

Annex 5- Risk Assessment Matrix

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Degradation of Marine Protected Areas due to fishing activity	4	2	3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake HRA and MCZ assessments to assess whether different fishing activities are appropriate for the MPAs and not having a significant impact • Undertake an adaptive co-management approach to fishing • Effective enforcement • Work closely with Management groups for MPAs • Introduction of proactive public education and outreach programme • Ensure that the Annual Research Programme includes survey work that continues to gather evidence to inform management • Undertake audit of environmental features likely to be affected by fishing activity • Use of new technology to monitor fishing activity within the district. 	2
	Loss of important habitat and species	Environmental welfare a statutory material consideration in IFCA management decision making process	<p>Fisheries responsible closed.</p> <p>Increased pressure from conservation groups to stop fishing activities</p> <p>Possible Judicial Review & possible breach of UK statutory duties & possible EU Infraction with financial liability for local taxpayers</p>	IFCA not meeting statutory duties under EU & UK conservation legislation.		Certain fishing activities can damage protected habitat and species.

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
	4	2	3	4		2
Enforcement activities conducted in an unprofessional and uncoordinated manner.	<p>Inconsistent approach to fisheries enforcement.</p> <p>Enforcement problems and non-compliance with legislation.</p> <p>Poor morale amongst IFCA staff.</p>	<p>Misinformation may be given by officers or information may be misinterpreted by fishermen.</p>	<p>Wrong interpretation of legislation may lead to loss of earnings of fishermen.</p> <p>Possible financial liability incurred for local taxpayers</p> <p>Uncoordinated enforcement may lead to over regulation by enforcement bodies.</p> <p>Failure of court cases with a loss of 'cost recovery'</p> <p>Failure to receive court determined costs from those accused of illegal fishing</p>	<p>Failure to carry enforcement efficiently and effectively reflects poorly on the IFCA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular staff meetings • Regular staff training • Staff appraisals • All IFCOs receive regular PACE training through a nationally accredited scheme. • Enforcement patrols are intel led, risk- based and targeted • Planning of enforcement patrols and debriefing after takes place • Code of Conduct for inspections at sea and ashore developed • Standard boarding forms developed • Standard legislation notes provided to all IFCOs • Legislation notes regularly updated • IFCOs trained alongside MMO boarding officers • IFCA and MMO officers work in partnership • Adequate budget identified for training of IFCOs • Compliance & Enforcement Strategy published on website • Joint working with other enforcement agencies • All seconded or contracted officers receive regular training 	<p>Considerable resources are directed towards officer training but frequent changes to legislation and human error can lead to mistakes being made.</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Failure to maintain a Research programme.	4	2	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work plans developed for research staff • Research staff well qualified and have experience and knowledge of local fisheries • Research staff are involved in IFCA TAG and share survey programmes, expertise and results of research work • Good communication with relevant organisations and local fisheries • Contingency plans developed to ensure research is completed within timescales • Work in partnership with relevant research groups and universities • Engage with undergraduate, MSc and PhD students and promote research programmes for them to complete to aid IFCA work • Partnership working with fishing industry and environmental partners • Use consultants or contractors with additional expertise when necessary. • Use of outside agencies to undertake specialist work areas. 	2
	<p>Lack of accurate data leading to poor management of fisheries.</p> <p>Collapse of stocks.</p> <p>Decline in bio-diversity</p> <p>Loss of public amenity</p> <p>Degradation of the wider environment.</p> <p>Failure to assess impacts of fishing</p>	<p>Well trained and qualified staff.</p> <p>Annual Research programme</p>	<p>Closure of a fishery due to over exploitation of stock.</p> <p>Fisheries not opened due to insufficient information available to gain consent through MPA Assessments.</p> <p>Potential breach of UK statutory duty and EU infringement</p> <p>Possible Judicial Review with financial liability incurred by local taxpayers</p>	<p>High expectation that fisheries and environment are well managed by IFCA</p>		<p>Planned surveys lost due to poor weather or lack of survey vessel.</p> <p>Change of approach for MPA assessments.</p> <p>New fisheries emerge which divert survey resources</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Failure to fully engage with stakeholders	4	3	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular contact with nature conservation bodies • Establish effective dialogue with relevant stakeholders • Introduction of proactive public education and outreach programme • Regular and effective contact and communication with fishing industry, both commercial and recreational. • Dissemination of all survey results and management proposals to relevant and affected stakeholders • Respond to all relevant consultations • Improved website design • Regular/structured liaison with other enforcement agencies • Develop communication strategy • Publish quarterly reports on IFCA website • Develop a database of stakeholders and regularly update 	3
	<p>Conflict between different stakeholders.</p> <p>Non-compliance with fisheries and environmental legislation.</p>	Difficult to identify and consult with relevant stakeholders	<p>Stakeholder requirements are not considered in management of the IFCA district fisheries.</p> <p>Possible breach of UK statutory duties & administrative law.</p> <p>Possible EU infringement.</p> <p>Possible financial liability for local taxpayers</p>	<p>Lack of trust in the IFCA's management processes.</p> <p>Misunderstanding of the IFCAs role</p>		<p>Further improvement to contact with NGOs and other stakeholders needs to be targeted.</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Injury to staff due to unsafe working practices	4	2	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety training register maintained • Adequate budget to cover all training requirements • Well trained staff • Standard operating procedures are maintained and reviewed regularly • Risk assessments available and regularly reviewed • High quality PPE issued to all staff • Scheduled safety drills conducted on vessel • Lone Working Policy adhered to. • Conflict Resolution Policy developed • Boarding Policy developed • Indemnity insurance obtained & maintained 	3
	Death or injury to staff	Well trained staff Provision of high quality safety equipment Well maintained IFCA assets	Injury claims, tribunals HSE/MCA investigations Possible criminal & civil proceedings with potential financial liability to local taxpayers	Poor morale of staff leading to problems with recruitment & retention Increased surveillance by regulatory authorities of IFCA's procedures and practices, with attendant costs		Regularly working in hazardous environments Difficult to mitigate for accidents Difficult to mitigate for the actions of third parties

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Failure to maintain effective financial management and control	4	2	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCC audit of accounts • Finance sub-committee in place to review budgetary spend • Policy developed with regard to the Bribery Act 2010. • Restricted use of company credit card • D&SIFCA Financial Regulations • Restricted authority to sign cheques • Annual Plan • Production of detailed accounts • Maintenance of contingency funds • Indemnity insurance obtained for marine peril • Budget monitoring report presented at IFCA ¼ meetings • Asset register kept up to date and audited. 	1
	<p>Fraudulent activity leading to misuse and/or misappropriation of funds</p> <p>Unforeseen expenditure, major mechanical failure or total loss of patrol vessel</p>	<p>Limited staff access to financial information and authority to spend money</p> <p>Vessel contingency funds maintained</p>	<p>Lack of financial resources to carry out statutory obligations</p>	<p>IFCA funded through local taxpayer money, expectation to provide best value for money service</p>		<p>Very limited potential for large scale fraud or corruption</p> <p>Small scale misuse of consumable items is still possible</p> <p>Patrol vessel operating in hazardous conditions</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
	3	3	3	3		3
<p>Fisheries in the district impacted by the activities of developers /industry</p> <p>Insufficient time to fully consider environmental impact assessments for offshore developments</p>	<p>Fisheries closed due to contamination.</p> <p>Significant fish / shellfish mortality</p> <p>Temporary or permanent loss of, or damage to, fish stocks, fishery habitats or fishing grounds</p> <p>Loss of public amenity</p> <p>Risk to public health</p>	<p>Lack of fishing activity data.</p> <p>Lack of baseline data</p> <p>Limited understanding of impacts of developments on the marine environment</p>	<p>Reduced catches and income from the fishery</p> <p>Displaced fishing activity</p> <p>Potential Judicial Review</p> <p>Breach of UK statutory duty and EU infringement</p> <p>Potential financial liability for local taxpayers</p>	<p>High expectation that the IFCA will represent the fishing and environmental interests, even when an activity may be occurring outside of the district</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations responded to • Liaison with consenting agencies • Developer meetings attended by IFCA representatives • Database created holding information on current historical fishing activities within the district • Development scrutinised by DEFRA, NE & English Heritage • Consents required for developments • Development of baseline data sets 	<p>Increased wind farm development, dredging and number of MPAs</p> <p>High reliance on modelling to determine impacts of developments</p> <p>Lack of baseline data</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Failure of vessel and vehicle assets	3	2	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly maintained Patrol and Survey vessels Six highly maintained vehicles Extensive annual refits Establish preventative maintenance programme Maintenance schedule for all vessels adhered to Annual Workboat Code survey Service contracts with main equipment suppliers Annual survey on all vessels All equipment serviced in line with manufacturers recommendations 	2
	<p>Limits enforcement and research capabilities</p> <p>Limited ability to undertake coastal visits</p>	<p>Patrol vessel is well maintained</p> <p>All vehicles are well maintained</p>	<p>Hiring of a replacement vessel / vehicle</p> <p>Significant mechanical failures are expensive and time consuming</p>	<p>Significant local taxpayer money invested in the service with a high expectation that the vessel provides value for money</p>		<p>Unforeseen events may lead to disruption of activities</p>

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Failure to comply with Data Protection (GDPR), Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environment Information Regulations 2004	4	3	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of an Information Management System • Rebuilding of shared server files • Secure access to information • Preparation of information in a catalogue • Preparation of retention schedules • Introduction of new GDPR Policy (and multiple standards) • Appointment of Data Protection Officer • Out sourcing for expert advice • Monitoring of staff adherence to implemented systems and Policy • Introduction of publications scheme • Review of Communications Strategy • 	1-2
	Investigation by ICO leading to possible penalty	Highly likely unless mitigated	<p>Possible breach of UK legislation.</p> <p>Possible EU infringement.</p> <p>Possible financial liability</p>	<p>Lack of trust in the IFCA's management processes.</p> <p>Severe damage to reputation of the Authority</p>		<p>The risk is reduced, but their emphasis is on staff to adapt to changes in the work place which may take some time</p>

		Impact			
		Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)	Very High (4)
Likelihood	Very High (4)				
	High (3)			1	1
	Medium (2)			1	5
	Low (1)				

- 1 - 2 Acceptable
- 3 - 6 Additional effort should be considered
- 8 -12 Additional effort must be implemented