated to staff. | Ian Staplin | March 10 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 4 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Cleaning duties | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous cleaning materials Wet floor Noise (vacuums) | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff/public | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least hazardous cleaning products used Floors mopped at quiet times wet floor signage displayed Vacuum regularly maintained and PAT tested | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 5 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Carry on with existing controls | I Staplin | Ongoing |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 5 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Violence/assault from member of public | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attack by a member of the public | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 12 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff trained in dealing with aggressive situations | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 6 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Investigate internal training courses for relative staff | I Staplin | March 2010 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 6 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Fire | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storage of fuels etc. | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the ability to deliver services | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 14 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No smoking policy in place Fuels kept in locked stores. No smoking signs displayed Fire alarm and procedures in place re regular testing and evacuation drills etc. | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 7 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 7 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Regular H&S Inspections. | M. Goodyear | April 2010 |
| Completed by | | Date |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | | 18/12/2009 |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|--|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 7 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Risk Assessments and reviews not undertaken | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff unaware of risks affecting service | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detrimental Impact on the service | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 6 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 3 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 18 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff trained in risk assessments. Full review undertaken Risk assessment procedures in place Health & Safety recommendations carried out | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 5 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 2 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 10 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 1. Staff to be trained in risk assessments. | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 2. Full review undertaken for all activities in the Business | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 4. Risk assessment s to be implemented and communicated to staff | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 5. Investigate Refresher training from Federation of Burial and Cremation Authorities | I Staplin | March 10 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |

| DESCRIPTION OF RISK | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Business Unit | Mountsett Crematorium (Joint Risk – Durham CC & Gateshead MBC) | |
| Risk | 8 | |
| Risk Owner | Ian Staplin | |
| Detail of Risk | Operational Risk - Slips, Trips and Falls | |
| BACKGROUND TO RISK EVENT | | |
| Risk Causes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manual handling Tripping hazards Step ladders 2 rung | |
| Potential Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injury to staff | |
| GROSS RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Delivery Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Impact Score (sum above) | 3 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Gross Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 3 | |
| Existing Control Measures | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Housekeeping – walkways kept clear at all times. | | |
| NET RISK ASSESSMENT | | |
| Financial Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Service Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Stakeholder Impact (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Impact Score (sum above) | 3 | |
| Likelihood (1 to 5) | 1 | |
| Total Net Risk Score (Total Impact * Likelihood) | 3 | |
| CONCLUSION | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOLERATE / TRANSFER / TREAT / TERMINATE | | |
| CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS/ ACTIONS | | |
| Activity | Responsible | Timescales |
| 6. Ensure training is kept up to date | I Staplin | June 10 |
| 7. Manual handling training provided where appropriate | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 8. Staff be issued with Manual Handling Risk Assessment | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 9. Risk Assessments are carried out for ladder duties | I Staplin | March 10 |
| 10. Internal checks to be carried out monthly to ensure carpets and flooring is defect /hazard free. | I Staplin | March 10 |
| Completed by | Date | |
| Marian Shanks / Ian Staplin | 18/12/2009 | |