

Risk Ranking Table

Brentwood Council has introduced a best practice five stage approach to Risk Management.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Likelihood | (5) Definite/very high | Low (5) | Medium (10) | High (15) | Very High (20) | Very High (25) |
| | (4) Very likely | Low (4) | Medium (8) | High (12) | Very High (16) | Very High (20) |
| | (3) Likely | Low (3) | Medium (6) | Medium (9) | High (12) | Very High (15) |
| | (2) Unlikely | Low (2) | Low (4) | Medium (6) | Medium (8) | High (10) |
| | (1) Highly unlikely | Low (1) | Low (2) | Low (3) | Medium (4) | Medium (5) |
| | | Negligible (1) | Minor (2) | Moderate (3) | Significant (4) | Major (5) |
| | | Impact | | | | |

Likelihood x Impact = Risk Score

| Level of Risk | Level of Concern | Recommended review pattern |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Very High 15-25 | Very concerned | 1-2 months |
| High Risk 10-15 | Concerned | 2-3 months |
| Medium Risk 4-10 | Quite Concerned Risk can be tolerated at this time | 3-4 months |
| Low Risk 1-5 | Not concerned Risk accepted at this time | 4-6 months |

| Score | Likelihood | Description |
|-------|------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Highly Unlikely/ rarely happens | 5% likely to happen or hasn't happened within the last 5 years |
| 2 | Unlikely/moderate | 20% likely to happen or has happened once or twice in the last 5 years |
| 3 | Likely/possible | 50% likely to happen or has happened once or twice in the last 24 months |
| 4 | Very likely/high | 75% likely to happen or has happened at least once or twice in the last 12 months |
| 5 | Definite/very high | 99% likely to happen or has happened on a regular basis over the last 12 months |

| Score | Impact | Effect on Service | Financial & Resources | Reputation | Legal | People | Effect on project objectives |
|-------|-------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Negligible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small impact on customer service which may result in complaints • Nuisance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small financial loss; less than £10K • Negligible property damage | No adverse effect on perception | No legal implication | No injury | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal impact to project • Minor slippage |
| 2 | Minor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small setback • Disruptive impact on service • Localised disgruntlement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticeable financial loss; £10-£100K • Slight damage to one property | Minimal effect to perception (e.g. minor criticism of the Council) | Breach of statutory process, duty or law resulting in possibility of legal action | Minor Injury | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effect to project. • Slippage requires review finances / short term programme |
| 3 | Moderate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widespread disgruntlement • Disrupted service delivery from one service area for up to 3 days • Can handle but with difficulty | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate financial loss £100-300K • Inability to deliver popular policies due to budgetary constrictions • Substantial damage to one part of a building | Negative effect on perception, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticism of the council • Local bad press | Breach of major statutory duty or law resulting in probably legal action | RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases & Dangerous Occurrences Regulations (1995) Reportable major injury to an individual | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important impact on project or most of expected benefits. • Considerable slippage • Possible impact on overall finances / programme |
| 4 | Significant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention in a key service • Disruption to service delivery for one or more service areas for 3-5 days • Failure of an operational partnership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sizeable financial loss up to 50% of budget or between £300K-1M • Extensive damage to a critical building or considerable damage to several properties from one source | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticism of key process • Large scandal • High level of complaints at corporate level across several service areas • Adverse national media coverage | Breach of law resulting in legal action against the Council which would be difficult to defend | Reportable major injuries to several people or death of an individual | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme delay |

| Score | Impact | Effect of Service | Financial & Resources | Reputation | Legal | People | Effect on project objectives |
|--------------|---------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| 5 | Major | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete breakdown in service delivery with severe, prolonged impact on customer service affecting the whole organisation • Failure of a strategic partnership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A substantial failure in accountability or integrity • A large financial loss over 50% of budget or greater than £1M • Total loss of a critical building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vote of no confidence in one service area • Officer(s) &/or Members forced to resign &/or Audit Commission enquiry • Substantial adverse & persistent national media coverage | Breach of law resulting in legal action against the Council which would be very difficult / impossible to defend | Death of several people | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete failure of project |