Western Rock Lobster

World leading sustainable fishery

Western Rock Lobster Industry

Risk Register

Updated November 2019

Western Rock Lobster Industry Risk Register - Summary

Following identification of the Industry risks each has been analysed using the Risk Reference Tables. Further investigation into the consequences allows the WRL to recognise the degree of risk and apply key control management strategies and tactics and develop the **Risk Register.**

Risk register reporting allows management to monitor and review risks in alignment with the strategic plan. There will be an annual review of the Risk Register, with a summary presented as the **Risk Dashboard** (below) to be updated and reviewed bi-annually (March and September) by the WRL Board.

RISK DASHBOARD as at November 2019

#	Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Level of Risk	Highest Consequence	Key Controls	Bi-annual change
1. →	**Poor understanding and relationship with State and Federal Government.**	4	4	16	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	A	Submission for private property rights inquiry. Develop package of initiatives. Broaden and strengthen government relationships.
2. →	**Single market as the sole outlet for Western Rock Lobster.**	4	4	16	Industry performance. Access to resources.	A	Functional TACC Industry committee. R&D program to understand markets, trade data and analysis. Develop maximum economic yield model.
3. →	**Animal welfare.**	3	4	12	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	A	Develop an animal welfare plan around crisis management. Education with members and the community.
4. ↑	**Lack of understanding of what affects western rock lobster recruitment and biomass.**	3	4	12	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	A	Continued planning for proposed collaborative lobster research institute. WRL involved in the co-development of the Harvest Strategy. Increased investment in R&D.
5. ↑	**Biosecurity** **Paralytic Shell Toxin (PST)**	3	4	12	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	A	Need to review and integrate with DPIRD's biosecurity response plan.
6. ↓	**Reduced confidence in the WRL.**	3	3	9	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	A	Reduced membership conflict causing division within the industry. Stronger engagement with members through communications and tours. A clear vision for industry development. WRL industry investment that benefits members.
7. →	**Capital costs for Quota and Pot leases escalate and drive a number of fishers from the industry.**	3	3	9	Stewardship of resource.	A	Proposed a unit registry to understand ownership demographics. Proposed a real time trading platform and trade dashboard.

8. →	**A significant OH&S event occurs.**	**3**	**3**	**9**	OH&S incidents. Industry performance.	**A**	Collaborated across other fishing sectors to develop a high standard of marine OH&S. Continued development of SeSAFE for western rock lobster industry.
9. →	**Loss of the right to fish due to community pressures.**	**3**	**3**	**9**	Stewardship of resource. Access to resources.	**A**	Local Lobster Program. MSC certification. Continued to improve stakeholder communications and industry promotion. Industry confidence in WRL >80%.
10. ↓	**Breakdown in the Chain of Custody.**	**2**	**3**	**6**	Stewardship of resource. Industry performance.	**A**	MSC recertification secured. Strong relationships with State and Commonwealth governments regarding trade representation.

NOTE: **Arrows:** show change in level of risk since April 2019 review.

Key Controls:

Excellent **-** control has been fully implemented.

Adequate **-** control is not fully implemented but there is a plan of action.

Inadequate **-** control has not been identified.

Risk Reference Tables

The Risk Reference Tables are used to create the **Risk Register** which in turn enables the WRL to document, manage, monitor, review and update strategic, corporate and project risk information in alignment with the strategic plan.

Risk Analysis Criteria

Risks are analysed based on assessments of the consequences chosen to characterise the risk, the existing mitigation in place, their effectiveness and the likelihood of those consequences arising.

Consequences Assessment

The realistic worst-case impact of the risk event should be assessed when analysing consequences. The choice of how to mitigate the risk (if at all) should be made once impacts are reviewed so that the risk aligns with the industry context.

Risk Consequence Matrix

Level	Rank	OH&S Incidents	Stewardship of resource	Access to resources Reputation and Image	Industry performance
1	**Insignificant**	Minor incident or near miss report but no sign of injury or illness.	The DoF 'Weight of Evidence' model monitoring biomass, egg, and puerulus values and tracked against catch rates has a 10% year to year variance.	Isolated individual issue-based complaint. No media, news coverage or government correspondence.	Up to 10% variance against key performance indicators or objectives.
2	**Minor**	Injury or illness requiring first aid treatment only.	The DoF 'Weight of Evidence' model monitoring biomass, egg, and puerulus values and tracked against catch rates has a 10-20% year to year reduction.	Local community impacts or issue-based concerns. Some local or industry media, and or news coverage or government correspondence.	10-20% variance against key performance indicators or objectives.
3	**Moderate**	Medical treatment required, rehabilitation or lost time injury or illness.	The DoF 'Weight of Evidence' model monitoring biomass, egg, and puerulus values and tracked against catch rates has a 20-30% year to year reduction.	Widespread community impacts and concerns publically expressed. Reduced confidence by community and stakeholders. State media and or news coverage. Ministerial correspondence.	20-30% variance against key performance indicators or objectives.
4	**Major**	Substantial injury, temporary disability or life-threatening injury or illness.	The DoF 'Weight of Evidence' model monitoring biomass, egg, and puerulus values and tracked against catch rates has a 30-50% year to year reduction.	Widespread, considerable and prolonged community impact and dissatisfaction publicly and repeatedly expressed. Criticism and loss of confidence and trust by community and stakeholders in the industry, processes and capabilities. Industry and /or organisation's integrity in question. Significant national and state media attention.	30-50% variance against key performance indicators or objectives.
5	**Catastrophic**	Loss of life. Permanent disability. Potential criminal liability charge.	The DoF 'Weight of Evidence' model monitoring biomass, egg, and puerulus values and tracked against catch rates greater than 50% year to year reduction.	Widespread, persistent and ongoing adverse community condemnation with substantial irrecoverable industry 'brand' damage. Wholesale loss of confidence/trust in the Industry's capabilities and intentions. Ministerial intervention at Board level. Widespread national/international media coverage.	Greater than 50% variance against key performance indicators or objectives.

Likelihood Assessment and Matrix

The descriptors of likelihood are designed to answer the question of how likely the described risk event is to cause the consequences at the level. The likelihood and consequence ratings for Strategic and Operational Risks must be considered *with* Key Controls in place (Residual Risk - *the threat that remains after all efforts to identify and eliminate **risk** have been made. There are four basic ways of dealing with **risk**: reduce it, avoid it, accept it or transfer it.)*

Level	Descriptor	Comment
1	Rare	Less than once in 5 years, or at all.
2	Unlikely	Controls and consideration provide confidence.
3	Moderate	Lack of diligence and external input.
4	Likely	Compliance and monitoring will break at some stage.
5	Almost certain	History and events suggest this will happen, when is the question.

Risk Measurement Criteria and Matrix

This process combines consequence, likelihood and the performance measurement for applied risk controls to provide a *risk assessment rating* which can be used as a foundation for prioritisation based on WRL risk tolerance. The Table reflects the Risk Measurement Criteria adopted by WRL.

Level of Risk	Criteria for Management of Risk		Responsibility/Risk Ownership	Review period
1 - 3	Low	Individual responsibility	Industry and individual participants	12 months
4 - 7	Minor	Acceptable with adequate controls	Executive oversight	12 months
8 - 9	Moderate	Only acceptable with adequate controls	Executive and Board oversight	6-12 months
10 - 15	High	Not acceptable without consultation	Executive and Board oversight	3-6 months
16+	Extreme	Not acceptable – intervention necessary	Board intervention and oversight	3-6 months

Control Status and Effectiveness and Matrix

A control is implemented, planned or identified as a *potential further action* as a result of the risk review process. All controls utilised should be relevant, documented, effective and current.

	Status	Description
E	**Excellent** (Implemented)	Control has been fully implemented and there is documentation evidencing the use of the control.
A	**Adequate** (Planned)	The control is not fully implemented but there is a documented plan of action which specifies tasks, responsibilities and completion date.
I	**Inadequate** (Action Required)	Control has not been identified or documented and should be considered to improve on/impact the assessed risk.