

RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

Organisation / department / function / project; Safety at Sports Ground Service

Risk Score	Rating
15-25	High
8-14	Medium
1-7	Low



Business Objective: Provision of efficient service meeting the requirements of the Safety at Sports Grounds Act 1975 & Fire and Safety at Places of Sport Act 1987

Completed by:

Date completed:

Date reviewed:

No	Risk Description (Threat/Opportunity to achievement of business objective)	Assessment of Risk 26-02-2013			Risk Control Measures	Assessment of Current Risk [With control measures implemented]				Timescale/ Review Frequency
		Likelihood (Probability) [L]	Impact (Severity) [I]	Risk Score [L x I]		Likelihood (Probability) [L]	Impact (Severity) [I]	Current Risk Score	Risk Level	
1	Risk that processes are unclear and inconsistent leading to errors and certificates being issued inappropriately.	4	5	20	Policy document approved by Regulatory Committee 07.10.09. new policy & strategy drafted for submission to Regulatory Committee March 2013. Agreed processes in place that meet SGSA guidance.	2	3	6	Threat: Low Trend: Down	Monthly
2	Risk that staff lack sufficient competency and experience to carry out efficient service.	5	5	25	Team have attended SGSA training course. Clear responsibility lines agreed within EPU.SGSA audit scores us well in this region. Team are constantly accruing experience and knowledge in this area.	2	3	6	Threat: Low Trend: Stable	Monthly
3	Risk that information provided by venues is incorrect or incomplete leading to certificates being issued inappropriately.	4	4	16	SAGs are in place for all grounds, however, remaining potential for operators to provide incomplete information	3	3	9	Threat: Medium Trend: Up	Monthly
4	Risk that the media misunderstand HCC's role and criticise the CC for issues that are not HCC's responsibility in the event of an incident, damaging HCC's reputation.	5	3	15	Clear documentation in place. EPU clear about limit of responsibility, which is clearly documented & is to be published.	3	3	9	Threat: Medium Trend: Up	Monthly
5	Risk that the income received is insufficient to meet the costs of providing the service leading to budget pressure to EPU.	4	3	12	Fee levels agreed. It is clear that the time to implement the legislation may not be met by charging regimes; new stands/grounds may exacerbate this situation.	3	2	6	Threat: Low Trend: Down	Monthly
6	Risk that other organisations that HCC is reliant on do not sufficiently prioritise sufficient resources at the right level and do not provide sufficiently robust challenge to sports ground's self assessments.	4	4	16	Experience is showing that statutory consultees/SAG members are taking their responsibilities seriously and fully engaged with all processes	3	3	9	Threat: Medium Trend: Up	Monthly