

NORTH EASTERN INSHORE FISHERIES AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Report to: Executive Committee
14 March 2019

Risk Management Strategy & Strategic & Operational Risk Register – Six Monthly Reviews

Report of the Clerk.

A. **Purpose of Report**

To present a revised Risk Management Strategy for adoption and inform members of the Executive Committee that in accordance with the Strategy, a six monthly review of the Strategic and Operational Risk Registers has also been undertaken and is reported for approval.

B. **Recommendation**

That the revised Risk Management Strategy be adopted and the revised Strategic and Operational Risk Register be approved and reviewed in six months' time.

1. **Background**

- 1.1 The Risk Management Strategy and associated Strategic and Operational Risk Registers were first approved by the shadow Authority at its quarterly meeting held on 25 January 2011 (Minute 17 refers).
- 1.2 The Authority agreed that the Risk Management Strategy be reviewed on an annual basis and that the Strategic and Operational Risk Registers be reviewed every six months and reported to the Authority (Minute 17 refers). In accordance with these recommendations the Operational Risk Registers were reviewed and updated on 6 September 2018 (Minuted item 62 refers).

2. **Strategic & Operational Risk Register Reviews**

- 2.1 The Strategic and Operational Risk Registers have been reviewed to consider any potential changes which have occurred over the last six months and affected the key risks identified within the Registers. The risks have been reviewed and the changes are highlighted in bold within the attached registers. An updated position for each of the key indicators is also included in the Register. The next review of the Strategic Risk Register is scheduled for September 2019. The identified risks have also been ranked in order of significance (highest residual risk score).
- 2.2 In the main, identified strategic and operational risk have largely remained unchanged since September 2018, although there have been some changes in operational risk relating to staff vacancies, funding for a replacement patrol vessel and implications surrounding the 2019 Organisational Review.
- 2.3 The revised Risk Management Strategy is attached as Appendix 1, the revised Strategic Risk Register is attached as Appendix 2, the Operational Risk Register as Appendix 3 and the risk based enforcement matrix, a sub register of the Operational Risk Register, as Appendix 4 for members information.

Contact Officer

Caroline Lacey, Clerk of the Authority
Ext 3000

Background Papers

Revised Risk Management Strategy
Strategic Risk Register
Operational Risk Register

Risk Management Strategy

1. Introduction

- 1.1 North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (NEIFCA) recognises its responsibility to manage risk in order to successfully achieve the Authority's objectives, maximise opportunity and minimise threats. This is also reflected in national guidance advice to Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities.
- 1.2 Risk cannot always be eliminated and this strategy provides a structured approach to enable the Authority to identify, manage and monitor the most significant risks it faces. From an operational perspective it also provides a framework for applying a more 'risk based' approach to its activities.
- 1.3 The aim of this strategy is to manage risk and to successfully integrate risk management into existing business and management processes. Risk management is a key part of the Authority's corporate governance arrangements and also provides assurance to meet the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003.

2. Objectives

- 2.1 The objectives of the risk management strategy are to –
- Embed risk management in the culture of NEIFCA including the Authority's decision making, strategic planning, policy, project and service delivery arrangements.
 - Manage risk in accordance with best practice, ensuring key strategic and operational risks are identified, monitored and controlled.
 - Raise awareness of the need for risk management both within the Authority and with key partners and suppliers of goods and services.
 - Enable the Authority to anticipate and respond to change.
 - Prevent injury, damage and loss, thus reducing the cost of risk.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

- 3.1 All Members and employees should have regard to risk when carrying out their duties. Risk management is part of all decisions at both manager and Member level and all Authority processes. The key roles within the risk management process are -

NEIFCA	To oversee the effective management of risk by Authority officers
Clerk	To champion risk management and ensure it is embedded throughout the Authority. To develop the Authority's risk management policy and strategy To report to Members on risk management
Senior Management Team	To ensure the Authority manages risk effectively through the development and implementation of the strategy. To identify, manage and monitor the strategic risks faced by the Authority.

IFC Officers	To manage risk effectively in their particular areas of service delivery.
Clerk and Treasurer	To support the Authority and its services in the effective development, implementation and review of the risk management strategy

3.2 Responsibilities and reporting requirements are set out in more detail in Annex A.

4. Risk Definitions

4.1 Risk is the chance of something happening that will have an impact on objectives.

4.2 Risks can be divided into two main categories –

Strategic risks – that need to be taken account of in judgements about the Authority's medium to long term goals.

Operational risks – day to day risks in the delivery of a service.

4.3 Examples of strategic and operational risks are listed at Annex B. The two are interlinked with the potential for operational risks to become a strategic risk for the Authority.

5. Risk Management Process

5.1 There are four key stages to the risk management process, which will be recorded and monitored through the use of risk registers –

- **Identification**

The Authority will identify both strategic and operational risks that can affect achievement of its strategic and service objectives.

- **Assessment**

Risks will be assessed for impact and likelihood using a scoring matrix. Both the gross risk (before controls) and the net risk (following the implementation of controls) will be assessed.

- **Control**

Mitigating controls will be identified for all medium and high scoring risks and action plans developed where controls need to be improved. Consideration must be given to the anticipated benefits in relation to the estimated costs in deciding whether it is cost effective to introduce the proposed controls/initiatives. Risks and controls will be allocated to a risk owner for monitoring and review.

- **Monitoring and Review**

Strategic and operational risk will be reviewed and reported at least every 6 months by the risk owners.

5.2 Strategic Risk Process

Identification and assessment of strategic risks will form part of the corporate business planning process. A full review of the strategic risk register will be undertaken every six months by the Clerk, Chief & Deputy Chief Officers and the Authority to ensure all risks associated with the delivery of strategic objectives have been identified and assessed.

Risks will be allocated a risk owner and will be reviewed every six months together with any outstanding actions required. This review will be reported to the Authority.

The Clerk and Chief Officer will be responsible for identifying any new risks and providing the link with any changes in operational risk that need to be reflected in the strategic risk register.

5.3 Operational Risk Process

The identification, assessment and control of operational risks will form part of the service planning process.

The Chief & Deputy Chief Officers will be responsible for reviewing registers and controls on a six monthly basis through management teams and updating registers accordingly.

The Authority will gain an understanding of key operational risks through the performance monitoring process and will monitor that the operational risk register is updated.

5.4 Risk Analysis & Risk Evaluation Process

5.4.1 Risk are measured in two ways:

- The likelihood of the risk event occurring
- The impact on the Authority should the risk event occur

The likelihood of the risk event occurring will be given a score from 1 to 5 using the following criteria:

Likelihood	Score	Description	Criteria
Almost certain	5	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances	Probability of occurring in the next year >90%
Likely	4	The event will probably occur in most circumstances	Probability of occurring in the next year 60 to 90%
Possible	3	The event will occur at some time	Probability of occurring in the next year 30 to 60%
Unlikely	2	The event is not expected to occur	Probability of occurring in the next year 10 to 30%
Remote	1	The event may only occur in exceptional circumstances	Probability of occurring in the next year <10%

5.4.2 The potential impact of an event on the Authority will also be given a score of 1 to 4 as follows:

- 1 Insignificant – Minimal disruption, no long-term consequences to service delivery or marine conservation and management. No stakeholder concern. Minor negative publicity
- 2 Minor – Short-term consequences to both service delivery and or marine conservation and management. Potential for stakeholder concern. Some adverse publicity in local media.
- 3 Moderate – Medium long term consequences to both service delivery and or marine conservation and management, impact absorbed with significant intervention. Extensive stakeholder concern. Extended adverse publicity in both local and national media.
- 4 Major – Significant long-term consequences, formal intervention from central government departments or Executive Agencies, significant stakeholder concern and pro-longed loss of confidence. Sustained adverse publicity both locally and nationally.

The gross risk score = likelihood x potential impact

The residual risk score includes the application of appropriate control actions

The application of appropriate control actions may not necessarily reduce the gross risk score

The table below provides a visual ‘heat chart’ of the relationship between the levels of potential impact and likelihood of certain risk occurring and provides a general guide to the overall risk assessment process.

LIKELIHOOD		IMPACT			
		Insignificant 1	Minor 2	Moderate 3	Major 4
	Almost Certain 5	Green 5	Green 10	Amber 15	Red 20
Likely 4	Green 4	Green 8	Amber 12	Red 16	
Possible 3	Green 3	Green 6	Amber 9	Red 12	
Unlikely 2	Green 2	Green 4	Green 6	Amber 8	
Remote 1	Green 1	Green 2	Green 3	Amber 4	

5.5 Project and Procurement Risk Process

Projects will be managed using appropriate methodology. Project managers will identify and assess the risks associated with the project and mitigating controls and document these in a risk register. The register will be maintained and updated throughout the life of the project and be reported to the Chief Officer on a regular basis.

The risks associated with a particular procurement will be considered and documented.

6. Corporate Business Processes

6.1 Risk management will continue to be embedded in all the Authority's key business processes including –

- Long term financial planning and annual budget setting processes.
- Authority Performance planning processes.
- Policy and decision making processes.
- Strategic planning processes.
- Operational delivery

7. Training and Communication

7.1 Risk management training will be provided to officers identified in Annex A.

7.2 The Clerk and Treasurer will provide support and advice on risk management throughout the Authority.

8. Measuring Effectiveness

8.1 The effectiveness of this process will be reported through the Statement of Intent Control.

9. Monitoring and Reporting

9.1 Assurance on the effectiveness of controls over key strategic and operational risks will also be provided by the Audit Section.

9.2 The strategy and action plan will be reviewed annually.

10. Links to other policies and strategies

10.1 Insurable retained risk will be managed by the Treasurer in accordance with the risk financing strategy.

NORTH EASTERN INSHORE AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY - STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Risk No	Performance Plan Strategic Objective	Category of Risk	Risk	Gross Risk Score	Control Action	Residual Risk Score	Further Action Required	Update	Risk Owner
NEIFCA 1	An Authority which attracts and keeps the best staff.	Customer/ Staff	Specialist staff and skills shortages. Sickness absence. Triggers include:- (i) Inability to recruit and retain staff. (ii) Inadequate succession planning. (iii) The Authority has a small but dedicated workforce. (iv) Private sector competition	9 (3x3)	Recruitment, retention policies, training and development, surveys of existing staff, analysis at exits interviews and managing sickness absence.	6 (2x3)	Recruitment processes expedited to fill vacancies when they arise.	NEIFCA currently carrying three operational vacancies. Organisational review commenced January 2019 to review and benchmark job roles, duties, responsibilities and remuneration levels.	Chief Officer & Deputy Chief Officer
NEIFCA 2	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship.	Disaster Planning	Major incident, i.e. patrol vessel collides with another vessel or runs aground.	4 (1x4)	The appropriate qualifications/licences/tickets are held by the crew. Train staff with skills in marine environment. Adequate Insurance.	4 (1x4)	Continue to keep up to date with training and appropriate qualifications		Chief Officer & Deputy Chief Officer
NEIFCA 3	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship.	Financial Reputation	Failure to manage the Authority's assets, caused by:- <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Lack of funding● Service failures/poor maintenance● Poor risk assessments and controls● Inaction on behalf of the Chief Officer and his assistants.● Age and deterioration of vessels & vehicles	6 (2x3)	Asset Management Plans - including audit and survey result to target investment and maintenance at high priority areas. Patrol Vessel renewal fund. Maintenance programme. Risk assessments. Inspections and surveys. Insurance.	4 (2x2)	Review and define inspection survey programme. Ensure compliance with the programme. Review health and safety arrangements. Review adequacy of sums insured and compliance with insurance policy conditions. Operating a close monitoring regime on investment priority criteria. Strengthen asset management and control.	Allocation of funds to the Renewals Fund made as part of the annual budget setting increased to £100K pa Sixth monthly review of asset registers. Vessel and vehicle replacement plans in place.	Chief Officer Deputy Chief Officer

Risk No	Performance Plan Strategic Objective	Category of Risk	Risk	Gross Risk Score	Control Action	Residual Risk Score	Further Action Required	Update	Risk Owner
NEIFCA 4	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship. Statutory responsibilities.	Reputation Legal	Failure to meet statutory responsibilities set out by legislation. Main causes of risk are:- (i) Poor leadership/ judgement by managers. (ii) Inadequate monitoring review. (iii) Lack of professional staff. (iv) Legal challenge. (v) Lack of trained, experienced staff.	6 (2x3)	Series of performance targets set and measured to meet the requirements. Reported on quarterly basis to the Authority. Understanding and adherence to all governing legislation	4 (2x2)	Reviewed on a quarterly basis by reporting to the Authority.	NEIFCA currently carrying three operational vacancies.	Chief Officer
NEIFCA 5	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship.	Financial/ Economic	Cuts to service, balance budget. Triggers include:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in Government funding Budget over spends, insufficient reserves. Precept set too low. Lack of compliance with financial regulations Increased pressure on resources from other agencies 	6 (2x3)	Three year financial plan in place based on prudent projections and sensitivity analysis. Budget process flexible enough to deal with changes in funding e.g. savings plans. Lobbying with other Authority's to get better deals. Government assumptions used in the planning exercise. Formal considerations of reserves. Monthly revenue and capital budget monitoring. Demonstrating the ability to manage in-year budget pressures. Early closure of accounts. Attraction of EU and other grants for project works.	3 (1x3)	Ensure sound business cases are made to Authority funders for continued financial support. Continue to apply for EU and other grants for project work.	Board agreed that the levy for 2019-20 be increased by 2% to meet identified pressures alongside the continuation of the IFCA 'New Burdens' funding support until March 2020. The national Association of IFCAs is developing a strong case for increased national funding as part of CSR 19	Clerk/ Treasurer/ Chief IFC Officer

Risk No	Performance Plan Strategic Objective	Category of Risk	Risk	Gross Risk Score	Control Action	Residual Risk Score	Further Action Required	Update	Risk Owner
NEIFCA 6	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship	Reputation	Loss or damage to reputation through poor press and public relations	6 (2x3)	Good internal communications, PR, reports to Authority, Press releases approved by the Chief Officer and Clerk/Chairman where necessary. Members and key managers to have received media training. Members receive detailed briefings on sensitive issues and confidentiality requirements supported by Standards Committee and procedures. Back up arrangements through the national Association and partner IFCA's.	3 (1x3)	Reviewed on a quarterly basis		Chief Officer
NEIFCA 7	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship. Strategic objectives	Reputation	Failure to achieve policies, aims and objectives.	6 (2x3)	Annual Plan produced each year outlining strategic objectives. Performance measured against number of targets. Reviewed in March. Exceptions reported to Authority. Constitution, Standing Orders Schemes of Delegation. The Authority has put in place structures and processes to govern decision making.	3 (1x3)	Reviewed on a quarterly basis by the Authority.		Chief Officer
NEIFCA 8	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship.	Reputation/ Legal	Officers acting beyond their statutory remit through inexperience. Legal challenge. Potential incident. Adverse publicity.	6 (2x3)	Full training in role. Qualifications. Performance monitoring, target setting, recruitment procedures.	3 (1x3)	As roles develop, change, continuous training and development. EDP process to be utilised for this.	Training strengthened through induction, national IFCA residential course.	Chief Officer

Risk No	Performance Plan Strategic Objective	Category of Risk	Risk	Gross Risk Score	Control Action	Residual Risk Score	Further Action Required	Update	Risk Owner
NEIFCA 9	A reputation for smart and prudent stewardship	Reputation/legal	<p>Failure to deliver revised fisheries management policies within Marine Protected Area Sites which fall within the Authority's jurisdiction.</p> <p>Procedural delays in the formal making of regulations.</p>	6 (2x3)	Full engagement with Defra, MMO, national working groups and local management groups.	3 (1x3)	Regular updates and progress reports to Science Advisory Group, Executive and full Committee.	Five outstanding byelaw regulations have now been moved to final confirmation stage with a revised national byelaw making process under consideration.	Chief, Deputy Chief Officers. Senior Environmental & Scientific Officer Environmental & Scientific Officers.

APPENDIX 3

NORTH EASTERN INSHORE FISHERIES AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY - OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

Risk Number	Process	Risk Identification	Risk Analysis	Risk Control	Residual Risk	Monitoring		
	Risk Category	Risk	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	Control Action	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	By Whom	Review Frequency	Triggers for Action
1	Financial reputation, technical.	<p>Insufficient funding to replace main fisheries vessel, North Eastern Guardian III.</p> <p>Access to European Funding has now been ruled out with no current prospect of securing any additional external funding support.</p>	9 (3x3)	<p>Maintenance of current funding levels to the vessel renewal account including allocating an additional £20K pa. Continued investment in current vessel as a saleable asset. Monitoring and utilisation of all appropriate external funding avenues. One off appropriation of funds to the Renewals Fund considered. Officers continue to explore all external funding options to support vessel replacement.</p>	9 (3x3)	Chairman, Clerk, Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer	Quarterly	Budget financial review & reporting to Committees and internal working groups.
2	Staffing	<p>Lack of staffing resources to deliver service and that staff have adequate skills training to achieve performance requirements.</p> <p>Increasing pressures from partner agencies to support their front-line services and primary service delivery could have a negative impact on the delivery of IFCA statutory duties and responsibilities.</p>	9 (3x3)	<p>Communication networks. Staff flexibility. Monitoring of workloads. Workforce Development. Vacancy Management. Adhere to Sickness Policy. Implement Training Plans. Health and Safety. Recruitment processes expedited to fill vacancies. Active participation in the MMO/IFCA joint working project and maintenance of active dialogue with all key partner agencies. AIFCA, NIMEG & TAG.</p> <p>Organisational review commenced January 2019</p>	6 (2x3)	Clerk and Chief IFC Officer.	Quarterly.	<p>Reports to Authority. Team meetings/ EDRs. Sickness Review Meetings. Vacancy/sickness. Performance monitoring results. Proactive training programmes.</p>

Risk Number	Process	Risk Identification	Risk Analysis	Risk Control	Residual Risk	Monitoring		
						By Whom	Review Frequency	Triggers for Action
	Risk Category	Risk	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	Control Action	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High			
3	Financial and contractual.	Unexpected budget demands and variances and failure to achieve agreed budget Income generation is expected to remain low during 2019/2020. Outcome of 2019 organisational review	6 (3x2)	Increase of 2% in 2019/2020 levy. Monitoring systems. Systems to capture spend. Regular budget holder meetings. Internal Audit. Regular reviews of the appropriate level of reserves. Scrutiny and oversight of the 2019 organisational review by Executive Committee.	6 (3x2)	Treasurer, Clerk and Chief Officer.	Monthly.	Budget financial reporting.
4	Financial and reputational	Breaches of new General Data Protection Regulations which came into force at the end of May 2018 could lead to fines and reputational impacts.	9 (3x3)	Key staffed trained and familiar with new GDP regulations. Data Protection Officer role agreed, creation of a register of data processing activities, utilisation of impact assessments when required, creation of public and internal privacy statements and active management of all data processing activities. Advice from ICO.	4 (2x2)	DPO Clerk Chief Officer Support Officer	Monthly	Formal complaint or report to ICO
5	Financial reputation, technical.	Volatility of global oil/fuel markets and national tax changes. Markets remain unstable	4 (2x2)	Regular monitoring of fuel spends included within quarterly reports to Authority. Additional provision made within annual precept.	4 (2x2)	Chairman, Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Chief Officer and Deputy Chief	Monthly.	Budget financial review & reporting
6	Legal/ reputation.	Legal challenge resulting from failure to undertake statutory responsibilities in terms of enforcement, poorly drafted Authority bye-laws or national legislation including national prohibition on landing egg bearing lobsters.	6 (3x2)	Performance monitoring in terms of enforcement targets. Drafting of bye-laws in consultation with Legal Services. Proper consultation processes followed in accordance with statutory requirements. Involvement of NEIFCA Legal team, MMO, DEFRA in final approval of bye-laws. Strengthening enforcement practices and techniques.	4 (2x2)	Clerk, Legal Advisor and Chief Officer.	Monthly and quarterly reports to Authority.	Performance monitoring reports. Legal challenges.

Risk Number	Process	Risk Identification	Risk Analysis	Risk Control	Residual Risk	Monitoring		
	Risk Category	Risk	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	Control Action	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	By Whom	Review Frequency	Triggers for Action
7	Financial reputation.	Failure to deliver projects through lack of resources or investment. Loss of funding and grants resulting in inability to proceed with projects. Change in legislation resulting in inability to generate funds. Reputation for inability to utilise grants awarded. Continued risk level due to ongoing national MPA management programme. Future funding implications of the UK exit from the EU.	3 (1x3)	Budget setting and monitoring process. Procurement policy followed. Appropriate resources available to undertake the project. Skills and knowledge of staff. With regard to supporting national projects ensure maintenance of dialogue and a proactive approach. Business Cases considered with full whole life costs of projects made	3 (1x3)	Clerk and Chief Officer.	Monthly	Performance monitoring reports. Budget reports. Legislative changes. Government funding initiatives. Authority decisions. Contract variation slippage.
8	Customer Service/ reputation	Failure to provide agreed service. Failure to establish and achieve performance targets therefore having a detrimental impact on the delivery of service to the customer and achievement of performance objectives.	3 (1x3)	Performance Indicators. Inspections audit. Workload monitoring. Policy and procedure compliance. Staff training. Communication with customers.	3 (1x3)	Clerk and Chief IFC Officer.	Quarterly	Annual reports. Performance monitoring reports. Feedback from staff and customers.
9	Professional, contractual, legal reputation.	Failure to effectively support projects, poor contract documentation, failure to meet contract deadlines, failure to meet legal requirements and procurement legislation Provider fails to deliver the contract.	3 (1x3)	Use of internal/external experts/consultants. Robust specifications. Risk Assessments. Strong contract management. Financial, technical and legal vetting of all providers. Procurement policy followed. Monitoring and reporting processes. Meet statutory requirements. With regard to supporting national projects ensure maintenance of dialogue and a proactive approach.	3 (1x3)	Chairman, Clerk and Chief IFC Officer.	Monthly.	Procurement processes. Legislative changes. Contract variations. Timetable slippage.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER – RISK BASED ENFORCEMENT MATRIX

Risk Number	Process	Risk Identification	Risk Analysis	Risk Control	Residual Risk	Monitoring		
	Risk Category	Risk	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	Control Action	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	By Whom	Review Frequency	Triggers for Action
1	Environmental	Impacts on fish and shellfish stocks through non-compliance with regulations. Prohibition on landing egg bearing lobsters.	8 (2x4)	Targeted approach to enforcement at ports and areas of known high non-compliance at peak season. Focus on ports of high volume landings out of season. New intelligence gathering system established to better inform targeted enforcement activity. Strengthening enforcement procedures and techniques.	6 (2x3)	Chief, Deputy Chief and IFC Officers	Monthly	Intelligence reports. Surveillance. Routine observations and complaints
2	Environmental	Impacts on fish and shellfish stocks through over-exploitation Pressures on stocks, particularly crustacea remain high although work is continuing on revised management measures. Over-exploitation of the Farne Deep's nephrop fishery by large pair and multi-rig trawlers leading to associated economic impacts on smaller scale local fleet	8 (2x4)	Detailed monitoring of stock health. Development of dedicated management plans and strategies. Tailored management provisions. Sound enforcement. Fisheries accreditation schemes. National coordination Working closely with MMO, CEFAS, DEFRA and NIFCA colleagues to support more effective national management of nephrop stocks Consultation processes continuing during 2019 in the development of a potting effort management regime.	6 (2x3)	Chief & Deputy Chief Officers and Environmental & Scientific Officers	Quarterly & monthly	Non achievement of stock indicators. Declining catches and fleets. Complaints and comments.

Risk Number	Process	Risk Identification	Risk Analysis	Risk Control	Residual Risk	Monitoring		
	Risk Category	Risk	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	Control Action	1-8 = Low 8-10 = Medium 10-20 = High	By Whom	Review Frequency	Triggers for Action
3	Environmental	Habitat damage caused by invasive fishing methods. Damage to protected features of European Marine Sites or Marine Conservation Zones Significant increases in nomadic scallop dredging activity surrounding the NEIFCA area	8 (2x4)	Ongoing monitoring of activities. Active participation in associated schemes of management. Introduction of emergency and long-term Byelaw regulations and codes of conduct governing activities. Enforcement of existing regulations. Timely use of emergency byelaw making procedures when necessary. Working closely with the MMO and Defra to ensure adequate protection remains in place. New byelaw regulation confirmed on 17 December 2015 to strengthen the management of scallop dredging within the Authority's district. 5 new regulations submitted for formal confirmation February 2019.	4 (1x4)	Chief Officer, Deputy Chief Officer Environmental & Scientific Officers	Quarterly to Authority and associated working groups	Significant increases in related activity. Evidence of damage and impact. Complaints
4	Environmental	Impacts on other marine species such as sea birds, cetaceans and other organisms associated with fishing activities	4 (1x4)	Monitoring through fishing permit and catch and effort schemes. One off studies and assessments. Timely use of emergency byelaw making procedures when required.	4 (1x4)	Chief Officer, Deputy Chief Officer Environmental & Scientific Officers	Quarterly to Authority and associated working groups	Negative feedback from catch reporting schemes and or studies. Complaints