

Annex 4 - 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 fishing activities are appropriate for the MPAs and are not having a significant negative impact on features and site integrity. Undertake an adaptive co-management approach to fishing through Permitting Byelaws. Effective enforcement. Work closely with SNCBs. Ensure that the Annual Research Programme includes survey work that continues to gather evidence to inform management. Use of technology to monitor fishing activity within the district, such as IVMS and gear in – gear out technology. 	2
	Damage to and loss of and designated habitats and species.	Timely management through use of Permit Byelaws and effective monitoring of activities.	<p>Additional measures may restrict access and have a financial impact to the fishing industry.</p> <p>Increased pressure from conservation groups to stop fishing activities.</p> <p>Possible Judicial Review and breach of UK statutory duties & EU Infraction with financial liability for local taxpayers.</p>	IFCA not meeting statutory duties under EU & UK conservation legislation and seen to be ineffective.		

Description	Risk High 4 – 3 – 2 – 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
	4	2	3	3		2
Enforcement investigations lead to complex extended court proceedings.	Requires considerable staff resources to prepare and participate in extended trials in Crown Court.	Most enforcement is undertaken against Byelaw offences which are summary only. There is opportunity for defendants to appeal to Crown Court following conviction in Magistrates' Court.	D&S IFCA has a limited funds to support legal action in its annual budget. Additional costs may have to be drawn from General Reserves to cover increased costs as a result of protracted legal action.	Taking legal action against some fishers may be perceived as financial bullying leading to fishers to plead guilty due to the financial cost of defending cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D&S IFCA follows a case review process whereby the Evidential and Public Interest tests are evaluated against the Code for Crown Prosecutors. D&S IFCA's Compliance and Enforcement Strategy sets out the range of actions the Authority may take to dispose of cases following investigation. D&S IFCA generally enforces against its own byelaws rather than national or European legislation All IFCOs receive regular PACE training through a nationally accredited scheme. Enforcement patrols are intel led, risk- based and targeted. 	D&S IFCA enforces mainly against byelaws that will result in summary cases that can be heard in Magistrates' Courts only. D&S IFCA continues to undertake some complex investigations. Fishers may elect to appeal against conviction to the Crown Court.

Description	Risk High 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 Low				Mitigation	Residual Risk
	Impact	Likelihood	Financial	Reputation		
Enforcement activities conducted in an unprofessional and uncoordinated manner.	4	2	3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 post-patrol debriefing. 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 to agreed joint compliance directions. 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. 	2
	<p>Inconsistent approach to fisheries enforcement.</p> <p>Lack of effective enforcement leads to greater 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>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 carry enforcement efficiently and effectively reflects poorly on the IFCA.</p>		<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 stakeholders Work in partnership with relevant research groups and universities Engage with undergraduate, MSc and PhD students and provide research opportunities to aid IFCA work. Use consultants or contractors with additional expertise when necessary. 	2
	<p>Reliance on low resolution data leads to more restrictive management and greater reliance on the Precautionary Principle.</p> <p>Collapse of stocks.</p> <p>Decline in ecosystem services.</p> <p>Decline in Natural capital.</p> <p>Degradation of the wider environment.</p> <p>Failure to assess impacts of fishing.</p>	<p>Authority is committed to resourcing an Environment team and research programme</p>	<p>Closure of a fishery due to over exploitation of stock.</p> <p>Fisheries not opened due to insufficient evidence available to inform MPA Assessments.</p> <p>Potential breach of UK statutory duty and EU infringement.</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>Change of direction through Whole Site Management approach.</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	2	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular contact with SNCBs. Establish effective dialogue with relevant stakeholders. Identify other ways of engaging with stakeholder through trialling of consultation surgeries. Dissemination of all survey results and management proposals to relevant and affected stakeholders. Respond to all relevant consultations. Improved website design. Effective use of Communication Strategy. Publish quarterly reports on IFCA website. Maintain and use Permit contact list and a database of stakeholders. 	2
	<p>Conflict between different stakeholders.</p> <p>Non-compliance with fisheries and environmental legislation.</p>	<p>Improved ability to identify and consult with relevant stakeholders through Byelaw Permits.</p>	<p>Commercial fishers do not provide accurate financial information to inform management decisions.</p>	<p>Lack of trust in the IFCA's management processes.</p> <p>Misunderstanding of the IFCA's role</p>		<p>Lack of will or motivation of stakeholders to engage with the IFCA.</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"> 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. Review and Maintain Health and Safety Policy. 	3
	Death or injury to staff.	<p>Well trained staff.</p> <p>Provision of high-quality safety equipment.</p> <p>Well maintained IFCA assets.</p>	<p>Injury claims and tribunals.</p> <p>HSE/MCA investigations.</p> <p>Possible criminal & civil proceedings with potential financial liability to local taxpayers.</p>	<p>Poor morale of staff leading to problems with recruitment & retention.</p> <p>Increased surveillance by regulatory authorities of IFCA's procedures and practices.</p>		<p>Regularly working in hazardous environments.</p> <p>Difficult to mitigate for unforeseen circumstance.</p> <p>Difficult to mitigate for the actions of third parties.</p>

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&S IFCA Financial Regulations. • Restricted authority to sign cheques. • Production of detailed accounts. • Maintenance of contingency funds. • Indemnity insurance obtained. • Budget monitoring report presented at IFCA ¼ meetings. • Asset register kept up to date and audited. 	1
	Fraudulent activity leading to misuse and/or misappropriation of funds.	Limited staff access to financial information and authority to spend money. Vessel contingency funds maintained.	Lack of financial resources to carry out statutory obligations.	IFCA funded through local taxpayer money, expectation is to provide best value for money.		Very limited potential for large scale fraud or corruption. Small scale misuse of consumable items is still possible.

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 or MMO licensed activity proposals.</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>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>Reliance on modelled data included in proposals.</p>	<p>Reduced catches and income from the fishery.</p> <p>Displaced fishing activity leading to possible increased conflict between sectors and pressure on other fisheries.</p> <p>Lack of Authority resources to consider and respond effectively to all consultations.</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"> Respond to all relevant Consultations. Liaison with consenting agencies Developer meetings attended by IFCA representatives Maintain information on current historical fishing activities within the District Development scrutinised by Defra, NE & Environment Agency. Consents required for developments. Development of baseline data sets. Gather evidence from potentially impacted stakeholders to inform response. 	<p>High reliance on modelling to determine impacts of developments.</p> <p>Lack of baseline data to inform Marine Plans.</p> <p>Lack of staff resource to consider and respond fully to the volume and scope of licensing applications.</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. Five highly maintained vehicles. Annual Workboat Code survey. Service contracts with main equipment suppliers. 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>Failure of equipment can still occur.</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	2	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of an Information Management System. Restricted access to information held electronically or in hard copy. Maintain a Data Register. 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 	2
	Investigation by ICO leading to possible penalty. Disclosure of Personal Information.	Officers provide considerable information to a range of stakeholders.	Possible breach of UK legislation. Possible EU infringement. Individuals or companies make claims against the Authority for the release of personal and or confidential information.	Lack of trust in the IFCA's management processes. Severe damage to reputation of the Authority. Reduction in stakeholders' confidence in providing information to the Authority.		The risk is reduced, but the emphasis is on staff adhere to policies in all aspects of their work.