**DET’s Project Management Condensed Risk Register (Minor projects) #**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk No.**  | **Risk Description** | **Existing Controls** | **Consequence** | **Likelihood** | **Risk Rating** | **Treatments to be Implemented** | **Risk Owner / Review Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 **#** Depending on your project’s size and complexity the Risk Unit provides two risk registers. For ‘minor projects’ a condensed risk register can be utilised. For ‘major projects’ the ‘standard risk register’ should be used as this will enable risks to significant projects to be reported through the Divisional operational risk register. Advice regarding which is the most appropriate register for you to use can be sought from the Risk Unit.

**DET Risk Management Framework - Assessment Tools**

**Consequence Criteria:** This guide provides indicative terms against which the significance of risk is evaluated.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptor** | **Educational Outcomes** | **Wellbeing and Safety** | **Operational** | **Finance** | **Reputation** | **Strategic** | **Program / Project Management** |
|
| **Insignificant** | * Educational outcomes can be met with workarounds
 | * Minor injury requiring no first aid or peer support for stress / trauma event
 | * Objectives can be met with workarounds
 | * Small loss that can be absorbed
 | * Internal impact (no external impact)
 | * Impact can be managed through normal process
 | * No impact on the quality of program / project deliverables, schedule, scope or stakeholder relationships
 |
| **Minor** | * Learning outcomes / pathways achieved but below target
 | * Injury / ill health requiring first aid
* Peer support for stress / trauma event
 | * Objectives met with some resource impact
* Compliance incident(s) which are not systematic
 | * Loss of ‘consumable’ assets,
* < 2% deviation from budget
* Minor fraud possible
 | * Adverse comments local community media
* Short term stakeholder dissatisfaction / comment
 | * Minimal impact on critical DET objectives
 | * Minimal impact on the quality of program / project deliverables, schedule, scope or stakeholder relationships
 |
| **Moderate** | * Student’s overall levels of Literacy and Numeracy static
* Partial achievement of targeted learning outcomes
* Increasing truancy
 | * Injury / ill health requiring medical attention
* Stress / trauma event requiring professional support
 | * Objectives cannot be met without significant internal reprioritisation
* Regulatory breaches resulting in adverse inspections / reports
 | * Loss of assets
* 2% - 5% deviation from budget
* External audit management letter
 | * External scrutiny e.g. VAGO
* Adverse state media comment
* Stakeholder relationship impacted
 | * Significant adjustment to resource allocation and service delivery required to manage impact on corporate priority
 | * Noticeable impact on the quality of program / project deliverables, schedule, scope or stakeholder relationships
 |
| **Major** | * National targeted improvements not achieved
* Student dissatisfaction with access to pathways / transitions
 | * Injury / ill health requiring hospital admission
* Stress / trauma event requiring ongoing clinical support
 | * Objectives can only be met with additional resources
* Significant staff shortage impacting service delivery
* Serious failure to comply with regulations
 | * Loss of significant assets
* 6% - 15% deviation from budget
* External audit qualification on accounts
* High end fraud committed
 | * External investigation
* Adverse comments national media
* Stakeholder relationship tenuous
 | * Unable to deliver core program / Government priority
 | * Significant impact on the quality of program / project deliverables, schedule, scope or stakeholder relationships
 |
| **Severe** | * Literacy and Numeracy decline
* Reduction in access to quality pathways and transitions
 | * Fatality or permanent disability
* Stress / trauma event requiring extensive clinical support for multiple individuals
 | * Multiple objectives cannot be met
* Sustained non-compliance to legislation
* Adverse Court Ruling
 | * Loss of key assets
* >15 % deviation from budget
* Systemic and high value fraud
 | * Commission of inquiry
* National front page headlines
* Stakeholder relationship irretrievably damaged
 | * Unable to deliver several core programs / Government priorities
 | * Severe / critical impact on the quality of program / project deliverables, schedule, scope or stakeholder relationships
 |

**Likelihood Criteria:** This guide provides the indicative terms against which the probability of a risk event occurrence is

evaluated.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptor** | **Description** | **Indicative %** | **Indicative Frequency** |
| **Almost Certain** | Expected to occur | >95% | Multiple times during the Program or it would be very surprising if it did not occur |
| **Likely** | Probably will occur (no surprise) | 66-95% | Likely to occur at least once in the life of the Program or it would not be surprising if it happens |
| **Possible** | May occur at some stage | 26-65% | Might occur at some time during the Program |
| **Unlikely** | Would be surprising if it occurred | 5-25% | Could occur at some time during the Program but it would be unexpected  |
| **Rare** | May never occur | <5% | It would be extremely surprising if it occurred during the Program |

**DET’s Control Effectiveness: Indicates the self-assessment of control effectiveness.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Controls Effectiveness Rating and Criteria** |
| **Ineffective** | * The design of controls overall, is ineffective in addressing key causes and/or consequences.
* Documentation and/or communication of the controls does not exist (e.g. policies, procedures, etc.).
* The controls are not in operation or have not yet been implemented.
 |
| **Needs Improvement** | * The design of controls only partially addresses key causes and/or consequences.
* Documentation and/or communication of the controls (e.g. policies, procedures, etc.) are incomplete, unclear or inconsistent.
* The controls are not operating consistently and/or effectively and have not been implemented in full.
 |
| **Acceptable** | * The design of controls is largely adequate and effective in addressing key causes and/or consequences.
* The controls (e.g. policies, procedures, etc.) have been formally documented but not proactively communicated to relevant stakeholders.
* The controls are largely operating in a satisfactory manner and are providing some level of assurance.
 |
| **Effective** | * The design of controls is adequate and effective in addressing the key causes and/or consequences.
* The controls (e.g. policies, procedures, etc.) have been formally documented and proactively communicated to relevant stakeholders.
* The controls overall, are operating effectively so as to manage the risk.
 |

**DET’s Risk Rating Matrix: Used to combine consequence with likelihood to determine the overall level of risk.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk Rating Matrix**   | **Consequence** |
| Insignificant | Minor | Moderate | Major | Severe |
| **Likelihood** | Almost Certain | Medium | High | Extreme | Extreme | Extreme |
| Likely | Medium | Medium | High | Extreme | Extreme |
| Possible | Low | Medium | Medium | High | Extreme |
| Unlikely | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | High |
| Rare | Low | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |

**DET’s Acceptability Chart: Used to decide whether the risk is acceptable, based on the rating calculated.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extreme = Unacceptable(must have Executive oversight)** | Immediately consider whether the activity associated with this risk should cease. Any decision to continue exposure to this level of risk should be made at Executive Officer level, be subject to the development of detailed treatments, on-going oversight and high level review. |
| **High = Tolerable (with ongoing management review)** | Risk should be reduced by developing treatments. It should be subject to on-going review to ensure controls remain effective, and the benefits balance against the risk. Escalation of this risk to senior levels should occur. |
| **Medium = Tolerable(with frequent risk owner review)** | Exposure to the risk may continue, provided it has been appropriately assessed and has been managed to as low as reasonably practicable. It should be subject to frequent review to ensure the risk analysis remains valid and the controls effective. Treatments to reduce the risk can be considered. |
| **Low = Acceptable (with periodic review)** | Exposure to this risk is acceptable, but is subject to periodic review to ensure it does not increase and current control effectiveness does not vary. |

**DET’s Issue Rating Matrix: Used to combine consequence with urgency to determine the overall level of the issue.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue Rating Matrix**   | **Consequence** |
| Insignificant | Minor | Moderate | Major | Severe |
| **Urgency** | Critical – resolution is required immediately  | Medium | High | Extreme | Extreme | Extreme |
| Urgent – resolution is required urgently in order to continue operations | Medium | Medium | High | Extreme | Extreme |
| Mildly Urgent – resolution is required as soon as possible | Low | Medium | Medium | High | Extreme |
| Least Urgent – issue tracked and a resolution identified when time permits | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | High |
| Not Urgent – issue should be tracked but a resolution may not be required | Low | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |