Port Health and Public Protection Key Risks (July 2014)
The table below shows a selection of our key risks which form part of our Departmental Risk Tracker.

Risk No.	Risk	Gross Risk		Risk Owner /	E talles October	Net Risk				Diamed Action	Control
		Likelihood	Impact	Lead Officer	Existing Controls	Likelihood	Impact		sk us &	Planned Action	Evaluation
M C P 4	Risk of serious injury to staff and service users due to constrained space for vehicle movement which, in the event of a serious accident/fatality could affect the operation and sustainability of the service.	4	4	Market Superintendents and Port Health & Public Protection Director	The TOP X risk priority system and a near miss reporting system is in place. Banksman employed at HARC. All accidents fully investigated and any follow up actions implemented.	3	4	A	\leftrightarrow	Review of traffic management controls currently being undertaken. Where there is specific heightened risk identified at New Spitalfields Market, M&CP is liaising with the Corporate H&S team to address the matter.	G
M C P 5	Failure by enforcement officers to act within statutory requirements, leading to reputational risk and potential financial loss.	3	4	Port Health & Public Protection Director	Competent enforcement officers; clear policies, procedures and decision making; monitoring of enforcement officers.	2	4	A	\leftrightarrow		G
M C P 6	Failure to meet air quality limit values in the City by the prescribed dates set by the EU which could result in a fine of unknown amount.	4	4	Port Health & Public Protection Director	The current systems in place allow the City to demonstrate that it is taking sufficient effective action to help the government and the GLA to meet air quality limit values.	4	4	R	1	This has been previously considered by the SRMG & Chief Officer Core Groups and will now be represented as a strategic risk.	Α
M C P 8	Loss of quarantine licensing due to breach of regulations or legislative change. This would result in the closure of the Border Inspection Post facility to imported animals, causing financial loss and negative publicity for the		4	Port Health & Public Protection Director	Current procedures reflect regulatory requirements and are actively managed.	2	4	G	\leftrightarrow		G
M C P 9	Outbreak of Legionnaires disease (Legionella sp.) in the City associated with a cooling tower situated within the City of London, the statutory monitoring of which is	3	4	Port Health & Public Protection Director	Regular inspections (frequency dependent upon risk). Independent audit by Environmental Health Officers looking at all aspects of the water risk management	2	4	A	\leftrightarrow		G
M C P 1	Inadequate Financial Management in respect of agents' "unsecured" debts.	3	3	Port Health & Public Protection Director	Existing controls in relation to agents require modification.	3	3	A	\leftrightarrow	Additional controls will be put in to minimise the risk. For future agents, a scheme will be developed linked to a security deposit.	Α
M C P 1	Significant delays to maintenance or repairs of equipment and facilities, causing operational difficulties and risk of reputational damage and financial loss. Ratings	5	4	Assistant Director Animal Health & Welfare	City Surveyor's PFMs have been dealing directly with Mitie to address known problem areas. Local management are regulary in touch with PFMs to press for remedial action.	5	4	R	\leftrightarrow	Senior Managers in both M&CP and CS have met to discuss suitable arrangements for maintenance. A contractor is scheduled to visit site on 1 September 2014 to deal with the most pressing maintenance item.	R

Ratings	Risk Status	Control Evaluation			
R - Red	High risk, requiring constant monitoring and deployment of robust	Existing controls are not satisfactory			
N - Neu	control measures.	Existing Controls are not satisfactory			
A - Amber	Medium risk, requiring at least quarterly monitoring, further	Existing controls require improvement/Mitigating controls			
A - Allibel	mitigation should be considered.	identified but not yet implemented fully			
C Croon	Low risk, less frequent monitoring, consideration may be given to	Robust mitigating controls are in place with positive			
G - Green	applying less stringent control measures for efficiency gains.	assurance as to their effectiveness			