



Team / Project Name: **Solid Waste**

Risk Register

Completed By: **Pat Cronin, Phil Ellis, Jackie Bishop, Carly Cooke, Jo Hall**

Date: **6/06/2019**

| Risk Ref # | Risk Statement | Inherent Risk | | | Expected Monetary Value (EMV) <small>Physical Works Projects Only</small> | | | Risk Treatment | Residual Risk score | | | Contingency action(s) | Risk Owner | Monitoring/ Reporting | Monitoring timeframe | Comment |
|------------|--|---------------|-------------|----------|--|-------------|---|----------------|---|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|---------|
| | | Likelihood | Consequence | Factor | Probability (%) | Impact (\$) | EMV | | What can we do about each significant risk to either eliminate it or reduce it? | Likelihood | Consequence | | | | | |
| SW-SR001 | Fit for purpose services are not provided to communities due to sizing of services and infrastructure not meeting growth demand | 4 | 4 | High | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review seeks to identify cost effective and fit for purpose community outcomes with a future focus. The review is due to be finalised early 2020. A requirement exists for access to consistent accurate growth forecasts and work with this team to enable planning needs to be improved. KPMG is currently performing a financial analysis on baseline cost of solid waste service. This piece of work will establish with some accuracy what Councils costs are. | 2 | 4 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Phil Ellis | Monthly | | |
| SW-SR002 | Solid Waste community outcomes are compromised due to a lack of cross organisational coordination (growth and budget models). | 4 | 4 | High | | \$ - | Contract provision and management currently mitigates this risk however a requirement exists for access to consistent accurate growth forecasts and work with this team to enable planning needs to be improved. | 3 | 4 | High | | Jackie Bishop | Jackie Bishop | Monthly | | |
| SW-SR003 | Council is exposed to significant financial impact (such as landfill costs / inappropriate contracts) caused by a lack of agility to meet anticipated legislative change. Note that the timeframes for legislative change and compliance outcomes are unknown. | 3 | 4 | High | | \$ - | New contracts have stipulation that facilitates passing on government imposed levies and charges (existing contracts do not have this stipulation however they will soon expire - 2021). WDC are members of the waste management industries which provide news letters that inform industry of potential changes. | 3 | 4 | High | | Phil Ellis | Phil Ellis | Ad-hoc & On-going | | |
| SW-SR004 | Council solid waste services fail to meet economic, social, environmental sustainability due to a lack of future planning. | 5 | 4 | Extreme | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review seeks to identify cost effective and fit for purpose community outcomes with a future focus. | 2 | 3 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Phil Ellis | Ad-hoc & On-going | | |
| SW-SR005 | Council solid waste services fail to meet economic, social, environmental sustainability due to a lack of waste recovery infrastructure. | 5 | 4 | Extreme | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review seeks to identify cost effective and fit for purpose community outcomes with a future focus. This risk mitigation addresses identifying the requirement however it does not mitigate the potential associated cost. | 2 | 4 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Phil Ellis | Ad-hoc & On-going | | |
| SW-SR006 | Council fails to provide best practice community outcomes due to the districts varied demographic, diversity and geographic situations. | 5 | 3 | High | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review seeks to identify cost effective and fit for purpose community outcomes with a future focus. | 2 | 3 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Phil Ellis | Fortnightly | | |
| SW-SR007 | Council fails to provide best practice community outcomes due to a lack of leadership and prioritization. | 3 | 3 | Moderate | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review engages organisational leaders, Councillors and other stakeholders ensuring high visibility of current situation and input into solid waste services options. | 2 | 3 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Jackie Bishop | Ad-hoc & On-going | | |
| SW-SR008 | Council fails to provide best practice community outcomes due to a lack of investment into innovation. | 5 | 2 | Moderate | | \$ - | The solid waste review is currently underway. The review seeks to identify cost effective and fit for purpose community outcomes with a future focus. The review includes stipulation around partnering and innovation. Outcomes from the review will still require WDC to drive innovative approaches. | 3 | 2 | Moderate | | GM Service Delivery | Jackie Bishop | Ad-hoc & On-going | | |
| SW-SR009 | Council misses opportunity to provide better community and environmental outcomes due to a lack of business process associated with contract design and management. | 5 | 2 | Moderate | | \$ - | A contract administration role has been implemented. The position monitors and tracks contract requirements. Monthly contract meetings are conducted to ensure contractors are effectively delivering contracted services. All existing contracts are due for renewal in 2021. This provides opportunity to deliver new, consistent contract requirements. | 2 | 2 | Low | | Phil Ellis | Monthly | Ad-hoc & On-going | Consideration being given to developing a single page contract reporting template. | |
| SW-SR010 | Council misses opportunity to provide better community and environmental outcomes due to a lack of budget clarity (separation from Waters). | 4 | 2 | Moderate | | \$ - | | 4 | 2 | Moderate | | | | | | |
| SW-SR011 | Council fails to maintain current levels of service due to business restructure eliminating ability to subsidize budget from Waters. | 2 | 2 | Low | | \$ - | | 2 | 2 | Low | | | | | | |
| SW-SR012 | Council cannot meet objectives for community outcomes through the solid waste review (in line with Liveable, Thriving, Connected Communities) due to a lack of community buy in. | 4 | 4 | High | | | As part of the Solid Waste Review public engagement and consultation are proposed to be included in the process (sign-off from council required). | 2 | 2 | Low | | Solid Waste Review Steering Group | Phil Ellis | Fortnightly | | |
| SW-SR013 | Council cannot meet objectives for community outcomes through the solid waste review (in line with Liveable, Thriving, Connected Communities) due to a lack of Councillor buy in. | 4 | 3 | High | | | Elected member workshops are also part of the review to ensure they have full visibility. New Councillor induction. | 3 | 3 | Moderate | | Solid Waste Review Steering Group | Phil Ellis | Fortnightly | | |
| SW-SR014 | Council cannot meet objectives for community outcomes through the solid waste review (in line with Liveable, Thriving, Connected Communities) due to a lack of Executive buy in. | 2 | 3 | Moderate | | | ELT are invited to internal stakeholder workshops. Expectation is that engagement with the Solid Waste Review and other Solid Waste outcomes are represented by the Service Delivery GM to the wider ELT. | 1 | 3 | Low | | GM Service Delivery | GM Service Delivery | Ad-hoc | | |

