



Task Risk Assessment

Instructions: Complete the risk assessment according to the guide *Risk management for emergencies*.

1. Task					
2. Context (including area/site)					
3. Risk factors/causes					
4. Acceptable level of protection (ALOP)					
5. Specific risk					
6. Area(s) of impact					
7. Inherent risk	Likelihood (A-E)		Consequence (1-5)		Inherent risk (VH, H, M, L)
8. Risk controls	1.				
9. Residual risk	Likelihood (A-E)		Consequence (1-5)		Residual risk (VH, H, M, L)
10. Conclusions					
11. Recommendations					

Name/s and role/s			Date	
Prepared by			Date completed	
Approved by			Date approved	

Task Risk Assessment

Table 1 - Consequences

	1: Insignificant	2: Minor	3: Moderate	4: Major	5: Extreme
High level Consequence description	Risk has negligible consequences and can be managed within existing resources and Budget.	Risk has minor short- term impact on the achievement of objectives and can be resolved within existing resources and budget.	Risk may affect the achievement of some objectives and can be resolved through the reassignment of resources.	Major impact that would disrupt business activities and may threaten our ability to achieve organisational objectives.	Significant threat to our functions and ability to fulfil our purpose and organisational objectives.
Programs and delivery	Minor disruptions to programs or services but no material impact.	Disruptions materially affecting part of a program without significantly affecting delivery of the overall program or service or benefits realisation.	Significant disruptions affecting services or delivery of one or more programs or benefits realisation.	Substantial negative impacts on services, delivery of a program or benefits realisation from a program across a division or cluster entity.	Extended disruptions to key services or programs affecting delivery across one or more divisions or cluster entity.
People	Minor injury, first aid treatment, minimal or no lost work time. Lost development opportunity for our people.	Moderate injury, medical treatment. Reduction in employee engagement.	Serious injury resulting in hospitalisation. Obvious increase in turnover of staff.	Potential for multiple serious injuries. Dangerous occurrence requiring notification to SafeWork NSW. Loss of key personnel, reduction in ability to attract and retain employees.	Extreme event involving fatality and/or more than 5 serious injuries. Potential prosecution.
Financial	Negligible increased costs by, whichever is lowest, <\$500K or <2% of full year total expenses budget Revenue leakage <3% of total revenue budget Capital under or over- spend <3% of total.	Minor increased costs by whichever is lowest \$500K to <\$1m or 2% to <5% of full year total expenses budget, with minor impacts Revenue leakage 3% to <10% of total revenue budget Capital under or over- spend 3% to <10% of total.	Moderate increased costs by, whichever is lowest, > \$1m to <\$5m at Division level or >5% to 8% of full year total expenses budget, with significant impacts Revenue leakage >10% to <15% of total revenue budget.	Major increased costs by, whichever is lowest, \$5m to <\$20m at Division level, or 8% to <12% of full year total expenses budget, with major Department wide impact. Revenue leakage 15% to <20% of total revenue budget. Capital under or overspend > 15% to <20% of total.	Severe increased costs by, whichever is lowest, > \$20m or 12%+ of full year total expenses budget, with severe Department wide impact. Revenue leakage 20%+ of total revenue budget. Capital under or over- spend 20%+ of total.
Reputation	Negative article(s) in local media. Confidence remains with possibly minor loss of goodwill or trust that is recoverable with little effort or cost.	Minor adverse publicity that may create some short-term, temporary concern amongst stakeholders. Some negative impact that is quickly recoverable at modest cost within existing budget and resources.	Short-term negative state/national media coverage. Confidence and trust are diminished but are recoverable with time, staff effort and additional funding.	Extended significant negative state/national media coverage leading to serious loss of credibility with clients, Minister's office, key stakeholders. Potential for lasting damage to reputation but recoverable at considerable cost, time, and staff effort.	Extended lead and/or major story in media. Critical long-term loss of credibility with clients, Minister's office and key stakeholders' Major inquiry, prosecution of the agency, ICAC hearing, or serious adverse and published.
Environment and Community	Change from normal conditions within environmental regulatory limits. No material community impact.	Short-term low level and/or easily-contained impacts on the environment or community.	Unacceptable impacts on the environment and/or community which can be contained with considerable staff effort and/or resources.	Substantial and/or long-term impacts on the environmental and/or community. Extensive effort and resources required to rectify.	Large-scale, significant, long term impacts on the environment or community which cannot be adequately remediated with available resources.
Animal health & welfare	Isolated impact on animals and/or plants on a single enterprise.	Limited animal illness/injuries &/or deaths on single enterprise. Limited plant damage/loss on single enterprise.	Some animal illness/injuries/deaths on multiple properties across a region. Animal welfare impacts across a region. Some plant damage/loss on multiple properties across a region.	Considerable animal illness/injuries/deaths on multiple properties across a region. Animal welfare impacted across multiple regions. Considerable plant damage/loss on multiple properties across a region.	Significant animal illness/injuries/deaths in multiple regions. Widespread animal welfare issues. Considerable plant damage/loss across multiple regions.
Plant health					

Table 2 – Likelihood

Table 3 – Risk Matrix

Task Risk Assessment

Likelihood	Description
A: Almost Certain	Occurs often – will generally occur at least once a year and potentially much more often
B: Likely	Likely to occur – more than 50% chance of occurrence in any 12-month period
C: Possible	Could occur; unlikely to occur in any 12-month period but >50% chance within 5 years
D: Unlikely	Will only occur in unusual circumstances but >50% chance within 20 years
E: Rare	Only occurs in highly exceptional circumstances – <50% chance in any 20-year period

	1: Insignificant	2: Minor	3 Moderate	4. Major	5: Extreme
A: Almost Certain	Medium	High	High	Very High	Very High
B: Likely	Low	Medium	High	High	Very High
C: Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
D: Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
E: Rare	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium

Table 4 – Risk Escalation & Monitoring Criteria

Level of Risk	Escalate to + oversight by (non-response)	Response approval	Escalate indicative timeframe *	Basic Tolerance	Suggested Response	Monitoring frequency**
Very High	Deputy Secretary or Director General	Deputy Director General Biosecurity & Food Safety	As soon as practical	Generally intolerable	Where a very high risk is identified, actions to reduce and manage the risk should be immediately implemented and approved. This may include stopping the task / activity in the short term.	Monthly
High	Executive Director or Deputy Director General	Hazard Owner	Within one week	Undesirable	Where a high risk is identified, actions to further manage the risk should be developed. While there may be times where such risks are tolerable, and no further treatment needed.	Quarterly
Medium	Director	Incident Controller (Local or State)	Within 1 month	Tolerable	Medium risks are tolerable if it is not commercially practical to reduce them further. Additional treatment measures should be sought if significant benefit can be demonstrated.	Six-Monthly
Low	Manager	Incident Controller, Function Officers, Operations Managers or Officers-in-Charge (OIC's)	Within 3 months	Broadly acceptable	Low risks are generally acceptable and should be managed and monitored through routine management activities. No formal treatment plans or response are usually necessary.	Annually

Have you notified the relevant people of the risk? This will depend on the nature and severity of the risk. Escalation points and timeframes are guided by the above table, but other people may need to be notified. For example, Communications and Engagement should be notified of potential high or extreme reputational issues, the Finance team of potential financial issues, and the Legal team of potential legal issues.

* Risk escalation for changes in rating or new risks - discussions should occur as soon as practical with your immediate manager. ** Timeframes are maximum and can be reduced at discretion of Group Heads.

Table 5 – Control Effectiveness

Task Risk Assessment

Ineffective	Partially effective	Substantially effective	Fully effective
<p>Significant gaps in current controls. Design of the controls address post risk event in some circumstances. Testing of our controls is not established or is not providing any degree of confidence. There is a single key control that is not proven and /or monitored.</p>	<p>While the design of our controls responds to a risk event, the controls do not prevent the risk from occurring in all cases. And / or Controls are not completely implemented across all relevant work areas.</p>	<p>Most of our controls are designed correctly and are in place and effective. Some more work to be done to improve operating effectiveness or there are doubts about operating effectiveness and reliability of some of our controls.</p>	<p>Testing activities are providing confidence that our controls are effective. Controls are well designed for the risk, address the causes and management believes that they are effective and reliable at all times. Management monitoring and review of controls is established.</p>