

Risk Identification			Risk Analysis				Risk Treatment			
Source of Risk	Identified Risks/Hazards (opportunities & threats)	Leading to ...	Existing Controls of Identified Risk/Hazard (If any)	Likelihood (1 - 5)	Consequence (1 - 5)	Risk Rating	Treatments / Actions	Residual Likelihood (1 - 5)	Residual Consequence (1 - 5)	Residual Risk Rating
Reputational, communication & quality risks										
Consultation & communication risks	New issues arise from interest from government, agency, community, media and political interest	Delays in program and/or new issues to address	Communication protocols prior to field work approved by WSU	3	3	9	Defer to WSU decision	2	3	6
Program delay	Project unable to be delivered in time to meet client commitments	Program timelines not met. Reputational damage to WSU and Cth Government	Draft program developed. Team members advised of delivery responsibilities	3	4	12	Identify additional resources to draw on if required. Additional contact as required.	2	3	6
Insufficient information available	Inability to meet scope or program	Program timelines not met. Reputational damage to WSU and Cth Government	Draft program developed. Early communication of issues to WSU	5	2	10	Documentation of gaps in reports and address via recommendations	3	2	6
Quality of outcomes/deliverables below expectations	Inadequate outcome	Reputational harm or program delays	Proactive communication and quality systems	2	4	8	WSU work from SMEC office as required.	2	3	6
Identified resources not available	Inadequate outcome. Delays to program	Reputational harm or program delays	Back up resources available in the event of unexpected illness or misadventure.	2	2	4	Monitor availability of back up resources.	2	2	4
WSU provided with poor advice	Inadequate outcome. Delays to program	Reputational harm or program delays	Experienced experts in the team. All outputs are subject to detailed review.	2	4	8	No additional action.	2	4	8
Misunderstanding the intended scope, objectives or expectations	Inadequate outcome. Delays to program	Reputational harm or program delays	Proactive communication. Weekly meetings with WSU	2	3	6	No additional action.	2	3	6
Recommendations not 'fit for purpose' or surprise to WSU	Inadequate outcome. Delays to program	Program delays and additional costs	Proactive communication. WSU to review draft documentation.	1	4	4	No additional action.	1	4	4
Safety risks during fieldwork	Injury, accident, fatigue.	Program delays and additional costs if fieldwork needs to be extended	Risk assessments, journey management procedures, site toolbox assessments, regular auditing.	3	5	15	Job risk assessment, Safe work method statement, Safety briefing for field personnel.	2	5	10
Community engagement during fieldwork	Misinformation about the project.	Distrust and scepticism about project at a government and public level	Site entry protocol. Field staff direct queries to Property Manager or WSU. Minimise disruptions to tenants.	4	2	8	PM toolbox talk with specialists. Exit strategy in site access protocol	3	2	6
Media management/reputation risks	Misinformation about the project.	Distrust and scepticism about project at a government and public level	Field staff direct queries to Property Manager or WSU.	2	2	4	No additional action.	2	2	4
Poor communication of the results of the investigations	Incorrect decisions made based on ill-informed information	Program delays. Reputational damage to WSU or Cth Government	Quality assurance procedures. Weekly progress meetings. Weekly progress reports. Presentation to WSU at completion	1	4	4	No additional action.	1	4	4
Inefficient utilisation of all available sources of existing baseline information	Methodological issues with field survey. Inaccurate reporting.	Quality of final report is compromised.	Experienced team. Consult with WSU to ensure all information available.	2	3	6	No additional action.	2	3	6
Not appropriately undertaking the project in a way that supports future assessment process	Lack of awareness of how report will be used	Quality of final report is compromised.	Experienced team. Consult with WSU to confirm scope of deliverables.	2	3	6	Ongoing review with WSU.	2	3	6
Technical risks - biodiversity, heritage and hydrology										
Species not surveyed at the optimum time of year (ie outside of flowering period)	Species not identified during field work.	Further field work being required.	Flowering time for relevant species identified.	5	2	10	Note limitations in reporting and address via recommendations as appropriate.	4	2	8
Survey methods not adequate to provide required level of detail	misunderstanding about level of survey required	Quality of final report is compromised.	Experienced team. Consult WSU early. Note survey limitations in reporting.	1	3	3	No additional action.	1	3	3
Threatened/migratory species not being identified during survey when they are present on site	Topography, landscape complexity, density of vegetation, mobility of species, surveyor's skills.	Quality of final report is compromised.	Detailed desktop assessment before fieldwork commences. Identify habitat requirements in report.	3	3	9	Note limitations in reporting and address via recommendations as appropriate.	3	2	6
Difficulty in finding suitable EPBC offsets for Cumberland Plain Woodland due to the limited availability of good sites	Not a significant issue for current investigation but potentially for future environmental assessment.	Overall delays in development of site.	Methods for applying, avoiding or minimising offsetting obligations.	4	1	4	Address via recommendation as future investigation	4	1	4
Limitations of the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage surveys design (esp previous Ab heritage surveys)	Inadequate data	Quality of final report is compromised.	Identification of gaps in report	4	2	8	Note limitations in reporting and address via recommendations as appropriate.	4	2	8
Cumulative impacts with regard to Aboriginal heritage over the wider area.	Need for Aboriginal Heritage Information License Agreement (AHILA) due to large number of sites and associated Aboriginal stakeholder consultation requirements.	Significant delay to program.	Limit no. of site cards requested to avoid triggering need for AHILA. Review regional grey literature.	1	5	5	Include recommendation to confirm need for AHILA and expedite application if required.	1	5	5
Hydrology assessment not adequately scoped	Lack of appreciation of previous studies leads to inadequate scoping of sampling and analysis	Quality of final report is compromised. Delays due to rework.	Review existing information including auditor's report. Consult with WSU.	2	3	6	No additional action.	2	3	6
Meteorological conditions at time of walkover for hydrology inspection	Rainfall events or dry periods affects ability to characterise hydrological conditions and water quality re	Misleading water quality results and inaccurate characterisation of hydrology	Address issues related to site conditions in the final report. Further monitoring may be required.	2	2	4	No additional action.	2	2	4
Access to land for broader regional perspective (especially flora/fauna)	No access.	Insufficient final report. Further field work required.	Address and compensate for access problems in final report. Survey nearby land or use ecological sampling unit approach. Observations from public land.	4	1	4	No additional action.	4	1	4
Length of vegetation constrains detection of heritage items/places.	Sites not identified.	Omission of sites from analysis.	Note limitations of field investigations.	5	1	5	No additional action.	5	1	5

