

POL 0015: Risk Management

Purpose

The Shire of Esperance's Risk Management Policy documents the commitment and objectives regarding managing uncertainty that may impact the Shire's strategies, goals or objectives. The purpose of risk management is to reduce the potential effects of risk by reducing liability, preventing litigation and improving loss control.

Scope

This policy covers all operations of the organisation including but not limited to all workers, contractors, visitors and volunteers. The key drivers for risk management are Managements responsibility.

Definitions

CEO: Chief Executive Officer

Councillor: a member of an elected group of local government representatives

Risk: a situation involving exposure to danger

Risk Appetite: the amount and type of risk that an organisation is willing to accept whilst pursuing its objectives.

SOE: Shire of Esperance

WHS: Work Health and Safety

Practice

It is the Shire's Policy to achieve best practice in the management of all risks that may affect the SOE, its customers, people, assets, functions, objectives, operations or members of the public.

Risk Management will form part of the Strategic, Operational, Project and Line Management responsibilities and where possible, be incorporated within the Shire's Integrated Planning Framework.

Council shall determine the Risk Management policy for the SOE. The Shire's Executive Management Team will communicate the *Risk Management Policy* and Objectives and determine Procedures for the implementation of Risk Management, as well as direct and monitor practice and performance.

Every Councillor, worker, volunteer and contractor within the SOE is recognised as having a role in risk management, from the identification of risks, to implementing risk treatments and shall be invited and encouraged to participate in the process.

Consultants may be retained at times to advise and assist in the risk management process or management of specific risks or categories of risk.

Risk Management Objectives

1. Optimise the achievement of our vision, mission, strategies, goals and objectives.
2. Provide transparent and formal oversight of the risk and control environment to enable effective decision making.
3. Enhance risk versus return within our risk appetite.
4. Embed appropriate and effective controls to mitigate risk.
5. Achieve effective corporate governance and adherence to relevant statutory, regulatory and compliance obligations.
6. Enhance organisational resilience.
7. Identify and provide for the continuity of critical operations.

Risk Appetite

The Shire has defined its risk appetite through the development and endorsement of the Shire's *Risk Assessment Criteria*. The criteria is subjected to ongoing review in conjunction with this policy.

All organisational risks to be reported at a corporate level are to be assessed according to the Shire's *Risk Assessment Criteria* to allow consistency and informed decision making. For operational requirements such as projects or to satisfy external stakeholder requirements, alternative risk assessment criteria may be utilised, however these cannot exceed the organisations appetite and are to be noted within the individual risk assessment.

Roles, Responsibilities & Accountabilities

The CEO is responsible for the allocation of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities. These are documented in the Risk Management Procedures Operational Document.

Monitor and Review

The Shire will implement and integrate a monitor and review process to report on the achievement of the Risk Management Objectives, the management of individual risks and the ongoing identification of issues and trends.

This policy will be kept under review by Council and will be reviewed biennially.

Appendix A – Risk Assessment Criteria

Applied Risk Matrix			Consequence				
			Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Moderate 3	Major 4	Catastrophic 5
Likelihood	Almost Certain	5	(5) Moderate	(10) High	(15) High	(20) Extreme	(25) Extreme
	Likely	4	(4) Low	(8) Moderate	(12) High	(16) High	(20) Extreme
	Possible	3	(3) Low	(6) Moderate	(9) Moderate	(12) High	(15) High
	Unlikely	2	(2) Low	(4) Low	(6) Moderate	(8) Moderate	(10) High
	Rare	1	(1) Low	(2) Low	(3) Low	(4) Low	(5) Moderate

Measures of Likelihood			
Level	Rating	Description	Frequency
5	Almost Certain	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances (>90% chance)	More than once per year
4	Likely	The event will probably occur in most circumstances (>50% chance)	At least once per year
3	Possible	The event should occur at some time (20% chance)	At least once in 3 years
2	Unlikely	The event could occur at some time (<10% chance)	At least once in 10 years
1	Rare	The event may only occur in exceptional circumstances (<5% chance)	Less than once in 15 years

Rating (Level)	Health	Financial Impact	Service Interruption	Compliance	Reputational	Property	Environmental
Insignificant (1)	Near miss. Minor first aid injuries	Less than \$20,000	No material service interruption	No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact	Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item	Inconsequential damage.	Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response
Minor (2)	Medical type injuries	\$20,001 - \$500,000	Short term temporary interruption – backlog cleared < 1 day	Some temporary non-compliances	Substantiated, low impact, low news item	Localised damage rectified by routine internal procedures	Contained, reversible impact managed by internal response
Moderate (3)	Lost time injury <30 days	\$500,001 - \$1.5 Million	Medium term temporary interruption – backlog cleared by additional resources	Short term non-compliance but with significant regulatory requirements imposed	Substantiated, public embarrassment, moderate impact, moderate news profile	Localised damage requiring external resources to rectify	Contained, reversible impact managed by external agencies
Major (4)	Lost time injury >30 days	\$1.5 Mil - \$3 Million	< 1 week	Non-compliance results in termination of services or imposed penalties	Substantiated, public embarrassment, high impact, high news profile, third party actions	Significant damage requiring internal and external resources to rectify	Uncontained, reversible impact managed by a coordinated response from external agencies
Catastrophic (5)	Fatality, permanent disability	More than \$3 Million	Prolonged interruption of services – additional resources; performance affected	Non-compliance results in litigation, criminal charges or significant damages or penalties	Substantiated, public embarrassment, very high multiple impacts, high widespread multiple news profile, third party actions	Extensive damage requiring prolonged period of restitution Complete loss of plant, equipment and building	Uncontained, irreversible impact

Existing Controls Rating		
Rating	Foreseeable	Description
Effective	There is <u>little</u> scope for improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Process (controls) operating as intended and aligned to policies / procedures 2. Subject to ongoing monitoring 3. Reviewed and tested regularly
Adequate	There is <u>some</u> scope for improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Processes (controls) generally operating as intended, however inadequacies exist 2. Nil or limited monitoring 3. Reviewed and tested, but not regularly
Inadequate	There is a <u>need</u> for improvement or action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Processes (controls) not operating as intended 2. Processes (controls) do not exist, or are not being complied with 3. Have not been reviewed or tested for some time

Risk Acceptance Criteria			
Risk Rating	Description	Criteria	Responsibility
Low	Acceptable	Risk acceptable with adequate controls, managed by routine procedures and subject to annual monitoring	Supervisor / Team Leader
Moderate	Monitor	Risk acceptance with adequate controls, managed by specific procedures and subject to semi-annual monitoring	Service Manager
High	Urgent Attention Required	Risk acceptable with excellent controls, managed by senior management / executive and subject to monthly monitoring	Executive Management Group
Extreme	Unacceptable	Risk only acceptable with excellent controls and all treatment plans to be explored and implemented where possible, managed by highest level of authority and subject to continuous monitoring	CEO and Council

Risk Treatment & Review Timeframes				
Risk Rating	Description	Risk Treatment	Responsibility	Risk Review
Low (1-4)	Acceptable	Treated within 6 months	Supervisor / Team Leader	Review every 6 months
Moderate (5-9)	Monitor	Treated within 3 months	Service Manager	Review every 3 months
High (10-16)	Urgent Attention Required	Treated within 2 weeks	Executive Management Group	Review within 2 weeks then monthly
Extreme (20-25)	Unacceptable	Treated within 1 week	CEO and Council	Review every 2 weeks

.....End.....

Document Information

Responsible Position	Manager Human Resources
Risk Rating	Medium

Referencing Documents

- *Local Government Act 1995*
- *Risk Management Framework*
- *Risk Assessment Criteria*

Revision History

Date	Version	CM Reference	Reason for Change	Resolution #	Next Review
Feb 2013		D13/4305[v1]	Draft policy		
Apr 2013	1		New policy	O0413-017	Apr 2015
Jun 2013		D13/4305[v2]	Draft policy		
Nov 2014	2	D14/23268		O1114-022	Nov 2016
Mar 2018	3	D16/29010	Biennial review, update document controller	O0318-073	Mar 2020
Nov 2019	4	D16/29010[v2]	Biennial review, no change	O1119-248	Nov 2021
Oct 2020	5	D16/29010[v3]	Update ISO standard reference	O1020-317	Oct 2022
Jan 2022	6	D16/29010[v4]	Biennial review, no change	O0122-012	Jan 2024
Nov 2023	7	D16/29010[v5]	Biennial review, no change.	O1123-189	Nov 2025
Aug 2024	8	D16/29010[v6]	Update purpose, scope, definitions, SOE references. Replace employee references with worker in line with new legislation. Remove reference to ISO. Update Risk Assessment Criteria tables. Update referencing documents.	O0824-028	Aug 2026