

<b>Committee(s)</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Port Health and Environmental Services Committee	19 January 2016
<b>Subject:</b> Risk – Port Health & Public Protection	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Markets and Consumer Protection	<b>For Information</b>

### Summary

This report has been produced to provide the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection are satisfactory and that they meet the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework.

Risk is reviewed regularly by the departmental Senior Management Team as part of the on-going management of operations within the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection. In addition to the flexibility for emerging risks to be raised as they are identified, a process exists for in-depth periodic review of the risk register.

The Department of Markets and Consumer Protection have identified a number of departmental risks. Of these, the most significant risks are for this Committee to consider are:

- CR21 – Air Quality (Current Risk: RED)
- MCP-HA 001 – Traffic Management (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 002 – Repair Delays (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 003 – IS Systems Failure (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 004 – Venomous or toxic species (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 007 – Loss support for bespoke database (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 010 – Zoonotic disease outbreak (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 013 – Legislative changes (Current Risk: AMBER)
- MCP-HA 014 – Failure of safety mechanism (Current Risk: AMBER)

### Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the report and the actions taken in the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection to monitor and manage effectively risks arising from our operations.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The Risk Management Framework of the City of London Corporation requires each Chief Officer to report regularly to Committee the key risks faced in their department. Audit and Risk Management Committee has requested that such risks should be reported at a Committee level.

### **Current Position**

2. This report provides an update of the key risks that exist in relation to the operations of the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection. The report also outlines the processes adopted for the on-going review of risk and mitigating actions.

### **Risk Management Process**

3. The Department of Markets and Consumer Protection risk management is a standing agenda item at the monthly Departmental Senior Management Group (SMG) meeting, over and above the suggested quarterly review. SMG receives the risk register for review, together with a briefing note highlighting any changes since the previous review. Consideration is also given as to whether any emerging risks exist for inclusion in the risk register as part of Divisional updates on key issues from each of the Assistant Directors and Superintendents, ensuring that adequate consideration is given to operational risk.
4. Between each SMG meeting, risk and control owners are consulted regarding the risks for which they are responsible, with updates captured accordingly.
5. Regular risk management update reports are provided to this Committee in accordance with the City's Risk Management Framework.

### **Identification of New Risks**

6. New and emerging risks are identified through a number of channels, the main being:
  - Directly by SMG as part of the monthly review process.
  - In response to regular review of delivery of the departmental Business Plan; slippage against key deliverables, for example.
  - Annual, fundamental, risk register review, undertaken by the tier of management below SMG.

The risk register may be refreshed over and above the stated process for review and oversight, in response to emerging issues or changing circumstances.

### **Summary of Key Risks**

7. The Department of Markets and Consumer Protection's risk Register for Port Health and Environmental Services, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, includes One RED risk which is also a Corporate Risk and Nine AMBER risks:

### **CR21 – Air Quality** (Current Risk: RED)

Small particulate pollution has chronic health impacts from long term exposure at very low concentrations and is in evidence within the City and central London. There is also a health impact associated with long term and short term exposure to nitrogen dioxide. Under certain atmospheric conditions there is a higher probability of poor air quality within the City and it is more likely that residents, workers and visitors would suffer the acute consequences.

The consequences both acute and chronic may include:

An increase in hospital referrals placed upon both emergency services and the NHS for those already suffering from respiratory or cardiovascular conditions (it may also place a strain on City social services).

An increase in deaths, particularly of those already suffering from respiratory or cardiovascular conditions (both residents and workers).

Economic costs such as acting as a deterrent of businesses coming to London or staying and financial penalties for non-compliance with air quality limits.

Persistent poor air quality may affect the longer term health of the City population.

### **MCP-HA 001 – Traffic Management** (Current Risk: AMBER)

The car parking area at HARC is used by staff and visitors as well as through traffic which includes Heavy Goods Vehicles. The area is also used for unloading by forklift truck.

There is a real risk of injury or death of a pedestrian if vehicle movements in this constrained space are not appropriately managed and controlled.

If this risk were realised it could result in serious injury or fatality; prosecution, a fine, reputational damage for the City. It could also have an adverse impact on the operation and sustainability of the service.

### **MCP-HA 002 – Repair Delays** (Current Risk: AMBER)

The Heathrow Animal Reception Centre has experienced significant delays to maintenance and/or repair of equipment and facilities due to be carried out under the corporate repair and maintenance contract.

This has resulted and will result in future operational difficulties, including security risks where security doors are left inoperable leading to the risk of closure of the facility by the enforcing authorities leading to reputational damage and financial loss to the City.

### **MCP-HA 003 – IS Systems Failure** (Current Risk: AMBER)

There is a lack of robustness of Information Technology systems at the Heathrow Animal Reception Centre.

A technical failure of these systems leading to the loss of computer network facilities and telephones for a period in excess of 24 hours would have an adverse effect on customer service and income generation. This would also result in a risk to animal welfare where HARC cannot be notified of airside incidents.

If realised, this risk would have a reputational as well as a financial impact on the City of London.

**MCP-HA 004 – Venomous or toxic species** (Current Risk: AMBER)

Arrival of unknown venomous/toxic species through BIP could result in the envenomation or poisoning of a staff member or visitor leading to serious illness or death.

If this risk were realised it could result in prosecution, a fine and serious reputational damage for the City.

**MCP-HA 007 – Loss support for bespoke database** (Current Risk: AMBER)

Loss of IS support for ARC Ledger bespoke database could result in loss of data, recording and reporting, and invoicing capability.

Realisation of this risk could result in reputational damage due to compromised service delivery and loss of income.

**MCP-HA 010 – Zoonotic disease outbreak** (Current Risk: AMBER)

Outbreak of zoonotic disease within Greater London/South East could result in a restriction of animal movements and possible closure of Border Inspection Post to some species.

If this risk were realised it could result in a loss of income if BIP closed

**MCP-HA 013 – Legislative changes** (Current Risk: AMBER)

Legislative change on current 100% checks of EU pet movements could result in reduced or no requirement to check EU pets entering UK.

Realisation of this risk would result in a loss of income.

**MCP-HA 014 – Failure of safety mechanism** (Current Risk: AMBER)

Failure of scissor lift safety mechanism during handling of heavy consignments in the Large Animal Border Inspection Post could result in Injury.

If this risk were to be realised it could result in prosecution, a fine and reputational risk to the City.

## **Conclusion**

8. Members are asked to note that risk management processes within the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection adhere to the requirements of the City Corporation's Risk Management Framework. Risks identified within the operational and strategic responsibilities of the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection are proactively managed.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix A – Port Health and Environmental Services Risk Register Summary
- Appendix B – Risk Matrix

## **Background Papers**

Department Business Plan  
Department Risk Review  
Department Business Plan Progress Report  
Risk Management Strategy

# MCP PH&PP Committee Risk Report Appendix A

Generated on: 08 January 2016 10:37



<b>Code</b>	CR21	<b>Title</b>	Air Quality
-------------	------	--------------	-------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> Small particulate pollution has chronic health impacts from long term exposure at very low concentrations and is in evidence within the City and central London. There is also a health impact associated with long term and short term exposure to nitrogen dioxide.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> Under certain atmospheric conditions there is a higher probability of poor air quality within the City and it is more likely that residents, workers and visitors would suffer the acute consequences.</p> <p><b>Effect:</b> The consequences both acute and chronic may include:          An increase in hospital referrals placed upon both emergency services and the NHS for those already suffering from respiratory or cardiovascular conditions (it may also place a strain on City social services).          An increase in deaths, particularly of those already suffering from respiratory or cardiovascular conditions (both residents and workers).          Economic costs such as acting as a deterrent of businesses coming to London or staying and financial penalties for non-compliance with air quality limits.          Persistent poor air quality may affect the longer term health of the City population.</p>
--------------------	---

<b>Category</b>	Environmental	<b>Approach</b>	Reduce ( By appropriate remedial action)
<b>Risk Level</b>	Corporate	<b>Risk Owner</b>	Jon Avern

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA2	<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection	<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	 Likelihood Impact 16 ↔ No change
<b>Likelihood</b>	Likely
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	16
<b>Review Date</b>	09-Oct-2015

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	 Likelihood Impact 6
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Serious
<b>Risk Score</b>	6
<b>Target Date</b>	31-Dec-2018

<b>Latest Note</b>	Risk moved to Corporate Risk Register as requested by P. Dudley
--------------------	---

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note
CR21 001a	Implement policies	Implement the policies contained in the City of London Air Quality Strategy 2015-2020. The strategy contains 10 policy areas with 60 specific actions. An annual report will be produced demonstrating progress with each action.	Jon Avern	29-Apr-2016	0%	The due date for this action is the end of April 2016 and each year after that - ongoing action, with progress reports produced in April each year. Actions are renewed and updated each April and reported on in subsequent years.
CR21 001b	Review Air Quality	Review and assess air quality in line with statutory obligations of the Environment Act 1995. Submit all relevant statutory reports. Approval of all reports by Defra and the GLA will demonstrate compliance with statutory obligations.	Jon Avern	29-Apr-2016	0%	The due date for this action is the end of April 2016 and each year after that - Ongoing compliance reports submitted in April each year. These are subject to audit by both Defra and the Greater London Authority.
CR21 001c	Become an Exemplar Borough	Ensure the City Corporation becomes a Mayor of London Exemplar Borough for air quality.	Jon Avern	29-Dec-2017	0%	To become a Cleaner Air for London Borough the authority will have to pledge (at cabinet level)

						to take significant action to improve local air quality and sign up for specific delivery targets. - this includes having an up-to-date air quality action plan, fully incorporated into LIP funding and core strategies.
CR21 001d	Develop communications strategy.	Develop and implement a robust communications strategy to ensure people have sufficient information to reduce their exposure on days of 'high' air pollution.	Jon Aaverns	30-Jun-2016	0%	Days of 'high' air pollution occur on a few days throughout the year and are caused by changes in weather conditions. The City Corporation has very little influence over these high air pollution days but will notify the public when they occur so they can take any relevant action to avoid any impact on their health.
CR21 001e	Develop plan	Develop and implement a plan for reducing the impact of diesel vehicles on air pollution in the Square Mile. This is to complement the work being undertaken by the Mayor of London to reduce air pollution in the central zone through the implementation of the Ultra Low Emission Zone.	Jon Aaverns	31-Dec-2018	0%	The development of this plan will involve following a complex process - obtaining funding, consultation with all stakeholders, integrated impact assessment, options and approval.

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 001	<b>Title</b>	Traffic Management
-------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> The car parking area is used by staff and visitors as well as through traffic which includes Heavy Goods Vehicles. The area is also used for unloading by forklift truck.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> There is a real risk of injury or death of a pedestrian if vehicle movements in this constrained space are not appropriately managed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Effect:</b> Serious injury or fatality; prosecution, a fine, reputational damage for the City. Adverse impact on the operation and sustainability of the service.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Health and Safety
<b>Risk Level</b>	Departmental

<b>Approach</b>	Reduce ( By appropriate remedial action)
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP5
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	<p>8 ↔ No change</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Unlikely
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Review Date</b>	24-Nov-2015

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	<p>8</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Unlikely
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Target Date</b>	31-Dec-2015

<b>Latest Note</b>	Training and licensing of all fork lift users has been carried out. All staff wear personal protective equipment when on duty, access is restricted and the Vehicle & Grounds Attendant controls vehicle movements at peak times.
--------------------	---

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note
MCP-HA 001a	Maintain Training	Maintain all current training activity for counterbalance truck users.	Robert Quest	31-Dec-2015	100%	V & G Attendant has now carried out recognised fork lift training course. Will be constructing a refresher training schedule for relevant HARC employees
MCP-HA 001b	Maintain Professional Staff Numbers	Ensure Vehicle & Grounds Attendant post remains filled and that a minimum of 4 other staff are also trained in banksman skills.	Robert Quest	11-Sep-2015	100%	Now have 11 trained banksman

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 002	<b>Title</b>	Repair Delays
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> The Heathrow Animal Reception Centre has experienced significant delays to maintenance and/or repair of equipment and facilities due to be carried out under the corporate repair and maintenance contract.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> This has resulted and will result in future operational difficulties, including security risks where security doors are left inoperable.</p> <p><b>Effect:</b> The risk of closure of the facility by the enforcing authorities leading to reputational damage and financial loss to the City.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Legal	<b>Approach</b>	Reduce ( By appropriate remedial action)
<b>Risk Level</b>	Departmental	<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3	<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP5
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection	<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	12
<b>Review Date</b>	24-Nov-2015

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Unlikely
<b>Impact</b>	Minor
<b>Risk Score</b>	2
<b>Target Date</b>	31-Dec-2015

<b>Latest Note</b>	City Surveyor's PFM's have been dealing directly with Mitie to address known problem areas. Local management are regularly in touch with PFM's to press for remedial action.
--------------------	--

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note
MCP-HA 002a	Address Needs With Property Services	Meetings between HARC and Property Services to address ongoing maintenance needs.	Robert Quest	31-Mar-2016	0%	
MCP-HA 002b	Raise Performance Issues	Maintenance issues/loss of facilities/resource planning concerns/unsatisfactory performance targets raised with C.O.	Tristan Bradfield; Robert Quest	31-Mar-2016	50%	Scissor lift and vehicle bay doors completed.

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 003	<b>Title</b>	IS Systems Failure
-------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> A lack of robustness of Information Technology systems at the Heathrow Animal Reception Centre.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> Technical failure of Information Technology systems leading to the loss of computer network facilities and telephones for a period in excess of 24 hours.</p> <p><b>Effect:</b> Disruption to service, damage to reputation, temporary loss of income. Possible threat to animal welfare where HARC cannot be notified of airside incidents.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Economic	<b>Approach</b>	Reduce ( By appropriate remedial action)
<b>Risk Level</b>	Departmental	<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3	<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP5
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection	<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	<p>12 ↔ No change</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	12
<b>Review Date</b>	08-Jan-2016

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	<p>1</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Minor
<b>Risk Score</b>	1
<b>Target Date</b>	31-Dec-2015

<b>Latest Note</b>	Records of animal movements are essential and whilst these can be maintained manually for a few hours, a period of computer network facilities loss greater than this in peak times significantly affects efficiency, customer service and income generation, as well as risking animal welfare and therefore has a reputational as well as a financial impact on the City of London. An ADSL line has been provided but this cannot be activated outside the I.S. department's working hours as the current I.S. service agreement does not include 24hr cover.
--------------------	--

**Actions related to this risk:**

<b>Ref No:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Action Description</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Latest Note</b>
MCP-HA 003a	Meet with Agilisys.	Meet with Agilisys to determine possibility of 24hr IS support.	Robert Quest	31-Jan-2016	75%	A process is now in place

---

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 004	<b>Title</b>	Venomous or toxic species
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> Arrival of unknown venomous/toxic species through BIP.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> Envenomation or poisoning of staff or visitor leading to serious illness or death.</p> <p><b>Effect:</b> Serious injury or fatality; prosecution, a fine, reputational damage for the City. Adverse impact on the operation and sustainability of the service.</p>
--------------------	---

<b>Category</b>	Health and Safety
<b>Risk Level</b>	Departmental

<b>Approach</b>	Accept
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP4
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	<p>8 ↔ No change</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Extreme
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Review Date</b>	08-Jan-2016

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	<p>8</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Extreme
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Target Date</b>	30-Dec-2016

<b>Latest Note</b>	
--------------------	--

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note
MCP-HA 004a	Update Envenomation procedure	Update Envenomation procedure with local hospital.	Robert Quest	01-Mar-2016	80%	Dialogue with hospital difficult so need to enlist Occupational Health Unit

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 007	<b>Title</b>	Loss support for bespoke database.
-------------	------------	--------------	------------------------------------

<b>Description</b>	<b>Cause:</b> Loss of IS support for ARC Ledger bespoke database. <b>Event:</b> Loss of data, recording and reporting, and invoicing capability. <b>Impact:</b> Reputational damage due to compromised service delivery. Temporary loss of income.		
--------------------	--	--	--

<b>Category</b>	Reputation
<b>Risk Level</b>	Service

<b>Approach</b>	Reduce ( By appropriate remedial action)
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP4
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Serious
<b>Risk Score</b>	6
<b>Review Date</b>	08-Jan-2016

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Minor
<b>Risk Score</b>	1
<b>Target Date</b>	30-Dec-2016

<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>Existing controls:</b> Investigation of new software underway.
--------------------	---

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note
MCP-HA 008a	Scoping of new database	Opportunity Outline drafted by Richard Reilly, for scoping of new database.	Robert Quest	31-Aug-2015	100%	Scope complete

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 010	<b>Title</b>	Zoonotic disease outbreak.
-------------	------------	--------------	----------------------------

<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Cause:</b> Outbreak of zoonotic disease within Greater London/South East.</p> <p><b>Event:</b> Restriction of animal movements, possible closure of Border Inspection Post to some species.</p> <p><b>Impact:</b> Loss of income if BIP closed, cost of resourcing response to zoonoses outbreak, damage to reputation if at fault or poor response.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Reputation
<b>Risk Level</b>	Service

<b>Approach</b>	Accept
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP4
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	<p>8 ↔ No change</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Extreme
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Review Date</b>	24-Nov-2015

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	<p>8</p>
<b>Likelihood</b>	Rare
<b>Impact</b>	Extreme
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Target Date</b>	30-Dec-2016

<b>Latest Note</b>	Existing control: Participation in UK contingency planning.
--------------------	---

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 013
-------------	------------

<b>Title</b>	Legislative changes.
--------------	----------------------

<b>Description</b>	<b>Cause:</b> Legislative change on current 100% checks of EU pet movements. <b>Event:</b> Reduced/no requirement to check EU pets entering UK. <b>Impact:</b> Loss of income, increased risk of introduction of rabies.
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Financial
<b>Risk Level</b>	Service

<b>Approach</b>	Accept
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP4
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Serious
<b>Risk Score</b>	6
<b>Review Date</b>	08-Jan-2016

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Possible
<b>Impact</b>	Serious
<b>Risk Score</b>	6
<b>Target Date</b>	30-Dec-2016

<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>Existing controls:</b> Providing consultation where sought.
--------------------	--

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note

<b>Code</b>	MCP-HA 014	<b>Title</b>	Failure of safety mechanism.
-------------	------------	--------------	------------------------------

<b>Description</b>	<b>Cause:</b> Handling of heavy consignments in the Large Animal Border Inspection Post, handling of large animals, failure of scissor lift safety mechanism. <b>Event:</b> Injury caused by failed safety mechanism on scissor lift, or kicking/trampling by horses and other large animals. <b>Impact:</b> Serious injury of staff, APHA staff or consignment attendant.
--------------------	--

<b>Category</b>	Health and Safety
<b>Risk Level</b>	Service

<b>Approach</b>	Accept
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Robert Quest

<b>Strategic Aim</b>	SA3
<b>Department</b>	Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

<b>Key Policy Priority</b>	KPP4
<b>Committee</b>	Port Health & Environmental Services Committee

<b>Current Risk Assessment, Score &amp; Trend Comparison</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Unlikely
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Review Date</b>	08-Jan-2016

<b>Target Risk Assessment &amp; Score</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Unlikely
<b>Impact</b>	Major
<b>Risk Score</b>	8
<b>Target Date</b>	30-Dec-2016

<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>Existing controls:</b> Hi-vis jackets are worn by staff and visitors when in the facility. Access restricted when not in use. Grooms in attendance are externally competency assessed. Scissor lift works to improve safety mechanism are now completed.
--------------------	---

**Actions related to this risk:**

Ref No:	Title	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date	Progress	Latest Note

# City of London Corporation Risk Matrix (Black and white version)

Note: A risk score is calculated by assessing the risk in terms of likelihood and impact. By using the likelihood and impact criteria below (top left (A) and bottom left (B) respectively) it is possible to calculate a risk score. For example a risk assessed as Unlikely (2) and with an impact of Serious (2) can be plotted on the risk scoring grid, top right (C) to give an overall risk score of a green (4). Using the risk score definitions bottom right (D) below, a green risk is one that just requires actions to maintain that rating.

## MCP Markets Committee Risk Report Appendix B

(A) Likelihood criteria

	Rare (1)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)
Criteria	Less than 10%	10 – 40%	40 – 75%	More than 75%
Probability	Has happened rarely/never before	Unlikely to occur	Fairly likely to occur	More likely to occur than not
Time period	Unlikely to occur in a 10 year period	Likely to occur within a 10 year period	Likely to occur once within a one year period	Likely to occur once within three months
Numerical	Less than one chance in a hundred thousand (<10-5)	Less than one chance in ten thousand (<10-4)	Less than one chance in a thousand (<10-3)	Less than one chance in a hundred (<10-2)

(B) Impact criteria

Impact title	Impact title	Definitions
Minor (1)	Minor (1)	<p><b>Service delivery/performance:</b> Minor impact on service, typically up to one day. <b>Financial:</b> Financial loss up to 5% of budget. <b>Reputation:</b> Adverse national media coverage between £500 and £50,000. <b>Legal/statutory:</b> Litigation claim or fine contained within business unit/division. <b>Safety/health:</b> Minor incident including injury to one or more individuals. <b>Objectives:</b> Failure to achieve team plan objectives.</p>
Serious (2)	Serious (2)	<p><b>Service delivery/performance:</b> Service disruption 2 to 5 days. <b>Financial:</b> Financial loss up to 10% of budget. <b>Reputation:</b> Adverse national media coverage between £500 and £50,000. <b>Legal/statutory:</b> Litigation claim or fine between £500 and £50,000. <b>Safety/health:</b> Significant injury or illness/disease causing short-term disability to one or more people. <b>Objectives:</b> Failure to achieve one or more service plan objectives.</p>
Major (4)	Major (4)	<p><b>Service delivery/performance:</b> Service disruption &gt; 1 - 4 weeks. <b>Financial:</b> Financial loss up to 20% of budget. <b>Reputation:</b> Adverse national media coverage &gt; £50,000. <b>Legal/statutory:</b> Major litigation claimable fine between £50,000 and £500,000. <b>Safety/health:</b> Major injury or illness/disease causing long-term disability to one or more people. <b>Objectives:</b> Failure to achieve a strategic plan objective.</p>
Extreme (8)	Extreme (8)	<p><b>Service delivery/performance:</b> Service disruption &gt; 4 weeks. <b>Financial:</b> Financial loss up to 35% of budget. <b>Reputation:</b> National and international media coverage &gt; £500,000. <b>Legal/statutory:</b> Multiple civil or criminal suits. <b>Safety/health:</b> Fatality or life threatening illness/disease (e.g. mesothelioma) to one or more persons. <b>Objectives:</b> Failure to achieve a major corporate objective.</p>

(C) Risk scoring grid

Likelihood	X	Impact			
		Minor (1)	Serious (2)	Major (4)	Extreme (8)
Likely (4)	4 Green	8 Amber	16 Red	32 Red	
Possible (3)	3 Green	6 Amber	12 Amber	24 Red	
Unlikely (2)	2 Green	4 Green	8 Amber	16 Red	
Rare (1)	1 Green	2 Green	4 Green	8 Amber	

(D) Risk score definitions

<b>RED</b>	Urgent action required to reduce rating
<b>AMBER</b>	Action required to maintain or reduce rating
<b>GREEN</b>	Action required to maintain rating

This is an extract from the City of London Corporate Risk Management Strategy, published in May 2014. Contact the Corporate Risk Advisor for further information. Ext 1297 Version date: December 2015